

Assessment of Invasive Species in Indiana's Natural Areas

OFFICIAL Burning Bush (*Euonymus alatus*) ASSESSMENT

Answers are highlighted in yellow, comments are inserted in *italics*

Last assessed 10/30/2019 by Ellen Jacquart, reviewed and approved by IPAC 10/30/2019)

Invasive Ranking Summary	Score
Ecological Impacts	24
Potential For Expansion	36
Difficulty of Management	28
Total Score:	88
	High
<i>Rankings: Low < 45, Medium 45 – 80, High > 80</i>	

Contents of the Assessment:

Section I – Invasion Status. Determines whether the species being evaluated is invasive in Indiana.

Section II – Ecological Impacts of Invasion. Evaluates the significance of impacts of the species.

Section III – Potential for Expansion. Evaluates the actual and/or potential expansion of the species.

Section IV – Difficulty of Management. Evaluates how hard it is to control the invasive species.

Section V – Commercial Value. Evaluates how valuable the species is economically in Indiana.

Questions in Sections I – V may direct you to one or more of the following sections for particular invasive species:

Section A. For species which have impacts limited to a few sites, assesses the potential for further spread.

Section B. For species which have medium impacts but high value, assesses whether species could be used in specific circumstances that would prevent escape and invasion.

A worksheet for use with the assessment is found on page 8.

Automatic Exemption From the Assessment

Is this species listed on any federal or on an Indiana state noxious, or prohibited plant lists?

If **YES** then do not proceed with assessment but indicate a conclusion of
Do not use this plant on the front of the response form.

If **NO** then go to Section I.

Section I Invasion Status

1-a Current Invasion in Indiana

1. Does this species occur in any natural areas in Indiana?

If **NO** then go to Section III-c.

If **YES** then go to 1-a 2.

2. Does it **ONLY** occur in natural areas of Indiana because it has persisted from its previous cultivation (e.g., in abandoned farmland or homesteads)?

If **YES** then go to Section III-c.

If **NO** then go to Section 1-b (below).


1-b Invasion Status in Indiana

Evidence of invasion (forming self-sustaining and expanding populations within a plant community with which it had not previously been associated) must be provided. If not available in a published, quantitative form, this evidence must include written observations from at least three appropriate biologists.

1. Is species invasive ONLY when natural disturbance regime and scale have been altered? (e.g. where frequency, extent, or severity of fires have been reduced by human activity).
 If YES then go to questions 1-b 2.
 If NO – the species is invasive, go to Section II (below).
2. Has this species ever been known to persist, following colonization, when the natural regime is resumed and the natural flora/communities recover? (e.g., is not an early successional species that only temporarily invades disturbed sites.)
 If YES (or unknown) - the species is invasive, go to Section II (below).
 If NO (known not to persist) the species is currently not invasive in Indiana. Go to Section III-c to assess the species' potential for future invasion.

2019 Map of EDDMaps Reports for Euonymus alatus (accessed 12/9/2019):

Note that the 2012 assessment of this species had 53 reported counties; this 2019 map has 68 reported counties.



Section II	Ecological Impacts of Invasion	Impact Index
------------	--------------------------------	--------------

II-a Known Impacts at WORST SITE(S) (without, or before, any control effort)

Add up points for ALL impact statements (i through vi) that are true at the worst affected site(s) then go to question II-b. Evidence of impacts must be provided. If not available in published, quantitative form, this evidence must include written observations from at least *three* appropriate biologists, including specific locations of observations. Scientific names of impacted species (e.g., State-listed or native species with which hybridization occurs) must be included on the response form. If there is no evidence of an impact, then assign 0 points unless the impact is considered very likely (e.g., fixes N₂ in low nutrient soil that can change the flora) or the impact (except vi) has been demonstrated in similar habitats in states. In these cases assign 0.5 points.

