

**TECHNICAL/AGENCY DRAFT
RECOVERY PLAN**
for
Astragalus bibullatus (Pyne's Ground-plum)



TECHNICAL/AGENCY DRAFT RECOVERY PLAN
for
Astragalus bibullatus (Pyne's Ground-plum)

Prepared by

David Lincicome
Andrea Shea Bishop
Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation, Bureau of Parks
Resource Management Division
Natural and Cultural Resources
Nashville, Tennessee

and

Geoff Call
Tennessee Ecological Services Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Cookeville, Tennessee

for

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Southeast Region
Atlanta, Georgia

December 2009

Recovery plans delineate reasonable actions that are believed to be required to recover and/or protect listed species. Plans published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) are sometimes prepared with the assistance of recovery teams, contractors, State agencies, and other affected and interested parties. Plans are reviewed by the public and submitted for additional peer review before they are adopted by the Service. The objectives of the plan will be attained and any necessary funds made available subject to budgetary and other constraints affecting the parties involved, as well as the need to address other priorities. Recovery plans do not obligate other parties to undertake specific tasks and may not represent the views nor the official positions or approval of any individuals or agencies involved in developing the plan, other than the Service. Recovery plans represent the official position of the Service **only** after they have been signed by the Regional Director as approved. Approved recovery plans are subject to modification as dictated by new findings, changes in species status, and the completion of recovery tasks.

By approving this recovery plan, the Regional Director certifies that the data used in its development represent the best scientific and commercial information available at the time it was written. Copies of all documents reviewed in the development of the plan are available in the administrative record, located at the Tennessee Field Office in Cookeville, Tennessee.

Literature citations should read as follows:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2009. Technical/Agency Draft Recovery Plan for *Astragalus bibullatus* (Pyne's Ground-plum). Atlanta, Georgia. 39 pp.

Additional copies of this plan can be obtained from:

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tennessee Field Office
446 Neal Street
Cookeville, TN 38501
Telephone: 931/528-6481

Recovery plans can be downloaded from Service website:

<http://www.fws.gov/endangered/recovery/Index.html#plans>

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Current Species Status: *Astragalus bibullatus* (Pyne's ground-plum) is federally listed as endangered. It is currently known from only eight extant occurrences (specific locations or sites), all of which are located within approximately 25 kilometers (15 miles) of one another in Rutherford County, Tennessee, in an area encompassing approximately 235 square kilometers (90 square miles).

Habitat Requirements and Limiting Factors: This rare plant, a perennial legume, is currently restricted to edges of limestone cedar glades and open areas in surrounding cedar woodlands in full to moderate light in the vicinity of Murfreesboro, Rutherford County, Tennessee. This is a small area of the Central Basin section of the Interior Low Plateau in Tennessee. Factors contributing to its endangered status are an extremely limited range, alteration or loss of habitat, and small population sizes. Encroachment of woody vegetation decreases the suitability of sites for this plant. These sites are also threatened by rapid urban development in Rutherford County.

Recovery Objective: The goal of this recovery plan is to ensure the long-term viability of Pyne's ground-plum in the wild, and ultimately, remove this plant from the *Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants* (50 CFR 17.12).

Recovery Criteria: Pyne's ground-plum will be considered for reclassification to threatened status when there are 9 occurrences that are distributed throughout the cedar glade ecosystem of the Stones River Basin within Davidson, Rutherford, and Wilson counties. Each occurrence should have at least 100 plants, be maintained for at least 5 years, have a cooperative management agreement in place, and be located on lands owned and managed by a public agency, or located on private lands protected by a permanent conservation easement.

Pyne's ground-plum will be considered for delisting when there are 12 occurrences that are distributed throughout the cedar glade ecosystem of the Stones River Basin within Davidson, Rutherford, and Wilson counties. Each occurrence should have at least 100 plants, be maintained for at least 10 years, have a cooperative management agreement in place, and be located on lands owned and managed by a public agency or located on private lands protected by a permanent conservation easement.

Actions Needed:

1. Protect and manage existing occurrences and habitats.
2. Search for new occurrences.
3. Conduct long-term site and occurrence monitoring.
4. Conduct biological research.
5. Propagate plants for potential reintroduction or augmentation of occurrences.
6. Communicate with local officials to coordinate city and county planning.

7. Develop and implement public education plans.
8. Periodically assess the success of recovery efforts for the species.

Estimated Cost of Recovery (\$000): \$3490

Date of Recovery: The estimated date for recovery completion is 2025, provided that funds are available to accomplish the required recovery tasks and that the recovery criteria are met.

Year	Need 1	Need 2	Need 3	Need 4	Need 5	Need 6	Need 7	Need 8	Total
1	565.0	50.0	25.0	100.0	51.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	803.0
2	565.0	50.0	25.0	100.0	51.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	803.0
3	560.0	50.0	15.0	50.0	21.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	708.0
4	560.0	0.0	15.0	50.0	21.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	658.0
5	560.0	0.0	15.0	00.0	21.0	1.0	10.0	1.0	608.0
Total	2810.0	150.0	95.0	300.0	165.0	5.0	50.0	5.0	3490.0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	5
PART I. INTRODUCTION.....	6
Background.....	6
Species Description and Taxonomy	6
Distribution and Population Trends	7
Habitat.....	10
Geology.....	10
Soils.....	11
Associated Vegetation	11
Ecology and Life History.....	12
Genetic Variation	13
Reasons For Listing and Ongoing Threats	14
Habitat Loss, Alteration, and Degradation	14
Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Education Purposes ..	15
Disease or Predation	15
Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms	15
Other Natural or Manmade Factors	16
Conservation Measures.....	17
Federal Regulatory Protection	17
State Regulatory Protection	17
Preserving Germplasm and Establishing Occurrences	18
Site Protection and Management	18
Surveys and Monitoring.....	19
PART II. RECOVERY	21
Recovery Strategy.....	21
Recovery Objective and Criteria.....	21
Narrative Outline	24
References.....	31
PART III. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE.....	34
PART IV. LIST OF RECIPIENTS	37

PART I. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Astragalus bibullatus Barneby and Bridges (formerly called Guthrie's ground-plum, but now commonly referred to as Pyne's ground-plum) is a rare, perennial member of the pea family (Fabaceae) and is endemic to the limestone cedar glades in the Central Basin Section of the Interior Low Plateau. This species is currently known from only eight extant occurrences (specific locations or sites treated as separate populations for recovery purposes), all in the vicinity of Murfreesboro, Rutherford County, Tennessee. This species also used to occur just north of the Rutherford County line in Davidson County, at a site that is now under the waters of the J. Percy Priest Reservoir, and likely occurred in other cedar glades in the Central Basin as discussed below.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (i.e., Service) listed *A. bibullatus* as an endangered species on September 26, 1991 (56 FR 48748; Service 1991) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*; hereinafter called the Act). The State of Tennessee (Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) 2008) also lists this species as endangered under the Rare Plant Protection and Conservation Act of 1985 (T.C.A. 51-901). The recovery priority number for this species is 2, which means it is highly threatened but also has a high recovery potential.

SPECIES DESCRIPTION AND TAXONOMY

Astragalus is a genus of the Fabaceae or pea family, consisting of approximately 2,500 mostly perennial species distributed primarily around the northern hemisphere and South America. The habitats of *Astragalus* species in the southeastern U.S. tend to be on rocky or sandy soils, providing a more arid contrast to the generally moist habitats found in the region (Weakley 2008), and this is true of native *Astragalus* in Tennessee. Specimens that are now assigned to *A. bibullatus* were apparently first collected as early as 1881 by the early Tennessee botanist, Augustin Gattinger. For over 100 years, this material was assigned to *A. crassicaarpus*, a related but morphologically and geographically distinct species that occurs approximately 750 kilometers (466 miles) to the west. Milo Pyne rediscovered the Rutherford County, Tennessee, type locality for the species in 1979. Botanists familiar with the genus *Astragalus* determined that the plants found by Pyne might represent a new species. In 1985, flowering and fruiting material from the type locality was sent by Jerry Baskin to Rupert Barneby, a monographer of the genus at the New York Botanical Garden. Barneby concluded that this was a new species, *A. bibullatus*, and described it with Edwin Bridges (Barneby and Bridges 1987). Kartez (1994) recognizes *A. bibullatus* as the correct name for plants in Tennessee.

