

NEW YORK

TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Scientific name: Myiopsitta monachus
 Common names: Monk Parakeet, Quaker Parrot
 Native distribution: Temperate South America: Uruguay, Argentina
 Date assessed: 1/23/2013
 Assessors: J. Corser
 Reviewers: _____
 Date Approved: _____ Form version date: 3 January 2013

New York Invasiveness Rank: Moderate (Relative Maximum Score 50.00-69.99)

Distribution and Invasiveness Rank (<i>Obtain from PRISM invasiveness ranking form</i>)		
Status of this species in each PRISM:	Current Distribution	PRISM Invasiveness Rank
1	Adirondack Park Invasive Program	Not Assessed
2	Capital/Mohawk	Not Assessed
3	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	Not Assessed
4	Finger Lakes	Not Assessed
5	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	Not Assessed
6	Lower Hudson	Not Assessed
7	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	Not Assessed
8	Western New York	Not Assessed

Invasiveness Ranking Summary (see details under appropriate sub-section)		Total (Total Answered*) Possible	Total
1	Ecological impact	30 (<u>30</u>)	0
2	Biological characteristic and dispersal ability	30 (<u>30</u>)	30
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	30 (<u>30</u>)	17
4	Difficulty of control	10 (<u>10</u>)	6
	Outcome score	100 (<u>100</u>) ^b	53 ^a
	Relative maximum score †		53.00
	New York Invasiveness Rank §	Moderate (Relative Maximum Score 50.00-69.99)	

* For questions answered "unknown" do not include point value in "Total Answered Points Possible." If "Total Answered Points Possible" is less than 70.00 points, then the overall invasive rank should be listed as "Unknown."

† Calculated as 100(a/b) to two decimal places.

§ Very High >80.00; High 70.00–80.00; Moderate 50.00–69.99; Low 40.00–49.99; Insignificant <40.00

A. DISTRIBUTION (KNOWN/POTENTIAL): Summarized from individual PRISM forms

A1.1. Has this species been documented in NY? (reliable source; voucher not required)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes – continue to A1.2	
<input type="checkbox"/>	No – continue to A2.1; Yes <input type="checkbox"/> NA; Yes <input type="checkbox"/> USA	
A1.2. In which PRISMs is it known (see inset map)?		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Adirondack Park Invasive Program	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Capital/Mohawk	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Finger Lakes	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lower Hudson	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	

NEW YORK TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

<input type="checkbox"/>	Western New York
--------------------------	------------------

Documentation:

Sources of information:

NYS Breeding Bird Atlas (McGowan and Corwin, 2008)

A2.0. Is this species listed on the Federal Injurious Fish and Wildlife list?

- Yes – the species will automatically be listed as Prohibited, no further assessment required
 No – continue to A2.1

A2.1. What is the likelihood that this species will occur and persist given the climate in the following PRISMs? (obtain from PRISM invasiveness ranking form and/ or Climatch score)

- | | |
|--------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Not Assessed | Adirondack Park Invasive Program |
| Not Assessed | Capital/Mohawk |
| Not Assessed | Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership |
| Not Assessed | Finger Lakes |
| Not Assessed | Long Island Invasive Species Management Area |
| Not Assessed | Lower Hudson |
| Not Assessed | Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario |
| Not Assessed | Western New York |

Documentation:

Sources of information (e.g.: distribution models, literature, expert opinions):

If the species does not occur and is not likely to survive and reproduce within any of the PRISMs, then stop here as there is no need to assess the species.

A2.2. What is the current distribution of the species in each PRISM? (obtain rank from PRISM invasiveness ranking forms)

	Distribution
Adirondack Park Invasive Program	Not Assessed
Capital/Mohawk	Not Assessed
Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	Not Assessed
Finger Lakes	Not Assessed
Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	Not Assessed
Lower Hudson	Not Assessed
Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	Not Assessed
Western New York	Not Assessed

Documentation:

Sources of information:

A2.3. Describe the potential or known suitable habitats within New York. Natural habitats include all habitats not under active human management. Managed habitats are indicated with an asterisk.

