

Draft Economic Analyses for Listing of 10 Freshwater Fish and 1 Crayfish Species as Injurious under the Lacey Act

Prepared by:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Division of Economics

September 2015

Introduction

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is proposing a rule to add 10 fish species and 1 crayfish species (11 species) to the list of injurious species at title 50, section 16.13 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR): crucian carp (*Carassius carassius*), Eurasian minnow (*Phoxinus phoxinus*), Prussian carp (*Carassius gibelio*), roach (*Rutilus rutilus*), stone moroko (*Pseudorasbora parva*), Nile perch (*Lates niloticus*), Amur sleeper (*Perccottus glenii*), European perch (*Perca fluviatilis*), zander (*Sander lucioperca*), wels catfish (*Silurus glanis*), and common yabby (*Cherax destructor*). The listing would prohibit importation and interstate transportation of live individuals of these species, none of which is native to the United States.

Of the 11 species, only one population of one species (zander) is found in the wild in the United States. Of the 11 species, 1 species (yabby) is in trade in the United States (LiveAquaria.com 2014a and b); 3 species (crucian carp, Nile perch, and wels catfish) have been imported in small numbers since 2011; and seven species are not in U.S. trade. The Lacey Act (18 USC 42 as amended; the Act) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to add to the injurious wildlife list by regulation those wild mammals, wild birds, fish, mollusks, crustaceans, amphibians, reptiles, and the offspring, eggs, or hybrids of any of the aforementioned, which are injurious to human beings, to the interests of agriculture, horticulture, forestry, or to the wildlife or wildlife resources of the United States. The lists of injurious wildlife are at 50 CFR 16.11-15. This economic analysis supports the proposed rule that is being published in the *Federal Register* ("Injurious Wildlife Species; Listing 10 Freshwater Fish and 1 Crayfish").

Preliminary risk screening showed that these 11 nonnative species pose a significant risk of becoming invasive if introduced into the United States, based on a history of invasiveness elsewhere in the world and a suitable climate match in parts of the United States. The Service is following up on the initial risk screening for invasiveness with an evaluation for injuriousness (see proposed rule for explanation). Reports from Europe, Asia, Australia, and Africa have shown that these species have become established in the wild outside of their native ranges to the detriment of native ecosystems and ecosystem services. Several of the species were intentionally introduced to areas outside their native range for commercial fishing or aquaculture, sport fishing, or as ornamentals for display.

At least two of the species (crucian carp and Nile perch) have been introduced into the United States in previous decades but failed to become established. The zander (*Sander lucioperca*) has been established in a single lake in North Dakota. There have been occurrences of the common yabby (*Cherax destructor*) in United States trade. The Service sought to determine if any of the 11 species have been imported alive in the last few years by checking the information on declaration forms. Table 1 shows the three species that have been declared for importation as live specimens since 2011, totaling 6,445 individuals (data is from the Service’s Law Enforcement Management Information System (LEMIS 2014)).

Table 1. Number of known importations of each species from 2011 to October 21, 2014

Species	Number of Importations	Number of Individuals
Crucian carp	1	6,200
Nile perch	13	203
Wels catfish	3	42

It is possible that other species may have been imported, but their information was not entered into LEMIS because it was not required to be. It is unlikely that significant importations have occurred with any of the 11 species.

Other than the common yabby and the above declared import events, none of these species is currently known to be present in trade in the United States.

The objective of this listing is to utilize the Lacey Act’s major strength by prohibiting importation and interstate transportation and thus preventing the species’ likely introduction and establishment in the wild and likely harm to human beings, to the interests of agriculture, wildlife, and wildlife resources. Based on our evaluation of the injurious nature of all 11 species, the Service seeks to prevent these introductions and establishment within the United States, consistent with the Lacey Act.

If any of these species enter the United States and are released into the wild under the appropriate conditions, they could survive and establish populations in many types of water bodies. There are a number of ways that these introduced aquatic species can harm United States interests, including, but not limited to:

- Prey on native fish, including game and endangered species, as well as farmed (aquaculture) species.
- Compete with native species for food, nest sites, and other resources.
- Serve as a vector for infectious diseases.
- Prey on invertebrates and juvenile fish, thus modifying the structure of native aquatic communities.

Any of these activities decrease social welfare, either through direct effects on human activities (such as reduced profit from aquaculture or reduced pleasure in fishing) or indirect effects on humans (such as lost existence value for pristine streams). This proposed rule seeks to avoid such probable harmful effects on the United States.

The following sections address the benefits and costs of the proposed rule as required by Executive Order 12866 and the certification of no effect on small entities as required by the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Act (SBREFA). In each case, a “No Action” alternative is compared to listing under the Act and to a voluntary refrain on importation by the live animal importers based on risk assessments provided by the Service.

Need for Action

This action will prevent the type of harm that has already been caused by numerous other invasive and injurious species that have entered the United States from other countries. Industries must spend millions of dollars to defend against damage from injurious species. For example, zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*) are estimated to have exceeded \$100 million in costs to economic activities (Johnson 2011). Millions of dollars more are spent to limit the spread of such species as silver carp (*Hypophthalmichthys molitrix*) and brown tree snake (*Boiga irregularis*). Public well-being is also decreased by the effects of invasive and injurious species on the environment. A river overrun with 40-pound silver carp that leap out of the water at the approach of a motorboat can result in serious injury to people in boats and can render boating dangerous and unpleasant. No unregulated market forces exist that can shift these costs to the individuals responsible for them.