The following description of *A. bibullatus* is adapted from Barneby and Bridges (1987) and Somers and Gunn (1990): a herbaceous perennial, stems simple, 5 to 15 centimeters (cm) (2 to 6 inches (in)) tall, loosely tufted and arising from a shallowly buried root-crown attached to a stout vertical taproot, glabrous (smooth, having no hairs, projections, or pubescence) and leafless at base, usually bearing 5 to 10 leaves with petioles (the stalk of a leaf) 2 cm (0.79 in), once-pinnate (resembling a feather in structure with the parts arranged on both sides of an axis) with 19 to 27 elliptic (broadening at or about the center and narrowing equally toward each end) or elliptic-obovate (having the broad end upward or toward the apex) leaflet. Stems and leaves are considered glabrous but have thinly scattered fine appressed (lying flat) hairs, stipules (one of a pair of usually leaf-like lateral appendages found at the base of the petiole of many leaves) membranous to thinly herbaceous forming a sheath (a tubular covering surrounding an organ or part of a plant) around the stem. The inflorescence (a group of flowers borne on a single stem) is a raceme (an unbranched inflorescence of stalked flowers) supporting 10 to 16 purple flowers. The plants flower in April and May. During flowering, the peduncle (the stalk of a single flower) supporting the inflorescence arches upward. After flowering, and as the fruits mature, this peduncle gradually arches downward. The fruits are fleshy pods that usually mature in May and June. At maturity, the pods are colored red above and yellow below.

Astragalus bibullatus superficially resembles the widespread *A. tennesseensis* (Tennessee milk-vetch), a State-listed special concern species widespread in the cedar glades of middle Tennessee. However, *A. tennesseensis* can be readily distinguished by its yellow rather than purple flowers, its yellow-brown rather than reddish-topped fruits, and the copious number of hairs found on the plant (Somers and Gunn 1990). These two species often grow in the same restricted cedar glade habitat, sometimes growing next to each other. *Astragalus tennesseensis* does appear to have a wider range of environmental tolerance and occasionally is found scattered throughout the glade (Baskin et al. 1972).

DISTRIBUTION AND POPULATION TRENDS

Astragalus bibullatus is endemic to the cedar glades (described in Habitat section below) of middle Tennessee and is presently known from 8 extant occurrences, all occurring in the Stones River watershed in the vicinity of Murfreesboro, Rutherford County, Tennessee. Five of the eight *A. bibullatus* occurrences are located on public lands. Four of these are Designated State Natural Areas (DSNAs) owned by TDEC, three of which were purchased using Recovery Land Acquisition grants funded through section 6 of the Endangered Species Act and extend onto adjacent private lands. One of these occurrences was planted into a cedar glade within the Stones River National Battlefield in March 2001 in a cooperative attempt by the Service, TDEC, National Park Service, and Missouri Botanical Garden to establish a new occurrence. Absent further augmentation of this occurrence, its long-term viability is doubtful, as only two plants were found

surviving in 2009 out of the 110 that were originally planted. The two remaining occurrences are located entirely on privately owned land. Table 1 provides a general summary of all extant and historic (i.e., extirpated) *A. bibullatus* occurrences.


Table 1. Summary of all extant and historic (i.e., extirpated) occurrences of *A. bibullatus*. The column labeled “EO Number” refers to the element occurrence number assigned by TDEC. Data in the column labeled “Population Data” are primarily from TDEC (2005) and present approximate ranges from counts or estimates of the occurrence; ranges for extirpated occurrences are historic.

<i>EO Number</i>	<i>Ownership</i>	<i>Status</i>	<i>Population Data</i>
1	TDEC	Extant	1,000 – 2,800
2	Private	Extirpated	<100
3	TDEC and Private	Extant	50 – 200
4	TDEC	Extant	10 – 45
5	Private	Extant	20 – 200
6	Private	Extant	100 – rumored to have been planted
8	Public	Extirpated	n/a
9	Public	Extant	250 – 520
10	Private	Extirpated	n/a
13	NPS	Extant	110 individuals planted in 2001; 2 found in 2008
16	TDEC	Extirpated	Failed introduction
18	Private	Extant	<300

Until 2006, the known occupied range of *A. bibullatus* was restricted to an approximately 35 square-mile area, and no occurrences were separated by a distance greater than approximately 11 miles. An occurrence that TVA biologists discovered during a 2006 survey of a powerline right-of-way extended the currently known range approximately 10 miles to the southwest and expanded the area encompassing the species’ current range to approximately 90 square miles. This discovery raises two important considerations. First, most of the surveys conducted for recovery efforts have focused on habitats in close proximity to existing occurrences. Second, TVA biologists discovered the occurrence in a small opening in an otherwise heavily wooded cedar forest, which would likely not have been recognized as suitable habitat for recovery surveys. This survey was required for TVA’s analysis of environmental effects from a proposed powerline right-of-way. The discovery of this occurrence, in a small opening within a matrix of presumably unsuitable habitats approximately 10 miles from the nearest historic or extant occurrence of *A. bibullatus*, provides evidence that we should consider the cedar glade ecosystem of the Stones River Basin within Davidson, Rutherford, and Wilson counties as the geographic range for recovering this species (Figure 1). Doing so is appropriate from a biogeographic perspective and increases opportunities for establishing new occurrences

on publicly owned conservation lands, as discussed under recovery task 5.2 in the Narrative Outline section in Part II of this plan.

Figure 1. Known locations of extant (filled circles) and extirpated (empty circles) occurrences of *A. bibullatus* in relation to Stones River watershed (shaded gray), the City of Murfreesboro, and Davidson, Rutherford, and Wilson counties.



There are believed to be three extirpated natural occurrences of *A. bibullatus* (Table 1). The first was in Rutherford County near the town of La Vergne and was collected by Augustin Gattinger in 1901. The landscape in this area has been radically changed since

1901 by urban growth. Several surveys have been conducted in this area and all failed to locate any plants of this species. Another occurrence is believed to have been extirpated from Davidson County, Tennessee. Vegetative material was collected in 1948 from a site just north of the Rutherford/Davidson County line by botanists from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. The site from which the plant was collected is now under the waters of J. Percy Priest Reservoir. Examinations of the glades adjacent to this part of the reservoir have failed to locate any *A. bibullatus*. It is unlikely that this species still exists in Davidson County. The third site occurred in Rutherford County on private land that was commercially developed in the mid-1990s. Recent surveys in this area have failed to locate any *A. bibullatus*. It is unlikely that this species still exists at these three sites. Occurrence number 16 is listed as extirpated in Table 1, but actually represents a failed attempt to establish a new occurrence on a DSNAs by transplanting nursery propagated plants into the habitat.

HABITAT

All known occurrences are associated with limestone cedar glade ecosystems in middle Tennessee, a rare community type which has an extraordinarily high number of endemic and disjunct Midwestern plant species. These cedar glades are located in the inner Central Basin, which is characterized by karst topography with little relief and limestone sinkholes and outcrops influencing surface and subsurface drainage (DeSelm 1959). It should be noted that the most recently discovered occurrence was found in a small opening in a closed cedar forest, suggesting the potential for long-term persistence of *A. bibullatus* in less than ideal conditions provided that habitat is not destroyed.

The exposed bedrock, poor drainage, thin soils, and lack of vegetative cover in cedar glade habitats, combined with seasonal weather patterns of Middle Tennessee, create microenvironmental conditions that typically are wet in winter and early spring, and dry and hot in the summer (Quarterman 1986). While microclimatic data are not available for sites supporting *A. bibullatus*, data from weather stations maintained in cedar glades for short periods of time by Dr. Thomas Hemmerly (1976) revealed that temperature differences between his glade stations and the nearest National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration weather stations "were slight or nonexistent in the winter but at other seasons the glade maxima were generally 10 degrees Fahrenheit and 30 degrees Fahrenheit higher." The highest glade temperature he recorded (on June 28, 1970) was 129 degrees Fahrenheit, compared to a temperature of 98 degrees Fahrenheit at the nearest NOAA station.

Geology

The glade areas in the inner Central Basin of Tennessee are open, rocky areas generally developing on Lebanon and Ridley limestone of Ordovician age. This limestone is thin-

bedded and fossiliferous with thin shale partings and minor amounts of magnesium limestone appearing as small irregular mottlings and thin bands. It weathers to "worm-eaten" flagstones that eventually break down to form a thin, gravelly layer over much of the bedrock. DeSelm (1959) describes the Central Basin of Tennessee as a topographic depression in the Interior Low Plateau ranging in altitude from 500 to 700 feet, with the surrounding Highland Rim having an altitude as great as 1,000 feet. The Ordovician limestone strata now exposed in the Basin were deposited on the slopes of the Nashville Dome (a broad area of geologic uplift caused by forces deep within the earth). Geologists have suggested that this dome at one time was connected to the Ozark Dome and sediments from the Mississippian period [i.e., 350 to 325 million years ago (mya)] were deposited over the limestone (Luther 1977). In the Miocene (23.8 to 5.3 mya) or early Pliocene (5.3 to 2.6 mya) epoch, middle Tennessee was thought to be a low-lying plain at a level similar to that of the current Highland Rim. Down-cutting by the Cumberland River and tributaries caused the present topography of the area, with Ordovician period (500 to 430 mya) limestone remaining exposed and the Mississippian deposits eroded away (DeSelm 1959). Central Basin bedrock is composed of Middle Ordovician Ridley and Lebanon limestones of the Stones River Group.

