Bobolink (*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*) Conservation Status Rank Summary

December 3, 2024

For details on assessment and ranking methodology, see: <u>Conservation Status Assessment Definitions, Process,</u> <u>Rank Factors, and Calculation of State Ranks for Montana Species</u>

| Rank Factor | Date Assessed | Value | Score Data Source | | Comments | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| Rarity | | | | | | | |
| Range Extent | 2023-12-27 | S: 380530.8 km² | 4.710 | MTNHP Range Maps | None | | |
| Area of Occupancy | 2024-12-03 | 11400 4km ² cells | 4.810 | MTNHP Modeling | None | | |
| Number of Occurrences | 2024-12-03 | 1644 | 5.500 | MTNHP Databases | None | | |
| Population Size | | | - | | Factor not used in ranking. | | |
| # of Occurrences in Good Condition | | | - | | Factor not used in ranking. | | |
| % of Area Occupied in Good Condition | | | - | | Factor not used in ranking. | | |
| Environmental Specificity | 2011-12-20 | Narrow | - | MTNHP Species Rank Data Table | Factor not used in ranking. Narrow Specialist. Need deep cover grasslands which are very limited in Montana so in Montana their specificity is narrow. Methodology: NS (2003) Original Score: B | | |
| Trends | Rarity | is calculated by a ((4.71 × 1) + (4.8 | | - | | | |
| Short-term Trend | 2023-12-20 | [-15.2, 21.1%] | [-0.070, 0.070] | IMBCR | IMBCR trend in population estimates for Montana. "- 95% CI" | | |
| Long-term Trend | m Trend 2011-12-20 -0.140 Speci Rank D | | MTNHP Species Rank Data Table | Species requires higher cover wetter grasslands with taller grasses. Some wetlands have been lost, but irrigation has increased since European arrival so overall trend is probably stable within +/-25% since European arrival. Methodology: NS (2003) Original Score: E | | | |
| Tren | ds score is calo | ulated by summi (([-0.07, 0.07] × 2 | | | long-term trend scores: 0] | | |

Rarity and Trends

Threats

| Rank Factor Date Assessed | | Value | Score | Data Source | Comments | | | |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Threats | | | | | | | | |
| Overall Threat Impact | | Very high | 0.000 | | Habitat loss, drought in relation to climate change, and mowing are probably the greatest threats to the species. | | | |
| Intrinsic Vulnerability | 2011-12-20 | Not intrinsically vulnerable | - | MTNHP Species Rank Data Table | Factor not used in ranking. Not Intrinsically Vulnerable. Species matures quickly, reproduces frequently, and/or has a high fecundity such that populations recover quickly (5 years or 2 generations) from decreases in abundance. Species has good dispersal capabilities such that extirpated populations generally become reestablished through natural recolonization. Methodology: NS (2003) Original Score: C | | | |
| Threat score is calculated from Overall Threat Impact when available or Intrinsic Vulnerability if not: (0.00) = 0.00 | | | | | | | | |

Individual Threats Data

| Threat Category | Date Assessed | Impact Score | Scope | Severity | Immediacy | Comments | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------|----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Agriculture & Aquaculture | 2024-12-03 | High | Large | Serious | High | Conversion of native grasslands to row crop agriculture is a significant concern for this species. Additionally, species will nest in hay fields and suffers loss of nests when fields are cut before young have fledged. | | | |
| Climate Change & Severe Weather | 2024-12-03 | High | Pervasive | Serious | Moderate | Audubon's Survival by Degrees project predicts significant loss of breeding habitat across various warming scenarios (1.5-3C). | | | |
| | Threat Tally: 0 - Very High, 2 - High, 0 - Medium, 0 - Low Overall Threat Impact* = Very high | | | | | | | | |

*See <u>Conservation Status Assessment Definitions</u>, <u>Process</u>, <u>Rank Factors</u>, <u>and Calculation of State Ranks for Montana Species</u> for calculation of Overall Threat Impact based on the number and impact of individual threats</u>.

