Flammulated Owl (*Psiloscops flammeolus*) Conservation Status Rank Summary

December 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>

Rarity and Trends

| Rank Factor Date Assessed | | Value | Score Data Source | | Comments | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| Rarity | | | | | | |
| Range Extent | Range Extent 2024-12-04 S: 122838.5 km ² 3.930 MTNHP Range No. Maps | | None | | | |
| Area of Occupancy | 2024-12-04 | 5031 4km² cells | 4.810 | MTNHP Modeling | None | |
| Number of Occurrences | 2024-12-04 | 811 | 5.500 | MTNHP Databases | None | |
| Population Size | | | - | | Factor not used in ranking. | |
| # of Occurrences in Good Condition | 2024-12-05 | | 1.100 | MTNHP Data | Due to historic forest management almost all of the area occupied by the species lacks ecological integrity | |
| % of Area Occupied in Good Condition | | | - | | Factor not used in ranking. | |
| Environmental Specificity 2009-01-27 | | Narrow | - | MTNHP Species Rank Data Table | Factor not used in ranking. Uses mature conifer forest which is widespread, but not common. Methodology: NS (2003) Original Score: B | |

Rarity is calculated by averaging weighted factor scores: $(3.93 \times 1) + (4.81 \times 2) + (5.50 \times 1) + (1.10 \times 2) / 6 = 3.54$

| Trends | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|--|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Short-term Trend | 2024-12-04 | | - | MTNHP Data | Factor not used in ranking. Populations are not monitored and trend data are not available | | | |
| Long-term Trend | 2009-01-27 | | -0.140 | MTNHP Species Rank Data Table | Mature Douglas Fir and Ponderosa Pine Forests have declined since European arrival so probably >25% of this habitat has been lost. Methodology: NS (2003) Original Score: D | | | |

Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores: $((-0.14 \times 1)) = -0.14$

Threats

| Rank Factor Date Assessed | | Value | Score Data Source | | Comments | | |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Threats | | | | | | | |
| Overall Threat Medium | | Medium | 3.670 | | Stand replacing fire, timber harvest that removes preferred nest habitat and forest structure, and pesticide application (they are insectivorous) are probably the biggest threats of concern. | | |
| Intrinsic Vulnerability | 2009-01-27 | Moderately vulnerable | - | MTNHP Species Rank Data Table | Factor not used in ranking. Methodology: NS (2003) Original Score: B | | |

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 | 2024-12-04 | Low | Restricted | Moderate | High | Removal of snags for firewood along roads. This is a significant threat where roads intersect suitable habitat, but is probably limited in scope as this activity only impacts trees within immediate proximity to roads where extraction of the wood is feasible. Removal of snags due to forest management practices such as salvage logging and thinning. This is more widespread |
| Natural System Modifications | 2024-12-05 | Medium | Pervasive | Moderate | High | Suppression of high severity fires leading to lower numbers of nesting snags |

Threat Tally: 0 - Very High, 0 - High, 1 - Medium, 1 - Low Overall Threat Impact* = Medium

^{*}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: $(3.54 \times 70\%)$ + Threats: $(3.67 \times 30\%)$ + Trends: (-0.14) = 3.44

Calculated Rank: S3

| Accepted Rank | S3B |
|--------------------|--|
| Date Approved | Date Unknown |
| Approval Authority | Legacy Assessment: MTNHP Staff |
| Rank Justification | Species is uncommon across mountainous areas of western Montana. It generally inhabits forests with larger diameter trees and nests in snags. There are currently no trend data available for this species. It faces threats due to habitat degradation due to historic fire suppression efforts and removal of standing dead trees. |

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=ABNSB01020

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:

https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=ABNSB01020

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 | | _ | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 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 | Throat Quality | Marginal | Threat Impact assessed at more than one value (e.g. "High - Medium") | | | | |
| inreats | 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 | | | | |
| Trends | | 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

Data to assess species status are generally available, but short-term trend is not.

Summary of Information Needs

General avian monitoring programs are insufficient to characterize population changes for this species. Species specific monitoring is needed to determine population trend and explore impacts of threats. A stable or positive trend might elevate status to S4.

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 |
|--|------------------|----------------|--|----------------|------------|----------------|---|
| Biological Resource Use - 5.3 - Logging & Wood Harvesting | 2024-12-04 | Dan Bachen | Expert Opinion | Restricte d | Moderate | High | Removal of snags for firewood along roads. This is a significant threat where roads intersect suitable habitat, but is probably limited in scope as this activity only impacts trees within immediate proximity to roads where extraction of the wood is feasable. Removal of snags due to forest management practices such as salvage logging and thinning. This is more widespread |
| Natural System Modifications - 7.1 - Fire & Fire Suppression | 2024-12-05 | Dan Bachen | Hutto and DellaSala 2024, Expert Opinion | Pervasiv e | Moderate | High | Suppression of high severity fires leading to lower numbers of nesting snags |
| Climate Change & Severe Weather - 11 | 2024-12-04 | Dan Bachen | Walsh and Hudiberg 2021 | Pervasiv e | Negligible | Moderat e | Modeling of habitat suitability in Northern Idaho did not show negative impacts of warming temperatures for this species |