

# Chestnut-backed Chickadee (*Poecile rufescens*)

## Conservation Status Rank Summary

January 31, 2025

For details on assessment and ranking methodology, see: [Conservation Status Assessment Definitions, Process, Rank Factors, and Calculation of State Ranks for Montana Species](#)

### Rarity and Trends

Rank Factor	Date Assessed	Value	Score	Data Source	Comments
<b>Rarity</b>					
Range Extent	2025-01-31	Y: 66589.3 km <sup>2</sup>	3.930	MTNHP Range Maps	None
Area of Occupancy	2025-01-31	4492   4km <sup>2</sup> cells	4.810	MTNHP Modeling	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	2011-12-22	Narrow	-	MTNHP Species Rank Data Table	Factor not used in ranking. Narrow Specialist. Species uses dense conifer forests across its range and Western Red-Cedar and Grand Fir Forests in Montana.   Methodology: NS (2003)   Original Score: B
Rarity is calculated by averaging weighted factor scores: $((3.93 \times 1) + (4.81 \times 2)) / 3 = 4.52$					
<b>Trends</b>					
Short-term Trend	2023-12-20	[-8.0, 14.4%]	[0.000, 0.070]	IMBCR	IMBCR trend in population estimates for Montana. "- 95% CI"
Long-term Trend	2011-12-22		-0.140	MTNHP Species Rank Data Table	Cedar and Grand Fir forests have been heavily impacted in Western Montana with probably greater than 50% decline in these habitats since European arrival.   Methodology: NS (2003)   Original Score: D
Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores: $(((0.00, 0.07) \times 2) + (-0.14 \times 1)) = [-0.14, 0.00]$					

## Threats

Rank Factor	Date Assessed	Value	Score	Data Source	Comments
<b>Threats</b>					
Overall Threat Impact		Medium	3.670		Drying of mesic forest types as a result of climate change and the potential for fire and disease to result as a consequence are probably the greatest threats to this species.
Intrinsic Vulnerability	2011-12-22	Not intrinsically vulnerable	-	MTNHP Species Rank Data Table	Factor not used in ranking. Not Intrinsicly 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: ( 3.67 ) = 3.67					

### Individual Threats Data

Threat Category	Date Assessed	Impact Score	Scope	Severity	Immediacy	Comments
Biological Resource Use	2025-01-31	Low	Restricted	Moderate	High	Logging of large diameter trees and mature forests may cause habitat loss and fragmentation
Natural System Modifications	2025-01-31	Medium	Large	Moderate	High	Loss of mature forests due to high severity fire and decline in forest health due to fire suppression
Threat Tally: 0 - Very High, 0 - High, 1 - Medium, 1 - Low Overall Threat Impact* = Medium						

\*See [Conservation Status Assessment Definitions, Process, Rank Factors, and Calculation of State Ranks for Montana Species](#) for calculation of Overall Threat Impact based on the number and impact of individual threats.

## Conservation Status Rank Calculation

### Raw score

Rarity:  $(4.52 \times 70\%)$  + Threats:  $(3.67 \times 30\%)$  + Trends:  $([-0.14, 0.00])$  =  $[4.12, 4.26]$

Calculated Rank: S4

<b>Accepted Rank</b>	S4
<b>Date Approved</b>	2025-01-31
<b>Approval Authority</b>	Montana Natural Heritage Program Staff
<b>Rank Justification</b>	Species is relatively common within suitable habitat and widely distributed across portions of the state.

## 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](https://mtnhp.mt.gov/docs/Montana_State_Rank_Criteria_20211201.pdf)

Montana Field Guide Species Account:

<https://fieldguide.mt.gov/speciesDetail.aspx?elcode=ABPAW01070>

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:

<https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=ABPAW01070>

## 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 Factor	Assessment Category	Value	Criteria
General Status	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)
		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)
Rarity	Range 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)
		Marginal	Range polygon defined, but may include or exclude notable areas where the species may or may not occur on the landscape
		Poor	Range polygon not defined
	Habitat Quality	Adequate	Species-habitat relationship is well-defined (e.g. relevant literature or robust habitat model available)
		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
Threats	Threat Quality	Adequate	Threat Impact is a single value (including "Unthreatened")
		Marginal	Threat Impact assessed at more than one value (e.g. "High - Medium")
		Poor	Threat Impact is Unknown but Intrinsic Vulnerability is assessed
		Unknown	Threat Impact is Unknown and Intrinsic Vulnerability is not assessed
Trends	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
	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

Information to assess status is available

### Summary of Information Needs

No further information is needed and monitoring through IMBCR/ BBS should continue.

## 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	Immediacy	Comments
<b>Biological Resource Use - 5.3 - Logging &amp; Wood Harvesting</b>	2025-01-31	Dan Bachen	Expert Opinion	Restricted	Moderate	High	Logging of large diameter trees and mature forests may cause habitat loss and fragmentation
<b>Natural System Modifications - 7.1 - Fire &amp; Fire Suppression</b>	2025-01-31	Dan Bachen	Expert Opinion	Large	Moderate	High	Loss of mature forests due to high severity fire and decline in forest health due to fire suppression