Peregrine Falcon (*Falco peregrinus*)
Conservation Status Rank Summary

April 15, 2022

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	2025-01-31	Y: 380530.8 km²	4.710	MTNHP Range Maps	None
Area of Occupancy	2025-01-31	945 | 4km² cells	4.130	MTNHP Modeling	None
Number of Occurrences	2025-02-14		4.130	Montana Peregrine Institute	Atleast 110 active nests in 2018
Population Size	2011-12-22		1.570	MTNHP Species Rank Data Table	The Montana Peregrine Institute documented 94 active Peregrine nest sites in 2011 which likely indicates a population of between 250-1,000 individuals. | Methodology: NS (2003) | Original Score: C
# 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 is dependent on cliff habitat for nesting and these are relatively uncommon on the landscape. Other than that they are generalist forager for ducks, pigeons, and Galliformes. | Methodology: NS (2003) | Original Score: B
Rarity is calculated by averaging weighted factor scores: **((4.71 × 1) + (4.13 × 2) + (4.13 × 1) + (1.57 × 2)) / 6 = 3.37**					
Trends					
Short-term Trend	2022-04-12		0.070	Montana Peregrine Institute Territory Counts	The 3-year average of occupied territories increased from 89 to 110 between 2006-2008 and 2016-2018.
Long-term Trend	2025-01-31		-0.400	Expert Opinion	The relative difference in abundance between historic and current populations is difficult to gauge. The species is continuing to occupy habitat it was extirpated from but is still much less common in the eastern and central regions of the state and has yet to begin to recolonize some of these areas.

Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores:
((0.07 × 2) + (-0.40 × 1)) = -0.26

Threats

Rank Factor	Date Assessed	Value	Score	Data Source	Comments
Threats					
Overall Threat Impact		Low/No Threats	5.500		No major threat identified, but nest competition, falconry and nest disturbance may represent threats.
Intrinsic Vulnerability	2011-12-22	Moderately vulnerable	-	MTNHP Species Rank Data 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 capabilities such that extirpated populations generally become reestablished through natural recolonization. | Methodology: NS (2003) | Original Score: B
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	2025-01-31	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: (3.37 × 70%) + Threats: (5.50 × 30%) + Trends: (-0.26) = 3.75

Calculated Rank: S4

Accepted Rank	S4
Date Approved	2022-04-15
Approval Authority	Montana Species of Concern Committee
Rank Justification	Impacts from the pesticide DDT in the mid 20th century caused catastrophic declines in abundance of this species across its range. A ban on this pesticide and subsequent conservation actions have recovered populations and resulted in delisting and removal of protections extended under the Endangered Species Act. In Montana the species had recolonized much of its historic range and continues to increase in abundance. This has resulted in its removal from the State species of Concern list in 2022.

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=ABNKD06070

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:
https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=ABNKD06070

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 but monitoring should continue to document population changes and insure continued recovery.

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	2025-01-31	None	None	None	None	None	None