

# NEW YORK FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Scientific name: Potamopyrgus antipodarum  
 Common names: New Zealand Mud Snail, Jenkins' Spire Shell  
 Native distribution: New Zealand  
 Date assessed: 5/31/2013  
 Assessors: E. Schwartzberg  
 Reviewers: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Form version date: 3 January 2013

**New York Invasiveness Rank:** High (Relative Maximum Score 70.00-80.00)

<b>Distribution and Invasiveness Rank</b> (Obtain from PRISM invasiveness ranking form)		
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

<b>Invasiveness Ranking Summary</b> (see details under appropriate sub-section)		Total (Total Answered*) Possible	Total
1	Ecological impact	30 (30)	30
2	Biological characteristic and dispersal ability	30 (30)	23
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	30 (30)	20
4	Difficulty of control	10 (10)	6
	Outcome score	100 (100) <sup>b</sup>	79 <sup>a</sup>
	Relative maximum score †		79.00
	New York Invasiveness Rank §	High (Relative Maximum Score 70.00-80.00)	

\* 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 type="checkbox"/>	Capital/Mohawk	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Finger Lakes	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lower Hudson	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Western New York	

## NEW YORK FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Documentation:  
Sources of information:

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rivers/streams	<input type="checkbox"/> Shrub swamps	<input type="checkbox"/> Forests/woodlands
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Roadsides*
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reservoirs/ impoundments*	<input type="checkbox"/> Beaches/or coastal dunes	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural*

Other potential or known suitable habitats within New York:

Documentation:  
Sources of information:  
Benson et al. 2013.

**NEW YORK  
FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

---

**B. INVASIVENESS RANKING**

*1. ECOLOGICAL IMPACT*

1.1. Impact on Ecosystem Processes and System-wide Parameters (e.g., water cycle, 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 10

**Documentation:**

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

Major influence of Carbon and Nitrogen fluxes in freshwater streams (Hall et al. 2003).

Sources of information:

Hall et al. 2003.

1.2. Impact on Natural Habitat/ Community Composition

- A. No perceived impact; causes no apparent change in native populations 0
- B. Influences community composition (e.g., reduces the number of individuals of one or more native species in the community) 3
- C. Significantly alters community composition (e.g., produces a significant reduction in the population size of one or more native species in the community) 7
- D. Causes major alteration in community composition (e.g., results in the extirpation of one or several native species, reducing biodiversity or change the community composition towards species exotic to the natural community) 10
- U. Unknown

Score 10

**Documentation:**

Identify type of impact or alteration:

Correlative negative affects on abundance of other macroinvertebrates at points of *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* colonization (Kerans et al. 2005) and can dominate species assemblage in streams (Hall et al. 2003).

Sources of information:

Kerans et al. 2005, Hall et al. 2003; GISD 2013.

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; injurious components/ spines; reduction in spawning; 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. impacts 1 species, <20% population decline, limited host damage) 3
- C. Moderate impact (e.g. impacts 2-3 species and/ or 20-29% population decline of any 1 species, kills host in 2-5 years, ,) 7
- D. Severe impact on other species or species groups (e.g. impacts >3 species and/ or ≥30% population decline of any 1 species, kills host within 2 years, extirpation) 10
- U. Unknown

**NEW YORK  
FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

Score 

10
----

**Documentation:**

Identify type of impact or alteration:

Negatively affects composition of other species groups, although in some cases positively (Schreiber et al. 2002). Thought to be responsible for endangered status of several native freshwater molluscs (ISSG 2013 and references therein).

Sources of information:

Schreiber et al. 2002; Kerans et al. 2005; Strzelec 2005; GISD 2013.

