NEW YORK
TERRESTRIAL VERTEBRATE INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Scientific name:	Myocastor coypus
Common names:	Nutria, Coypu
Native distribution:	Southern South America
Date assessed:	6/27/2013
Assessors:	E. Schwartzberg
Reviewers:	
Date Approved:	Form version date: 12 June 2013

New York Invasiveness Rank: Very High (Relative Maximum Score >80.00)

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

Invasiveness Ranking Summary (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)	24
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	30 (30)	21
4	Difficulty of control	10 (10)	6
	Outcome score	100 (100)[b]	81[a]
	Relative maximum score †		81.00
	New York Invasiveness Rank §	Very High (Relative Maximum Score >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)	
☒	Yes – continue to A1.2
☐	No – continue to A2.1; Yes ☐ NA; Yes ☐ USA
A1.2. In which PRISMs is it known (see inset map)?	
☐	Adirondack Park Invasive Program
☐	Capital/Mohawk
☐	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership
☐	Finger Lakes
☐	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area
☒	Lower Hudson
☐	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario

☐	Western New York

Documentation:
Sources of information:
One record from New York (Lower Hudson PRISM) in 1989. (Fuller 2013).

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)

Very Likely	Adirondack Park Invasive Program
Very Likely	Capital/Mohawk
Very Likely	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership
Very Likely	Finger Lakes
Very Likely	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area
Very Likely	Lower Hudson
Very Likely	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario
Very Likely	Western New York

Documentation:
Sources of information (e.g.: distribution models, literature, expert opinions):
Nutria has been introduced into every continent with the exception of Antarctica and Australia (Carter and Leonard 2002).

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
☐ Marine	☒ Salt/brackish marshes	☐ Cultivated*
☒ Salt/ brackish waters	☒ Freshwater marshes	☐ Grasslands/old fields
☐ Freshwater tidal	☐ Peatlands	☐ Shrublands
☒ Rivers/streams	☐ Shrub swamps	☐ Forests/woodlands
☒ Natural lakes and ponds	☐ Forested wetlands/riparian	☐ Alpine
☐ Vernal pools	☒ Ditches*	☐ Roadsides*
☒ Reservoirs/impoundments*	☐ Beaches/or coastal dunes	☐ Cultural*

Other potential or known suitable habitats within New York:

Documentation:
Sources of information:

LeBlanc 1994, Genesis Laboratories, Inc. 2002

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 10

Documentation:
Identify ecosystem processes impacted (or if applicable, justify choosing answer A in the absence of impact information)
Nutria have major impacts on the ecosystem process of the habitats they invade and are considered to be "ecosystem engineers", meaning that they influence community structure of the habitats in which they invade. Furthermore, nutria invasion results in decreased habitat availability (Crooks 2002). Nutria grazing and burrowing results in erosion of river banks (Carter and Leonard 2002).
Sources of information:
Crooks 2002, Carter and Leonard 2002.

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 10

Documentation:
Identify type of impact or alteration:
Cause severe habitat alteration as a result of grazing activities (Fuller 2013, TLDWF 2013) including direct erosion of river banks (Carter and Leonard 2002) and destruction of young shoots and rhizomes of marsh plants (LeBlanc 1994).
Sources of information:
LeBlanc 1994, Carter and Leonard 2002, Fuller 2013, TLDWF 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; 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 10

Documentation:
Identify type of impact or alteration:
Nutria cause damage to agricultural and ornamental crops and plants, including to sugar cane, as well as rice, fruit, nut, and shade trees (LeBlanc 1994). Nutria impact on native communities include extensive grazing on wetland species, including several that are replanted for conservation purposes (USGS 2013).
Sources of information:
LeBlanc 1994, USGS 2013.

Total Possible 30
Section One Total 30

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:
Nutria breed sexually in all seasons and sexually active individuals are present every month of the year in most of their range, although breeding time range has not been confirmed for New York state. Nutria reach sexual maturity at four months and produce liters on average of 4-5 offspring.
Sources of information:
LeBlanc 1994

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:
Nutria are non-migratory and occupy a home range of roughly 32 acres.
Sources of information:
LeBlanc 1994

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

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 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
C. Adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, movement and evidence that offsping 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 0

Documentation:
Identify dispersal mechanisms:
None.
Sources of information:

2.4. Practical potential to be spread by human activities, both directly and indirectly (possible vectors include: commercial sales, deliberate stocking, translocation, 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 4

Documentation:
Identify dispersal mechanisms:
Historic establishment of nutria in the United States (1930s) has been caused by range expansion and escape and release from fur farms. State and federal agencies released nutria into several states a to promote the fur trade and control aquatic vegetation. Range expansion continues to be an issue.
Sources of information:
Carter and Leonard 2002.

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 4

Documentation:
Evidence of competitive ability:
Charasmatic species valued for their fur.
Sources of information:
Carter and Leonard 2002, Fuller 2013.

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 8

Documentation:
Evidence of competitive ability:
Nutria are generalists, burrow, live in and out of wet habitat, and are non-seasonal breeders

with a relatively high reproductive rate.

