# Greater Short-horned Lizard (*Phrynosoma hernandesi*) Conservation Status Rank Summary

October 23, 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<br>Source |  | Comments   |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Rarity                                |            |                       |                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Range Extent                          | 2024-10-23 | Y: 305255.2 km²       | 4.710                | MTNHP<br>Range<br>Maps                 | None   |  |  |  |  |
| Area of Occupancy                     | 2024-10-23 | 13890   4km²<br>cells | 5.500                | MTNHP<br>Modeling                      | None   |  |  |  |  |
| Number of<br>Occurrences              | 2024-10-23 | 1806                  | 5.500                | MTNHP<br>Databases                     | None   |  |  |  |  |
| Population Size                       |            |                       | -                    |  | Factor not used in ranking.  |  |  |  |  |
| # of Occurrences in<br>Good Condition |            |                       | -                    |  | Factor not used in ranking.  |  |  |  |  |
| % of Area Occupied in Good Condition  |            |                       | -                    |  | Factor not used in ranking.  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental<br>Specificity          | 2018-05-03 | Moderate              | -                    | MTNHP<br>Species<br>Rank Data<br>Table | Factor not used in ranking. Found most commonly in shrub and grasslands with friable soils suitable for burrowing   Methodology: NS (2003)   Original Score: C |  |  |  |  |

Rarity is calculated by averaging weighted factor scores:  $(4.71 \times 1) + (5.50 \times 2) + (5.50 \times 1) / 4 = 5.30$ 

| Trends           |            |                     |  |   |
|------------------|------------|---------------------|--|---|
| Short-term Trend | 2018-05-03 | 1                   | MTNHP<br>Species<br>Rank Data<br>Table | Factor not used in ranking. No data on trends<br>available   Methodology: NS (2003)   Original<br>Score: U  |
| Long-term Trend  | 2018-05-03 | [-0.400,<br>-0.310] | MTNHP<br>Species<br>Rank Data<br>Table | Based on anecdotal reports this species is much less common than it previously was. The exact extent of these declines is unknown but if the reports are correct, the decline is substantial and could be over 75%   Methodology: NS (2003)   Original Score: B |

Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores:  $(([-0.40, -0.31] \times 1)) = [-0.40, -0.31]$ 

## **Threats**

| Rank Factor Date Assessed  |            | Value           | Score | Data<br>Source                         | Comments  |  |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------------|-------|--|---|--|
| Threats                    |            |                 |       |  |   |  |
| Overall Threat<br>Impact   |            | Very high       | 0.000 |  | Degradation/ development of sagebrush steppe ecosystems   |  |
| Intrinsic<br>Vulnerability | 2018-05-03 | Moderately S Ra |       | MTNHP<br>Species<br>Rank Data<br>Table | Factor not used in ranking. Moderately Vulnerable. Species exhibits moderate age of maturity, frequency of reproduction, and/or fecundity such that populations generally tend to recover from decreases in abundance within 5- 20 years or 2-5 generations. Species has good dispersal ca   Methodology: NS (2003)   Original Score: B |  |

Threat score is calculated from Overall Threat Impact when available or Intrinsic Vulnerability if not: (0.00) = 0.00

## **Individual Threats Data**

| Threat Category   | Date<br>Assessed | Impact<br>Score | Scope | Severity | Immediacy | Comments   |
|---|------------------|-----------------|-------|----------|-----------|--|
| Agriculture & Aquaculture                                       | 2024-10-23       | High            | Large | Serious  | High      | Conversion of native habitat to row crop agriculture   |
| Invasive & Other<br>Problematic<br>Species, Genes &<br>Diseases | 2024-10-23       | High            | Large | Serious  | High      | Invasion of cheatgrass causing loss of basking habitat and increased predation rates through impediment of escape behavior |

Threat Tally: 0 - Very High, 2 - High, 0 - Medium, 0 - Low Overall Threat Impact\* = Very high

<sup>\*</sup>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:  $(5.30 \times 70\%)$  + Threats:  $(0.00 \times 30\%)$  + Trends: ([-0.40, -0.31]) = [3.31, 3.40]

Calculated Rank: S3

| Accepted Rank      | S3   |  |  |  |
|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Date Approved      | Date Approved 2003-01-01   |  |  |  |
| Approval Authority | Montana Species of Concern Committee   |  |  |  |
| Rank Justification | This species if found across much of eastern and central Montana. It is uncommon in grasslands, shrublands, and badlands. There is anecdotal evidence of significant declines, likely from habitat loss through lands use changes. It faces threats from continued habitat loss and invasion of non-native plat species. |  |  |  |

## **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=ARACF12080

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:

https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=ARACF12080

## **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    | 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 Ovalita   | 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<br>Adequate | Short-term Trend assessment date is more than 10 years old or Unknown, but species is Unthreatened  |  |  |  |  |
| Trends  |                 | 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<br>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**

Range in numeric values stems for uncertainty in the magnitude of historic declines. Rarity data is of good quality and threats are understood. Trend data is uncertain.

## **Summary of Information Needs**

Baseline surveys and subsequent monitoring of populations across Montana will allow better understanding of the species status and population trajectory.

## **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<br>Assessed | Assessed<br>By | Data<br>Source                           | Scope | Severity | Imme-<br>diacy | Comments   |
|---|------------------|----------------|--|-------|----------|----------------|--|
| Agriculture & Aquaculture<br>- 2.1 - Annual & Perennial<br>Non-Timber Crops   | 2024-10-23       | Dan Bachen     | NHP Data<br>and WWF<br>Plowprint<br>tool | Large | Serious  | High           | Conversion of native habitat to row crop agriculture   |
| Invasive & Other<br>Problematic Species,<br>Genes & Diseases - 8.1 -<br>Invasive Non-Native/Alien<br>Species/Diseases | 2024-10-23       | Dan Bachen     | Newbold<br>2005,<br>Blakemor<br>e 2018   | Large | Serious  | High           | Invasion of cheatgrass causing loss of basking habitat and increased predation rates through impedement of escape behavior |