Total Possible 

30
----

  
Section One Total 

30
----

**2. BIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND DISPERSAL ABILITY**

**2.1. Mode and rate of reproduction (provisional thresholds, more investigation needed)**

- A. No reproduction (e.g. sterile with no sexual or asexual reproduction). 0
- B. Limited reproduction (e.g., intrinsic rate of increase <10%, low fecundity, complete one life cycle) 1
- C. Moderate reproduction (e.g., intrinsic rate of increase between 10-30%, moderate fecundity, complete 2-3 life cycles) 2
- D. Abundant reproduction (e.g., intrinsic rate of increase >30%, parthenogenesis, large egg masses, complete > 3 life cycles) 4
- U. Unknown

Score 

4
---

**Documentation:**

Describe key reproductive characteristics:

P. antipodarum reproduce both both sexually and asexually, however non-native populations are parthenogenetic and generations per year ranges from one to six, producing as many as 230 offspring (Alonso and Castro-Diez 2008). All introduced individuals in North America are parthenogenetic (Benson et al. 2013).

Sources of information:

Alonso and Castro-Diez 2008, Benson et al. 2013.

**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:

Non migratory

Sources of information:

**2.3. Biological potential for colonization by long-distance dispersal/ movement (e.g., veligers, resting stage eggs, glochidia)**

- A. No long-distance dispersal/ movement mechanisms 0
- B. Adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, but studies report that most individuals (90%) establish territories within 5 miles of natal origin or within a distance twice the home range of the typical individual, and tend not to cross major barriers such as dams and watershed divides 1
- C. Adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, movement and evidence that offspring often disperse greater than 5 miles of natal origin or greater than twice the home range of typical individual and will cross major barriers such as dams and watershed divides 2

**NEW YORK  
FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

---

U. Unknown

Score

**Documentation:**

Identify dispersal mechanisms:

Can survive passage through the guts of animals, although the extent to which this aids in long distance dispersal is unknown (Benson et al. 2013).

Sources of information:

Benson et al. 2013.

2.4. Practical potential to be spread by human activities, both directly and indirectly – possible vectors include: commercial bait sales, deliberate illegal stocking, aquaria releases, boat trailers, canals, ballast water exchange, live food trade, rehabilitation, pest control industry, aquaculture escapes, 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:

Primarily moved via ballast water, but can also be dispersed by birds or by drifting on aquatic macrophytes (Alonso and Castro-Diez 2008 an references therein). Also thought to be moved via shipments through the aquaculture , as well as by other means including via drinking water barels (ISSG 2013).

Sources of information:

Alonso and Castro-Diez 2008; GISD 2013.

2.5. Non-living chemical and physical characteristics that increase competitive advantage (e.g., tolerance to various extremes, pH, DO, temperature, desiccation, 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:

Can withstand dessication and extreme temperatures.

Sources of information:

Alonso and Castro-Diez 2008; GISD 2013.

2.6. Biological characteristics that increase competitive advantage (e.g., high fecundity, generalist/ broad niche space, highly evolved defense mechanisms, behavioral adaptations, piscivorous, etc.)

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| 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

**NEW YORK  
FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

---

**Documentation:**

Evidence of competitive ability:  
High fecundity (ISSG 2013).  
Sources of information:  
GISD 2013.

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

**Documentation:**

Identify species:

Total Possible	30
Section Two Total	23

**3. ECOLOGICAL AMPLITUDE AND DISTRIBUTION**

3.1. Current introduced distribution 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

**Documentation:**

Identify states and provinces:

Established in Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, and Lake Michigan. NY, PA, OH, IN, IL, MI, WI, MN.

Sources of information:

- See known introduced range at [www.usda.gov](http://www.usda.gov), and update with information from states and Canadian provinces.

Benson et al. 2013.

3.2. Current introduced distribution 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

**Documentation:**

Describe distribution:

SLELO, Western NY.

Sources of information:

Benson et al. 2013.

**NEW YORK  
FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

---

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

- A. None 0
- 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 4

**Documentation:**

Describe known or potential releases:

Potential release events could be moderate due to small size and ability to be transferred via multiple sources.

Sources of information:

GISD, 2013.

