Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus*)
Conservation Status Rank Summary

September 24, 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
Rarity					
Range Extent	2024-09-24	Y: 149716.0 km²	3.930	MTNHP Range Maps	None
Area of Occupancy	2024-09-24	8790 | 4km² cells	4.810	MTNHP Modeling	None
Number of Occurrences			-		**Factor not used in ranking.**
Population Size	2024-09-24	[993, 1210]	[1.570, 2.360]	MTFWP 2023	e. iPOM estimates of wolf population size are the preferred monitoring method due to accuracy, confidence intervals, and cost efficiency. The 2023 iPOM estimate of wolf population size was 1096 wolves (95% C.I. = 993 – 1,210)
# of Occurrences in Good Condition			-		**Factor not used in ranking.**
% of Area Occupied in Good Condition			-		**Factor not used in ranking.**
Environmental Specificity	2010-05-04	Moderate	-	MTNHP Species Rank Data Table	**Factor not used in ranking.** Moderate Generalist. Occupy a variety of landscapes and habitats and even denning locations are widespread on the landscape. Potentially limited somewhat ungulate winter range. | Methodology: NS (2003) | Original Score: C
Rarity is calculated by averaging weighted factor scores: **((3.93 × 1) + (4.81 × 2) + ([1.57, 2.36] × 2)) / 5 = [3.34, 3.65]**					
Trends					
Short-term Trend	2024-09-24		0.000	MTFWP 2023	Population is relatively stable to slightly declining
Long-term Trend	2010-05-04		[-0.400, -0.310]	MTNHP Species Rank Data Table	Based on contraction of range statewide since European arrival they have probably declined by 75-90%. | Methodology: NS (2003) | Original Score: B
Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores: **((0.00 × 2) + ([-0.40, -0.31] × 1)) = [-0.40, -0.31]**					

Threats

Rank Factor	Date Assessed	Value	Score	Data Source	Comments
Threats					
Overall Threat Impact		Low/No Threats	5.500		The greatest threat to the conservation of the species is inadequate regulation of human caused mortality via lethal control to address livestock conflicts, illegal killing, regulated harvest, vehicle collisions, and diseases. 80-90% of mortality document
Intrinsic Vulnerability	2010-05-04	Not intrinsically vulnerable	-	MTNHP Species Rank Data Table	**Factor not used in ranking.** Not Intrinsically Vulnerable. Species has shown great ability to recolonize and recover breeding packs across a large portion of western Montana in the last 15-30 years despite a variety of human conflicts. They are not intrinsically vulnerable. | Methodology: NS (2003) | Original Score: C
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
No Threat Identified	2024-09-24	Low	None	None	None	None
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: ([3.34, 3.65] × 70%) + Threats: (5.50 × 30%) + Trends: ([-0.40, -0.31]) = [3.59, 3.90]

Calculated Rank: S4

Accepted Rank	S4
Date Approved	2024-12-18
Approval Authority	MTNHP
Rank Justification	Species has recovered from precipitous declines due to over-hunting and persecution to become widely distributed across central and western Montana. If faces no significant threats and the population has been relatively stable to slightly declining over the past decade.

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=AMAJA01030

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:
https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=AMAJA01030

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

Data to assess status are available

Summary of Information Needs

No additional information are needed at this time.

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
No Threat Identified - 0	2024-09-24	None	None	None	None	None	None