Soils

Soil types generally associated with rock outcrops in Rutherford County are the Gladeville and Talbott series. The Gladeville series soils are formed in material derived from thin-bedded flaggy limestone, while the Talbott series soils are formed in material weathered from limestone. Glades are often included in areas where these series are mapped together as the Gladeville-Rock outcrop-Talbott association. The Gladeville soil in this association is on nearly bare rocky places (glades). The land surface is relatively smooth, and 7 to 30 cm (3 to 12 in) of clayey material overlay thinly bedded limestone. Thin flags of limestone 5 to 25 cm (2 to 10 in) long commonly are scattered over the surface and throughout the soil. The Talbott soil in this association is generally in strips between the bouldery limestone outcrops. This mapping unit has a low potential for farming and trees (USDA/SCS 1977). In general, slope angles on cedar glades seldom exceed 5 percent (Somers and Gunn 1990), and soil depths are estimated to range from 0 to 20 cm (0 to 8 inches) (Quarterman 1986).

Associated Vegetation

Cedar glades often have a striking zonal pattern of plant distribution, based primarily upon depth of soil, microtopographic relief, and degree of shading from surrounding woody vegetation (Somers et al. 1986). A shade intolerant species, *A. bibullatus* is sometimes found growing and reproducing vigorously along old roadbeds and in natural and man-made open areas in woodlands adjacent to glades. Typically, this species is found in very restricted habitat occurring in transition zones at the edges of either glades or tree/shrub islands within the glades. Moderate shading and slightly deeper soils in

these areas of glades likely temper the drought conditions typical of glades in summer months.

Woody and herbaceous associates of *A. bibullatus* are species typical of limestone cedar glades in the Central Basin and include some endemics and near-endemics restricted to this region (Baskin and Baskin 1986; Barneby and Bridges 1987). Tree and shrub species include: *Juniperus virginiana* (eastern redcedar), *Carya carolinae-septentrionalis* (southern shagbark hickory), *Fraxinus americana* (white ash), *Fraxinus quadrangulata* (blue ash), *Quercus muehlenbergii* (chinkapin oak), *Frangula caroliniana* (Carolina buckthorn), *Rhus aromatica* (fragrant sumac), *Hypericum frondosum* (St. Johnswort), *Ulmus alata* (winged elm), *Cercis canadensis* (eastern redbud), *Symphoricarpos orbiculatus* (coralberry), and *Forestiera ligustrina* (privet). Some of the herbaceous species include: *Pediomelum subacaule* (whiterim scurfpea), *Dalea gattingeri* (purpletassels), *Hypericum sphaerocarpum* (roundseed St. Johnswort), *Aristida longispica* (slimspike threeawn), *Sporobolus vaginiflorus* (poverty dropseed), *Manfreda virginica* (false aloe), *Onosmodium molle* subsp. *molle* (softhair marbleseed), *Onosmodium molle* subsp. *subsetosum* (softhair marbleseed), *Hedyotis nigricans* (diamondflowers), *Astragalus tennesseensis* (Tennessee milk-vetch), *Heliotropium tenellum* (pasture heliotrope), *Erigeron strigosus* (daisy fleabane), *Viola egglestonii* (glade violet), *Evolvulus nuttallianus* (shaggy dwarf morning-glory), *Scutellaria parvula* (small skullcap), *Solidago nemoralis* (gray goldenrod), *S. missouriensis* var. *fasiculata* (Missouri goldenrod), *Grindelia lanceolata* (Gulf gumweed), *Oxalis priceae* subsp. *priceae* (tufted yellow woodsorrel), *Helianthus hirsutus* (hairy sunflower), *Ruellia humilis* (wild petunia), *Desmanthus illinoensis* (Illinois bundleflower), *Croton capitatus* (doveweed), *C. monanthogynus* (oneseeded croton), *Euphorbia dentata* (toothed euphorbia), *Opuntia compressa* var. *compressa* (common pricklypear), *Satureja glabella* (called glade mint), *Oenothera macrocarpa* (bigfruit evening-primrose) and *Verbena canadensis* (homestead purple).

ECOLOGY AND LIFE HISTORY

Astragalus bibullatus is a perennial and flowers in late April through early May. Fruiting begins in early May with seed dispersal beginning around the first of June. As many as 26 above ground stems and 50 fruits have been observed on one plant. Dispersal mechanisms appear to be limited to abiotic factors including gravity and water (Morris et al. 2002). At a few of the sites, bush-hogging to control woody vegetation encroachment appears to have facilitated an increase in the number of plants, likely due to reduction of shade and enhanced seed dispersal.

Characteristics of *A. bibullatus* seeds and habitat favor the development of a large, persistent seed bank that is stratified by age (Morris et al. 2002). The seeds of *A. bibullatus* have a hard, impermeable seed coat that imposes a strong physical germination barrier. Species of

legumes, like *A. bibullatus*, that have hard seed coats are relatively long-lived and are known to remain viable in the soil longer than seeds of most other species (Toole and Brown 1946). Soils in the cedar glade habitats where *A. bibullatus* is found contain an abundance of unconsolidated rock fragments in a soil matrix that is granular in structure (USDA/SCS 1977), which, in combination with repeated frost heaving and sedimentation processes, would promote migration of *A. bibullatus* seeds down through the soil column over time, favoring the stratification of seeds of different ages (Morris et al. 2002).

There are noticeable differences in vigor and fruit production between populations. Morris et al. (2002) found that the number of *A. bibullatus* seeds in soil samples varied substantially among sites. Degree of shading from woody plant encroachment may be a significant factor. It appears that shaded plants tend to have more vigorous vegetative growth but less fruit set, while plants in full sun often have copious fruit production but go dormant much earlier. The fruits of “older plants” appear to be much larger than the fruit of “young plants.” If woody encroachment is a significant factor in the extinction of vegetative populations of *A. bibullatus*, then residual seed populations may exist at many sites in this region where habitat conditions are currently inhospitable to their growth and survival (Morris et al. 2002). The pollinating agents for this plant are not known, but flying insects play a role in many other legumes.

Factors relating to population structure and dynamics have not been researched. Population size seems to fluctuate dramatically in colonies from year to year, possibly in response to the amount of rainfall and the amount of disturbance (Somers and Gunn 1990).

GENETIC VARIATION

Investigations of genetic structure in *A. bibullatus* using both isozymes (Baskauf and Snapp 1998) and amplified fragment length polymorphisms (AFLP) (Baskauf 2006) yielded comparable estimates of low levels of differentiation among populations; though, the AFLP study produced higher estimates of overall diversity and estimates of heterozygosity nearly twice those found with isozymes. Baskauf (2006) concluded that, despite a history of small and fluctuating populations reported by Somers and Gunn (1990), the potential for loss of genetic variability in populations of *A. bibullatus* should be minimal because the species is a perennial with a long-lived seed bank. The results of these studies indicate that the origin of the seeds or plants used in establishing any new occurrences is probably not crucial.

In contrast to the studies of genetic variability from samples of vegetative material, Morris et al. (2002) investigated temporal and spatial genetic variability in the seed bank of *A. bibullatus* using allozyme analysis. They found high levels of among-site variability and the highest heterozygote deficiencies examining genetic structure in the seed banks within the top centimeter of soil (i.e., within a stratum containing more recently deposited seeds). They did not detect significant differences among sites for the deepest (i.e., oldest) soil seed

layers. Morris et al (2002) concluded that the among-site genetic structure they detected within the youngest soil seed layers was likely attributable to an increased incidence of inbreeding over time, due to the isolation of populations caused by fragmentation. They cited evidence that cedar glades were likely more widespread and had lower densities of trees in the past and that landuse changes in the last century led to increased shading and fragmentation of habitats due to woody plant encroachment. Morris et al. (2002) surmised that, because of these environmental changes, *A. bibullatus* populations were reduced in size and gene flow among them was likely restricted, leaving them vulnerable to effects of genetic drift and inbreeding.

REASONS FOR LISTING AND ONGOING THREATS

The Service listed *A. bibullatus* as endangered throughout its range primarily due to threats of habitat loss or alteration posed by development, encroachment of competing vegetation, livestock grazing, intensive right-of-way maintenance activities, off-road-vehicle (ORV) traffic, and trash dumping. The Service also identified as a threat potential impacts to the characteristically small *A. bibullatus* populations from extended drought (Service 1991). The following analysis details threats to this species as they relate to the five listing factors outlined in section 4(a)(1) of the Act.

Habitat Loss, Alteration, and Degradation

Astragalus bibullatus is extremely vulnerable because of its limited range and its specific limestone cedar glade habitat. The primary threat to *A. bibullatus* and other cedar glade endemics is the loss, alteration, or degradation of habitat from residential, commercial, or industrial development; livestock grazing and trampling; encroachment of competing vegetation; and potential for illegal ORV use.

