# Sturgeon Chub (*Macrhybopsis gelida*) Conservation Status Rank Summary

March 7, 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>

Rank Factor	ank Factor Date Value Value		Score Data Source		Comments			
Rarity								
Range Extent	Range Extent 2024-02-20 Y: 23776.4 km²		3.930	MTNHP Range Maps	None			
Area of Occupancy			-		Factor not used in ranking.			
Number of Occurrences	2024-02-20	6	1.380	MTNHP Databases	None			
Population Size	2024-02-20	2734	3.140	USFWS 2023	Pop estimate for Upper Missouri River population (459-infinate. 95% Cl)			
# of Occurrences in Good Condition	2024-03-07	[5, 6]	2.200	MTNHP Data	From NHP databases			
% 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 × 1) + (1.38 × 1) + (3.14 × 2) + (2.20 × 2) ) / 6 = 2.67								
Trends								
Short-term Trend	rt-term Trend 2024-02-20 [-25.0, -16.0%] -0.07		-0.070	FWP monitoring data, Stagliano 11, Stagliano 2014	Species is relatively stable above Ft. Peck, but declining in other occupied areas although distribution and abundance appeared to increase on the middle Powder River. Occupancy declined by 0.16 between 2012 and 2021			
Long-term Trend	g-term Trend 2024-02-20 [-50.0, -25.0%] [-0.220, -0.070]		USFWS 2023 Species has been extirpated along the Yellowstone upstream of the Tongue to the Wyoming border and within the Missouri Riv within Ft. Peck Reservoir. This represents are a 25-030% loss of habitat					
Trends score is calculated by summing weighted short and long-term trend scores: ( (-0.07 × 2) + ([-0.22, -0.07] × 1) ) = [-0.36, -0.21]								

# **Rarity and Trends**

#### **Threats**

Rank Factor	Date Assessed	Value	Score	Data Source	Comments		
Threats							
Overall Threat Impact		Low/No Threats	5.500	None			
Intrinsic Vulnerability			-		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	
Climate Change & Severe Weather	2024-02-20	Low	Restricted	Moderate	High	Climate change is projected to reduce discharge and impact populations in the tributaries of main stem rivers. This threat will impact a restricted portion of the species range and is predicted to have moderate impacts.	
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: (2.67 × 70%) + Threats: (5.50 × 30%) + Trends: ([-0.36, -0.21]) = [3.16, 3.31]

Calculated Rank: S3

Accepted Rank	S3				
Date Approved	2024-09-30				
Approval Authority	Montana Species of Concern Committee				
Rank Justification	Species is relatively widespread but uncommon with general declines in abundance and occupancy. No severe threats recognized, but continued impacts of dams and altered hydrology may be causing observed declines.				

## **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=AFCJB53020

Predicted Suitable Habitat Model:

https://mtnhp.mt.gov/resources/models/?elcode=AFCJB53020

# **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		Critaria				
Factor	Category	value	Cintella				
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)				
	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				
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				
	Threat Quality	Adequate	Threat Impact is a single value (including "Unthreatened")				
Throats		Marginal	Threat Impact assessed at more than one value (e.g. "High - Medium")				
meats		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				
Trends <sup>–</sup>	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				
		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				

<u>Summary of Information Availability</u> Information to assess status is available

Summary of Information Needs No further information is needed

## **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
Natural System Modifications - 7.2 - Dams & Water Management/Use	2024-02-20	Dan Bachen	USFWS 2023	Large	Serious	Insignific ant	Species has lost significant portions of its habitat due to large dams. However, ongoing effects are minimal as impacts have already occurred.
Climate Change & Severe Weather - 11.1 - Habitat Shifting & Alteration	2024-02-20	Dan Bachen	USFWS 2023	Restricted	Moderate	High	Climate change is projected to reduce discharge and impact populations in the tributaries of main stem rivers. This threat will impact a restricted portion of the species range and is predicted to have moderate impacts.