Sources of information:
(Genesis Laboratories, Inc. 2002)

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 2

Documentation:
Identify species:
Ondatra zibethicus are native to North America, but have been introduced to other parts of the world (Birnbaum 2006).

Total Possible 30
Section Two Total 24

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:
Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, Maryland, Deleware, New York, Ohio, and Missouri.
Sources of information:
- See known introduced range at www.usda.gov, and update with information from states and Canadian provinces.

Carter and Leonard 2002, Fuller 2013.

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 0

Documentation:
Describe distribution:
No known established populations in New York.
Sources of information:

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
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 6

Documentation:
Describe known or potential releases:
Historic establishment of nutria in the United States (1930s) has been caused by range expansion and escape and release from fur farms. State and federal agencies released nutria into several states a to promote the fur trade and control aquatic vegetation. Range expansion continues to be an issue.

Sources of information:
Carter and Leonard 2002.

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 2

Documentation:
Describe population density:
Quebec, Ontario, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, Maryland, Deleware, New York, Ohio, and Missouri. Can grow to dense populaitons.
Sources of information:
Carter and Leonard 2002, Fuller 2013.

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 3

Documentation:
Identify type of habitats where it occurs and degree/type of impacts:
Brackish waters and marshes, natural lakes and ponds, rivers, ditches, and impoundments.
Sources of information:
LeBlanc 1994, Genesis Laboratories, Inc. 2002.

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	2

natural or anthropogenic disturbances

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

U. Unknown

Score 3

Documentation:
Identify anthropogenic features:
Common in rice paddies and sugar cane fields. although can establish independent of disturbance.
Sources of information:
LeBlanc 1994, Genesis Laboratories, Inc. 2002.

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 4

Documentation:
Describe known climate similarities: 16 of 51 stations scored 5 or greater on Climatch.
Sources of information:
ADAFF 2013.

Total Possible 30

Section Three Total 21

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 2

Documentation:
Identify source/ vectors:
Range expansion most likely current means of new populations, but could also be release intentionally.
Sources of information:
TLDWF 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:
Monitoring protocols exist for some states in the southern and northwestern U.S.
Sources of information:
Anon 1998, TLDWF 2013.

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:
Established resources are available.
Sources of information:
Anon 2012.

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:
Nutria were successfully eradicated from England in the 1980s following a previously unsuccessful attempt at eradication in the 1960s. The method of eradication is sustained trapping aided by cold winters. eradication is dificult.
Sources of information:
Baker 2006, Carter and Leonard 2002, Anon 2012.

Total Possible	10
Section Four Total	6
Total for 4 sections Possible	100
Total for 4 sections	81

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:

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:

Anon, 1998. Nutria management plan. <http://lacoast.gov/reports/project/3891065~1.pdf>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

Anon, 2012. Coastwide nutria control program 2011-2012. Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. <http://www.nutria.com/uploads/1112CNCPfinalreport_FINAL2.pdf>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

Austrailian Department of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Forestry (ADAFF). 2012. Climatch Mapping Tool. <http://adl.brs.gov.au:8080/Climatch/climatch.jsp>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

Baker, S. (2006). The eradication of coypus (Myocastor coypus) from Britain: the elements required for a successful campaign. Assessment and Control of Biological Invasion Risks. Shoukadoh Book Sellers, Kyoto, Japan and IUCN, Gland, Switzerland, 142-147.

Birnbaum, C. (2006): NOBANIS – Invasive Alien Species Fact Sheet – Ondatra zibethicus. – From: Online Database of the North European and Baltic Network on Invasive Alien Species – NOBANIS. <www.nobanis.org>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

Carter, J., & Leonard, B. P. (2002). A review of the literature on the worldwide distribution, spread of, and efforts to eradicate the coypu (Myocastor coypus). Wildlife Society Bulletin, 162-175.

Crooks, J. A. (2002). Characterizing ecosystem□level consequences of biological invasions: the role of ecosystem engineers. Oikos, 97(2), 153-166.

Fuller. 2013. Myocastor coypus. USGS Nonindigenous Aquatic Species Database, Gainesville, FL. Revision Date: 5/19/2005. <http://nas.er.usgs.gov/queries/factsheet.aspx?speciesid=1089>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

Genesis Laboratories, Inc. 2002. Nutria (Myocastor coypus) in Louisiana. <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/wildlife_damage/nwdp/pdf/Nutria%20in%20Louisiana.pdf> ; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

Global Invasive Species Database (GISD) 2013. Myocastor coypus. <http://www.issg.org/database/species/ecology.asp?si=99&fr=1&sts=&lang=EN>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

LeBlanc, Dwight J. 1994. Nutria Prevention and control of wildlife damage. (Eds) Scott E. Hygnstrom Robert M. Timm & Gary E. Larson.

<http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/nreos/wild/pdf/wildlife/NUTRIA.PDF>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (TLDWF) 2013. Nutria. <http://www.nutria.com/site.php>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2013. Nutria, Eating Louisiana's CoastUSGS Fact Sheet 020-00. <http://www.nwrc.usgs.gov/factshts/020-00/020-00.htm>; [Accessed on June 27, 2013].

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 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.