NAME OF SPECIES: Tubenose goby (Proterorhinus marmoratus)

A. CURRENT STATUS AND DISTRIBUTION	
1. In Wisconsin?	a. YES ☒ NO ☐
	b. Abundance: not common
	c. Geographic Range: Duluth Harbor - Lake Superior
	d. Type of Waters Invaded (rivers, ponds, lakes, etc): lakes, rivers
	e. Historical Status and Rate of Spread in Wisconsin: Found in Duluth/Superior Harbor in 2001
2. Invasive in Similar Climate Zones	YES ☒ NO ☐ Where: Lakes Huron and Erie
3. Similar Habitat Invaded Elsewhere	YES ☒ NO ☐ Where: Inland River in Michigan
4. In Surrounding States	YES ☒ NO ☐ Where: MI, MN, Ontario
5. Competitive Ability	High: Low: Species not spreading rapidly. They do not feed on zebra mussels like round gobies do and are also smaller and less aggressive than round gobies, so some experts expect their impacts to be low.
B. ESTABLISHMENT POTENTIAL AND LIFE HISTORY TRAITS	
1. Temperature:	Range: 4 - 19 deg. C
2. Spawning Temperature:	Range:
3. Number of Eggs:	Range:
4. Preferred Spawning Substrate:	lay eggs on vegetation
5. Hybridization Potential:	
6. Salinity Tolerance	Fresh: ☒ Marine: ☒ Brackish: ☒
7. Oxygen Regime	Range:
8. Water Hardness Tolerance	Range:
9. Easily confused for Native Species?	List: could be confused with invasive round goby, also native sculpins
C. DAMAGE POTENTIAL	

1. Likelihood of Damage	a. Presence of Natural Enemies:
	b. How well introductory and expansion pathways can be described and quantified: 1st introduced to St. Clair Rivere, MI via ballast water, then further spread within Great Lakes via ballast water
2. Environmental Impacts	a. Alteration of ecosystem composition, structure and function: feed on aquatic insects, will also eat round goby fry
	c. Damage to ecosystem resilience/sustainability: unknown
	d. Loss of biological diversity:
	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:
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:	Education targeting boaters and anglers could be effective in preventing their spread to inland waters
3. Detection Capability:	
4. Control Tactics Effective:	Mechanical: ☐ Biological: ☐ Chemical: ☐
5. Efficacy/Feasibility of Control (effort, # of staff):	
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:	