3.4. Current introduced population density, or distance to known occurrence, in northern USA and/ or southern Canada.

- A. No known populations established. 0
- B. Low to moderate population density (e.g., ≤1/4 to < 1/2 native population density) with few other invasives present and/ or documented in 1 or more non-adjacent state/ province and/ or 1 unconnected waterbody. 1
- C. High or irruptive population density (e.g., ≥1/2 native population density) with numerous other invasives present and/ or documented in 1 or more adjacent state/ province and/ or 1 connected waterbody. 2
- U. Unknown

Score 2

**Documentation:**

Describe population density:

Present in multiple great lakes and can occur at irruptive population densities.

Sources of information:

Hall et al. 2003; GISD 2013.

3.5. Number of habitats the species may invade

- A. Not known to invade any natural habitats given at A2.3. 0
- B. Known to occur in 2 or 3 of the habitats given at A2.3, with at least 1 or 2 natural habitat(s). 2
- C. Known to occur in 4 or more of the habitats given at A2.3, with at least 3 natural habitats. 3
- U. Unknown.

Score 2

**Documentation:**

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

Rivers, lakes, and reservoirs.

Sources of information:

Benson et al. 2013.

3.6. Role of anthropogenic (human related) and natural disturbance in establishment (e.g. water level management, man-made structures, high vehicle traffic, major storm events, 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

**NEW YORK  
FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

- C. Can establish independent of any known natural or anthropogenic disturbances. 3
- U. Unknown.

Score 2

**Documentation:**

Identify type of disturbance:  
Thrives in disturbed watersheds.  
Sources of information:  
Benson et al. 2013.

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

- A. Native range does not include climates similar to New York (e.g., <10%). 0
- B. Native range possibly includes climates similar to portions of New York (e.g., 10-29%). 4
- C. Native range includes climates similar to those in New York (e.g.,  $\geq 30\%$ ). 8
- U. Unknown.

Score 4

**Documentation:**

Describe known climate similarities:  
8 out of 55 stations scored five or greater.  
Sources of information:  
ADAFF 2013.

Total Possible 30  
Section Three Total 20

**4. DIFFICULTY OF CONTROL**

**4.1. Re-establishment potential, nearby propagule source, known vectors of re-introduction (e.g. biological supplies, pets, aquaria, aquaculture facilities, connecting waters/ corridors, mechanized transportation, live wells, etc.)**

- A. No known vectors/ propagule source for re-establishment following removal. 0
- B. Possible re-establishment from 1 vector/ propagule source following removal and/ or viable <24 hours. 1
- C. Likely to re-establish from 2-3 vectors/ propagule sources following removal and/ or viable 2-7 days. 2
- D. Strong potential for re-establishment from 4 or more vectors/ propagule sources following removal and/or viable >7 days. 3
- U. Unknown.

Score 3

**Documentation:**

Identify source/ vectors:  
Ballast water, fishing and boating equipment, on boats, via aquaculture vegetaiton.  
Sources of information:  
GISD 2013.

**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 1

**Documentation:**

Describe protocols:



**NEW YORK  
FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

Management protocols exist.  
Sources of information:  
ANSTF 2007.

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 0

Documentation:  
Describe resources:  
Management resources are available.  
Sources of information:  
ANSTF 2007.

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 infestation 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 infestation.) | 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 infestation.)           | 3 |
| U. | Unknown  |   |

Score 2

Documentation:  
Identify types of control methods and time required:  
Erradiation is not probably, however treatment protocols beyond prevention do exist, including physical (draining ponds), chemical (treatment with molecicide), and potential biological control using a parasite.  
Sources of information:  
GISD 2013.

Total Possible	10
Section Four Total	6

<b>Total for 4 sections Possible</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Total for 4 sections</b>	<b>79</b>

**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: Two morphotypes known to exist, including a regular and carinatus (keeled) forms (Butkus et al. 2011). Several clones known to exist (ANSTF 2007).

