

NEW YORK NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Scientific name: Prunus avium (L.) L. USDA Plants Code: PRAV
 Common names: Sweet cherry
 Native distribution: Eurasia
 Date assessed: October 13, 2009
 Assessors: Steve Glenn, Gerry Moore
 Reviewers: LIISMA SRC
 Date Approved: October 14, 2009 Form version date: 10 July 2009

New York Invasiveness Rank: Moderate (Relative Maximum Score 50.00-69.99)

Distribution and Invasiveness Rank (<i>Obtain from PRISM invasiveness ranking form</i>)		
Status of this species in each PRISM:	Current Distribution	PRISM Invasiveness Rank
1 Adirondack Park Invasive Program	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
2 Capital/Mohawk	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
3 Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
4 Finger Lakes	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
5 Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	Widespread	Moderate
6 Lower Hudson	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
7 Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	Not Assessed	Not Assessed
8 Western New York	Not Assessed	Not Assessed

Invasiveness Ranking Summary (see details under appropriate sub-section)		Total (Total Answered*) Possible	Total
1	Ecological impact	40 (<u>20</u>)	3
2	Biological characteristic and dispersal ability	25 (<u>25</u>)	19
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	25 (<u>25</u>)	19
4	Difficulty of control	10 (<u>10</u>)	3
	Outcome score	100 (<u>80</u>) ^b	44 ^a
	Relative maximum score [†]		55.00
	New York Invasiveness Rank [§]	Moderate (Relative Maximum Score 50.00-69.99)	

* For questions answered "unknown" do not include point value in "Total Answered Points Possible." If "Total Answered Points Possible" is less than 70.00 points, then the overall invasive rank should be listed as "Unknown."

[†]Calculated as 100(a/b) to two decimal places.

[§]Very High >80.00; High 70.00–80.00; Moderate 50.00–69.99; Low 40.00–49.99; Insignificant <40.00
 Not Assessable: not persistent in NY, or not found outside of cultivation.

A. DISTRIBUTION (KNOWN/POTENTIAL): Summarized from individual PRISM forms

A1.1. Has this species been documented to persist without cultivation in NY? (reliable source; voucher not required)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes – continue to A1.2	
<input type="checkbox"/>	No – continue to A2.1	
A1.2. In which PRISMs is it known (see inset map)?		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Adirondack Park Invasive Program	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Capital/Mohawk	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Finger Lakes	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lower Hudson	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Western New York	

NEW YORK

NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Documentation:

Sources of information:

Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009; Weldy & Werier, 2009.

A2.1. What is the likelihood that this species will occur and persist outside of cultivation, given the climate in the following PRISMs? (obtain from PRISM invasiveness ranking form)

Not Assessed	Adirondack Park Invasive Program
Not Assessed	Capital/Mohawk
Not Assessed	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership
Not Assessed	Finger Lakes
Very Likely	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area
Not Assessed	Lower Hudson
Not Assessed	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario
Not Assessed	Western New York

Documentation: Well established in PRISM.

Sources of information (e.g.: distribution models, literature, expert opinions):

Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009.

If the species does not occur and is not likely to occur in any of the PRISMs, then stop here as there is no need to assess the species. Rank is "Not Assessable."

A2.2. What is the current distribution of the species in each PRISM? (obtain rank from PRISM invasiveness ranking forms)

	Distribution
Adirondack Park Invasive Program	Not Assessed
Capital/Mohawk	Not Assessed
Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	Not Assessed
Finger Lakes	Not Assessed
Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	Widespread
Lower Hudson	Not Assessed
Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	Not Assessed
Western New York	Not Assessed

Documentation:

Sources of information:

Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009.

A2.3. Describe the potential or known suitable habitats within New York. Natural habitats include all habitats not under active human management. Managed habitats are indicated with an asterisk.

<p>Aquatic Habitats</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Salt/brackish waters <input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater tidal <input type="checkbox"/> Rivers/streams <input type="checkbox"/> Natural lakes and ponds <input type="checkbox"/> Vernal pools <input type="checkbox"/> Reservoirs/impoundments*	<p>Wetland Habitats</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Salt/brackish marshes <input type="checkbox"/> Freshwater marshes <input type="checkbox"/> Peatlands <input type="checkbox"/> Shrub swamps <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forested wetlands/riparian <input type="checkbox"/> Ditches* <input type="checkbox"/> Beaches and/or coastal dunes	<p>Upland Habitats</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Cultivated* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grasslands/old fields <input type="checkbox"/> Shrublands <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forests/woodlands <input type="checkbox"/> Alpine <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Roadsides*
--	---	--

Other potential or known suitable habitats within New York: Swamp margins, pond margins, fencerows, railroad bank.

