Looking Forward: Risk Assessment Tools to Identify Future Invaders Before They Arrive

Reuben Keller & Abigail Jacobs

Institute of Environmental Sustainability Loyola University Chicago

Jennifer Howeth

Department of Biological Sciences University of Alabama

Crysta Gantz & David Lodge

Department of Biological Sciences University of Notre Dame

Nick Mandrak

Department of Fisheries and Oceans Government of Canada

Established Non-native Aquatic Species in IL



Established Non-native Aquatic Species in IL



Geography of Established Species



Taxonomy of Established Species

Таха	Number of	Number of				
	NECOLUS	Species				
Algae	11	5				
Plants	4,551	31				
Coelenterates	3	2				
Crustaceans	286	10				
Mollusks	2,269	7				
Fishes	15,939	23				
TOTAL	23,059	78				

Invasion Sequence



Options for Management

Risk Assessment

Goal of Risk Assessment is to identify high risk Non-native species before they species pool are introduced Transport Prevention Introduced Early detection/ Reproduction rapid response **Established** Spread, impacts Control, management, Invasive adaptation

Great Lakes Policy Response

 Shared resource, but little coordination for management and policy

 All jurisdictions remain at risk from almost all invaders

Species	IL	IN	MI	MN	NY	OH	ON	PA	WI
Bighead carp (Hypophthalmichthys nobilis)	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Bitterling (Rhodeus sericeus)			Х						
Black carp (Mylopharyngodon piceus)	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Chinese weatherloach (Misgusnus			Х						
anguillicaudatus)									
Eastern banded killifish (Fundulus diaphanus)						Х			
Grass carp, triploid (Ctenopharyngodon idella)			Х	Х	Х		Х		Х
Grass carp, diploid (Ctenopharyngodon idella)						Х		Х	Х
Ide/Orfe (Leuciscus idus)			Х						
Mosquitofish, eastern (Gambusia holbrooki)									Х
Mosquitofish, western (Gambusia affinis)									Х
Piranha (Multiple genera)					Х				
Round goby (Neogobius melanostomus)	Х	Х		Х		Х	Х	Х	
Rudd (Scardinius erythrophthalamus)	Х	Х	Х	Х		Х	Х	Х	
Ruffe (Gymnocephalus cernuus)	Х	Х		Х		Х	Х	Х	
Sea lamprey (Petromyzon marinus)				Х		Х			
Silver carp (Hypophthalmichthus molitrix)	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Snakehead, giant (Channa micropeltes)									Х
Snakehead, northern (Channa argus)	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х	Х
Snakehead family									Х
Red shiner (Cyprinella lutrensis)									Х
Tench (Tinca tinca)			Х						
Three spine stickleback (Gasterosteus						Х			
aculeatus)									
Tilapia (Multiple genera)								Х	
Tubenose goby (Proterorhinus marmoratus)	Х	Х		Х		Х	Х	Х	
Walking catfish (Family Clariidae)	Х								
Walking catfish (Clarias batrachus)						Х			
White perch (Morone americana)		Х		Х		Х			
Zander (Sander lucioperca)				Х					Х

Organisms in Trade Risk Assessment Project

Research Objectives

Objective 1: Develop risk assessment tools for fishes, plants, mollusks, amphibians, reptiles and crustaceans for the GL Basin.

Communication (Objective 3)

Produce and make freely available text and online versions of risk assessment tools. Conduct workshops in their use and application.

Objective 2: Use tools (Objective 1) to assess invasion risks of species currently in trade in the GL Basin Species lists annotated for risk distributed to stakeholders across GL basin, made available online. <u>Outcomes</u>

GL governments have scientifically rigorous and comprehensive information and tools to support coordinated action to manage high risk aquatic species in trade now and in the future.

