# Brassy Minnow (*Hybognathus hankinsoni*) Conservation Status Rank Summary

March 5, 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	2024-02-23	Y: 230357.9 km²	4.710	MTNHP Range Maps	None			
Area of Occupancy	2024-02-23	10871   1km² cells	4.810	FWP Fish Distributio n Layer	None			
Number of Occurrences			-		Factor not used in ranking.			
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			-		Factor not used in ranking.			
Rarity is calculated by averaging weighted factor scores: ((4.71 × 1) + (4.81 × 2)) / 3 = 4.78								
Short-term Trend	rt-term Trend 2024-03-05 [-20.0, 0.0%] [-0.070, 0.000] [-0.070, 0.000] [-0.070, 0.000] WY st		Trend est. from BLM surveys Duncan abundance paper – Brassy were rare in Yellowstone River, but notes Yellowstone had a severe drought in years preceding study which could be reason for low numbers. WY study shows possible expansion or increases in populations (Patton et al. 1998)					
Long-term Trend			-		Factor not used in ranking.			
Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores: ( ([-0.07, 0.00] × 2) ) = [-0.14, 0.00]								

# **Rarity and Trends**

# Threats

Rank Factor	Date Assessed	Value	Score	Data Source	Comments	
Threats						
Overall Threat Impact		Low/No Threats	5.500		Intensive agriculture, overgrazing, road crossings, dams, and exotic species (Northern Pike in particular) all represent threats.	
Intrinsic Vulnerability			-		Factor not used in ranking.	
Threat score is calculated from Overall Threat Impact when available or Intrinsic Vulnerability if not: ( 5.50 ) = 5.50						

### **Individual Threats Data**

Threat Category	Date Assessed	Impact Score	Scope	Severity	Immediacy	Comments	
Invasive & Other Problematic Species, Genes & Diseases	2024-03-05	Low	Pervasive	Slight	High	Predation from Northern pike, walleye, smallmouth bass (FWP field guide, Schlosser, I.J. 1988). As proper hydrologic processes are lost due to stream channel modifications (impact listed above) predation impacts will increase as well – less habitat types for species to hide from predators. Carp may degrade feeding areas as carp uproot vegetation through their feeding process and increase turbidity (Carp in North America)	
Pollution	2024-03-05	Low	Small	Slight	High	Poorly managed livestock grazing – reduces riparian vegetation which reduces food source, thermal refuge, filtration of overland flow, increased sedimentation, excess nutrients, etc. Streams flowing through oil and gas fields periodically have high conductivity levels to a lethal point (all personal observations)	
Climate Change & Severe Weather	2024-03-05	Low	Pervasive	Slight	Moderate	Drought and drying of small streams – Scheurer et al. 2003 found Brassy to persist in higher numbers in pool habitats that were connected to other habitat types vs disconnected pools	
Threat Tally: 0 - Very High, 0 - High, 0 - Medium, 3 - Low Overall Threat Impact* = Low/No Threats							

\*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.

## **Conservation Status Rank Calculation**

#### Raw score

Rarity: (4.78 × 70%) + Threats: (5.50 × 30%) + Trends: ([-0.14, 0.00]) = [4.85, 4.99]

Calculated Rank: S5

Accepted Rank	S5				
Date Approved	2025-02-03				
Approval Authority	Montana Natural Heritage Program Staff				
Rank Justification	Species is widespread, faces low-level threats and populations are stable				

# **Supplementary Information**

Montana Natural Heritage Program. 2021. Conservation Status Assessment Definitions, Process, Rank Factors, and Calculation of State Ranks for Montana Species. 18 p. <u>https://mtnhp.mt.gov/docs/Montana\_State\_Rank\_Criteria\_20211201.pdf</u>

Montana Field Guide Species Account: https://fieldguide.mt.gov/speciesDetail.aspx?elcode=AFCJB16020

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:

https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=AFCJB16020

# **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	Mahua	Criteria				
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)				
		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")				
Inreats		Poor	Threat Impact is Unknown but Intrinsic Vulnerability is assessed				
		Unknown	Threat Impact is Unknown and Intrinsic Vulnerability is not assessed				
	Recency	Current	Short-term Trend assessment date less than 10 years old				
		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 None

Summary of Information Needs None

# **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
Natural System Modifications - 7.2 - Dams & Water Management/Use	2024-03-05	Christina Stuart	None	Restricted	Negligible	High	Require multiple habitat types within a given year for all life stages to survive (Falke and Fausch 2010) – reservoirs, diversion dams, impoundments all reduce habitat types. (rough est. based on habitat that is altered is avoided, able to expand into other favorable habitat)
Invasive & Other Problematic Species, Genes & Diseases - 8.1 - Invasive Non-Native/Alien Species/Diseases	2024-03-05	Christina Stuart	None	Pervasive	Slight	High	Predation from Northern pike, walleye, smallmouth bass (FWP field guide, Schlosser, I.J. 1988). As proper hydrologic processes are lost due to stream channel modifications (impact listed above) predation impacts will increase as well – less habitat types for species to hide from predators. Carp may degrade feeding areas as carp uproot vegetation through their feeding process and increase turbidity (Carp in North America)
Pollution - 9.3 - Agricultural & Forestry Effluents	2024-03-05	Christina Stuart	None	Small	Slight	High	Poorly managed livestock grazing – reduces riparian vegetation which reduces food source, thermal refuge, filtration of overland flow, increased sedimentation, excess nutrients, etc. Streams flowing through oil and gas fields periodically have high conductivity levels to a lethal point (all personal observations)
Climate Change & Severe Weather - 11.2 - Droughts	2024-03-05	Christina Stuart	None	Pervasive	Slight	Moderat e	Drought and drying of small streams – Scheurer et al. 2003 found Brassy to persist in higher numbers in pool habitats that were connected to other habitat types vs disconnected pools