Documentation:

Sources of information:

Myster, 1993; Tomaino, 2004; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009.

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

B. INVASIVENESS RANKING

Questions apply to areas similar in climate and habitats to New York unless specified otherwise.

1. ECOLOGICAL IMPACT

1.1. Impact on Natural Ecosystem Processes and System-Wide Parameters (e.g. fire regime, geomorphological changes (erosion, sedimentation rates), hydrologic regime, nutrient and mineral dynamics, light availability, salinity, pH)

- A. No perceivable impact on ecosystem processes based on research studies, or the absence of impact information if a species is widespread (>10 occurrences in minimally managed areas), has been well-studied (>10 reports/publications), and has been present in the northeast for >100 years. 0
- B. Influences ecosystem processes to a minor degree (e.g., has a perceivable but mild influence on soil nutrient availability) 3
- C. Significant alteration of ecosystem processes (e.g., increases sedimentation rates along streams or coastlines, reduces open water that are important to waterfowl) 7
- D. Major, possibly irreversible, alteration or disruption of ecosystem processes (e.g., the species alters geomorphology and/or hydrology, affects fire frequency, alters soil pH, or fixes substantial levels of nitrogen in the soil making soil unlikely to support certain native plants or more likely to favor non-native species) 10
- U. Unknown

Score

U

Documentation:
Identify ecosystem processes impacted (or if applicable, justify choosing answer A in the absence of impact information)
No studies on the impact to natural ecosystem processes located.
Sources of information:
Tomaino, 2004.

1.2. Impact on Natural Community Structure

- A. No perceived impact; establishes in an existing layer without influencing its structure 0
- B. Influences structure in one layer (e.g., changes the density of one layer) 3
- C. Significant impact in at least one layer (e.g., creation of a new layer or elimination of an existing layer) 7
- D. Major alteration of structure (e.g., covers canopy, eradicating most or all layers below) 10
- U. Unknown

Score

3

Documentation:
Identify type of impact or alteration:
Reported to have a high impact on natural community structure in the Pacific Northwest (Tomaino, 2004). No studies on the impact to natural community structure in eastern North America located. Based on observations in the Northeast, the species frequently establishes in the existing tree layer with no noticeable impact to its structure; in some areas it can increase the density of the tree layer, especially in areas where tree densities are low.
Sources of information:
Tomaino, 2004; authors' pers. obs..

1.3. Impact on Natural Community Composition

- A. No perceived impact; causes no apparent change in native populations 0
- B. Influences community composition (e.g., reduces the number of individuals in one or more native species in the community) 3
- C. Significantly alters community composition (e.g., produces a significant reduction in the population size of one or more native species in the community) 7
- D. Causes major alteration in community composition (e.g., results in the extirpation of one or several native species, reducing biodiversity or change the community composition towards

**NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

- species exotic to the natural community)
U. Unknown

Score

0

Documentation:

Identify type of impact or alteration:

Reported to have a high impact on natural community composition in the Pacific Northwest (Tomaino, 2004). Observations here in the Northeast have shown it to have no perceived impact on the natural community composition.

Sources of information:

Tomaino, 2004; authors' pers. obs.

1.4. Impact on other species or species groups (cumulative impact of this species on the animals, fungi, microbes, and other organisms in the community it invades. Examples include reduction in nesting/foraging sites; reduction in habitat connectivity; injurious components such as spines, thorns, burrs, toxins; suppresses soil/sediment microflora; interferes with native pollinators and/or pollination of a native species; hybridizes with a native species; hosts a non-native disease which impacts a native species)

- | | |
|---|----|
| A. Negligible perceived impact | 0 |
| B. Minor impact | 3 |
| C. Moderate impact | 7 |
| D. Severe impact on other species or species groups | 10 |
| U. Unknown | |

Score

U

Documentation:

Identify type of impact or alteration:

No studies on the impact to other species groups located. Species not known to hybridize with any native cherry species.

Sources of information:

Tomaino, 2004.