## NEW YORK FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE 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:

### References for species assessment:

- Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force (ANSTF) 2007. National Management and Control Plan for the New Zealand Mudsnail (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*) New Zealand Mudsnail Management and Control Plan Working Group.  
<[http://anstaskforce.gov/Documents/NZMS\\_MgmtControl\\_Final.pdf](http://anstaskforce.gov/Documents/NZMS_MgmtControl_Final.pdf)>; [Accessed on May 31, 2013].
- Australian Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry (ADAFF). 2013. Climatch Mapping Tool.  
<<http://adl.brs.gov.au:8080/Climatch/>>; [Accessed: May 31, 2013].
- Alonso, A., & Castro-Diez, P. (2008). What explains the invading success of the aquatic mud snail *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* (Hydrobiidae, Mollusca)? *Hydrobiologia*, 614(1), 107-116.
- Benson, A.J., R.M. Kipp, J. Larson, and A. Fusaro. 2013. *Potamopyrgus antipodarum*. USGS Nonindigenous Aquatic Species Database, Gainesville, FL. Revision Date: 6/11/2012.  
<<http://nas.er.usgs.gov/queries/factsheet.aspx?SpeciesID=1008>>; [Accessed on May 31, 2013].
- Butkus, R., Šidagytė, E., & Arbačiauskas, K. (2012). Two morphotypes of the New Zealand mud snail *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* (JE Gray, 1843) (Mollusca: Hydrobiidae) invade Lithuanian lakes. *Aquatic Invasions*, 7(2), 211-218.
- Global Invasive Species Database (GISD). 2013. *Potamopyrgus antipodarum*.  
<<http://www.issg.org/database/species/ecology.asp?si=449&fr=1&sts=&lang=EN>>; [Accessed on May 31, 2013].
- Hall Jr, R. O., Tank, J. L., & Dybdahl, M. F. (2003). Exotic snails dominate nitrogen and carbon cycling in a highly productive stream. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 1(8), 407-411.
- Kerans, B. L., Dybdahl, M. F., Gangloff, M. M., & Jannot, J. E. (2005). *Potamopyrgus antipodarum*: distribution, density, and effects on native macroinvertebrate assemblages in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society*, 24(1), 123-138.
- Schreiber, E.S.G., P.S. Lake, and G.P. Quinn. 2002. Facilitation of native stream fauna by an invading species? Experimental investigation of the interaction of the snail, *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* (Hydrobiidae) with native benthic fauna. *Biological Invasions* 4(3):317–325.
- Strzelec, M. 2005. Impact of the introduced *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* (Gastropods) on the snail fauna in post-industrial ponds in Poland. *Biologia (Bratislava)* 60(2):159–163.

**Citation:** The New York Fish & Aquatic Invertebrate 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 Fish and Aquatic Invertebrate 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

## NEW YORK

# FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

---

of this form. Members of the Office of 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 Fish and Aquatic Invertebrate 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.

Copp, G. H., R. Garthwaite and R. E. Gozlan. 2005. Risk Identification and Assessment of Non-native Freshwater Fishes: Concepts and Perspectives on Protocols for the UK. Sci. Ser. Tech Rep., Cefas Lowestoft, 129: 32pp.

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

Generic Nonindigenous Aquatic Organisms Risk Analysis Review Process. 1996. Risk Assessment and Management Committee, Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force.

International Conference on Marine Bioinvasions. 2007. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

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.

Long Island Sound Interstate Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan. 2007. Balcom, N. editor, New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission.

Molnar, J., R. Gamboa, C. Revenga, and M. Spalding. 2008 Assessing the Global Threat of Invasive Species to Marine Biodiversity. Front. Ecol. Environ.

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.

Trinational Risk Assessment Guidelines for Aquatic Alien Invasive Species. 2009. Commission for Environmental Cooperation. Montreal, Canada.

**NEW YORK**  
**FISH & AQUATIC INVERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

---

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