Impact of AIS on SAR

There are three states of overlap for AIS with SAR:

1. SAR and AIS in a waterbody, with AIS also found upstream – eradication is not possible (probably)
2. SAR and AIS in waterbody, with **no** AIS found upstream
3. SAR in waterbody, with no AIS found, but AIS are upstream – highest priority – can be prevented (species dependent) – if the interaction may be lower

What about putting in a column for 1. Monitoring and prevention, and then 2. Other stuff (eradication or management)

Interactions may be important for how they get ranked

The SAR are fishes, and invertebrates (mussel)

AIS will have variable impacts on SAR species. Each SAR will have variable responses and tolerances to AIS

A ranking system with values 1 – 3, low to high, are developed.



Not all these will have easily assessed values = use the values we have information for to generate a risk value – ignore those that are blank

What is the highest importance? – How do the three states listed above get prioritised?

Some waterbodies have multiple SAR species – are these more or less important than waterbodies with one SAR?

Some also have multiple AIS – same question as above

Multiple SAR – should rank higher

AIS – Tricky – multiple AIS maybe this is higher?

What are the approaches to management – or what is this tool to be used for?

1. Prevention
2. Eradication
3. Control

Categories should be

* Monitoring (presence/absence) and prevention – for high impacts? – how to narrow that list down?
  + SAR number and impact of AIS on these?
* Prevention – for low impacts? (mid-range)

Can these categories be assigned? – values are needed first

* Management and control (response)?

Are some waterbodies more important than others? Why would they be more important?

* Life history of SAR – sensitive stages of development
* Reproduction – where fish spawn for instance, or where mussels are sources of larvae for other locations
* Stakeholder interest – First nations for instance – must be included