Total Possible	20
Section One Total	3

2. BIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND DISPERSAL ABILITY

2.1. Mode and rate of reproduction

- | | |
|--|---|
| A. No reproduction by seeds or vegetative propagules (i.e. plant sterile with no sexual or asexual reproduction). | 0 |
| B. Limited reproduction (fewer than 10 viable seeds per plant AND no vegetative reproduction; if viability is not known, then maximum seed production is less than 100 seeds per plant and no vegetative reproduction) | 1 |
| C. Moderate reproduction (fewer than 100 viable seeds per plant - if viability is not known, then maximum seed production is less than 1000 seeds per plant - OR limited successful vegetative spread documented) | 2 |
| D. Abundant reproduction with vegetative asexual spread documented as one of the plants prime reproductive means OR more than 100 viable seeds per plant (if viability is not known, then maximum seed production reported to be greater than 1000 seeds per plant.) | 4 |
| U. Unknown | |

Score

4

Documentation:

Describe key reproductive characteristics (including seeds per plant):

Abundant seed production (authors' personal observations); 1000s of seeds produced by one tree.

**NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

Sources of information:

Authors' personal observations.

2.2. Innate potential for long-distance dispersal (e.g. bird dispersal, sticks to animal hair, buoyant fruits, pappus for wind-dispersal)

- A. Does not occur (no long-distance dispersal mechanisms) 0
- B. Infrequent or inefficient long-distance dispersal (occurs occasionally despite lack of adaptations) 1
- C. Moderate opportunities for long-distance dispersal (adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal, but studies report that 95% of seeds land within 100 meters of the parent plant) 2
- D. Numerous opportunities for long-distance dispersal (adaptations exist for long-distance dispersal and evidence that many seeds disperse greater than 100 meters from the parent plant) 4
- U. Unknown

Score 4

Documentation:

Identify dispersal mechanisms:

Endozoochory (spread by animals through ingestion): racoons (Hamilton, 1951; Llewellyn & Uhler, 1952); black bears (Garner & Vaughan, 1986); avian frugivores- Cedar Waxwing, American Robin (Witmer, 1996), grouse, thrashers (Tomaino, 2004); (probably numerous, undocumented avian spp.). Other mammals (Herrera, 1989).

Epizoochory (spread by animals without ingestion)- chipmunks scatter-hoarded fruits/seeds (Yerger, 1955); probably not all recovered.

Sources of information:

Hamilton, 1951; Llewellyn & Uhler, 1952; Garner & Vaughan, 1986; Herrera, 1989; Witmer, 1996; Tomaino, 2004.

2.3. Potential to be spread by human activities (both directly and indirectly – possible mechanisms include: commercial sales, use as forage/revegetation, spread along highways, transport on boats, contaminated compost, land and vegetation management equipment such as mowers and excavators, etc.)

- A. Does not occur 0
- B. Low (human dispersal to new areas occurs almost exclusively by direct means and is infrequent or inefficient) 1
- C. Moderate (human dispersal to new areas occurs by direct and indirect means to a moderate extent) 2
- D. High (opportunities for human dispersal to new areas by direct and indirect means are numerous, frequent, and successful) 3
- U. Unknown

Score 3

Documentation:

Identify dispersal mechanisms:

Cultivated for fruit production and occasionally escaping from cultivation; indirect transport through dropping of fruits and movement of yard waste.

Sources of information:

Grier & Grier 1928-29; Flint, 1983; Gleason & Cronquist, 1991.

2.4. Characteristics that increase competitive advantage, such as shade tolerance, ability to grow on infertile soils, perennial habit, fast growth, nitrogen fixation, allelopathy, etc.

- A. Possesses no characteristics that increase competitive advantage 0
- B. Possesses one characteristic that increases competitive advantage 3
- C. Possesses two or more characteristics that increase competitive advantage 6

**NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

U. Unknown

Score

6

Documentation:

Evidence of competitive ability:

Perennial, shade tolerant. Adaptable to various moisture regimes, documented from sub-xeric to mesic sites (Pearson, 1962). Resistant to drought (Small, 1957). Documented from well drained and poorly drained soils (Monk, 1961). Precocious-bearing fruit when only 3 feet high (Bicknell, 1911).

Sources of information:

Bicknell, 1911; Small, 1957; Monk, 1961; Pearson, 1962;

2.5. Growth vigor

A. Does not form thickets or have a climbing or smothering growth habit 0

B. Has climbing or smothering growth habit, forms a dense layer above shorter vegetation, forms dense thickets, or forms a dense floating mat in aquatic systems where it smothers other vegetation or organisms 2

U. Unknown

Score

0

Documentation:

Describe growth form:

Not observed forming thickets nor having a climbing or smothering habit in the Northeast, nor any literature found suggesting this.

Sources of information:

Tomaino, 2004; authors' personal observations.