All the occurrences of *A. bibullatus* are within a short distance of the rapidly growing middle Tennessee city of Murfreesboro. Five of the occurrences are located on public lands and as such are protected from development threats. However, the three remaining occurrences are located on private lands where development pressures are increasing at a rapid rate. Limestone cedar glades are relatively flat and clear areas that often attract developers. In fact, one occurrence (population 2 in the listing rule) has been either destroyed or significantly altered by commercial development since *A. bibullatus* was listed and is now believed to be extirpated.

Only one of the eight known occurrences of *A. bibullatus* is currently threatened by impacts from livestock grazing. This threat has been reduced at this occurrence through the establishment of a State Natural Area (SNA) registry between TDEC and the private landowner, which resulted in construction of a fence around the habitat containing *A. bibullatus* and regular monitoring of the fence and occurrence.

All the known *A. bibullatus* occurrences are threatened by the encroachment of more competitive herbaceous vegetation and/or woody plants, such as eastern redcedar, that produce shade and compete for limited water and nutrients. The Service did not cite the threat of habitat alteration or degradation due to invasive exotic species as a factor in the decision to list *A. bibullatus* as endangered (Service 1991), but we recognize this as part of the threats currently posed to the species by encroaching vegetation. Invasive exotic species that currently are either being managed or have been noted as potential threats at *A. bibullatus* occurrences include spotted knapweed (*Centaurea biebersteinii*), Japanese honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*), privet (*Ligustrum* spp.), and sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata*), among others. Active management to reduce or eliminate vegetation encroachment is required to ensure that the species continues to survive at all the sites.

Biologists from the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) discovered an occurrence of *A. bibullatus* during surveys of a proposed powerline right-of-way that were completed in 2006. Through section 7 consultation with the Service, TVA identified measures to avoid impacts to this occurrence. See the Conservation Measures section in for a discussion on Federal Regulatory Protection and agency obligations to consult with the Service regarding projects that might affect threatened and endangered species.

Habitat degradation due to ORV use of sites on private lands remains a potential threat, as does illegal ORV use on sites protected by public ownership. Sites in public ownership are reasonably well protected from this threat by the construction of fences and regular monitoring that would detect increasing levels of ORV usage.

Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Education Purposes

No commercial trade in this species is known to occur. We are not aware of collections for wildflower gardening or other recreational purposes affecting this species. While one occurrence is rumored to have been established by a private landowner, this has not been confirmed. Collections for scientific or educational purposes are limited, and this activity is typically coordinated by TDEC in cooperation with the Service.

Disease or Predation

Herbivory has been observed to varying degrees during monitoring of *A. bibullatus* occurrences. However, we do not believe that herbivore pressure constitutes a substantial threat to *A. bibullatus* at this time.

Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

With the exception of the protection that the Act affords listed plants on Federal lands and in matters pertaining to interstate commerce, state and Federal laws provide little or no protection to plants. *Astragalus bibullatus* is listed as endangered by the State of Tennessee (TDEC 2008) and is protected under the Tennessee Rare Plant Protection and Conservation Act of 1985 (T.C.A. 51-901), which forbids persons from knowingly uprooting, digging, taking, removing, damaging, destroying, possessing, or otherwise disturbing for any purpose, any endangered species from private or public lands without the written permission of the landowner. While this legislation does not forbid the destruction of *A. bibullatus* or its habitat with landowner permission, neither does the Endangered Species Act afford such protection to listed plants. See the Conservation Measures section below for summaries of state and Federal regulatory protection for listed plants. Those colonies located in DSNAs are afforded additional protection by the State of Tennessee's Natural Area Preservation Act (T.C.A. 11-14-01), which protects DSNAs from vandalism and forbids removal of threatened and endangered species from these areas.

Other Natural or Manmade Factors

The Service identified extended drought conditions as a threat to *A. bibullatus*, because of the likely reduced resilience of the three small populations that were known at the time of listing to endure such stochastic environmental events (56 FR 48750, Service 1991). The occurrence of severe drought in middle Tennessee, during the summers of 2007 and 2008, provides an opportunity to assess effects of drought to populations that are periodically monitored. It is possible that alterations in drought frequency or severity that might accompany climate change could pose a growing threat to *A. bibullatus* in the future.

Effects of drought and other natural factors, including tornadoes and catastrophic fire, could be compounded by (1) diminished resilience of individual occurrences due to their small sizes, and (2) diminished ability of the species to endure stochastic disturbances due to limited representation across the landscape, as only eight occurrences are known to exist. While it is unlikely that a single tornado or catastrophic fire would affect all populations, prolonged or severe drought could affect populations throughout the geographic range of *A. bibullatus*.

Small population sizes and fragmentation of cedar glade habitats could influence genetic structure of *A. bibullatus* populations. As noted above, Morris et al. (2002) concluded that the among-site genetic structure they detected within the youngest soil seed layers of *A. bibullatus* occurrences was likely attributable to an increased incidence of inbreeding over time, due to the isolation of populations caused by fragmentation. They surmised that, because of increased fragmentation of cedar glade habitats and increased shading due to vegetation encroachment in those that remain, *A. bibullatus* populations were reduced in

size and gene flow among them was likely restricted, leaving them vulnerable to effects of genetic drift and inbreeding.

CONSERVATION MEASURES

Conservation measures provided for *A. bibullatus* include Federal and state regulatory protection; investigating the species biology, ecology, and life history; preserving germplasm and establishing or augmenting occurrences; site protection and management; and surveys and monitoring.

Federal Regulatory Protection

Section 7(a)(2) of the Act requires Federal agencies to consult with the Service prior to authorizing, funding, or carrying out activities that may affect Federally listed species. Section 7(a)(1) also requires these agencies use their authorities to further the conservation of Federally listed species, which resulted in the introduction of a new occurrence into cedar glades at the Stones River National Battlefield in a cooperative effort among the National Park Service (NPS), TDEC, the Missouri Botanical Garden (MBG), and the Service.

Sections 9 and 10 of the Act and the corresponding implementing regulations found in 50 CFR 17.61, 17.62, and 17.63 set forth a series of prohibitions and exceptions that apply to all plants listed as endangered under the Act. These prohibitions, in part, make the following activities illegal for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States: import or export; transport in interstate or foreign commerce; sell or offer for sale this species in interstate or foreign commerce; remove and reduce to possession this species from areas under Federal jurisdiction; and maliciously damage or destroy this species on any other area in knowing violation of any state law or regulation in the course of any violation of a state criminal trespass law. These regulations apply to any part of the plant, including seeds, roots, and other parts. The Act provides for the issuance of permits for scientific purposes or for the enhancement of propagation and survival of the endangered species.

State Regulatory Protection

The State of Tennessee lists the species as endangered under the authority of the "Rare Plant Protection and Conservation Act of 1985 (TDEC 2008)." Commercial exploitation or willful destruction of *A. bibullatus* by persons other than the landowner could result in a fine of not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both. This law does not prevent a landowner from disturbing or destroying plants on his land, nor can it be used to impede public works projects such as highway construction. It is

also not a violation to destroy the plants in the course of routine forestry or agricultural practices.

Preserving Germplasm and Establishing Occurrences

The Missouri Botanical Garden (MBG), acting as a member institution of the Centers for Plant Conservation (CPC), has collected seeds of *A. bibullatus* as recently as June 2009 and currently holds seed collections from all known extant occurrences. Early attempts to grow *A. bibullatus* plants from seed were hampered for this species by use of a growing medium that retained excessive amounts of moisture. Using a medium that more closely mimics the well-drained soils of cedar glades, the MBG has established reliable protocols for propagating *A. bibullatus* from seed (McCue et al. 2001).

The production of plants from seed facilitated two attempts by partners including MBG, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), NPS, the Service, and TDEC to establish new occurrences using cultivated plants. One of these efforts was initiated with the planting of 110 individuals into cedar glades at Stones River National Battlefield. The future for this occurrence, absent further management, looks bleak as only two plants were found surviving in 2008. The second introduction attempt occurred at the Sunnybells Cedar Glade DSNA, which at the time was a TNC preserve, and failed. Additional work is needed to refine parameters used to identify suitable habitats for population introductions and the procedures for transplanting nursery reared plants into sites and caring for them until they become established. Given the small sizes of most *A. bibullatus* populations, the possibility of augmenting some occurrences with nursery grown plants should be considered. Attempts to do so could provide insight into the care that is needed following transplanting to promote survival of transplanted individuals into sites known to be suitable for the species.

Site Protection and Management

Five of the eight *A. bibullatus* occurrences are located on public lands. Four of these are Designated State Natural Areas (DSNAs) owned by TDEC, three of which were purchased using Recovery Land Acquisition grants funded through section 6 of the Endangered Species Act and extend onto adjacent private lands. The State of Tennessee's Natural Area Preservation Act (T.C.A. 11-14-01) protects DSNAs from vandalism and forbids removal of threatened and endangered species from these areas. One occurrence was planted on Federal government property at the Stones River National Battlefield. A sixth occurrence is managed under a DSNA registry, which is a non-binding agreement between TDEC and a private landowner. This differs from a DSNA, in that a SNA registry is not owned by the State of Tennessee and not provided equivalent protection under the state's Natural Area Preservation Act (T.C.A. 11-14-01). The remaining two occurrences are entirely on privately owned lands and are not protected by conservation agreements.

