NAME OF SPECIES: Black carp (Mylopharyngodon piceus)

A. CURRENT STATUS AND DISTRIBUTION	
1. In Wisconsin?	a. YES ☐ NO ☒
	b. Abundance:
	c. Geographic Range:
	d. Type of Waters Invaded (rivers, ponds, lakes, etc): (in other states) rivers
	e. Historical Status and Rate of Spread in Wisconsin:
2. Invasive in Similar Climate Zones	YES ☐ NO ☒ Where: central to southern IL
3. Similar Habitat Invaded Elsewhere	YES ☒ NO ☐ Where: Horseshoe Lake, IL
4. In Surrounding States	YES ☒ NO ☐ Where: IL
5. Competitive Ability	High: **Ron - might need more of an expert opinion on just how competitive/invasive this fish has the potential to be Low: Unclear why this fish has not become as widespread as other invasive Asian carp species
B. ESTABLISHMENT POTENTIAL AND LIFE HISTORY TRAITS	
1. Temperature:	Range:
2. Spawning Temperature:	Range: in the range of 19 - 29 deg. C; egg development occurs between 18 - 30 deg. C
3. Number of Eggs:	Range:
4. Preferred Spawning Substrate:	Large riverine environments
5. Hybridization Potential:	none found
6. Salinity Tolerance	Fresh: ☒ Marine: ☐ Brackish: ☐
7. Oxygen Regime	Range:
8. Water Hardness Tolerance	Range:
9. Easily confused for Native Species?	List: none found, closely resembles invasive grass carp

C. DAMAGE POTENTIAL	
1. Likelihood of Damage	a. Presence of Natural Enemies:
	b. How well introductory and expansion pathways can be described and quantified: First brought in to the US in the 1970s as a contaminant in grass carp stocks and again in the 1980s as biocontrol for grubs in aquaculture ponds and to sell as food fish; escaped into the Missouri River when high water flooded a hatchery at an aquaculture facility
2. Environmental Impacts	a. Alteration of ecosystem composition, structure and function: Feed on mussels and snails
	c. Damage to ecosystem resilience/sustainability:
	d. Loss of biological diversity: Could negatively impact populations of native mussels, many of which are endangered or threatened
	e. Abiotic modifications (affects on turbidity, H2O chemistry, etc.):
	f. Biotic effects on other species (loss of cover, nesting sites, forage, changing competitive relationships:
D. NET SOCIO/ECONOMIC IMPACT	
1. Positive aspects of the species to the economy/society:	Effect: Used to control disease-carrying snails in aquaculture; also used for food
2. Direct and indirect effects of the invasive species:	Effect:
3. Type of damage caused by organism:	Effect:
Industries affected by invasive:	Effect:
4. Loss of aesthetic value affecting recreation and tourism:	Effect:
5. Increased cost to a sector (monitoring, inspection, control, public education, modifying practices, damage repair, lower yield, loss of export markets due to quarantine:	Effect:
6. Cost of prevention or control relative to cost of allowing invasion to occur (cost of prevention is borne by different groups than cost of control):	Effect:

7. Cost at different levels of invasion:	Effect:
E. CONTROL AND PREVENTION POTENTIAL	
1. Costs of Prevention (including Education):	
2. Responsiveness to Prevention Efforts:	
3. Detection Capability:	
4. Control Tactics Effective:	Mechanical: ☐ Biological: ☐ Chemical: ☐
5. Efficacy/Feasibility of Control (effort, # of staff):	none found
6. Cost of Control:	High: ☐ Medium: ☐ Low: ☐
7. Non-Target Effects of Control:	
8. Threshold at which control would be attempted:	
9 Efficacy of Monitoring:	