- | Aquatic Habitats | Wetland Habitats | Upland Habitats |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Marine | <input type="checkbox"/> Salt/brackish marshes | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultivated* |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Salt/ brackish waters | <input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater marshes | <input type="checkbox"/> Grasslands/old fields |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater tidal | <input type="checkbox"/> Peatlands | <input type="checkbox"/> Shrublands |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rivers/streams | <input type="checkbox"/> Shrub swamps | <input type="checkbox"/> Forests/woodlands |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Natural lakes and ponds | <input type="checkbox"/> Forested wetlands/riparian | <input type="checkbox"/> Alpine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vernal pools | <input type="checkbox"/> Ditches* | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roadsides* |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reservoirs/impoundments* | <input type="checkbox"/> Beaches/or coastal dunes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural* |

Other potential or known suitable habitats within New York:

Documentation:

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

**NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

B. INVASIVENESS RANKING

1. ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

1.1. Impact on Ecosystem Processes and System-wide Parameters (e.g., energy cycle, nutrient and mineral dynamics, light availability, or geomorphological changes (erosion and sedimentation rates).

- A. No perceivable impact on ecosystem processes based on research studies, or the absence of impact information if a species is widespread (>10 occurrences in minimally managed areas), has been well-studied (>10 reports/publications), and has been present in the northeast for >100 years 0
- B. Influences ecosystem processes to a minor degree, has a perceivable but mild influence 3
- C. Significant alteration of ecosystem processes 7
- D. Major, possibly irreversible, alteration or disruption of ecosystem processes 10
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify ecosystem processes impacted (or if applicable, justify choosing answer A in the absence of impact information)

These birds, in their current introduced populations, are confined to highly (sub)urban areas and therefore seem to have little effect on natural systems.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008; Minor et al., 2012.

1.2. Impact on Natural Habitat

- A. No perceived impact; causes no apparent change in native habitat 0
- B. Influences natural habitat (e.g., reduces the stem density and height of one or more native species in core habitat) 3
- C. Significantly alters natural habitat (e.g., produces a notable reduction in the population size of one or more native species in core habitat) 7
- D. Causes major alteration in natural habitat (e.g., results in the extirpation of one or more native species, or changes the community composition in core habitat towards species exotic to the natural community) 10
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify type of impact or alteration:

Confined to un-natural habitats: heavily (sub)urban.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008; Minor et al., 2012.

1.3. Impact on other species or species groups, including cumulative impact of this species on other organisms in the community it invades (e.g., interferes with native predator/ prey dynamics; hybridizes with a native species; hosts a non-native disease which impacts a native species)

- A. Negligible perceived impact 0
- B. Minor impact (e.g. 1 species, <20% population decline) 3
- C. Moderate impact (e.g. 2-3 species and/ or 20-29% population decline of any 1 species) 7
- D. Severe impact on other species or species groups (e.g. >3 species and/ or ≥30% population decline of any 1 species) 10
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

**NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

Identify type of impact or alteration:

Early fears that the monk parakeet would be an agricultural pest in North America were not realized.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

Total Possible	30
Section One Total	0

2. BIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND DISPERSAL ABILITY

2.1. Mode and rate of reproduction

- A. No reproduction (e.g. sterile with no sexual or asexual reproduction) 0
- B. Limited reproduction (e.g. intrinsic rate of increase <10%/ year) 1
- C. Moderate reproduction (e.g. intrinsic rate of increase between 10-30%/ year) 2
- D. Abundant reproduction (e.g. intrinsic rate of increase >30%/ year) 4
- U. Unknown

Score 4

Documentation:

Describe key reproductive characteristics:

These birds are capable of exponential population growth in the US. Increased from 3 to 15 inhabited BBA blocks between first and second NY Breeding Bird Atlas.