2.6. Germination/Regeneration

A. Requires open soil or water and disturbance for seed germination, or regeneration from vegetative propagules. 0

B. Can germinate/regenerate in vegetated areas but in a narrow range or in special conditions 2

C. Can germinate/regenerate in existing vegetation in a wide range of conditions 3

U. Unknown (No studies have been completed)

Score

2

Documentation:

Describe germination requirements:

Seeds reportedly need cold treatment for germination.

Sources of information:

Young & Young, 1992

2.7. Other species in the genus invasive in New York or elsewhere

A. No 0

B. Yes 3

U. Unknown

Score

0

Documentation:

Species:

Prunus cerasifera, P. cerasus, P. fruticosa, P. mahaleb, P. padus, and P. spinosa reported from NY and northeastern North America; but none tracked as invasive.

Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009; Weldy & Werier, 2009; U.S.D.A. NRCS, 2009.

Total Possible

25

Section Two Total

19

3. ECOLOGICAL AMPLITUDE AND DISTRIBUTION

3.1. Density of stands in natural areas in the northeastern USA and eastern Canada (use same definition as Gleason & Cronquist which is: "The part of the United States

**NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

covered extends from the Atlantic Ocean west to the western boundaries of Minnesota, Iowa, northern Missouri, and southern Illinois, south to the southern boundaries of Virginia, Kentucky, and Illinois, and south to the Missouri River in Missouri. In Canada the area covered includes Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and parts of Quebec and Ontario lying south of the 47th parallel of latitude”)

- A. No large stands (no areas greater than 1/4 acre or 1000 square meters) 0
- B. Large dense stands present in areas with numerous invasive species already present or disturbed landscapes 2
- C. Large dense stands present in areas with few other invasive species present (i.e. ability to invade relatively pristine natural areas) 4
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify reason for selection, or evidence of weedy history:
No large stands reported from northeastern North America in the literature nor have any been observed.
Sources of information:
Tomaino, 2004; authors' pers. obs.

3.2. Number of habitats the species may invade

- A. Not known to invade any natural habitats given at A2.3 0
- B. Known to occur in one natural habitat given at A2.3 1
- C. Known to occur in two natural habitats given at A2.3 2
- D. Known to occur in three natural habitat given at A2.3 4
- E. Known to occur in four or more natural habitats given at A2.3 6
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify type of habitats where it occurs and degree/type of impacts:
See A2.3.
Sources of information:
Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009; authors' pers. obs.

3.3. Role of disturbance in establishment

- A. Requires anthropogenic disturbances to establish. 0
- B. May occasionally establish in undisturbed areas but can readily establish in areas with natural or anthropogenic disturbances. 2
- C. Can establish independent of any known natural or anthropogenic disturbances. 4
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Identify type of disturbance:
Demonstrated to invade old fields (Myster, 1993) and disturbed areas (Tomaino, 2004); observed in relatively undisturbed woodlands in the Northeast (author's personal observations).
Sources of information:
authors' personal observations; Myster, 1993; Tomaino, 2004.

3.4. Climate in native range

- A. Native range does not include climates similar to New York 0
- B. Native range possibly includes climates similar to at least part of New York. 1
- C. Native range includes climates similar to those in New York 3

**NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM**

U. Unknown

Score

3

Documentation:

Describe what part of the native range is similar in climate to New York:
Europe, as far north as Norway and Sweden.

Sources of information:
Tutin & Heywood, 1968.

3.5. Current introduced distribution in the northeastern USA and eastern Canada (see question 3.1 for definition of geographic scope)

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| A. | Not known from the northeastern US and adjacent Canada | 0 |
| B. | Present as a non-native in one northeastern USA state and/or eastern Canadian province. | 1 |
| C. | Present as a non-native in 2 or 3 northeastern USA states and/or eastern Canadian provinces. | 2 |
| D. | Present as a non-native in 4–8 northeastern USA states and/or eastern Canadian provinces, and/or categorized as a problem weed (e.g., “Noxious” or “Invasive”) in 1 northeastern state or eastern Canadian province. | 3 |
| E. | Present as a non-native in >8 northeastern USA states and/or eastern Canadian provinces, and/or categorized as a problem weed (e.g., “Noxious” or “Invasive”) in 2 northeastern states or eastern Canadian provinces. | 4 |
| U. | Unknown | |

Score

4

Documentation:

Identify states and provinces invaded:

Reported from all northeastern states and provinces except IA, MN, VT, and Prince Edward Island.