Many invasive and injurious species have been imported to the United States unintentionally, while others were brought here intentionally. In either case, unregulated market forces failed to provide adequate incentives to prevent the escape and survival of these species. The unregulated market does not require those entities importing a species or transporting a species across state lines to bear the full costs and liabilities for all of the consequences of their actions. The Act provides a framework for preventing pathways that lead to introduction, establishment, and spread of injurious species and the negative externalities that they cause.

State or municipal government actions alone are insufficient to address the international and interstate threat of invasive species. While States have major responsibilities for wildlife within their borders, invasive species ignore political boundaries. States do not have authority to regulate importation or interstate transportation. Therefore, Federal action is necessary. The Act provides a Federal

mechanism to prevent the introduction, establishment, and spread of injurious species into and throughout the United States by prohibiting the importation and interstate transportation of injurious species.

Authority

The Act provides that the Secretary of the Interior may amend by regulation the list of injurious wildlife prohibited from importation and interstate transportation (18 USC 42(a)(1)).

Baseline and Alternatives

Three alternatives are considered in this rule-making:

1. No Action-Baseline – Allow importation and interstate transportation of these species within the United States and cope with the future consequences of their introduction into United States habitats in other ways.
2. Injurious Wildlife Listing – Prohibit importation and interstate transportation in these species, except as permitted for scientific, educational, medical, and zoological purposes.
3. Voluntary refrain – Do not amend the list of injurious wildlife, but instead encourage a voluntary refrain on importation and interstate transportation of these 11 species by the live animal trade businesses, even though the species are not listed as injurious. This follows a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Service, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (USFWS 2013) but is not limited to the parties in the MOU.

The effects of the alternatives are compared to a baseline scenario. Under Alternative 1, the No Action Baseline, no action is taken with regard to trade in these species. Importers will be able to bring the species into the United States for any purpose. Several of the species are raised for food in commercial aquaculture operations outside of their native range and currently outside of the United States. Others have been released into natural water bodies outside of the United States to add to sport fishing opportunities. Several species also serve as aquarium fish or pond ornamentals outside the United States. This experience abroad indicates that the threat from these species is not merely speculative. Aquaculturists, anglers, and aquarium enthusiasts may have the same incentives in the United States that existed elsewhere to import these species.

Seven of these species are not in trade in the United States at this time. Three of these species have been imported in small numbers during the last several years. As a result, the listing of these 11 species should have little or no economic impact on small

businesses or the U.S. economy as a whole. We have no information that would predict the prices and quantities of these species that might result if they were to enter into trade in this country. Lacking that information, any attempt to quantify the economic impacts (that is, producer and consumer surplus gains) that would result from introduction of these species into the United States would be purely speculative. The following qualitative discussion outlines the likely costs and benefits of each alternative.

Expected Costs of Alternatives

Under Alternative 1 (the No Action alternative), we expect importers may eventually introduce these species to United States markets. The Act is permissive in that otherwise lawful importation or interstate transportation of a species may occur until it is designated as injurious by statute or by regulation. International agreements, such as CITES, NAFTA, and GATT, also affect the import of wildlife; however, none prohibits the importation of these 11 species. Additionally, U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Centers for Disease Control have the authority to regulate imports of live animals, primarily used to prevent the spread of diseases to agriculture and humans; however, neither currently prohibits the importation of these species. Without a listing as injurious, the Service cannot prevent importation or interstate transport of these 11 species. The following examples characterize the effects that could be expected from introduction of these species into waters of the United States under the No Action Alternative.

The crucian carp (*Carassius carassius*) is a freshwater fish species native to regions of north and central Europe (Godard and Copp 2012). This fish species has been widely introduced and established in Croatia, Greece, France (Holčík 1991, Godard and Copp 2012), Italy, and England (Kottelat and Freyhof 2007), Spain, Belgium, Israel, Switzerland, Chile, India, Sri Lanka, Philippines (Holčík 1991, Froese and Pauly 2014), and Turkey (Innal and Erk'akan 2006). The crucian carp competes with native fish species, alters the health of freshwater habitats, hybridizes with other carp species (Godard and Copp 2012), and is a vector of the fish disease spring viremia of carp (SVC) (Ahne et al. 2002). If introduced and established in United States waters, the crucian carp could have similar effects to the nonnative silver carp (*Hypophthalmichthys molitrix*), which has been linked to declines of some native fish species in the United States. Crucian carp can also harbor SVC, which infects numerous fish, such as carp, pike, and perch (Ahne et al. 2002). This disease can result in fish mortality, and thus can be detrimental to commercial and recreational fisheries and aquaculture.

The Eurasian minnow (*Phoxinus phoxinus*) is native to the brackish and freshwater streams, rivers, ponds, and lakes throughout Eurasia (Sandlund 2008, Froese

and Pauly 2013). This fish species is expanding its nonnative, invasive range (Hesthagen and Sandlund 2010.). The Eurasian minnow affects native species through competition, predation, and parasite transmission. In Norway, this fish competes with brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) for food resources and preys on vendace (a salmonid) larvae (Huusko and Sutela 1997). Dense populations of this fish species have resulted in an average of 35 percent reduction in recruitment and growth rates of brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) (Museth *et al.* 2007). If introduced to the U.S., this fish species could decrease native salmon and trout populations. Thus, this species' introduction could reduce wildlife diversity and the economic value of salmonid fisheries and aquaculture.