Sites on lands protected either solely by TDEC or cooperatively by TDEC and private landowners are managed as necessary to conserve *A. bibullatus* and other cedar glade endemics. Management activities on these sites have included maintaining desired vegetation structure and composition using mechanical and manual clearing, prescribed burning, and judicious application of herbicides. Management plans specifically devoted to *A. bibullatus* have either been completed or are under development for these sites.

All of the landowners and managers of the known occurrences have been contacted about the presence of *A. bibullatus* on their property. Acquisition of habitat from willing landowners, conservation easements, SNA registries, and development of cooperative management plans will be utilized to help recover this species.

Surveys and Monitoring

Despite an intensive search for additional populations of *A. bibullatus* in 1994 and numerous searches for other limestone cedar glade species that have taken place within apparently suitable habitat, few new occurrences have been found. However, discovery of an occurrence by a private landowner in 1999 and another by TVA biologists, during a 2006 survey of a proposed powerline right-of-way, indicate that additional survey work is warranted. The population found in 2006 is located approximately 10 miles away from the nearest known occurrence and was found in a small clearing within a matrix of seemingly unsuitable forested habitat. This discovery underscores the need to carefully search for isolated occurrences even in marginal habitats when conducting surveys within the range of *A. bibullatus*.

Informal monitoring of *A. bibullatus* occurrences, in the form of site visits to identify threats and count or estimate the number of plants present, began in the early 1980s following the rediscovery of the species. Structured monitoring of *A. bibullatus* occurrences began in 2001 with tracking of tagged plants that were introduced into cedar glades at the Stones River National Battlefield and Sunnybells Cedar Glade DSNAs. As noted above, these introductions have either failed or resulted in the apparent persistence of no more than a few plants. In 2005, MBG and TDEC initiated long-term monitoring by tagging a variable number of plants at each of three occurrences. This monitoring is intended to provide insight into the species' life history characteristics, including: age at which plants become reproductively mature; survival rate; and lifespan of individual plants. In addition, TDEC has established a variable number of demographic monitoring plots at each of the five occurrences in DSNAs and at the one occurrence that is protected by a SNA registry. Several variables are recorded in each plot, including the total number of seedlings and juveniles, the number of vegetative adult plants and numbers of stems per adult vegetative plant, and the number of reproductive adult plants and numbers of stems and fruits per reproductive plant. Two extant occurrences are currently not monitored in a structured manner.

PART II. RECOVERY

RECOVERY STRATEGY

To ensure the long-term survival of *A. bibullatus*, it is important to protect and manage the eight known occurrences and any others that are discovered. Management plans should be developed for each occurrence and should include some type of management regime to prevent encroachment of vegetation into *A. bibullatus* habitat that might out-compete and/or shade *A. bibullatus*. Three of the known occurrences of *A. bibullatus* are located on privately owned land and five occurrences are on land owned by the State of Tennessee and/or the Federal government.

Protection of privately owned occurrences should be achieved through land acquisitions or permanent conservation easements. State Natural Area registries and cooperative management agreements should be pursued and implemented with private landowners if permanent measures cannot be immediately achieved. Protecting and managing habitat is critical for the survival of the species. Development pressures in Rutherford County pose a threat to this species. Surveys for new occurrences should continue both through recovery projects funded under section 6 or other sources and through surveys for threatened and endangered species that are recommended for Federal agency projects. The establishment of new occurrences into suitable protected habitat within the species' range will also be an important component of recovery for this species. A coordinated outreach program will also be important to inform landowners that this plant occurs on their property and of the management required to perpetuate its existence.

RECOVERY OBJECTIVE AND CRITERIA

The goal of this recovery plan is to ensure the long-term viability of *A. bibullatus* in the wild, allowing initially for reclassification of this plant to threatened status, and ultimately, remove this plant from the *Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Plants* (50 CFR 17.12).

A. bibullatus will be considered for reclassification to threatened status when there are 9 occurrences distributed throughout the cedar glade ecosystem of the Stones River Basin within Davidson, Rutherford, and Wilson counties. Each occurrence should have at least 100 plants, be maintained for at least 5 years, have a cooperative management agreement in place, and be located on lands owned and managed by a public agency, or located on private lands protected by a permanent conservation easement.

A. bibullatus will be considered for delisting when there are 12 occurrences that are distributed throughout the cedar glade ecosystem of the Stones River Basin within

Davidson, Rutherford, and Wilson counties. Each occurrence should have at least 100 plants, be maintained for at least 10 years, have a cooperative management agreement in place, and be located on lands owned and managed by a public agency, or located on private lands protected by a permanent conservation easement.

Listing/Recovery Factors Addressed by Recovery Tasks: Tasks listed below with each listing/recovery factor are examples of actions that may reduce or remove the identified threats. These tasks are described in more detail in the Narrative Outline section that follows.

Listing/Recovery Factor A: The Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification, or Curtailment of a Species Habitat or Range. To ensure the long-term recovery needs of *A. bibullatus* and provide adequate assurance of population stability, threats to the ground-plum's habitat must be removed or minimized (see Reasons for Listing and Ongoing Threats for a discussion of applicable threats). This can be accomplished by the following actions:

- a) Acquire habitat. (Task 1.1)
- b) Pursue protection with landowners. (Task 1.2)
- c) Develop and implement adaptive management plans for each occurrence. (Task 1.3)
- d) Develop cooperative management agreements for occurrences that are not on conservation lands. (Task 1.4)
- e) Monitor demographic trends and threats at all occurrences. (Task 3.2)
- f) Identify suitable unoccupied habitat and establish new occurrences. (Tasks 5.2 and 5.3)
- g) Communicate with local officials to coordinate city and county planning. (Task 6)

Listing/Recovery Factor B: Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes. Little or no commercial trade in *A. bibullatus* is known to exist at this time, and it is not anticipated that it will become an issue in the future. Likewise, overutilization for recreational, scientific, or educational purposes is not known to be an issue. However, Task 5.1 calls for maintaining a seed source *ex situ* for this species. These stored seeds could be used for reintroductions to replace extirpated occurrences if suitable habitat remains, for establishing new occurrences as part of recovery efforts, or for augmenting existing occurrences, where necessary.

Listing/Recovery Factor C: Disease or Predation. At this time, there are no data indicating that this is a limiting factor; however, given that herbivory has been observed to varying degrees at *A. bibullatus* occurrences, we will monitor the severity of this potential threat through Task 3.2.

Listing/Recovery Factor D: The Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms. *A. bibullatus* is typically found growing on land that has a high potential for residential or commercial development. Existing regulatory mechanisms do not protect these open non Federal lands from conversion to other uses such as residential or commercial development. The following actions can help to overcome these inadequacies and lead to recovery:

- a) Pursue protection with landowners through land acquisition or conservation easements. (Tasks 1.1 and 1.2)
- b) Develop cooperative management agreements for occurrences that are not on conservation lands. (Task 1.4)
- c) Communicate with local officials to coordinate city and county planning. (Task 6)
- d) Develop and implement public education plans. (Task 7)

Listing/Recovery Factor E: Other Natural or Manmade Factors Affecting Its Continued Existence. Small population sizes likely diminish the resiliency of *A. bibullatus* occurrences to stochastic disturbances, and the lack of redundancy across the landscape leaves the species at greater risk of extinction due to potential extirpation of these vulnerable occurrences. Management efforts to address this threat are constrained by limited knowledge of ecological and life history characteristics of the species. The following recovery actions should improve resilience of individual occurrences and provide sufficient redundancy to buffer the species against potential losses of individual occurrences:

- a) Develop and implement adaptive management plans for each occurrence. (Task 1.3)
- b) Search for new populations. (Task 2)
- c) Study life history and reproductive biology. (Tasks 4.1 and 4.2)
- d) Maintain plant and seed sources *ex situ*. (Task 5.1)
- e) Identify suitable unoccupied habitat. (Task 5.2)
- f) Establish new occurrences within the historic range. (Task 5.3)
- g) Augment existing occurrences, where necessary. (Task 5.4)

NARRATIVE OUTLINE

1: Protect and manage existing occurrences and habitats.