Conservation Status Rank Calculation

Raw score

Rarity: (4.96 × 70%) + Threats: (0.00 × 30%) + Trends: ([-0.28, 0.00]) = [3.19, 3.47]

Calculated Rank: S3

| Accepted Rank | S3B | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| Date Approved 2004-07-01 | | | |
| Approval Authority | Montana Species of Concern Committee | | |
| Rank Justification | Species is somewhat common across grasslands and valley bottoms state-wide. It appears to be stable or declining and faces threats from habitat loss due to conversion of native grasslands to row crop agriculture and a warming climate. Additionally, it suffers loss of nests in hay fields when hay is cut before young have fledged. | | |

Supplementary Information

Montana Natural Heritage Program. 2021. Conservation Status Assessment Definitions, Process, Rank Factors, and Calculation of State Ranks for Montana Species. 18 p. https://mtnhp.mt.gov/docs/Montana State Rank Criteria 20211201.pdf

Montana Field Guide Species Account: https://fieldguide.mt.gov/speciesDetail.aspx?elcode=ABPBXA9010

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model: https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=ABPBXA9010

Information Needs

Information needs are assessed by considering the availability of factors used to assess species status as well as the quality of these assessments. Current information availability and quality to inform Conservation Status Rank for this species are highlighted.

| Rank Assessment | | Malua | Oritaria | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Factor | Category | Value | Criteria | | | | |
| General | Status Quality | Adequate | Calculated rank has low uncertainty and is represented by a single rank (e.g. S3); accepted rank may be adjusted to a range rank (e.g. S2S3) | | | | |
| Status | Status Quality | Poor | Rank assessed as SU or calculated rank has notable uncertainty and corresponds to a range rank with 2 or more values (e.g. S2?, S1S3, or S4S5) | | | | |
| | Danas Quality | Adequate | Range polygon adequately represents area of probable occupancy and does not include substantial unoccupied areas; range may be adequately defined and still include areas of unsuitable habitat (e.g. mountain ranges for plains species) | | | | |
| | Range Quality | Marginal | Range polygon defined, but may include or exclude notable areas where the species may or may not occur on the landscape | | | | |
| Rarity | | Poor | Range polygon not defined | | | | |
| - | | Adequate | Species-habitat relationship is well-defined (e.g. relevant literature or robust habitat model available) | | | | |
| | Habitat Quality | Marginal | Understanding of species-habitat relationship is adequate among some but not all habitats (e.g. literature covers similar habitats outside of Montana or habitat model performance is only somewhat adequate) | | | | |
| | | Poor | Species-habitat relationship is not well understood | | | | |
| | | Adequate | Threat Impact is a single value (including "Unthreatened") | | | | |
| Threats | Threat Quality | Marginal | Threat Impact assessed at more than one value (e.g. "High - Medium") | | | | |
| meats | Threat Quality | Poor | Threat Impact is Unknown but Intrinsic Vulnerability is assessed | | | | |
| | | Unknown | Threat Impact is Unknown and Intrinsic Vulnerability is not assessed | | | | |
| | | Current | Short-term Trend assessment date less than 10 years old | | | | |
| | Recency | Out of Date but Adequate | Short-term Trend assessment date is more than 10 years old or Unknown, but species is Unthreatened | | | | |
| | | Out of Date | Short-term Trend assessment date more than 10 years old | | | | |
| | | Not Available | Short-term Trend data are not available | | | | |
| Trends | Trend Quality | Sufficient | Short-term Trend assessed at a single value or multiple values with a minimum trend greater than -10% (stable or increasing) | | | | |
| | | Unknown but Sufficient | Short-term Trend is Unknown, but species is Unthreatened | | | | |
| | | Poor | Short-term Trend is less than -10% (in decline) with two or more values selected | | | | |
| | | Unknown | Short-term Trend is Unknown | | | | |

Summary of Information Availability

Data to assess status are available. Short-term trend is available, but the confidence intervals overlap 0. Given the high degree of threats, additional monitoring could provide greater certainty in population trend.

Summary of Information Needs

Continuation of existing and possibly additional monitoring to determine current trend and assess ongoing impacts of threats.

Additional Threat Details

The table below contains the complete threats assessment for this species. While the Conservation Status Rank Calculation is based on cumulative, broadly categorized (Level 1) threats data, threats are assessed and tracked for more specifically categorized (Level 2) threats when available.

| Threat Category | Date Assessed | Assessed By | Data Source | Scope | Severity | Imme- diacy | Comments |
|---|------------------|----------------|---|---------------|----------|----------------|---|
| Agriculture & Aquaculture - 2.1 - Annual & Perennial Non-Timber Crops | 2024-12-03 | Dan Bachen | MTNHP Data, WWF Plow Print Tool, Expert Opinion | Large | Serious | High | Conversion of native grasslands to row crop agriculture is a significant concern for this species. Additionally, species will nest in hay fields and suffers loss of nests when fields are cut befor young have fledged. |
| Climate Change & Severe Weather - 11 | 2024-12-03 | Dan Bachen | Audubon' s Survival by Degrees Project | Pervasiv e | Serious | Moderat e | Audubon's Survival by Degrees project predicts significant loss of breeding habitat across various warming scenarios (1.5-3C). |