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| <p>i) Causes long-term, broad alterations in ecosystem processes changing the community as a whole (e.g. invasion of cattails changes hydrology, drying the site and allowing open aquatic systems to become forested).
 <i>Heffernan (2004): "No reported impact in referenced literature (Martin 2002; Ebinger et al. 1984). "However, ecological studies on the species are limited.</i>
 <i>Sources of information:</i>
 <i>Ebinger et al., 1984; Martin, 2002; Heffernan, 2004.</i></p> | <p><u>Points</u></p> <p>15</p> |
|--|--------------------------------|

- ii) Has negatively impacted Indiana State-listed or Federal-listed plants or animals (choose one of the following):
- Displacement, death or hybridization has been documented AND occurs in at least 20% of known locations of the listed species, OR these effects occur in less than 20% of known locations of the listed species, but at least 4 different listed species are affected. 12
- Displacement, death or hybridization occurs in less than 20% of locations of the listed species OR impacts are considered likely because the listed and invasive species closely co-habit (e.g., compete for light). 4
- Burning bush was impacting *Dendrolycopodium hickeyii* at a TNC preserve in Jasper County (Prairie Border West) until it was controlled.*
- iii) Displaces or precludes native vegetation (affecting mortality and/or recruitment) by achieving infestations in the state that have at least 50% coverage of this species (as defined in the glossary) in the affected stratum that meet any of the following criteria:
- a) collectively add up to at least 10 acres
 b) are 5 infestations of at least 0.25 acres
 c) are 5 infestations that cover an entire localized community (e.g. sinkhole, seeps, fens, bogs, barrens, cliffs)
 d) are 5 infestations some of which are at least 0.25 acres and others of which cover entire localized communities. 12
- There are 160 EDDMaps reports of infestations with over 50% cover in sites that collectively add to over 10 acres.*
- iv) Changes community structure in ways other than vegetation displacement (e.g., alters wildlife abundance, adds a new stratum, or increases stem density within a stratum by more than 5-fold). 4
- Can increase the density of the shrub layer, but not reported to be creating a new layer or causing major alteration of community structure.*
- Sources of information:
 Ebinger et al., 1984; Martin, 2002; Heffernan, 2004.*
- v) Hybridizes with native Indiana plants or commercially-available species. 4
- vi) Covers over 15% of invaded stratum (but if 12 points were assigned for statement iii, do not assign points here) on > 10 acres in the state. 16
- Total points (place in worksheet page 8): 16**

II-b Range of Habitats in Which Species is Invasive

- Forest: 1)Dry upland, 2)Dry-mesic upland, 3)Mesic upland, 4)Mesic floodplain, 5)Wet-mesic floodplain, 6)Wet floodplain, 7)Bluegrass till plain flatwoods*, 8)Boreal flatwoods*, 9)Central till plain flatwoods, 10)Dry flatwoods*, 11)Sand flatwoods*, 12)Southwestern lowland mesic flatwoods*
- Savanna: 13)Mesic savanna*, 14)Dry sand savanna*, 15)Dry-mesic sand savanna*
- Barrens: 16)Limestone bedrock*, 17)Sandstone bedrock*, 18)Siltstone bedrock*, 19)Chert*, 20)Gravel*, 21)Sand*, 22) Clay*
- Prairie: 23)Dry-mesic prairie*, 24)Mesic prairie*, 25)Wet prairie*, 26)Dry sand prairie*, 27)Dry-mesic sand prairie*, 28)Wet-mesic sand prairie*, 29)Wet sand prairie*
- Wetland: 30)Marl beach*, 31)Acid bog*, 32)Circumneutral bog*, 33)Fen*, 34)Forested fen*, 35)Muck and Sand flats*, 36)Marsh, 37)Sedge meadow*, 38)Panne*, 39)Acid seep*, 40)Calcareous seep*, 41)Circumneutral seep*, 42)Forest swamp, 43)Shrub swamp
- Lake: 44)Lake, 45)Pond
- Stream: 46)Low-gradient creek, 47)Medium-gradient creek, 48)High-gradient creek, 49)Low-

gradient river, 50)Medium-gradient river, 51)Major river

Primary: 52)Aquatic cave*, 53)Terrestrial cave*, 54)Eroding cliff*, 55)Limestone cliff*, 56)Overhang cliff*, 57)Sandstone cliff*, 58)Lake dune*, 59)Gravel wash*

Is this species known to be invasive in at least four habitat-types (note – rare habitat-types are marked with a * and count as 2 when adding) OR does it occur in at least one habitat-type of each of the terrestrial and palustrine/aquatic lists (palustrine/aquatic habitats are shown in **bold**) *8 habitat types affected, 2 rare for a total of 10 points.*

**If YES then multiply total score from II-a by 1.5
then go to Section II-c (Below)**

If NO then multiply total score from II-a by 1
then go to Section II-c (Below)

Place point total in worksheet, page 8.

