

Public Comment Notes:

The Verification Process (Fatal Flaw Analysis) includes standardized justifications for NJDFW biologists to move a species from its screened category to a different category. Standardized justifications provide consistency and transparency in NJ's Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) selection process. We are asking for your comments on the Standardized Justifications below. You'll find the **comment form** at the bottom of the justifications.

Some comment examples might include:

I would suggest including [x] as a justification to move a species on the SGCN list.

Instead of justification B4, I suggest including [x].

Why didn't you include [x] as a justification to move a species to Data Deficient SGCN?

STANDARDIZED JUSTIFICATIONS FOR STATUS CHANGE

Note: Here "responsibility" is a category that is based on NJDFW biologists' knowledge of the species.

A. Justifications to move species **ON** the SGCN list:

1. Responsibility: NJ's responsibility is currently low because NJ its northern edge of range, but its population is expanding and likely to increase. There are indications of concern. NOTE: This includes naturalized species that were **not** anthropogenically introduced.
2. Concern: It is listed in adjacent states or has a low s-rank in adjacent states.
3. Concern: Emerging threats that have yet to get captured in the status assessments used in the screening (i.e. new diseases, decline in host trees/plants).
4. Concern: There is new information about status and trend that indicate the status meets the criteria outlined for SGCN. (i.e. new peer reviewed studies or papers).
5. Responsibility: It is an important subspecies or a population of a secure (not SGCN) species, but the NJ population is not secure.
6. Responsibility: NJ is an important migratory stopover state. This includes birds that are USFWS conservation concern and/or PIF ACAD management attention, in areas north of NJ.
7. Concern: It is a sensitive indicator species of environmental conditions (e.g., fish population levels, toxin levels, disease) that reflect ecosystem health and function.

B. Justifications to move species **OFF** the SGCN list. Issue/concern is that the factor/s triggering a SGCN status may not be enough to justify SGCN status in NJ.

1. The species is secure in NJ.
2. Responsibility: It has marginal occurrences in NJ and is unlikely to naturally expand its range.

3. Concern: Nationally and Regionally there is some concern, but it is secure in NJ
4. Concern and responsibility indicate SGCN status, but the species is naturalized and therefore a lower priority.
5. Responsibility: While the species is documented as occurring in NJ in the past, it is now likely extirpated in NJ.
6. Responsibility: NJ's responsibility is currently low because we are at its northern or southern edge of range, but its population is expanding and likely to increase. There are no indications of concern at the range wide or state levels. NOTE: This includes naturalized species that were **not** anthropogenically introduced.

C. Justifications to **MOVE** species from SGCN to Data Deficient SGCN.

1. Concern: Regional and/or Global data indicate greater confidence in the status of species than we have in NJ.

D. Justifications to **MOVE** species from not SGCN to Data Deficient SGCN.

1. Concern: It is questionable that it is secure in New Jersey.

Public Comment Form

<https://dep.nj.gov/njfw/conservation/comments-on-standardized-justifications/>