Risk Assessment for Fishes in the Great Lakes

3 Invasion Process Species Elsewhere Introduced Established Invasive

Introduced to Established

Established to Invasive

Gather species lists
 2. Gather trait data
 3. Analyze data

Gather Species Lists: Introduced to Established

Species Introduced

1. Gather Species Lists: Introduced to Established

2. Gather Trait Data

Life History	Body size
	Egg size
	Fecundity
	Larval size
	Longevity
	Maturation size
	Reproductive guild
	Spawning frequency
Habitat preference	Macrohabitat preference
	Salinity tolerance
	Temperature tolerance
Invasion risk	Climate similarity
	Prior invasion success
Phylogenetic	Phylogeny
	Relatedness
Trophic ecology	Diet breadth
	Trophic guild
Native range	Size of range

3. Analyze Data: Introduced to Established

Species Introduced n=65

3. Risk Assessment Tool

Species Introduced n=65

Climate Match ≤ 71.7% 5 Established 22 Failed Climate Match ≥ 71.7% 32 Established 6 Failed

Risk Assessment Tool

- AUROC = 0.775
- 10% Cross-validated test sample: 78.04%
 Established: 81.08%
 Failed: 75.00%

High vs. Low Risk

High vs. Low Risk

3. Analyze Data: High vs. Low Risk

3. Analyze Data: High vs. Low Risk

Economics of Risk Assessment: US Herptile Trade

<u>Current U.S. Policy:</u> Essentially 'open-door'

<u>Alternative Policy:</u> Risk Assessment, remove high risk species from trade

<u>Question:</u> Under a policy of Risk Assessment, how much is it worth spending per species to assess risk?

Photo: Skip Snow, National Park Service, Bugwood.org

African rock python

monitor

Photo: Gary M. Stolz, USFWS, Bugwood.org

Risk Assessment for Reptiles & Amphibians

<u>Answer:</u> It is worth paying from \$54,000 - \$141,000 to assess each species within a program of risk assessment

Our risk assessment is basic, but would still allow at least 73% of new species for import

Michael Springborn, Christina Romagosa & Reuben Keller (2011) The value of nonindigenous species risk assessment in international trade. *Ecological Economics* 70:2145-2153

Looking Forward

 Prevention is the most effective way to reduce future impacts from invasive species

- Many species are in trade, and new species are added regularly
 - e.g., We found 826 freshwater and euryhaline species, from 106 families, in trade in GL Basin
- Rapid risk assessment tools are needed
 - Accurate risk assessment is possible (and not too complicated)
 - Risk Assessment can generate environmental and economic benefits

Proactive Policy Can Slow Rates of Invasion

Gather Species Lists: Established to Invasive

Ecological Impact Questionnaire

Impact level	Description
1 (none to low)	Species has little to no discernible impact on existing biota
2 (moderate)	Species causes discernible decline in the abundance of existing biota in most locations
3 (high)	Species causes discernible decline in the abundance of existing biota and becomes a dominant component of the food web
4 (very high)	Species causes discernible decline in the abundance of existing biota with extirpation of species likely. Food webs are highly altered and ecosystem-level consequences apparent

Ecological Impact Questionnaire

Impact level	Description
1 (none to low)	Species has little to no discernible impact on existing biota
2 (moderate)	Species causes discernible decline in the abundance of existing biota in most locations
3 (high)	Species causes discernible decline in the abundance of existing biota and becomes a dominant component of the food web
4 (very high)	Species causes discernible decline in the abundance of existing biota with extirpation of species likely. Food webs are highly altered and ecosystem-level consequences apparent

• Twenty-seven Great Lakes Fishery experts ranked the established species into these categories

Ecological Impacts of Established Fishes in Great Lakes

Ecological Impacts of Established Fishes in Great Lakes

Risk Assessment for Reptiles & Amphibians

<u>Methods:</u>

- Construct risk assessment from readily available data
- Assess the economic outcomes from applying that risk assessment to the US live import trade

Factors Included:

- Number of species in trade
- Value of species in trade
- Rate at which species in trade become invasive
- Cost of invasive species