

# Freshwater Drum (*Aplodinotus grunniens*)

## Conservation Status Rank Summary

February 20, 2024

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	2024-02-20	Y: 39425.4 km <sup>2</sup>	3.930	MTNHP Range Maps	None
Area of Occupancy			-		Factor not used in ranking.
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: $( (3.93 \times 1) ) / 1 = 3.93$					
<b>Trends</b>					
Short-term Trend	2024-02-20		0.000	FWP Monitoring Data	Freshwater drum are often not explicitly monitored, and any information is often a by-product of other long term monitoring programs. Therefore, from what I could analyze from the MFWP FIS database, what trend data there are from these programs, the populations are mostly stable (FWP data; M. Duncan – 2019 – Dissertation) across the state. In Region 7, FWP’s Mat Rugg’s long-term monitoring section on the Lower Yellowstone shows an upward trend in drum they capture during sampling surveys.
Long-term Trend	2024-02-20		0.000	Expert opinion	Human population growth, agricultural land use, and irrigation practices all have diminished the populations of freshwater drum in a significant measure. We do not have adequate information to assess the percent change as they are generally not sought after by humans. There is limited information on their distribution pre-European settlement in Montana.

Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores:  
**( 0.00 × 2 ) + ( 0.00 × 1 ) = 0.00**

## Threats

Rank Factor	Date Assessed	Value	Score	Data Source	Comments
<b>Threats</b>					
<b>Overall Threat Impact</b>		Low/No Threats	5.500		None
<b>Intrinsic Vulnerability</b>			-		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
<b>Biological Resource Use</b>	2024-02-20	Low	Small	Serious	High	Closest study in relatively comparable systems was the Red River, Manitoba, Canada (Card and Hasler 2021). Authors evaluated catch-and-release mortality and estimated 33% of freshwater drum mortality due to deep hooking from recreational angling.
Threat Tally: 0 - Very High, 0 - High, 0 - Medium, 1 - Low Overall Threat Impact* = Low/No Threats						

\*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:  $(3.93 \times 70\%)$  + Threats:  $(5.50 \times 30\%)$  + Trends:  $(0.00) = 4.40$

Calculated Rank: S4

<b>Accepted Rank</b>	S4
<b>Date Approved</b>	2025-02-03
<b>Approval Authority</b>	Montana Natural Heritage Program Staff
<b>Rank Justification</b>	Populations are stable, low threats from harvest, water management and drought.

## 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=AFCQH01010>

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:

<https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=AFCQH01010>

## 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

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	Immediacy	Comments
<b>Biological Resource Use - 5.4 - Fishing &amp; Harvesting Aquatic Resources</b>	2024-02-20	Demi Blythe	Card and Hasler 2021	Small	Serious	High	Closest study in relatively comparable systems was the Red River, Manitoba, Canada (Card and Hasler 2021). Authors evaluated catch-and-release mortality and estimated 33% of freshwater drum mortality due to deep hooking from recreational angling.
<b>Natural System Modifications - 7.2 - Dams &amp; Water Management/Use</b>	2024-02-20	Demi Blythe	Jacquemin et al. 2014	Unknown	Unknown	High	There are no studies in Montana estimating the effects of an altered flow regime on freshwater drum; however, a study done on the Wabash River in Indiana identified growth as being impacted by variable flow regimes (Jacquemin et al. 2014)
<b>Climate Change &amp; Severe Weather - 11.2 - Droughts</b>	2024-02-20	Demi Blythe	(Jacquemin et al. 2014	Pervasive	Unknown	High	Freshwater drum are likely to be most impacted by drastic, drought-related changes in flow regime (Jacquemin et al. 2014).