Sources of information:

Van Bael and Pruett Jones, 1996; McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

2.2. Migratory behavior

- A. Always migratory in its native range 0
- B. Non-migratory or facultative migrant in its native range 2
- U. Unknown

Score 2

Documentation:

Describe migratory behavior:

This bird is a non-migrant and has resident populations in NY, often seen during Christmas Bird counts.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

2.3. Biological potential for colonization by long-distance dispersal/ movement.

- A. No long-distance dispersal/ movement mechanisms 0
- A. Adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, but studies report that most individuals (90%) establish territories within 10 miles of parent or within a distance twice the home range of the parent, and tend not to cross major barriers such as rivers and major roads 1
- B. Adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, movement and evidence that offspring often disperse greater than 10 miles of parent or greater than twice the home range of parent and will cross major barriers such as river and major roads 2
- U. Unknown

Score 2

Documentation:

Identify dispersal mechanisms:

This species is capable of long distance dispersal > 100 Km and readily colonizes new areas.

Sources of information:

Da Silva et al., 2010; Munoz and Real, 2006.

2.4. Practical potential to be spread by human activities, both directly and indirectly (possible vectors include: commercial sales, deliberate stocking, translocation,

NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

rehabilitation, pest control industry, agricultural escapes, pet abandonment and release, etc.)

- A. Does not occur 0
- B. Low (human dispersal to new areas occurs almost exclusively by direct means and is infrequent or inefficient) 1
- C. Moderate (human dispersal to new areas occurs by direct and indirect means to a moderate extent) 2
- D. High (opportunities for human dispersal to new areas by direct and indirect means are numerous, frequent, and successful) 4
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify dispersal mechanisms:

Heavy international pet trade releases are known to occur. In cold climates, the birds rely on supplemental feeding from bird feeders to survive cold winters (Minor et al., 2012).

Sources of information:

Da Silva et al., 2010; McGowan and Corwin, 2008; Russello et al. 2008.

2.5. Non-living chemical and physical characteristics that increase competitive advantage (e.g., tolerance to various extremes, pH, temperature, fill vacant niche, charismatic species)

- A. Possesses no characteristics that increase competitive advantage 0
- B. Possesses one characteristic that increases competitive advantage 4
- C. Possesses two or more characteristics that increase competitive advantage 8
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Evidence of competitive ability:

This species has a very high tolerance for human disturbance and density; it is also somewhat cold tolerant but gravitates towards artificial heat sources (light poles, etc.).

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008; South and Pruett Jones, 2000.

2.6. Biological characteristics that increase competitive advantage (e.g., high fecundity, generalist, highly evolved defense mechanisms, behavioral adaptations)

- A. Possesses no characteristics that increase competitive advantage 0
- B. Possesses one characteristic that increases competitive advantage 4
- C. Possesses two or more characteristics that increase competitive advantage 8
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Evidence of competitive ability:

This species has very high fecundity and is capable of exponential population growth and long distance colonization, and is highly adaptable to human environments.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008. Minor et al., 2012.

2.7. Other species in the family and/ or genus invasive in New York or elsewhere?

- A. No 0
- B. Yes 2
- U. Unknown

Score

**NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

Documentation:

Identify species:

Almost all monk parakeets in North America are thought to be *M.m. monachus*, but other subspecies *M.m. calita*, *luchsi*, *cotorra* have also been involved in the pet trade (Russello et al., 2008).

Total Possible	30
Section Two Total	30

3. ECOLOGICAL AMPLITUDE AND DISTRIBUTION

3.1. Current introduced distribution of established populations in the northern latitudes of USA and southern latitude of Canada (e.g., between 35 and 55 degrees)

- A. Not known from the northern US or southern Canada 0
- B. Established as a non-native in 1 northern USA state and/or southern Canadian province 1
- C. Established as a non-native in 2 or 3 northern USA states and/or southern Canadian provinces 2
- D. Established as a non-native in 4 or more northern USA states and/or southern Canadian provinces, and/or categorized as a problem species (e.g., "Invasive") in 1 northern state or southern Canadian province 3
- U. Unknown

Score 3

Documentation:

Identify states and provinces:

Breeding colonies also occur in NY, CT, DE, NJ, RI.