The Prussian carp (*Carassius gibelio*) is native to regions of Asia and central Europe and eastward to Siberia (Britton 2011). The Prussian carp's nonnative range includes the Asian countries of Armenia, Turkey, and Uzbekistan and the European countries of Belarus, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Poland, and Switzerland (Britton 2011), as well as recently in the Iberian Peninsula (Ribeiro *et al.* 2015). The Prussian carp is closely related and behaviorally similar to the crucian carp. Like the crucian carp, introduced Prussian carp may compete with native fish species, alter freshwater habitats, and serve as a vector for parasitic infections for native and aquaculture fish. Introduced populations of Prussian carp have decreased biodiversity and populations of native fish, invertebrates, and plants (Anseeuw *et al.* 2007, Lusk *et al.* 2010). A significant trait is that Prussian carp have a very rare mode of reproduction unique among fish. Introduced populations often include, or are solely composed of, triploid females that can undergo natural gynogenesis, allowing them to reproduce from unfertilized eggs (Vetemaa *et al.* 2005, Britton 2011). Thus, the eggs can hatch without being fertilized by males. In Greece, introduced Prussian carp have increased lake turbidity levels and intensively fed on zooplankton; thus, increasing the frequency of algal blooms and changing nutrient availability and ecosystem cycling (Crivelli 1995). Increased turbidity and algal blooms reduce the aesthetic and recreational value of freshwater rivers and lakes (Pretty 2003). The Prussian carp was recently documented as established in southern Alberta, Canada (Elgin *et al.* 2014).

The roach (*Rutilus rutilus*) is native to regions of Europe and Asia (Kottelat and Freyhof 2007). The roach has been introduced and become established in Ireland, Italy, Madagascar, Morocco, Cyprus, Portugal, the Azores, Spain, and Australia (Rocabayera and Veiga 2012). Introduced roach compete with native species for food and habitat resources, hybridize with native species, alter habitats and nutrient cycling, and transmit parasites and pathogenic bacteria. The roach is a highly adaptive species and will switch between habitats and food sources to best avoid predation and competition (Winfield and Winfield 1994). The pathogenic bacterium *Aeromonas salmonicida* infects the

roach causing the disease furunculosis (Wiklund and Dalsgaard 1998). This disease causes skin ulcers and hemorrhaging and can be spread through a fish's open sore. The roach may spread this disease to both farmed and wild fish populations. If introduced, the roach may reduce native fish populations causing decreased wildlife diversity and economic damage to aquaculture, fisheries, and recreational resources.

The stone moroko (*Pseudorasbora parva*) is native to Asia including southern and central Japan, Taiwan, Korea, China, and the Amur River basin (Copp 2007). This fish species was first introduced in Europe (Romania) in the early 1960s. By 2000, this fish species had invaded nearly every European country and additional countries in Asia (Copp 2007). Introduced populations of the stone moroko affect native species through predation, competition, disease transmission, and altering freshwater ecosystems (Witkowski 2011). Both predation and competition result in the decline of populations and decreased wildlife diversity. Additionally, the stone moroko is an unaffected vector of the pathogenic rosette-like agent *Sphaerothecum destruens* (Gozlan *et al.* 2005; Pinder *et al.* 2005). This agent is a documented pathogen of farmed and wild European fish. It causes spawning failure, organ failure, and death in some fish species (Gozlan *et al.* 2005). If introduced, the stone moroko may reduce wildlife diversity and damage aquaculture, fisheries, and recreational resources.

The Nile perch (*Lates niloticus*) is a predatory fish native to central, western, and eastern Africa (Witte 2011). This fish species was introduced into Lake Victoria in Africa in an effort to improve the local fishery. Since this species' introduction in Lake Victoria, the Nile perch has become the top predator in the system contributing over 90 percent of demersal (bottom-dwelling) fish body mass within this lake (Witte 2011). This fish is considered responsible for the decreased populations of native fish species (lungfish and catfish species) and the local extinction of at least 200 haplochromine cichlid fish species. The disappearance of many native fish species has drastically altered Lake Victoria's trophic level structure and biodiversity. These changes have resulted in increased lake eutrophication (excess nutrient load) and frequency of algal blooms (Witte 2011). The introduction and establishment of the Nile perch has been so devastating to the Lake Victoria ecosystem such that this species has been named as one of the 100 "World's Worst" Invaders (Snoeks 2005). If introduced and established in the United States, the Nile perch would likely prey on small native fish species (mudminnows, cyprinids, sunfish, and darters) and compete with native largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) and the catfish species of blue catfish (*Ictalurus furcatus*), channel catfish (*Ictalurus punctatus*), and flathead catfish (*Pyodictis olivaris*). These native fish are integral components of freshwater ecosystems, and are also economically important to both commercial and recreational fisheries.