- 1.1 **Acquire habitat.** Four occurrences are located in DSNAs, though three of these extend onto adjacent private lands, and one occurrence is located at the Stones River National Battlefield. The remaining three known occurrences are entirely on privately owned land. Protection of the extant occurrences that are located on private land is an essential step in recovery of this species and would preferably be accomplished by acquiring properties where *A. bibullatus* occurs.
- 1.2 **Pursue protection with landowners.** Landowners of all properties harboring known occurrences of *A. bibullatus* have been contacted and encouraged to protect *A. bibullatus* on their property. During contacts with private landowners, their potential willingness to sell or donate properties harboring *A. bibullatus* should be discussed. If acquisition is not feasible, the most effective alternative protection is conservation easements; however, many landowners are not agreeable to the permanent restrictions on potential uses of their properties that conservation easements require. Conservation agreements may be acceptable instruments for protecting populations in instances where landowners are unwilling to either sell or donate their property or enter into a conservation easement. One privately owned occurrence has been registered as a SNA, which is an example of a non-binding agreement.
- 1.3. **Develop and implement adaptive management plans for each occurrence.** While studies documenting responses to management actions are lacking for *A. bibullatus*, general knowledge concerning the importance of disturbance regimes in maintaining cedar glade habitats suggests that management plans for each site should promote open areas that are free from competitive herbaceous and woody vegetation. Based on field observations, habitat disturbance appears to enhance vigor and increase plant densities, abundance, and spatial extent of *A. bibullatus* occurrences. Management treatments that have been applied to *A. bibullatus* occurrences include prescribed fire, bush-hogging, mechanical and manual removal of woody vegetation, and chemical control of woody vegetation and invasive exotic species. As knowledge is gained by monitoring responses of *A. bibullatus* to management activities, management plans can be modified to include site-specific objectives. Plans must consider past and present land use in order to maintain or to enhance the conditions at each site. The following management objectives should be addressed for each site: 1) the type of land use desired; 2) the type of compatible ground cover; 3) the type of vegetative disturbance feasible with the land use; and 4) the use and application of herbicides and fertilizers. An important goal of management plans for *A. bibullatus* should

be to apply management treatments at scales extending beyond the immediate area currently occupied by *A. bibullatus*.

An occurrence was found in 1996 in an area that had been regularly, but unsuccessfully, surveyed for additional occurrences since 1979. This occurrence only became apparent after the landowner commenced regular mechanical removal of the woody vegetation in the area. It is possible that vegetative individuals had persisted at this site, but were overlooked during surveys, or that seeds were dispersed from the adjacent site. Morris et al. (2002) offered a more likely explanation: the high density of seeds they found throughout the soil strata indicated that a large population of *A. bibullatus* was present at this site at some point in the past and that the majority of the extant population was probably derived from the soil seed bank within the last few years. The emergence of these plants following habitat disturbance adjacent to an existing occurrence underscores the importance of applying management treatments at scales extending beyond the immediate area currently occupied by *A. bibullatus*. Managing at larger scales should not only increase the chance of stimulating germination of dormant seed banks, it will also expand restoration of the cedar glade ecosystem that *A. bibullatus* shares with numerous at-risk species.

- 1.4. Develop cooperative management agreements for occurrences that are not located on conservation lands.** A cooperative management agreement should be developed with landowners that would include the management plan for the site and an outline of methods to implement the plan. This agreement would be between the landowner and TDEC and/or the Service and would be strictly voluntary. One component of the agreement should be that the landowner would agree to notify the parties of the agreement if ownership or management changes. Another component is that the agencies should be able to offer technical support and, if requested, provide assistance for management activities if resources permit.

2: Search for new occurrences. As discussed above, few new occurrences of *A. bibullatus* have been found despite numerous surveys since 1994. However, discovery of occurrences by a private landowner in 1999 and by TVA biologists, during a 2006 survey of a proposed powerline right-of-way, indicate that additional survey work is warranted. The population found in 2006 is located approximately 10 miles away from the nearest known occurrence and was found in a small clearing within a matrix of seemingly unsuitable forested habitat. This discovery underscores the need for carefully searching for isolated occurrences even in marginal habitats when conducting surveys within the range of *A. bibullatus*, especially in cases where proposed projects would destroy potentially suitable habitat.

3: Conduct long-term site and occurrence monitoring. Dramatic population fluctuations have been observed at several colonies, but until recently data have not been collected in a way that permits analysis of population dynamics of this species and the effects that habitat manipulation has upon these dynamics. An effective monitoring program is needed for documenting trends in population densities and abundance, spatial extent of occurrences, and demographic structure, as well as threats at natural and introduced occurrences, to provide feedback for adaptive management. Monitoring the demographic structure of Pyne's ground plum populations is necessary for identifying vulnerable life-history stages that could require intensive management for introductions to succeed and for identifying populations at risk of extinction in the near future.

3.1 Develop a written protocol for monitoring *A. bibullatus* occurrences. To ensure that the monitoring program is well-designed and will be consistently implemented, a monitoring protocol should be written. The protocol should clearly articulate what the questions are that will be answered through monitoring; goals and objectives concerning the levels of change the monitoring program should allow managers to detect; step-by-step procedures for collecting, managing, and analyzing data; and include a schedule of the years that monitoring will be conducted and the specific dates within which monitoring should happen to ensure consistency among years.

The sampling methodology should be designed to assess population demographic features such as abundance, density, recruitment, age to reproductive maturity, and longevity, as well as measures of individual vigor such as number of vegetative stems, flowering stems, and fruit. The monitoring program for *A. bibullatus* should also include regular assessment of threats to the occurrences, such as documenting incidences of herbivory, identifying sites where management is needed to maintain desired vegetation structure and composition, and ensuring that fences are maintained to prevent impacts from ORV access or livestock grazing.

No studies have been done to determine the long-term effects of disturbance regimes on growth, reproduction, and survival of *A. bibullatus*. Monitoring protocols should include measures to provide feedback loops for adaptive management programs that are designed to maintain desired vegetation structure and composition. Such monitoring programs should not only measure responses in *A. bibullatus* occurrences, they should measure variables that are thought to be important in defining suitable habitat conditions. Examples include measures of stem densities or percent cover of competing vegetation in multiple vertical strata, degree of litter accumulation at the ground surface, and, in the case of herbicide applications, apparent effects of chemicals on vigor and abundance of non-target species, including *A. bibullatus*.

3.2 Monitor demographic trends and threats at all occurrences. Using the protocol developed to accomplish task 3.1, all occurrences of *A. bibullatus* should be monitored at a frequency that is sufficient to provide data for assessing trends when the Service conducts status reviews of the species.

4: Conduct biological research. In order to successfully manage the species, it is important to understand its basic biology and the species' relationship to its environment. Research should be conducted on the species' life history, ecological requirements, and reproductive biology.

4.1 Study the life history and ecological requirements. Work has been completed on temporal and spatial variability in seed banks for *A. bibullatus* (Morris et al. 2002). Work has also been completed by the Missouri Botanical Gardens on germination requirements, seed viability and seedling establishment in the lab; however, investigations are still needed to determine preferred light and soil conditions for the species and assess seed production and dispersal mechanisms.

4.2 Study reproductive biology. Pollinators should be identified and the frequency of visits determined. Once pollinators are known, literature searches or studies should be conducted to determine the dispersal ability of species providing this function. Knowledge of pollinator dispersal ability should be used in selecting sites for establishing new occurrences and in assessing connectivity among *A. bibullatus* occurrences.

5: Propagate plants for potential reintroduction or augmentation of occurrences. While surveys to discover populations of *A. bibullatus* should continue, it is important to guard against natural or human destruction or extirpation of populations by enhancing existing colonies or by establishing new colonies from propagated plants or collected seeds. While some studies have suggested that there is little variability in the genetic structure of *A. bibullatus* populations (Baskauf and Snapp 1998, Baskauf 2006), a study of seed bank genetic structure led the authors to conclude that contemporary *A. bibullatus* populations were reduced in size and gene flow among them was likely restricted, leaving them vulnerable to effects of genetic drift and inbreeding (Morris et al. 2002). They cited evidence that cedar glades were likely more widespread and had lower densities of trees in the past and that landuse changes in the last century led to increased shading and fragmentation of habitats due to woody plant encroachment. These findings suggest that a critical component of recovering *A. bibullatus* will be to: establish new occurrences to increase redundancy of *A. bibullatus* on the landscape; where possible, do so in strategically located sites that would enhance potential for connectivity among all occurrences; and to determine whether any occurrences should be augmented with propagated individuals to enhance their resilience to stochastic disturbances.

- 5.1 Maintain plant and seed sources *ex situ*.** Seed collections from each colony should be placed in long-term storage at the U.S.D.A. Agricultural Research National Seed Storage Laboratory in Fort Collins, Colorado. These should be replaced with fresh collections when needed. Seeds should also be stored for use in propagation efforts. *Astragalus bibullatus* is presently a part of the living collection of endangered species at the Center for Plant Conservation at Missouri Botanical Gardens. Propagation of plants for potential reintroductions, introductions, or population augmentations should be initiated.
- 5.2 Identify suitable unoccupied habitat.** Suitable *A. bibullatus* habitat should be identified within the cedar glade ecosystem of the Stones River Basin within Davidson, Rutherford, and Wilson counties, which we consider the geographic range for recovering this species (Figure 1). The specific habitat requirements of *A. bibullatus* are not known, beyond a recognition that the species is associated with cedar glade habitats and tends to be located in transition zones between the open glade and adjacent woodlands or in small openings within the woodland matrix. Tasks that would improve our understanding of habitat needs for Pyne's ground plum for reintroduction purposes include: experimentally investigating the micro-environmental (e.g., light, soils, and vegetation cover) requirements for seed survival and seedling recruitment at natural populations and introduced colonies at Stones River National Battlefield and conducting controlled greenhouse studies to understand the role of soil, water, and light on seedling growth and survival.

The Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation manages several DSNAs within the Central Basin for the purpose of conserving cedar glade habitats. Two of these are located in Davidson County, eight in Rutherford County (one of which extends into Wilson County), and four are entirely in Wilson County. The DSNAs in Wilson County are located either within 10 miles of the historic Davidson County occurrence or within 15 miles of extant occurrences in Rutherford County. Most of these DSNAs contain at least one other federally listed cedar glade endemic and have played an instrumental role in protecting habitats needed for their recovery. Surrounding J. Percy Priest Reservoir in these three counties, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers owns land that contains limestone cedar glades. Efforts to identify suitable unoccupied habitats should emphasize these lands because they are already in public ownership and contain some of the best remaining examples of cedar glade habitats.

In 1999, TDEC completed development of GIS-based habitat models for several federally listed species, including *A. bibullatus*. While the spatial resolution of this model is coarse (i.e., 625 m² cell size), it should provide an indication of

areas containing potentially suitable habitat that are not known to harbor this species. It should be noted, though, that this model gives greater weighting to sites within one mile of *A. bibullatus* when evaluating habitat suitability, because of the assumption that a seed bank is more likely to be present in close proximity to known occurrences.

5.3 Establish new occurrences. In 2001, MBG, NPS, TDEC, TNC, and the Service collaborated on attempts to establish two new occurrences on conservation lands. One of these introductions was located at the Sunnybells Cedar Glade DSNA, but no plants survive there today. This natural area is named for the sunnybells (*Schoenolirion croceum*) that are prominent in wet calcareous limestone washes of cedar glades, which characterize the habitat at this site. Such habitat is likely wetter during spring and early summer months than habitats where *A. bibullatus* is typically found. The other introduction took place at Stones River National Battlefield and cannot at this time be considered successful, as only two plants were found surviving in 2009, one of which flowered (Terri Hogan, pers. com. 2009). Approximately 110 nursery-grown plants were transplanted to this site. Despite the lack of success in these early attempts, it is important that efforts to establish new occurrences continue in order to increase representation of this species across the landscape.

5.4 Augment existing occurrences, where necessary. The extant occurrences of *A. bibullatus* are typically small, consisting of tens to hundreds of individuals. Only one occurrence has ever been estimated to include greater than 1,000 individuals. It is possible that many of the extant populations are reduced in size from historic levels, and are likely less resilient in the face of environmental stochasticity than they previously were. Morris et al. (2002) found lower densities of seeds and higher heterozygote deficiencies in shallow (i.e., presumably more recent) seed bank deposits of *A. bibullatus* occurrences compared to deeper seed bank deposits. They interpreted the apparent reduction in seed density of shallow deposits as evidence that contemporary rates of seed input have been lower than earlier rates. The differences in heterozygote deficiency, they concluded, were likely the result of increased incidence of inbreeding, which would decrease the effective population size. Monitoring programs should be designed to evaluate relative seed production in relation to occurrence size and determine whether larger populations are reproductively more successful than smaller ones. Further genetic studies might be warranted to estimate what level of demographic change in populations might have been associated with the reduction of heterozygosity observed in shallow seed bank deposits compared to older ones. Such an investigation might provide an indication of the population sizes that would be necessary to prevent further reductions in genetic variability within occurrences.

6: Communicate with local officials to coordinate city and county planning. Meet periodically with local city and county officials to solicit their participation in the conservation of the species.

7: Develop and implement public education plans. Educating the public should be accomplished by providing information to landowners, government agencies, local parks, schools, nature centers and the media. This education could lead to the discovery of new populations and promote an understanding of the importance of conserving endangered species. Because the species is geographically restricted, the recovery of this species will depend largely on the support of the local landowners and local government. The Center for Cedar Glade Studies, which was established at Middle Tennessee State University in 2005 using Environmental Protection Agency funds, should be engaged as a partner in developing educational materials and opportunities for the public.

8: Periodically assess the success of recovery efforts for the species. Timely review of new information and evaluation of ongoing programs are essential to ensure that full recovery occurs as rapidly and efficiently as possible.

REFERENCES

- Allendorf, F. W. and G. Luikart. 2007. Conservation and the Genetics of Populations. Blackwell Publishing. Malden, MA. 642 pp.
- Barneby, R. C. and E. L. Bridges. 1987. A new species of *Astragalus* (Fabaceae) from Tennessee's Central Basin. *Brittonia* 39(3): 358-363.
- Baskauf, C. J., and S. Snapp. 1998. Population genetics of the cedar-glade endemic *Astragalus bibullatus* (Fabaceae) using isozymes. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden* 85:90-96.
- Baskauf, C. J. 2006. Population genetics of *Astragalus bibullatus* using AFLP's. Unpublished report for the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 9 pp.
- Baskin, J. M. and C. C. Baskin. 1986. Distribution and geographical/evolutionary relationships of cedar glade endemics in Southeastern United States. *ASB Bulletin* 33: 138 - 154.
- Baskin, C. C, J. M. Baskin, and E. Quarterman. 1972. Observations on the ecology of *Astragalus tennesseensis*. *American Midland Naturalist* 88(1):167-182.
- DeSelm, H. 1959. A new map of the Central Basin of Tennessee. *Journal of the Tennessee Academy of Science* 34(1): 66-72.
- Hemmerly, T. E. 1976. Life cycle strategy of a highly endemic cedar glade species: *Echinacea tennesseensis* (Compositae). Ph.D. Dissertation, Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville. 187 pp.
- Hogan, T. 2009. Phone call. Geoff Call, Recovery Coordinator, Cookeville Ecological Services Field Office. Information on Pyne's ground-plum and tornado disturbance at Stones River National Battlefield. *Ecologist*, National Park Service, September 25, 2009.
- Kartez, J.T. 1994. A Synonymized Checklist of the Vascular Flora of the United States, Canada, and Greenland. Second Edition. Timber Press, Portland, Oregon. 622 pp.
- Luther, E. T. 1977. *Our Restless Earth, the Geologic Regions of Tennessee*. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville, Tennessee. 94 pp.

- McCue, K. E., E. Belt, and M. Yurlina. 2001. Propagation protocol for *Astragalus bibullatus*. *Native Plant Journal* 2(2):131-132.
- Morris, A. B., R. S. Baucom, and M. B. Cruzan. 2002. Stratified analysis of the soil seed bank in the cedar glade endemic, *Astragalus bibullatus*: Evidence for historical changes in genetic structure. *American Journal of Botany* 89:29-36.
- Quarterman, E. 1986. Biota, ecology, and ecological history of cedar glades: introduction. *ASB Bulletin* 33(4): 124-127.
- Somers, P., L. R. Smith, P. B. Hamel and E. L. Bridges. 1986. Preliminary analyses of plant communities and seasonal changes in cedar glades of Middle Tennessee. *ASB Bulletin* 33: 178-192.
- Somers, P. and S. C. Gunn. 1990. Status report, *Astragalus bibullatus* Barneby and Bridges. Unpublished report to the Southeast Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 33 pp.
- Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation. 2008. Tennessee Natural Heritage Program Rare Plant List. Prepared by Todd Crabtree, Nashville, Tennessee. 50 pp.
- Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation. 2005. *Astragalus bibullatus*, *Dalea foliosa*, and *Echinacea tennesseensis* Population Monitoring. Unpublished report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 29 pp.
- Toole, E. H. and E. Brown. 1946. Final results of the Duvel buried seed experiment. *Journal of Agricultural Research* 72(6):201-210.
- U. S. Dept. of Agriculture/Soil Conservation Service. 1977. Soil Survey of Rutherford County. United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, in cooperation with the University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station. 95 pp.
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1991. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; *Astragalus bibullatus* (Guthrie's Ground-plum) determined to be endangered. *Federal Register* 56(187): 48748 - 48751.
- Weakley, A. S. 2008. Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, Northern Florida, and Surrounding Areas. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC. Working draft of April 7, 2008. 924 pp.