Sources of information: See known introduced range in plants.usda.gov, and update with information from states and Canadian provinces.
U.S.D.A. NRCS, 2009.

3.6. Current introduced distribution of the species in natural areas in the eight New York State PRISMs (Partnerships for Regional Invasive Species Management)

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| A. | Present in none of the PRISMs | 0 |
| B. | Present in 1 PRISM | 1 |
| C. | Present in 2 PRISMs | 2 |
| D. | Present in 3 PRISMs | 3 |
| E. | Present in more than 3 PRISMs or on the Federal noxious weed lists | 4 |
| U. | Unknown | |

Score

4

Documentation:

Describe distribution:
See A1.1.

Sources of information:
Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009; Weldy & Werier, 2009.

Total Possible	25
Section Three Total	19

4. DIFFICULTY OF CONTROL

4.1. Seed banks

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

- A. Seeds (or vegetative propagules) remain viable in soil for less than 1 year, or does not make viable seeds or persistent propagules. 0
- B. Seeds (or vegetative propagules) remain viable in soil for at least 1 to 10 years 2
- C. Seeds (or vegetative propagules) remain viable in soil for more than 10 years 3
- U. Unknown

Score 2

Documentation:

Identify longevity of seed bank:

One European study found *P. avium* to have a low seed banking capacity and was classified as having a transient seed bank (Bisteau & Mahy, 2005). One investigation in New York City found that while *Prunus avium* was a component of the flora, the seed bank was devoid of *P. avium* (Kostel-Hughes & Young, 1998). Cherries generally have viability longer than a year; no evidence for viability greater than ten years.

Sources of information:

Kostel-Hughes & Young, 1998; Tomaino, 2004; Bisteau & Mahy, 2005.

4.2. Vegetative regeneration

- A. No regrowth following removal of aboveground growth 0
- B. Regrowth from ground-level meristems 1
- C. Regrowth from extensive underground system 2
- D. Any plant part is a viable propagule 3
- U. Unknown

Score 1

Documentation:

Describe vegetative response:

Could have regrowth from the ground level meristem after cutting..

Sources of information:

Tomaino, 2004; authors' pers. obs.

4.3. Level of effort required

- A. Management is not required: e.g., species does not persist without repeated anthropogenic disturbance. 0
- B. Management is relatively easy and inexpensive: e.g. 10 or fewer person-hours of manual effort (pulling, cutting and/or digging) can eradicate a 1 acre infestation in 1 year (infestation averages 50% cover or 1 plant/100 ft²). 2
- C. Management requires a major short-term investment: e.g. 100 or fewer person-hours/year of manual effort, or up to 10 person-hours/year using mechanical equipment (chain saws, mowers, etc.) for 2-5 years to suppress a 1 acre infestation. Eradication is difficult, but possible (infestation as above). 3
- D. Management requires a major investment: e.g. more than 100 person-hours/year of manual effort, or more than 10 person hours/year using mechanical equipment, or the use of herbicide, grazing animals, fire, etc. for more than 5 years to suppress a 1 acre infestation. Eradication may be impossible (infestation as above). 4
- U. Unknown

Score 0

Documentation:

Identify types of control methods and time-term required:

Management not required in New York.

Despite the documented presence of *Prunus avium* in numerous floristic studies throughout northeastern North America during the past 50 years, there is little in the literature regarding the ecology and control of this species in northeastern North America.

This is probably due to the majority of studies which have found this species to have a

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

ubiquitous- Gleason & Cronquist (1991) state for *P. avium*: "...even appearing like a native."-but small component, as measured by: low importance values; occasional species; low density; low percentage of basal area; low absolute dominance; low relative dominance; low relative frequency; low tree per acre, etc. The following studies have ranked *P. avium* as such: DE: Stalter, 1982; OH: Lafer & Wistendahl, 1970; Whitney & Runkle, 1981; PA: Pearson, 1974; Robertson et al., 1994; NJ: Cantlon, 1953; Monk, 1961a; Monk, 1961b; Pearson, 1962; Buell et al., 1966; Wales, 1972; White et al., 1990; Wyckoff & Webb, 1996; Ehrehfeld, 2005; NY: Lefkowitz & Greller, 1973; Greller et al., 1978; Greller & Garcia, 1986; Levine & Greller, 2004; Stalter, 2004. Hunter & Mattice (2002) did find a marked increase of the frequency of *P. avium* from 20% in 1938 to 80% in 1999 in forests of Monroe County, New York; but while in six forests in 1938, by 1999 it still had not attained greater than a 5% cover in any of them.