The Amur sleeper (*Perccottus glenii*) is native to the freshwater regions of northeastern China, northern North Korea, the Far East of Russia (Reshetnikov 2004), and South Korea (Grabowska 2011). This fish species is invasive in western Russia and 14 additional countries including Mongolia, Belarus, Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Moldova, and Croatia (Grabowska 2011, Froese and Pauly 2014). Introduction of the Amur sleeper could result in decline of native invertebrate, amphibian, and fish species through competition and predation. Additionally, this fish species harbors parasites which can be transmitted to native and aquaculture fish species. Declining populations of native fish species could reduce wildlife diversity and reduce the visual, economic, and recreational benefits of native species and their natural habitat.

The European perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) is native to Europe (Snoeks 2010) and regions of Asia including Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Iran, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Turkey, and Uzbekistan (Froese and Pauly 2014). This fish species has been introduced and become established in Ireland, Italy, Spain, Australia, New Zealand, China, Turkey, Cyprus, Morocco, and South Africa (FAO 2014). The European perch competes with native fish species for both food and habitat resources (Closs *et al.* 2003) and is responsible for the local extinction of native fish in introduced areas (Snoeks 2010). Additionally, this fish species forms dense populations competing with each other to the extent of stunting their own growth (NSW DPI 2013). These perch are voracious predators, and in one instance, consumed 20,000 trout fry from an Australian reservoir in less than 72 hours (NSW DPI 2013). The European perch might not only compete with the yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) native to the United States, but could also hybridize with this native species resulting in irreversible changes to the genetic structure of this important native species (Schwenk *et al.* 2008). Hybridization can reduce the fitness of the native species and in some cases has resulted in drastic population declines resulting in endangered classification and even extinction (Mooney and Cleland 2001). The yellow perch has value for both commercial and recreational fishing and is also an important forage fish in many freshwater ecosystems (Froese and Pauly 2014). The European perch also harbors the viral disease Epizootic Haematopoietic Necrosis (EHN) which can be spread to native fish stocks (NSW DPI 2013) and to aquaculture stocks. Through competition, predation, hybridization, and disease transmission, the European perch reduces native wildlife diversity and reduces the value of commercial and recreational fisheries.

The zander (*Sander lucioperca*) is native to the freshwater basins of the Caspian Sea, Baltic Sea, Black Sea, Aral Sea, North Sea, and Aegean Sea (Godard and Copp 2011). The zander is a native fish species in much of Eastern Europe, the Scandinavian

Peninsula, and regions of Asia. This fish species has been introduced and become established in part of Asia (China, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkey), Africa (Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia), and much of Europe (Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, the Azores, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom) (Godard and Copp 2011, Froese and Pauly 2014). The zander has been introduced to the United States, and a small established population is present in Spiritwood Lake (North Dakota) (Fuller 2009). If introduced and established, the zander may reduce native fish populations through competition (Linfield and Rikards 1979), predation (Kangur and Kangur 1998, Jepsen *et al.* 2000, Koed *et al.* 2002), parasite transmission (Kvach and Mierzejewska 2011), and hybridization (Godard and Copp 2011, Fuller 2009). The parasites may also be transmitted to aquaculture fish. Declining populations of native fish species reduces wildlife diversity and the value of commercial and recreational fisheries.

The wels catfish (*Silurus glanis*) is native to eastern Europe and western Asia including the North Sea, Baltic Sea, Black Sea, Caspian Sea, and Aral Sea basins (Rees 2012). This catfish species has been introduced and become established in China; the North African countries of Algeria, Syria, Tunisia; and the European countries of Belgium, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom (Rees 2012, Froese and Pauly 2014). The introduction of wels catfish may reduce native fish populations through competition, predation, disease transmission, and altering the natural habitat. This catfish species is a very large (maximum 16 feet, 675 lb.) (Copp *et al.* 2009, Rees 2012) predatory fish with a voracious generalist diet extending to invertebrates, fish, crayfish, eels, small mammals, and birds (Copp *et al.* 2009). The wels catfish is a carrier of the virus, spring viremia of carp (SVC) and can transmit this fatal disease to native fish species (Hickey and Chare 2004) and to aquaculture fish. This catfish species also excretes excess amounts of phosphorus and nitrogen to the freshwater habitat (Schaus *et al.* 1997, McIntyre *et al.* 2008) that can result in eutrophication, increased algal blooms, and decreased oxygen levels. Changes in water quality not only affect the health of native fish and mollusks, but also the value of commercial and recreational fisheries.

The common yabby (*Cherax destructor*) is a crayfish (related to and resembling a small lobster) native to regions of south and eastern Australia. This species has been introduced and become established in western Australia, Tasmania, China, South Africa, Zambia, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland (Gherardi 2011a). The species can survive in temperatures from 1°C (34 °F) to 35°C (95 °F) as well as long periods of drought (Withnall 2000). Yabbies are capable of digging burrows up to 2 meters (6.5 feet) deep (Withnall 2000). This burrowing behavior has resulted in increased erosion and collapse

of banks of some waterbodies. The costs to repair yabby-damaged banks could be significant. The common yabby is also a known carrier of the parasite *Thelohania parastaci* which causes “chalky tail,” muscle deterioration, and host death (Moodie *et al.* 2003). If introduced to the United States, this crayfish species could spread disease among species of native crayfish, including the endangered Nashville crayfish (*Orconectes shoupi*) and to aquaculture crayfish. Because yabbies’ can accumulate heavy metal contaminants from polluted waters, humans that eat yabbies may be directly harmed by ingesting the heavy metals (Gherardi 2010).