PART III. IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Recovery plans are intended to assist the Service and other stakeholders in planning and implementing actions to recover and/or protect endangered and threatened species. The following Implementation Schedule indicates task priorities; task numbers; task descriptions; task duration; potential stakeholders and responsible agencies; and, lastly, estimated costs. It is a guide for planning and meeting the objectives discussed in Part II of this plan. The Implementation Schedule outlines recovery actions and their estimated costs for the first 5 years of this recovery program. The estimated date of recovery is 2025, provided that funds are available to accomplish the required recovery tasks and that the recovery criteria are met. The costs are broad estimates and identify foreseeable expenditures that could be made to implement the specific recovery tasks during a 5-year period. **Actual expenditures by identified agencies and other partners will be contingent upon appropriations and other budgetary constraints.**

Priorities in column 1 of the following Implementation Schedule are assigned as follows:

1. Priority 1 - An action that must be taken to prevent extinction or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly in the foreseeable future.
2. Priority 2 - An action that must be taken to prevent a significant decline in species population/habitat quality or some other significant negative impact short of extinction.
3. Priority 3 - All other actions necessary to meet the recovery objective.

While the Act assigns a strong leadership role to the Service for the recovery of listed species, it also recognizes the importance of other Federal agencies, States, and other stakeholders in the recovery process. The “Responsible Agency” column of the Implementation Schedule identifies partners who can make significant contributions to specific recovery tasks. **The identification of agencies and other stakeholders within the Implementation Schedule does not constitute any additional legal responsibilities beyond existing authorities (e.g., Act, CWA). Recovery plans do not obligate other stakeholders to undertake specific tasks and may not represent the views nor the official positions or approval of any agencies or stakeholders involved in developing the plan, other than the Service.**

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

CPC - Center for Plant Conservation

ES – Ecological Services Division, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

TDEC - Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation

R4 – Region 4 (Southeast Region), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

NPS – National Park Service

PVT – A university, research center, or private landowner

TNC – The Nature Conservancy

CTY – Murfreesboro City Government

CNTY – Rutherford County Government

<i>Astragalus bibullatus</i> Implementation Schedule											
Priority	Task Number	Task Description	Task Duration	Responsible Agency		Cost Estimates (\$000s)					Comments
				FWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	FY4	FY5	
1	1.1	Acquire habitat.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, TNC, CTY, CNTY	500	500	500	500	500	
1	1.2	Pursue protection with landowners.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, TNC, CTY, CNTY	10	10	10	10	10	
1	1.3	Develop and implement management plans for each occurrence.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, PVT	50	50	50	50	50	
1	1.4	Establish cooperative management agreements for occurrences that are not located on conservation lands.	2 years	R4/ES	TDEC, PVT	5	5				
2	2	Search for new occurrences.	3 years	R4/ES	TDEC, PVT	50	50	50			
2	3.1	Develop a written protocol for monitoring <i>A. bibullatus</i> occurrences.	2 years	R4/ES	TDEC, CPC, PVT	10	10				
2	3.2	Monitor demographic trends and threats at all occurrences.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, CPC, PVT	15	15	15	15	15	
2	4.1	Study life history and ecological requirements.	4 years	R4/ES	TDEC, PVT	50	50	50	50		
2	4.2	Study reproductive biology.	2 years	R4/ES	TDEC, PVT	50	50				
2	5.1	Maintain plant and seed sources <i>ex situ</i> .	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, CPC	1	1	1	1	1	
2	5.2	Identify suitable unoccupied habitat.	2 years	R4/ES	TDEC, NPS, CPC, PVT	30	30				
2	5.3	Establish new occurrences.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, NPS, CPC	10	10	10	10	10	
2	5.4	Augment existing occurrences, where necessary.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, CPC	10	10	10	10	10	
3	6	Communicate with local officials to coordinate city and county planning.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, CTY, CNTY	1	1	1	1	1	
3	7	Develop and implement public education plans.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC, TNC, CTY, CNTY	10	10	10	10	10	
3	8	Periodically assess the success of recovery efforts for the species.	Continuous	R4/ES	TDEC	1	1	1	1	1	

PART IV. LIST OF RECIPIENTS

Copies of this recovery plan were made available to the following agencies, organizations, and individuals. This does not imply that they provided comments or endorsed the contents of this plan.

Governor Phil Bredesen
State Capitol
Nashville, TN 37243

The Honorable Lamar Alexander [R-TN]
United States Senate
District Office – Nashville
3322 West End Avenue, #120
Nashville, TN 37203

The Honorable Bob Corker [R-TN]
United States Senate
District Office - Nashville
3322 West End Ave., Suite 610
Nashville, TN 37203

The Honorable Bart Gordon [D-TN]
United States House of Representatives
305 West Main Street
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Ernest Burgess, County Mayor
Rutherford County Courthouse
Room 101
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Mr. Tommy Bragg, Mayor
City of Murfreesboro
111 West Vine Street
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

James H. Fyke, Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Environment and
Conservation
401 Church Street
21st Floor, L&C Annex
Nashville, TN 37243

Ed Carter, Executive Director
Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
Nashville, Tennessee 37204

David Lincicome, Manager
Tennessee Department of Environment and
Conservation, Bureau of Parks
Resource Management Division
Natural and Cultural Resources
401 Church Street
7th Floor, L&C Annex
Nashville, TN 37243

Ruth Tackett, State Director
USDA – Rural Development
3322 West End Avenue, Suite 300
Nashville, TN 37203-1084

Louis E. Buck, State Executive Director
Farm Service Agency
579 U.S. Courthouse
801 Broadway
Nashville, TN 37203-3816

Kevin Brown, State Conservationist
Natural Resources Conservation Service
U.S. Courthouse, Room 675
801 Broadway
Nashville, TN 37203

Gerald F. Nicely, Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Transportation
James K. Polk Building
505 Deaderick Street
Suite 700
Nashville, TN 37243-0349

Tennessee Division Administrator
Federal Highways Administration
640 Grassmere Park Road, Suite 211
Nashville, TN 37211

Harry E. Walls, Environmental Officer
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
75 Spring Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303-3388
Project Manager (7507C)

Endangered Species Protection Program
Environmental Field Branch, OPP
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460

Regional Director
Federal Railroad Administration
Department of Transportation
61 Forsyth Street, SW, Suite 16T20
Atlanta, GA 30303

Director
Atlanta Support Office
U.S. Department of Energy
75 Spring Street, SW, Suite 200
Atlanta, GA 30303-3308

Regional Administrator
Attention: Endangered Species Coordinator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303-3104

Lt. Colonel Bernard R. Lindstrom
Nashville District Engineer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 1070
Nashville, TN 37202-1070

Superintendent
Stones River National Battlefield
3501 Old Nashville Highway
Murfreesboro, TN 37129

Peggy Shute, Director
Natural Heritage Program
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, TN 37902

Steven Scott, State Forester
Tennessee Division of Forestry
Box 40627, Melrose Station
Nashville, TN 37204

Ken Givens, Commissioner
Tennessee Department of Agriculture
Box 40627, Melrose Station
Nashville, TN 37204

Tennessee State Planning Office
660 Capitol Hill Building
Nashville, TN 37219

NMNH - Botany Department
MRC 0166
Smithsonian Institution
P.O. Box 37012
Washington, DC 20013-7012

Ms. Rhedona Rose, Director of Public Affairs
Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation
P.O. Box 313
Columbia, TN 38401

The Nature Conservancy of Tennessee
2021 21st Avenue South, Suite 400
Nashville, TN 37212

Tennessee Native Plant Society
P.O. Box 159274
Nashville, TN 37215

*Matthew Albrecht
Plant Conservation Biologist
Center for Conservation & Sustainable
Development
Missouri Botanical Garden
P.O. Box 299
St. Louis, MO 63166

Kimberlie McCue, Ph.D.
Instructor and Faculty Chair
School for Science and Math at Vanderbilt
806 Light Hall
Nashville, TN 37232-0670

*Dwayne Estes, Ph.D.
Austin Peay State University
Department of Biology
Sundquist Science Complex, D125
P. O. Box 4718

B. Eugene Wofford, Ph.D.
The University of Tennessee
190a James D Hoskins Library
1400 West Cumberland
Knoxville, TN 37996-1100

Jerry Baskin, Ph.D.
College of Arts & Sciences
213 Patterson Office Tower
Lexington, KY 40506-0027
Phone: 859-257-8354
Fax: 859-323-1073

*Maile Neel, Associate Professor
Department of Plant Science and Landscape
Architecture
Department of Entomology
2116 Plant Sciences Building
College Park, Maryland 20742-4452

Carol J. Baskauf, Ph.D.
Department of Biology
P.O. Box 4718
Austin Peay State University
Clarksville, TN 37044

*Jeffrey L. Walck, Ph.D.
Department of Biology
Middle Tennessee State University
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

World Wildlife Fund
2021 21st Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37212

Rick Davis
1595 Cranor Road
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Buddy Gambill
5707 Shelbyville Pike
Christiana, TN 37037

Don Moefield
1935 Factory Road
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

John McFadden, Executive Director
One Vantage Way, Suite D-105
Nashville, TN 37228

Tim Henderson
7703 Manus Road
Murfreesboro, TN 37127

Kenneth Evans
Rt. 8, Box 550
Halls Hill Pike
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

Sandy Summers
2335 Factory Road
Murfreesboro, TN 37130

*peer reviewers