II-c Proportion of Invaded Sites with Significant Impacts

Of the invaded sites, might any of the worst impacts [items i-v in section II-a] only occur under a few, identifiable, environmental conditions (i.e., edaphic or other biological conditions occurring in 1-10% of the sites)? Documentation of evidence must be provided for a YES answer.

If NO or NO SCORE on items i to v in section II-a

then go to Section III

If YES then go to Section A

Section III

Potential for Expansion

Potential Index

This section evaluates a species' actual and/or potential for expansion in Indiana.

III-a Potential for Becoming Invasive in Indiana

1. Is information available on the occurrence of new populations of this species in Indiana over the last 5 years?

If YES then go to section III-b

If NO go to Section III-c to estimate potential for expansion based on the biology of the species.

III-b. Known Rate of Invasion.

1. Was this species reported in more than two new discrete sites (e.g., lakes, parks, fragments of habitats at least 5 miles apart) in any 12 month period within the last 5 years?

If NO then P = Low; then go to Section IV

If YES then P = High; then go to Section IV

III-c. Estimated Rate of Invasion. This section is used to predict the risk of invasion for species that are 1) not currently invasive in the state, and 2) invasive in the state but for which no data on current rate of spread exists. These questions are based on Hiebert et al. 1995.

1. Does this species hybridize with any State-listed plants or commercially-important species? (E.g., exhibit pollen / genetic invasion.)

If YES then go to Section B

If NO then go to question III-c 2.

2. Add up all points from statements that are true for this species.

Points

- i. Ability to complete reproductive cycle in area of concern
 - a. not observed to complete reproductive cycle
 - b. observed to complete reproductive cycle

0
5

Personal observation by Will Drews and Ellen Jacquart

- ii. Mode of reproduction

a. reproduces almost entirely by vegetative means	1
b. reproduces only by seeds	3
c. reproduces vegetatively and by seed	5
<i>Personal observation by Will Drews and Ellen Jacquart</i>	
iii. Vegetative reproduction	
a. no vegetative reproduction	0
b. vegetative reproduction rate maintains population	1
c. vegetative reproduction rate results in moderate increase in population size	3
d. vegetative reproduction rate results in rapid increase in population size	5
<i>Personal observation by Will Drews and Ellen Jacquart</i>	
iv. Frequency of sexual reproduction for mature plant	
a. almost never reproduces sexually in area	0
b. once every five or more years	1
c. every other year	3
d. one or more times a year	5
<i>Seeds can remain viable for up to two years; no evidence for ten years.</i>	
<i>Sources of information:</i>	
<i>Catalpa Tree Seed Company, 2007.</i>	
v. Number of seeds per plant	
a. few (0-10)	1
b. moderate (11-1,000)	3
c. many-seeded (> 1,000)	5
<i>Number of seeds per plant varies by cultivar; Brand et al. (2012) found seed production per plant ranged from 981 seeds/plant (Monstrosus cv.) to 6,090 seeds/plant (Compactus cv.).</i>	
vi. Dispersal ability	
a. little potential for long-distance dispersal	0
b. great potential for long-distance dispersal	5
<i>Birds and small animals provide numerous opportunities for long-distance dispersal.</i>	
<i>Sources of information:</i>	
<i>Goo et al., 1995; Heffernan, 2004; Ma & Moore, 2004.</i>	
vii. Germination requirements	
a. requires open soil and disturbance to germinate	0
b. can germinate in vegetated areas but in a narrow range or in special conditions	3
c. can germinate in existing vegetation in a wide range of conditions	5
<i>Significant germination rates (up to 37.8%) were found in dry deciduous woods and pine woods (Brand et al. 2010)</i>	
viii. Competitive ability	
a. poor competitor for limiting factors	0
b. moderately competitive for limiting factors	3
c. highly competitive for limiting factors	5
<i>Perennial habit, shade tolerant.</i>	
<i>Sources of information:</i>	
<i>Heffernan, 2004; Ma & Moore, 2004.</i>	

Total points for questions i – viii (place in worksheet page 8): 36

Section IV

Difficulty of Management

Management Index

IV Factors That Increase the Difficulty of Management

Add up all points from statements that are true for this species then go to Section V. Assign 0.5 point for