Alternative 2, which lists the species under the Act, avoids the ecosystem, agricultural, and infrastructure costs of the No Action alternative discussed above. The listing would add marginally to the work of wildlife inspection offices at United States ports of entry. These species would be additional species to be watched for and identified in incoming shipments. Federal wildlife enforcement agencies are authorized to enforce the interstate transport provisions of the Act and assist State law enforcement in the affected States. To the extent they investigate it, they may have added costs due to the listing. The listing would also add marginally to the Service’s permit office workload with a potential increase of permit applications for scientific, educational, medical, and zoological purposes.

Of the 11 species, only one population of one species (zander) is found in the wild in the United States. Of the 11 species, one species (yabby) is in trade in the United States; three species (crucian carp, Nile perch, and wels catfish) have been imported in only small numbers since 2011; and seven species are not in U.S. trade. Therefore, businesses derive little or no revenue from their sale, and the economic effect in the United States of this proposed rule would be negligible, if not nil. Thus, listing them under the Act would have no immediate effect on any firms. With this proposed rule, the Service is striving to be proactive without harming U.S. trade. A possibility exists that, in the future, some importer may wish to import one of these species. This listing would forestall that opportunity, but estimating those discounted future costs would be purely speculative. The objective of this listing is to utilize the Lacey Act’s major strength by prohibiting importation and interstate transportation and thus preventing the species’ likely introduction and establishment in the wild and likely harm to human beings and to the interests of agriculture, wildlife, or wildlife resources. Based on our evaluation of the injurious traits of all 11 species, the Service seeks to prevent these introductions and establishment within the United States, consistent with the Lacey Act.

Alternative 3 is based on an existing MOU between the Service, Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, and the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (USFWS 2013) but is

not limited to the importers in the MOU. The alternative envisions a voluntary refrain by the public (such as leading importer organizations that represent the ornamental fish, aquaculture, sportfishing, bait, and other trades that might benefit from importing these species) from importing these 11 species. Voluntary cooperation to not import these species will not have any enforcement provisions or legal restraint on the public, industries, or members of the organizations. Voluntary cooperation may create a situation in which the first importer will have no competition as all of the other importers continue to comply. Therefore, the species could become more rare and desirable and the profits to be made by importing the species will increase. If there is a large enough profit to be made, the market would be expected to eventually exploit this opportunity and import one or more of these species. Eventually other dealers will see the opportunity, the agreement may break down, and the species could be introduced to the United States. However, while some importers might realize some economic gain from importing one of these species, it is also likely that the importation could negatively affect their own industry in the long term. For example, the wels catfish may provide sportfishing opportunities only until the species caused the decline of the habitat for all species. Another species, the Nile perch was introduced into Africa's Lake Victoria to provide larger fish for human consumption but caused the loss of approximately 200 species of endemic fish that local villagers utilized. The loss of the native fish resulted in the loss of income and food for traditional fishermen. The costs of Alternative 3 are likely to be smaller than those of Alternative 1 to the extent that the voluntary cooperation forestalls imports but have the potential to be similar to Alternative 1.

Expected Benefits of Alternatives

Information about these species in foreign countries indicates that some consumers could benefit economically from continuing to allow importation and interstate transport of these 11 species under the No Action alternative. Any benefits ultimately derive from consumer demand for the animal. In general, when consumers enjoy a product, they gain equal to or more utility from its use than they paid for it. Otherwise, they would have kept their money and bought something else. For example, people buying these species for display expect to enjoy having the display, garnering equal to or more utility from their ownership than their purchase price. The difference between the price they would be willing to pay and the price they need to pay for it is the "consumer surplus," which is an element of expected benefits. The Service has no information to quantitatively estimate the consumer surplus that might be derived from allowing imports of these species for aquaculture, sportfishing, and ornamental display. Any such quantitative estimate would be purely speculative.

Producers (Importers, distributors, aquaculturists, and pet shops) could also benefit economically from continuing to allow importation and interstate transportation of these 11 species under the No Action alternative. The importation and interstate transport of new species could offer new sales opportunities and drive purchases of food, enclosures, and ancillary equipment. Producers supplying these species could gain from their sale. The difference between the amount a producer is paid and the amount a producer would be willing to accept is the “producer surplus,” which is another element of the expected benefits. Again, the Service has no information on which to base a quantitative estimate of these benefits. Any such quantitative estimate would be purely speculative.

Some of the 11 species might be raised for food or introduced to water bodies to increase sportfishing opportunities. Trying to predict the benefits that might be derived from these uses would also be speculative. The evidence from introductions in Europe and Africa strongly suggest that any benefit to those who introduce the species is temporary and ultimately outweighed by impairment to indigenous stocks and habitat.

The benefits of the No Action alternative are lost by selecting either of the other alternatives. The loss of benefits from importation is an opportunity cost of Alternatives 2 and 3. By choosing one action, the opportunities afforded by another action are closed off. Alternative 2 prohibits importation and interstate transportation and so forestalls any of the benefits that could be derived from those activities. If we assume complete compliance with the voluntary constraints of Alternative 3, it also forestalls any benefits to importers.