Two studies determined *P. avium* to have a medium-level occurrence: DE: Matlack, 1989; NJ: Frei & Fairbrothers, 1963 (listed as common, but not abundant).

Only three studies classified *Prunus avium* occurrence as relatively high: ME: Milne & Forman, 1986; NY: Greller et al., 1979 (Forest Park- 3rd highest in relative & absolute dominance on slopes); Greller, 1977 (Cunningham Park- "common", but rare in uplands in 1973 Lefkowitz & Greller survey).

Al-Khatib et al., (1992), documented simulated drift damage of *P. avium* from several common herbicides.

Can be controlled by digging out smaller plants, girdling trees, or cutting down trees, possibly painting cut stumps with herbicide (Tomaino, 2004).

Sources of information:
Al-Khatib et al., 1992; Tomaino, 2004.

Total Possible	10
Section Four Total	3

Total for 4 sections Possible	80
Total for 4 sections	44

C. STATUS OF CULTIVARS AND HYBRIDS:

At the present time (May 2008) there is no protocol or criteria for assessing the invasiveness of cultivars independent of the species to which they belong. Such a protocol is needed, and individuals with the appropriate expertise should address this issue in the future. Such a protocol will likely require data on cultivar fertility and identification in both experimental and natural settings.

Hybrids (crosses between different parent species) should be assessed individually and separately from the parent species wherever taxonomically possible, since their invasiveness may differ from that of the parent species. An exception should be made if the taxonomy of the species and hybrids are uncertain, and species and hybrids can not be clearly distinguished in the field. In such cases it is not feasible to distinguish species and hybrids, and they can only be assessed as a single unit.

Some cultivars of the species known to be available: numerous

References for species assessment:

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

- Al-Khatib, K., R. Parker & E. P. Fuerst. 1992. Sweet cherry (*Prunus avium*) response to simulated drift from selected herbicides. *Weed Tech.* 6(4):975-979.
- Bicknell, E. P. 1911. The ferns and flowering plants of Nantucket-VIII. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 38(10):447-460.
- Bisteau, E. & Mahy, G. 2005. Vegetation and seed bank in a calcareous grassland restored from a Pinus forest. *Appl. Veg. Sci.* 8:167-174.
- Brooklyn Botanic Garden. 2009. AILANTHUS database. [Accessed on 13 October 2009].
- Buell, M. F., A. N. Langford, D. W. Davidson & L. F. Ohmann. 1966. The Upland Forest Continuum in Northern New Jersey. *Ecology.* 47(3):416-432.
- Cantlon, J. E. 1953. Vegetation and microclimates on north and south slopes of Cusketunk Mountain, New Jersey. *Ecological Monographs.* 23(3):241-270.
- Ehrenfeld, J. G. 2005. Vegetation of forested wetlands in urban and suburban landscapes in New Jersey. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc.* 132(2):262- 279.
- Flint, H. L. 1983. Landscape plants for eastern North America. John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY. 677 pp.
- Frei, K. R. & D. E. Fairbrothers. 1963. Floristic study of the William L. Hutcheson Memorial Forest (New Jersey). *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 90(5):338-355.
- Garner, N. P. & M. R. Vaughan. 1986. Black bears' use of abandoned homesites in Shenandoah National Park. IN: Bears: their biology and management, Vol. 7, A selection of papers from the Seventh International Conference on Bear Research and Management, Williamsburg, Virginia, USA, and Plitvice Lakes, Yugoslavia, February and March 1986 (1987), pp. 151-157.
- Gleason, H. A. & A. Cronquist. 1991. Manual of Vascular Plants of northeastern United States and adjacent Canada. 2nd ed. New York Botanical Garden, New York. 910 pp.
- Greller, A. M. 1977. A vascular flora of the forested portion of Cunningham Park, Queens County, New York, with notes on the vegetation. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 104(2):170-176.
- Greller, A. M. 1989. Vascular flora of the Kalbfleisch Field Research Station of the American Museum of Natural History, Suffolk County, Long Island, New York. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 116(2):174-181.
- Greller, A. M., R. E. Calhoun & J. M. Mansky. 1978. Grace Forest, a mixed mesophytic stand on Long Island, New York. *Bot. Gazette.* 139(4):482-489.
- Greller, A. M., R. E. Calhoun & E. Iglich. 1979. The upland, oak-dominated community of Forest Park, Queens County, New York. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 106(2):135-139.
- Greller, A. M. & O. L. Garcia. 1986. Variation in canopy composition of the forest of Alley Park, Queens County, New York. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 113(1):36-41.
- Greller, A. M., J. M. Mansky & R. E. Calhoun. 1982. An oak, hickory-dogwood forest on Central Long Island, New York. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 109(2):219-225.