Sources of information:

- See known introduced range at www.usda.gov, and update with information from states and Canadian provinces.

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

3.2. Current introduced distribution of established populations of the species in natural areas in the eight New York State PRISMs (Partnerships for Regional Invasive Species Management)

- A. Established in none of the PRISMs 0
- B. Established in 1 PRISM 1
- C. Established in 2 or 3 PRISMs 3
- D. Established in 4 or more PRISMs 5
- U. Unknown

Score 3

Documentation:

Describe distribution:

Confirmed breeding reported in 10 blocks, representing Suffolk, Nassau, Kings, Bronx, Westchester and Rensselaer Counties. The single nesting pair in Watervliet, Rensselaer Co. (which would constitute a significant northward expansion in NY) was removed by NYS DEC and Power Co. in the summer of 2012.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

3.3. Number of known, or potential (each individual possessed by a vendor or consumer is a potential release), individual releases and/ or release events (propagule pressure)

- A. None 0

NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

- B. Few releases (e.g., <10 annually) 2
- C. Regular, small scale releases (e.g., 10-99 annually) 4
- D. Multiple, large scale (e.g., ≥100 annually) 6
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Describe known or potential releases:

There is strong scientific evidence that this species demonstrates propagule pressure.

Sources of information:

Da Silva et al. 2010, Russello et al. 2008

3.4. Current introduced population density in northern USA and/ or southern Canada.

- A. No known populations established 0
- B. Low to moderate population density (e.g., ≤1/4 or < to 1/2 native population density) 1
- C. High or irruptive population density (e.g., ≥1/2 native population density) 2
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Describe population density:

Colonies can become dense.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

3.5. Number of habitats the species may invade

- A. Not known to invade any natural habitats 0
- B. Known to occur in 2/ 3 habitats, with at least 1/ 2 natural habitat(s) 2
- C. Known to occur in 4 or more habitats, with at least 3 natural habitats 3
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify type of habitats where it occurs and degree/type of impacts:

This bird is restricted to heavily (sub)urban habitats. Does not invade natural habitats.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

3.6. Role of anthropogenic (human related) features in establishment (e.g. buildings, roads, agricultural fields, etc)

- A. Requires anthropogenic disturbances to establish 0
- B. May occasionally establish in undisturbed areas but can readily establish in areas with natural or anthropogenic disturbances 2
- C. Can establish independent of any known natural or anthropogenic disturbances 3
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify anthropogenic features:

This bird is restricted to heavily (sub)urban areas. Entirely reliant on human intervention (bird feeders) and artificial heat sources to survive cold north- temperate winters (Minor et al., 2012). Nests exclusively on non natural substrates.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008; Munoz and Real, 2006.

NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

3.7. Climate in native range (e.g., med. to high, ≥ 5 , Climatch score; within 35 to 55 degree latitude; etc.)

- A. Native range does not include climates similar to New York 0
- B. Native range possibly includes climates similar to portions of New York 4
- C. Native range includes climates similar to those in New York 8
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Describe known climate similarities: Native range of the Monk parakeet is temperate and it is known to be somewhat cold tolerant. Climatch comparison resulted in 13/57 stations scoring = or > 5. These included stations in the New York City and Western Long Island areas.

Sources of information:

ADAFF, 2013; McGowan and Corwin, 2008; South and Pruett Jones, 2000.

Total Possible
 Section Three Total

4. DIFFICULTY OF CONTROL

4.1. Re-establishment potential, nearby propagule source, known vectors of re-introduction in vicinity (e.g. biological supplies, pets, game farms, zoos, shooting preserves, connecting corridors, mechanized transportation)

- A. No known vectors/ propagule source for re-establishment following removal 0
- B. Possible re-establishment from 1 vector/ propagule source following removal 1
- C. Likely to re-establish from 2-3 vectors/ propagule sources following removal 2
- D. Strong potential for re-establishment from 4 or more vectors/ propagule sources following removal 3
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify source/ vectors:

Potential for re-establishment very likely due to pet trade releases.

Sources of information:

McGowan and Corwin, 2008.