Listing these species now, before U.S. industries begin trading in them, ensures that this listing has little or no effect on current economic conditions. In addition, the listing gives industries certainty about which species will be prohibited from importation and interstate transportation in the future.

Benefit-Cost Comparison

Table 2 summarizes the sources of costs and benefits of each alternative.

Table 2. Costs and Benefits of the Alternatives

Alternative	Costs	Benefits
1. No Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harm to humans or to the interests of agriculture, wildlife, or wildlife resources. • Ongoing cost to control. • No certainty for industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consumer and producer surplus from potential importation and interstate transport of the 11 species.
2. Injurious Wildlife listing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible future lost consumer or producer surplus from prohibiting importation and interstate transportation of the 11 species. • Possible added inspection costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoided harm to humans, to the interests of agriculture, wildlife, or wildlife resources. • Avoided cost to control or eradicate. • Certainty for industry.
3. Voluntary Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible future lost consumer or producer surplus from prohibiting importation and interstate transportation of the 11 species. • Risk of introduction through non-compliance. • No certainty for industry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible avoided harm to humans, to the interests of agriculture, wildlife, or wildlife resources. • Possible avoided cost to control or eradicate.

Past experience with other aquatic invasive species, and with these species in other countries, has shown that the costs of damage to native species, habitat, agriculture, and infrastructure, far exceed the benefits of introducing the species. The No Action alternative will ultimately have the highest costs and fewest benefits. The costs to prevent the establishment of an invasive species before it is introduced are minuscule compared to the costs to control the spread of the species once it is established. While purely voluntary cooperation may slow down and reduce the risk of introduction of the species to the environment, it creates an opportunity for individuals to profit by breaking away from the self-imposed restraint. We find it most likely that voluntary cooperation will not function perfectly and will eventually break down and lead to the importation of the injurious species. Only Alternative 2 offers low implementation costs and avoids the harmful effects of the species.

Regulatory Flexibility Analysis - Certification of No Impact on Small Entities

The Service has determined that the proposed rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Seven of these species are not currently in trade in the United States, so businesses do not derive any revenue from their sale. Three species have been reported as imported in only small numbers during the last several years (LEMIS 2014), and one species has reports of being in negligible trade in the United States. Therefore, this rule should have little or no impact on small businesses. The rule does not impose any additional reporting or record-keeping requirements.

Paperwork Reduction Act

None of the options under consideration have any reporting or recordkeeping requirements. Compliance will consist of not initiating importation or interstate transportation in the 11 species. Compliance, therefore, would not be unduly burdensome on small entities. Different application of the regulation to reduce the impact on small entities is unnecessary and would defeat the objective of the regulation. However, information about the listing and how to comply will be distributed on the Service's internet site and through the industry media.

Regulatory Conflict and Overlap

Several Federal programs are involved in the prevention of the introduction of invasive species into the United States. The objective of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) is to protect the health of American agriculture. APHIS has the authority to regulate the imports affecting domesticated animals and crops. We provided a summary of this rule to APHIS during the development of the rule and we received no concerns. We also provided a summary to other agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the U.S. Coast Guard, which have some authorities with regard to aquatic invasive species, and we received no concerns. We contacted other agencies with related interests, including: Customs and Border Protection, Army Corps of Engineers, Small Business Administration, U.S. Forest Service, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Homeland Security, and Council on Environmental Quality, as well as the Department of the Interior and various Interior bureaus, and we received no concerns.

States may also regulate the possession, sale, or use of species within their borders. The Service is not aware of any State authorities related to these 11 species that overlap or conflict with the Service's Lacey Act authority.

Need for a Proposed Rule

The threat posed by these 11 species is evident. These 11 nonnative species have a history of invasiveness elsewhere in the world and have a high climate match in parts of the United States. Although these 11 species are not currently found in ecosystems within the United States (except for one species in one lake), we anticipate that these species would become invasive if introduced and established. All of these species have wide distribution ranges (where they are native and where they are invasive), suggesting they are highly adaptable and tolerant of new environments and opportunistic when expanding from their native range. Under the Act, the Service has the ability to prevent the introduction and establishment of injurious wildlife that poses a threat to the interests of agriculture, humans, wildlife, and wildlife resources of the United States by prohibiting the importation and interstate transportation of such wildlife. We find preventing the introduction and establishment of injurious wildlife within the United States by prohibiting importation and interstate transportation, consistent with the Lacey Act, to be the most economically effective and efficient approach for avoiding the adverse ecological effects and economic costs often caused by injurious species.

Literature Cited

- Ahne W, Bjorklund H, Essbauer S, Fijan N, Kurath G, Winton J. 2002. Spring viremia of carp (SVC). *Dis Aquat Org* 52(3):261-72.
- Anseeuw D, Branquart E, Lieffrig F, Micha J, Parkinson D, Verreycken H. 2007. *Carassius gibelio* - Prussian carp. In *Invasive Species of Belgium*. Available from: <http://ias.biodiversity.be/species/show/2>. Accessed 2014 12/03.
- Britton R. 2011. *Carassius gibelio* (Prussian carp). in: *Invasive species compendium*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. Available from www.cabi.org/isc.
- Closs Gerard P., Ludgate, Ben, and Goldsmith, Ruth J. 2003. Controlling European perch (*Perca fluviatilis*): Lessons from an experimental removal. *Managing invasive freshwater fish in New Zealand: Proceedings of a workshop hosted by department of conservation*. 10 p.
- Copp G. 2007. *Pseudorasbora parva* (stone moroko). in: *Invasive species compendium*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. Available from <http://www.cabi.org/isc>.
- Copp GH, Robert Britton J, Cucherousset J, García-Berthou E, Kirk R, Peeler E, Stakénas S. 2009. Voracious invader or benign feline? A review of the environmental biology of European catfish *Silurus glanis* in its native and introduced ranges. *Fish* 10(3):252-82.