	<u>Points</u>
i) Control techniques that would eliminate the worst-case effects (as listed in Section II) have been investigated but none has been found.	15
ii) This species is difficult to control without significant damage to native species because: it is widely dispersed throughout the sites (i.e., does not occur within discrete clumps nor monocultures); it is attached to native species (e.g., vine, epiphytes or parasite); or there is a native plant which is easily mistaken for this invader in: (choose one)	
≥ 50% of discrete sites in which this species grows;	10
25% to 50% of discrete sites in which this species grows.	7
iii) Total contractual costs of known control method per acre in first year, including access, personnel, equipment, and materials (any needed re-vegetation is not included) > \$2,000/acre (estimated control costs are for acres with a 50% infestation)	5
<i>Control is complicated by the fact that pulled stems can root from the stem nodes and so must be removed from the site.</i>	
iv) Further site restoration is <i>usually</i> necessary following plant control to reverse ecosystem impacts and to restore the original habitat-type or to prevent immediate re-colonization of the invader.	5
<i>Not in our experience (TNC, 2019, IPAC members, 2019).</i>	
v) The total area over which management would have to be conducted is: (choose one).	
≥ 100 acres;	5
< 100 but > 50 acres.	2
≤ 50 but > 10 acres.	1
≤10 acres	½
<i>The 209 reports in EDDMaps on December 9, 2019 totaled approximately 129 infested acres in Indiana. There are many other infestations that have not been reported in EDDMaps.</i>	
vi) Following the first year of control of this species, it would be expected that individual sites would require re-survey or re-treatment, due to recruitment from persistent seeds, spores, or vegetative structures, or by dispersal from outside the site: (choose one)	
at least once a year for the next 5 years;	10
one to 4 times over the next 5 years;	6
regrowth not known	2
<i>Persistent seeds which often germinate when parent plants are removed require followup for many years (Jacquart personal observation)</i>	
vii) Occurs in more than 20 discrete sites (e.g., water-basins, parks, fragments of habitats at least 5 miles apart).	3
<i>Overlease et al. 2002 notes it is naturalized throughout the state; there are reports from 209 sites in 68 Indiana counties in EDDMaps..</i>	
viii) The number of viable, independent propagules per mature plant (e.g., seeds, spores, fragments, tubers, etc. detached from parent) is > 200 per year AND one or more of the following:	
A. the propagules can survive for more than 1 year;	
B. the propagules have structures (<u>fleshy coverings</u> , barbs, plumes, or bladders) that indicate they may spread widely by birds, mammals, wind or water;	
C. the infestations at 3 or more sites exhibit signs of long distance dispersal. Some possible indicators of long distance dispersal include: the infestation has outlier individuals distant [>50 yards] from the core population; the infestation apparently lacks sources of propagules within ¼ mile.	3
<i>Seeds are covered by fleshy covering.</i>	

ix) Age at first reproduction is within first 10% of likely life-span and/or less than 3 months. **2**

50 year estimated life span: plants are able to flower and fruit by age 5 years.

Total points (place in worksheet page 9): **28**

Section V	Commercial Value	Value Index
-----------	------------------	-------------

V-a **Commercial Value**

Does this species have any commercial value?

If response is **NO** then V = 0 and Go to Conversion of Index Scores to Index Categories

If response is **YES** then go to Section V-b

V-b **Factors that Indicate a Significant Commercial Value**

Add up all points from statements that are true for this species. Assign 0.5 point for each statement for which a true/false response is not known.

Points

i) This species is sold in national or regional retail stores (e.g., WalMart, Home Depot, Publix). **10**

ii) State-wide there are more than 20 commercial growers of this species. **7**

iii) More than five growers in Indiana rely on this species as more than 10% of their production. 3

iv) This species has provided a crop, turf, or feed source (e.g., forage, nectar) that has been, or resulted in, a significant source of income for at least five farmers for over 20 years. 3

v) This species is utilized statewide. **3**

vi) There are more than 100 retail seed outlets statewide 3

Total points (place in worksheet page 9): **20**

Section A (from Section II-c)

A1 Can the habitats in which the worst-case ecological impacts occur (items i to v in Section II-a) be clearly defined as different from invaded sites where there are no such impacts (e.g., defined by edaphic or biological factors)? (If ecological impacts include negative effects on a State-listed species, then the specific habitats in which that State-listed species occurs must be clearly distinguishable from habitats in which it does not occur.)