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

- Grier, N. M. & C. R. Grier 1928-29. A list of plants growing under cultivation in the vicinity of Cold Spring Harbor, New York. *Amer. Midland Naturalist*. 11(6/7):307-387.
- Hamilton, W. J. 1951. Warm weather foods of the raccoon in New York State. *J. Mammalogy*. 32(3):341-344.
- Herrera, C. M. 1989. Frugivory and seed dispersal by carnivorous mammals, and associated fruit characteristics, in undisturbed Mediterranean habitats. *Oikos*. 55(2):250-262.
- Hunter, J. C. & J. A. Mattice. 2002. The spread of woody exotics into the forests of a northeastern landscape, 1938-1999. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc.* 129(3):220-227.
- Kostel-Hughes, F. & T. P. Young. 1998. The soil seed bank and its relationships to the aboveground vegetation in deciduous forests in New York City. *Urban Ecosystems*. 2:43-59.
- Lafer, N. G. & W. A. Wistendahl. 1970. Tree composition of Dysart Woods, Belmont County, Ohio. *Castanea*. 35(4):302-308.
- Lefkowitz, A. & A. M. Greller. 1973. The distribution of tree species on the uplands of Cunningham Park, Queens County, New York. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*. 100(5):313-318.
- Levine, M. E. & A. M. Greller. 2004. Ecological and floristic analyses of vascular plants along a gradient on disturbed serpentinite on opposing slopes in Staten Island, NY. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc.* 131(1):69-92.
- Llewellyn, L. M. & F. M. Uhler. 1952. The foods of fur animals of the Patuxent Research Refuge, Maryland. *Amer. Midland Naturalist*. 48(1):193-203.
- Matlack, G. R. 1989. Secondary dispersal of seed across snow in *Betula Lenta*, a gap-colonizing tree species. *J. Ecology*. 77(3):853-869.
- Milne, B. T. & R. T. T. Forman. 1986. Peninsulas in Maine: woody plant diversity, distance, and environmental patterns. *Ecology*. 67(4):967-974.
- Monk, C. D. 1961a. The vegetation of the William L. Hutcheson Memorial Forest, New Jersey. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*. 88(3):156-166.
- Monk, C. D. 1961b. Past and present influences on reproduction in the William L. Hutcheson Memorial Forest, New Jersey. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*. 88(3):167-175.
- Myster, R. W. 1993. Tree invasion and establishment in old fields at Hutcheson Memorial Forest. *Bot. Review*. 59(4):251-272.
- Pearson, P. R. 1962. Increasing importance of sugar maple on two calcareous formations in New Jersey. *Ecology*. 43(4):711-718.
- Pearson, P. R. 1974. Woodland vegetation of Fort Washington State Park, Pennsylvania. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*. 101(2):101-104.
- Robertson, D. J., M. C. Robertson & T. Tague. 1994. Colonization dynamics of four exotic plants in a northern Piedmont natural area. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*. 121(2):107-118.

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Small, J. A. 1957. Drought response in William L. Hutcheson Memorial Forest, 1957. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 88(3):180-183.

Stalter, R. 1982. Some ecological observations of Delaware forests. *Castanea.* 47(1):105-114.

Stalter, R. 2004. The flora on the High Line, New York City, New York. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc.* 131(4):387-393.

Tomaino, A. 2004. *Prunus avium*. U.S. Invasive Species Impact Rank (I-Rank). NatureServe Explorer. <www.natureserve.org>. [Accessed on 13 October 2009].

Tutin, T. G. & V. H. Heywood (eds.). 1968. *Flora Europaea* Vol. 2. Cambridge Univ. Press. Cambridge, UK. 455 pp.

United States Department of Agriculture, National Resources Conservation Service. 2009. The PLANTS Database. National Plant Data Center, Baton Rouge, Louisiana [Accessed on 13 October 2009].

Wales, B. A. 1972. Vegetation analysis of north and south edges in a mature oak-hickory forest. *Ecological Monographs.* 42(4):451-471.

Weldy, T. and D. Werier. 2009. *New York Flora Atlas*. [S.M. Landry, K.N. Campbell, and L.D. Mabe (original application development), Florida Center for Community Design and Research. University of South Florida]. New York Flora Association, Albany, New York. [Accessed on 13 October 2009].