Injurious Wildlife – 10 Fish and 1 Crayfish Economic Analysis

Copp GH, Garthwaite R, Gozlan RE. 2005. Risk identification and assessment of non-native freshwater fishes: A summary of concepts and perspectives on protocols for the UK. *J Appl Ichthyol* 21(4):371-3.

Crivelli AJ. 1995. Are fish introductions a threat to endemic freshwater fishes in the northern Mediterranean region? *Biol Conserv* 72(2):311-9.

Drs. Foster and Smith. 2014. White ghost lobster. Live Aquariacom.
http://www.liveaquaria.com/product/prod_display.cfm?c=1075+1668&pcatid=1668
Accessed 10/27/2014.

Drs. Foster and Smith. 2014. Blue knight lobster. Live Aquariacom
http://www.liveaquaria.com/product/prod_display.cfm?c=1075+1641&pcatid=1641
Accessed 10/27/2014.

Elgin EL, Tunna HR, and Jackson LJ. 2014. First confirmed records of Prussian carp, *Carassius gibelio*, in open waters of North America. *BiolInvasions Records* 2014(3).

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). 2014. *Perca fluviatilis*. <www.fao.org/fishery/introsp/2065/en>. Accessed 2014 10/16.

Froese R and Pauly D. 2013. FishBase. <www.fishbase.org>.

Froese R and Pauly D. 2014. FishBase. <www.fishbase.org>. Accessed 2014 11/26.

Fuller P. 2009. *Sander lucioperca*. USGS Nonindigenous Aquatic Species Database, Gainesville, FL. <http://nas.er.usgs.gov/queries/FactSheet.aspx?SpeciesID=830> . Accessed 2014 12/03.

Gherardi, F. (2010). Invasive crayfish and freshwater fishes of the world. *Revue Scientifique Et Technique (International Office of Epizootics)*, 29(2), 241-254.

Gherardi F. 2011. *Cherax destructor* (common yabby). in: Invasive species compendium. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. Available from <http://www.cabi.org/isc>.

Godard M and Copp G. 2012. *Carassius carassius* (crucian carp). In: Invasive species compendium. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. Available from: www.cabi.org/isc.

Godard M and Copp G. 2011. *Sander lucioperca* (zander). in: Invasive species compendium. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. Available from <http://www.cabi.org/isc/>.

Gozlan RE, St-Hilaire S, Feist SW, Martin P, Kent ML. 2005. Biodiversity: Disease threat to European fish. *Nature* 435(7045):1046-.

Grabowska J. 2011. *Perccottus glenii* (Amur sleeper). in: Invasive species compendium. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. Available from <http://www.cabi.org/isc>.

- Hesthagen T, Floystad L, Hegge O, Staurnes M, Skurdal J. 1999. Comparative life-history characteristics of native and hatchery-reared brown trout, *Salmo trutta* L., in a sub-Alpine reservoir. *Fish Manage Ecol* 6(1):47-61.
- Hickley P and Chare S. 2004. Fisheries for non-native species in England and Wales: Angling or the environment? *Fish Manage Ecol* 11(3-4):203-12.
- ISSG (Invasive Species Specialist Group).2005a. *Lates niloticus*. Global Invasive Species Database. <<http://www.issg.org/database/species/ecology.asp?si=89&fr=1&sts=&lang=EN>>. Accessed 2013 04/11.
- ISSG (Invasive Species Specialist Group).2010. *Perca fluviatilis*. Global Invasive Species Database. <<http://www.issg.org/database/species/ecology.asp?si=548>>. Accessed 2013 04/11.
- Jepsen N, Pedersen S, Thorstad E. 2000. Behavioural interactions between prey (trout smolts) and predators (pike and pikeperch) in an impounded river. *Regul Rivers: Res Manage* 16(2):189-98.
- Johnson LE. 2011. Zebra mussel. Simberloff D and Rejmánek M, editors. In: *Encyclopedia of Biological Invasions*. University of California Press. p.712.
- Kangur A and Kangur P. 1998. Diet composition and size-related changes in the feeding of pikeperch, *Stizostedion lucioperca* (Percidae) and pike, *Esox lucius* (Esocidae) in the Lake Peipsi (Estonia). *Ital J Zool* 65(S1):255-9.
- Koed A, Balleby K, Mejlhede P. 2002. Migratory behaviour of adult pikeperch (*Stizostedion lucioperca*) in a lowland river. In: *Aquatic telemetry*. Springer. 175 p.
- Kottelat M and Freyhof J. 2007. *Handbook of European freshwater fishes*. Vol. 13. Cornol: Publications Kottelat.
- Kvach Y and Mierzejewska K. 2011. Non-indigenous benthic fishes as new hosts for *Bucephalus polymorphus* Baer, 1827 (Digenea: Bucephalidae) in the Vistula river basin, Poland. *Knowledge and Management of Aquatic Ecosystems* (400).
- LEMIS. 2014. Import data for 2011 to October 2014. US Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Linfield R and Rickards R. 1979. The zander in perspective. *Aquacult Res* 10(1):1-16.
- Lusk S, Lusková V, Hanel L. 2010. Alien fish species in the Czech Republic and their impact on the native fish fauna. *Folia Zool* 59(1):57-72.
- McIntyre PB, Flecker AS, Vanni MJ, Hood JM, Taylor BW, Thomas SA. 2008. Fish distributions and nutrient cycling in streams: Can fish create biogeochemical hotspots. *Ecology* 89(8):2335-46.