If **NO** then return to Section III

If **YES** then Go to question A2 and prepare such a site definition

A2 Can an estimate be made of the maximum distance that propagules (or pollen if hybridization is a concern) might reasonably be expected to disperse?

If **NO** then return to Section III

If **YES** then prepare instructions for Specified and Limited Use based on maximum dispersal distance (e.g., may be acceptable for use in specific areas but not near habitats where impacts are high.) Reassess if the incidence of worst-case impacts increases above 10% or within 10 years, whichever is earlier. THEN resume the assessment at Section III to provide scores for the other indices.

Section B (from Section III-c or if Value = High and Impact = Medium)

B1 Are there specific circumstances in which this species could be used that would not be expected to result in escape and invasion? (E.g., foliage plants that are only used indoors and which can be reasonably prevented, by conspicuous labeling, from use or disposal in the landscape.)

If **NO**, then retain the previously derived Conclusion.

If **YES**, then Acceptable for Specified and Limited Use where regulations and educational programs for penalties and enforcement of misuse exist. Reassess this species every 2 years.

Worksheet for Assessment

Section I:

Follow directions to different sections.

Section II:

Impacts Point Total: 16 X (1 or 1.5) = 24 **Impacts**

Section III:

Potential = High Medium or Low 36 **Potential for Expansion**

Section IV:

Difficulty of Management Point Total: 28 **Difficulty of Management**

Section V:

Commercial Value Point Total: 20 **Value**

Invasive Ranking Summary:

Invasive Ranking Summary	Score
Ecological Impacts	24
Potential For Expansion	36
Difficulty of Management	28
Total Score:	88
	High
<i>Rankings: Low < 45, Medium 45 – 80, High > 80</i>	

Assessment History

Original assessment 9/19/07 by Ellen Jacquart (TNC), David Gorden, Rebecca Dolan.

Reviewed and updated 9/20/2012 by Alison Clements, Angela Sturdevant, Ellen Jacquart

Reviewed and updated 6/1/2019 by Ellen Jacquart.

Reviewed and approved 6/30/2019 by Michael Warner and Amber Slaughterback

Reviewed and approved 10/30/2019 by IPAC (Dawn Slack, Ross Miller, David Gorden, and Will Drews).

Literature Cited

Brand, M.H., J.D. Lubell and J. Lehrer. 2010 Fecundity of winged Euonymus cultivars and their ability to invade various natural environments. HortScience vol. 47(8): 1029-1033.

Dirr, M. 1998. Manual of Woody Landscape Plants: Their Identification, Ornamental Characteristics, Culture, Propagation, and Uses. Stipes Publications, 1,187 pp.

Ebinger, J. E., J. Newman, and R. Nyboer. 1984. Naturalized winged wahoo (Euonymus alatus) in Illinois. Natural

- Goo, H. G., J. S. Choi, and K. S. Youn, 1995, Effects of the seed treatment on field germination and seedling growth in four useful species, *Euonymus alatus*, *Nandina domestica*, *Thea sinensis* and *Zanthoxylum piperitum*. *Journal-of-Korean-Forestry-Society*. 84(1): 87-96.
- Heffernan, K. 2004. *Euonymus alatus*. U.S. Invasive Species Impact Rank (I-Rank). NatureServe Explorer. <www.natureserve.org>. [Accessed September 28, 2008].
- Invasive Species Specialist Group 2005. *Euonymus alata*. Global Invasive Species Database. <www.issg.org/database/species/ecology.asp>. [Accessed March 12, 2008].
- Knight, T. M., K. Havens, and P. Vitt. 2011. Will the use of less fecund cultivars reduce the invasiveness of perennial plants? *BioScience*, 61(10): 816-822.
- Ma, J. S. and G. Moore, 2004. *Euonymus alatus* – Wildland Shrubs of the United States and Its Territories: Thamnic Descriptions, USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report HTF-GTR-26 1: 331 <<http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/plants/shrub/euoaala/all.html> >. [Accessed June 20, 2012].
- Martin, T. 2002. Weed alert: *Euonymus alatus*. The Nature Conservancy <<http://www.invasive.org/gist/alert/alrteuon.html>>. [Accessed June 20, 2012].
- Overlease, W. and E. Overlease. 2006. 100 Years of Change in the Distribution of Common Indiana Weeds. Purdue University Press, 270 pp.
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. 2012. <https://dnr.wi.gov/topic/Invasives/fact/Euonymus.html> (Web access: August 19, 2018)