

Species Data:

Index Result:

Species ***Hesperocyparis bakeri***
 English Name **Baker's cypress**
 Taxonomic Group Vascular Plant
 Geographic Area Josephine and Jackson counties

Less Vulnerable
Confidence Very High
 (based on entered data)
 GRank G3
 SRank S1
 Assessor Caitlin Lawrence

Cave/Ground Water Obligate No
 Migratory area included in assessment: No

Climate Change Vulnerability Index Values: (greatest shown when range was selected)

Category	Factor	Score	Comments
Temperature Scope (predicted increase)	A >6.0F	0	
	A 5.5F	0	
	A 5.1F	0	
	A 4.5F	0	
	A 3.9F	0	
	A <3.9F	100	
Hamon AET:PET Moisture Metric Scope	< -0.119	0	
	-0.119	0	
	-0.096	65	
	-0.073	35	
	-0.05	0	
	>-0.028	0	
Sea level rise Natural barriers Anthropogenic barriers Climate Change mitigation	B1	N	
	B2a	N	
	B2b	N	
	B3	N	
Dispersal/Movement Historical thermal niche Physiological thermal niche Historical hydrological niche Physiol. hydrological niche Disturbance dependence Ice/snow dependence Physical habitat restrictions Other spp create habitat Dietary Versatility Pollinator Versatility Other spp for dispersal Pathogen sensitivity Competition sensitivity	C1	N	Fires occurring too frequently in cypress groves may destroy them, as reproduction could be eliminated before it had a chance to produce cones. Conversely, fire suppression could threaten the species. (Farjon 2013) Seedlings of Baker Cypress are susceptible to damping-off fungi. Baker Cypress is occasionally attacked by Juniper Mistletoe in Plumas County, and Siskiyou Cypress has been infected by Coryneum Canker, which can kill trees. (Farjon 2013)
	C2ai	Inc	
	C2aii	N	
	C2bi	N	
	C2bii	N	
	C2c	Inc	
	C2d	N	
	C3	SI	
	C4a	N	
	C4b	U	
	C4c	N	
	C4d	N	
	C4e	SI	
	C4f	N	

Interspecific Relationship	C4g	U	
Measured genetic variation	C5a	U	
Bottlenecks	C5b	U	
Plant reproductive system	C5c	U	
Phenological response	C6	U	
Documented response	D1	U	
Modeled change	D2	U	
Modeled overlap	D3	U	
Modeled protected areas	D4	U	

Data sources and notes:

Climate and precipitation data from Climate Wizard using the A1B emissions scenario and ensemble average general circulation model. Historical = past 50 years; Future = mid-century (2050s). Species data from ORBIC database. Assessment performed in conjunction with the Element Rank Calculator. Other resources consulted: NREL national wind resources, 50m resolution (http://www.nrel.gov/gis/data_analysis_background.html); SILVIS lab Wildland Urban Interface 2010 layer (http://silvis.forest.wisc.edu/maps/wui_main); Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries geologic map (<http://www.oregongeology.org/sub/publications/GMS/gms.htm>); US mining claims on federal lands (<http://mrddata.usgs.gov/mine-claim/>); Oregon Protected Areas Database (<http://gapanalysis.usgs.gov/padus/data/>).

Detailed definitions of criteria and methodology can be found in the documentation at <http://www.natureserve.org/conservation-tools/climate-change-vulnerability-index>

Legend and Definitions

Affect to Vulnerability:
GI = Greatly increase
Inc = Increase
SI = Somewhat increase
N = Neutral
U = Unknown

Index Scores:

Extremely Vulnerable: Abundance and/or range extent within geographical area assessed extremely likely to substantially decrease or disappear by 2050.

Highly Vulnerable: Abundance and/or range extent within geographical area assessed likely to decrease significantly by 2050.

Moderately Vulnerable: Abundance and/or range extent within geographical area assessed likely to decrease by 2050.

Less Vulnerable: Available evidence does not suggest that abundance and/or range extent within the geographical area assessed will change (increase/decrease) substantially by 2050. Actual range boundaries may change.

Insufficient Evidence: Information entered about a species' vulnerability is inadequate to calculate an Index score.