Injurious Wildlife – 10 Fish and 1 Crayfish Economic Analysis

- Moodie EG, Le Jambre LF, Katz ME. 2003. *Thelohania parastaci* sp. nov. (Microspora: Thelohaniidae), a parasite of the Australian freshwater crayfish, *Cherax destructor* (Decapoda: Parastacidae). *Parasitol Res* 91(2):151-65.
- Mooney HA and Cleland E. 2001. The evolutionary impact of invasive species. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98(10):5446-51.
- Museth J, Hesthagen T, Sandlund O, Thorstad E, Ugedal O. 2007. The history of the minnow *Phoxinus phoxinus* (L.) in Norway: From harmless species to pest. *J Fish Biol* 71(sd):184-95.
- Nico, L.G., P.J. Schofield, J. Larson, and A. Fusaro. 2014. *Carassius auratus*. USGS Nonindigenous Aquatic Species Database, Gainesville, FL.
<<http://nas.er.usgs.gov/queries/GreatLakes/SpeciesInfo.asp?NoCache=9%2F13%2F2013+7%3A22%3A07+AM&SpeciesID=508&State=&HUCNumber=>> Revision Date: 3/1/2012.
- NSW Department of Primary Industries. 2013. Redfin Perch (*Perca fluviatilis*).
<<http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/fisheries/pests-diseases/freshwater-pests/species/redfin-perch>>. Accessed 2013 05/09.
- Pinder AC, Gozlan RE, Britton J. 2005. Dispersal of the invasive topmouth gudgeon, *Pseudorasbora parva* in the UK: A vector for an emergent infectious disease. *Fish Manage Ecol* 12(6):411-4.
- Pretty JN, Mason CF, Nedwell DB, Hine RE, Leaf S, Dils R. 2003. Environmental costs of freshwater eutrophication in England and Wales. *Environ Sci Technol* 37(2):201-8.
- Rees A. 2012. *Silurus glanis* (wels catfish). in: *Invasive species compendium*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International Available from: www.cabi.org/isc.
- Reshetnikov AN. 2004. The fish *Perccottus glenii*: History of introduction to western regions of Eurasia. *Hydrobiologia* 522(1):349-50.
- Rocabayera OC and Veiga AM. 2012. *Rutilus rutilus* (roach). In: *Invasive species compendium*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International Available from: www.cabi.org/isc.
- Sandlund O. 2008. *Phoxinus phoxinus* (European minnow). In: *Invasive species compendium*. Wallingford, UK: CAB International Available from: www.cabi.org/isc.
- Schaus M, Vanni M, Wissing T, Bremigan M, Garvey J, Stein R. 1997. Nitrogen and phosphorus excretion by detritivorous gizzard shad in a reservoir ecosystem. *Limnol Oceanogr* :1386-97.
- Schwenk K, Brede N, Streit B. 2008. Introduction. extent, processes and evolutionary impact of interspecific hybridization in animals. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 363(1505):2805-11.

Injurious Wildlife – 10 Fish and 1 Crayfish Economic Analysis

- Souty-Grosset C, Holdich DM, Noël PY, Reynolds J, Haffner P. 2006. Atlas of crayfish in Europe. Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle.
- USFWS. 2013. Memorandum of Understanding Between the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council and the Association Of Fish and Wildlife Agencies to Collaborate on the Development of Nonregulatory Approaches to Reduce the Risk of Introducing Potentially Invasive Species Through International Trade and to Promote Voluntary No-Trade in Certain Species Not Present in Trade. June 10, 2013. 11 pp.
- Vetemaa M, Eschbaum R, Albert A, Saat T. 2005. Distribution, sex ratio and growth of *Carassius gibelio* (Bloch) in coastal and inland waters of Estonia (north-eastern Baltic sea). J Appl Ichthyol 21(4):287-91.
- Wiklund T and Dalsgaard I. 1998. Occurrence and significance of atypical *Aeromonas salmonicida* in non-salmonid and salmonid fish species: A review. Dis Aquat Organ 32(1):49-69.
- Withnall F. 2000. Biology of yabbies (*Cherax destructor*). Aquaculture Notes. Department of Natural Resources and Environment, Melbourne, VIC, Australia :1-4.
- Witkowski A. 2011 NOBANIS - invasive alien species fact sheet -*Pseudorasbora parva*. from: Online database of the European network on invasive alien species - NOBANIS. <www.nobanis.org>. Accessed 2013 06/06.
- Witte F. 2011. *Lates niloticus* (Nile perch). in: Invasive species compendium. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. Available from: <http://www.cabi.org/isc>.