White, D. W., W. Worthen & E. W. Stiles. 1990. Woodlands in a post-agricultural landscape in New Jersey. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 117(3):256-265.

Witmer, M. C. 1996. Annual diet of cedar waxwings based on U.S. Biological Survey Records (1885-1950) compared to diet of American robins: contrasts in dietary patterns and natural history. *The Auk.* 113(2):414-430.

Whitney, G. G. & J. R. Runkle. 1981. Edge versus age effects in the development of a beech-maple forest. *Oikos.* 37(3):377-381.

Wyckoff, P. H. & S. L. Webb. 1996. Understory influence of the invasive Norway Maple (*Acer platanoides*). *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club.* 123(3):197-205.

Yerger, R. W. 1955. Life history notes on the eastern chipmunk, *Tamias striatus lysteri* (Richardson), in central New York. *Amer. Midland Naturalist.* 53(2):312-323.

Young, J. A. & C. G. Young. 1992. *Seeds of woody plants in North America*. Dioscorides Press, Portland, OR. 414 pp.

Citation: This NY ranking form may be cited as: Jordan, M.J., G. Moore and T.W. Weldy. 2008. Invasiveness ranking system for non-native plants of New York. Unpublished. The Nature Conservancy, Cold Spring Harbor, NY; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Brooklyn, NY; The Nature Conservancy, Albany, NY. Note that the order of authorship is alphabetical; all three authors contributed substantially to the development of this protocol.

Acknowledgments: The NY form incorporates components and approaches used in several other systems, cited in the references below. Valuable contributions by members of the Long Island Invasive Species Management Area's Scientific Review Committee were incorporated in revisions of this form. Original members of the LIISMA SRC

NEW YORK

NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

included representatives of the Brooklyn Botanic Garden; The Nature Conservancy; New York Natural Heritage Program, New York Sea Grant; New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation; National Park Service; Brookhaven National Laboratory; New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Region 1; Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk/Nassau Counties; Long Island Nursery and Landscape Association; Long Island Farm Bureau; SUNY Farmingdale Ornamental Horticulture Department; Queens College Biology Department; Long Island Botanical Society; Long Island Weed Information Management System database manager; Suffolk County Department of Parks, Recreation and Conservation; Nassau County Department of Parks, Recreation and Museums; Suffolk County Soil & Water Conservation District.

References for ranking form:

- Carlson, Matthew L., Irina V. Lapina, Michael Shephard, Jeffery S. Conn, Roseann Densmore, Page Spencer, Jeff Heys, Julie Riley, Jamie Nielsen. 2008. Invasiveness ranking system for non-native plants of Alaska. Technical Paper R10-TPXX, USDA Forest Service, Alaska Region, Anchorage, AK XX9. Alaska Weed Ranking Project may be viewed at: http://akweeds.uaa.alaska.edu/akweeds_ranking_page.htm.
- Heffernan, K.E., P.P. Coulling, J.F. Townsend, and C.J. Hutto. 2001. Ranking Invasive Exotic Plant Species in Virginia. Natural Heritage Technical Report 01-13. Virginia Dept. of Conservation and Recreation, Division of Natural Heritage, Richmond, Virginia. 27 pp. plus appendices (total 149 p.).
- Morse, L.E., J.M. Randall, N. Benton, R. Hiebert, and S. Lu. 2004. An Invasive Species Assessment Protocol: Evaluating Non-Native Plants for Their Impact on Biodiversity. Version 1. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. <http://www.natureserve.org/getData/plantData.jsp>
- Randall, J.M., L.E. Morse, N. Benton, R. Hiebert, S. Lu, and T. Killeffer. 2008. The Invasive Species Assessment Protocol: A Tool for Creating Regional and National Lists of Invasive Nonnative Plants that Negatively Impact Biodiversity. *Invasive Plant Science and Management* 1:36–49
- Warner, Peter J., Carla C. Bossard, Matthew L. Brooks, Joseph M. DiTomaso, John A. Hall, Ann M. Howald, Douglas W. Johnson, John M. Randall, Cynthia L. Roye, Maria M. Ryan, and Alison E. Stanton. 2003. Criteria for Categorizing Invasive Non-Native Plants that Threaten Wildlands. Available online at www.caleppc.org and www.swvma.org. California Exotic Pest Plant Council and Southwest Vegetation Management Association. 24 pp.
- Williams, P. A., and M. Newfield. 2002. A weed risk assessment system for new conservation weeds in New Zealand. *Science for Conservation* 209. New Zealand Department of Conservation. 1-23 pp.