4.2. Status of monitoring and/ or management protocols for species

- A. Standardized protocols appropriate to New York State are available 0
- B. Scientific protocols are available from other countries, regions or states 1
- C. No known protocols exist 2
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Describe protocols:

Because monk parakeets readily rebuild nests, nest removal is only a short term solution for control on power poles and utility stations where nests can cause extensive power outages. Trapping at night and removal (killing) of the birds at the nest seems to provide the best longer term solution. Trapping protocols in Florida are being researched and seem to provide a method that could be implemented in NY, however the birds are very wary and agile and difficult to trap, and killing them may not be politically feasible. Releasing the birds in nature sanctuaries may not be a good solution because the birds readily return to nest sites.

Sources of information:

Tilman et al., 2004.

**NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

4.3. Status of monitoring and/ or management resources (e.g. tools, manpower, travel, traps, lures, ID keys, taxonomic specialists, etc.)

- A. Established resources are available including commercial and/ or research tools 0
- B. Monitoring resources may be available (e.g. partnerships, NGOs, etc) 1
- C. No known monitoring resources are available 2
- U. Unknown

Score

1

Documentation:

Describe resources:

Power Companies whose poles and electrical substations have nests would be the active managers. For example Florida Power and Light Co. spends large sums of money to control (but not eradicate) populations in Florida.

Sources of information:

Tilman et al., 2004

4.4. Level of effort required.

- A. Management is not required (e.g., species does not persist without repeated human mediated action) 0
- B. Management is relatively easy and inexpensive; invasive species can be maintained at low abundance causing little or no ecological harm (e.g., 10 or fewer person-hours of manual effort can eradicate a local population in 1 year) 1
- C. Management requires a major short-term investment, and is logistically and politically challenging; eradication is difficult, but possible (e.g., 100 or fewer person-hours/year of manual effort, or up to 10 person-hours/ year for 2-5 years to suppress a local population) 2
- D. Management requires a major investment and is logistically and politically difficult; eradication may be impossible (e.g., more than 100 person-hours/ year of manual effort, or more than 10 person hours/year for more than 5 years to suppress a local population) 3
- U. Unknown

Score

3

Documentation:

Identify types of control methods and time required:

Large eradication programs were instituted in the 1970s--failed. Politically difficult, many locales defend the birds.

Sources of information:

Minor et al., 2012.

Total Possible

10

Section Four Total

6

Total for 4 sections Possible

100

Total for 4 sections

53

C. STATUS OF GENETIC VARIANTS AND HYBRIDS:

At the present time there is no protocol or criteria for assessing the invasiveness of genetic variants independent of the species to which they belong. Such a protocol is needed, and individuals with the appropriate expertise should address this issue in the future. Such a protocol will likely require data on cultivar fertility and identification in both experimental and natural settings.

Genetic variants of the species known to exist: No

NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Hybrids (crosses between different parent species) should be assessed individually and separately from the parent species wherever taxonomically possible, since their invasiveness may differ from that of the parent species. An exception should be made if the taxonomy of the species and hybrids are uncertain, and species and hybrids can not be clearly distinguished in the field. In such cases it is not feasible to distinguish species and hybrids, and they can only be assessed as a single unit.

Hybrids of uncertain origin known to exist: No

References for species assessment:

- Australian Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry (ADAFF). 2013. Climatch Mapping Tool. <Available: <http://adl.brs.gov.au:8080/Climatch/climatch.jsp>>; [Accessed on January 25, 2013].
- DaSilva, A., Eberhard, J.R., Wright, T.F., Avery, M.L., & M.A. Russello. 2010. Genetic evidence for high propagule pressure in monk parakeet (*Myiopsitta monachus*) invasive populations. *Molecular Ecology* 19:3336-3350.
- McGowan, and K. Corwin. 2008. *Second Atlas of Breeding Birds in New York State*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Minor, E.S., Appelt, C.W., Grabiner, S, Ward, L., Moreno, A., & S. Pruett-Jones. 2012. Distribution of exotic monk parakeets across an urban landscape. *Urban Ecosystems*, doi:10.1007/s11252-012-0249-0.
- Muñoz, A. R., & Real, R. (2006). Assessing the potential range expansion of the exotic monk parakeet in Spain. *Diversity and Distributions*, 12(6), 656-665.
- Russello, M. A., Avery, M. L., & Wright, T. F. (2008). Genetic evidence links invasive monk parakeet populations in the United States to the international pet trade. *BMC evolutionary biology*, 8(1), 217.
- South, J. M., & Pruett-Jones, S. (2000). Patterns of flock size, diet, and vigilance of naturalized Monk parakeets in Hyde Park, Chicago. *The Condor*, 102(4), 848-854.
- Tillman, E. A., Genchi, A. C., Lindsay, J. R., Newman, J. R., & Avery, M. L. (2004). Evaluation of trapping to reduce monk parakeet populations at electric utility facilities. USDA National Wildlife Research Center - Staff Publications. Paper 391.
- Van Bael, S., & Pruett-Jones, S. (1996). Exponential population growth of Monk Parakeets in the United States. *The Wilson Bulletin*, 584-588.

Citation: The New York Terrestrial Vertebrate Invasiveness Ranking Form is an adaptation of the New York Plant Invasiveness Ranking Form. The original plant form may be cited as: Jordan, M.J., G. Moore and T.W. Weldy. 2008. Invasiveness ranking system for non-native plants of New York. Unpublished. The Nature Conservancy, Cold Spring Harbor, NY; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Brooklyn, NY; The Nature Conservancy, Albany, NY.

Acknowledgments: The New York Terrestrial Vertebrate Invasiveness Ranking Form incorporates components and approaches used in several other systems, cited in the references below. Valuable contributions by members of the Invasive Species Council and Invasive Species Advisory Committee were incorporated in revisions of this form. Members of the Office of

NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Invasive Species Coordination's Four-tier Team, who coordinated the effort, included representatives of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation* (Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources, Division of Lands and Forests, Division of Water); The Nature Conservancy; New York Natural Heritage Program; New York Sea Grant; Lake Champlain Sea Grant*; New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets (Division of Plant Industry and Division of Animal Industry); Cornell University (Department of Natural Resources and Department of Entomology); New York State Nursery and Landscape Association; New York Farm Bureau; Brooklyn Botanic Garden; Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council*; Trout Unlimited; United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service* (Plant Protection and Quarantine and Wildlife Services); New York State Department of Transportation; State University of New York at Albany and Plattsburgh; and Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies. Those organizations listed with an asterisk comprised the Terrestrial Vertebrate Working Group.

References for ranking form:

Bomford, M. 2008. Risk Assessment Models for Establishment of Exotic Vertebrates in Australia and New Zealand. Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre, Canberra.

Broken Screens: The Regulation of Live Animal Imports in the United States. 2007. Defenders of Wildlife, Washington, DC.

Cooperative Prevention of Invasive Wildlife Introduction in Florida. 2008. The Environmental Law Institute, Washington, DC.

Jordan, M.J., G. Moore and T.W. Weldy. 2008. Invasiveness ranking system for non-native plants of New York. Unpublished. The Nature Conservancy, Cold Spring Harbor, NY; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Brooklyn, NY; The Nature Conservancy, Albany, New York.

Natural Resources Board Order No. IS-34-06, Invasive Species Identification, Classification and Control. 2008. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison Wisconsin.

Preventing Biological Invasions: Best Practices in Pre-Import Risk Screening for Species of Live Animals in International Trade. 2008. Convention of Biological Diversity, Global Invasive Species Programme and Invasive Species Specialist Group of IUCN's Species Survival Commission. University of Notre Dame, Indiana.

Standard Methodology to Assess the Risks From Non-native Species Considered Possible Problems to the Environment. 2005. DEFRA.

Witmer, G., W. Pitt and K. Fagerstone. 2007. Managing Vertebrate Invasive Species. USDA National Wildlife Research Center Symposia, Fort Collins, Colorado.