

NEW YORK NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Scientific name: | Hypericum perforatum L. | USDA Plants Code: HYPE |
| Common names: | Common St. John's-wort | |
| Native distribution: | Eurasia, North Africa | |
| Date assessed: | May 8, 2009 | |
| Assessors: | Steve Glenn, Gerry Moore | |
| Reviewers: | LIISMA SRC | |
| Date Approved: | May 20, 2009 | Form version date: 3 March 2009 |

New York Invasiveness Rank: Low (Relative Maximum Score 40.00-49.99)

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


| Invasiveness Ranking Summary (see details under appropriate sub-section) | | Total (Total Answered*) Possible | Total |
|--|---|--|-----------------|
| 1 | Ecological impact | 40 (<u>20</u>) | 0 |
| 2 | Biological characteristic and dispersal ability | 25 (<u>22</u>) | 14 |
| 3 | Ecological amplitude and distribution | 25 (<u>25</u>) | 19 |
| 4 | Difficulty of control | 10 (<u>10</u>) | 3 |
| | Outcome score | 100 (<u>77</u>) ^b | 36 ^a |
| | Relative maximum score [†] | | 46.75 |
| | New York Invasiveness Rank [§] | Low (Relative Maximum Score 40.00-49.99) | |

* 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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>A1.1. Has this species been documented to persist without cultivation in NY? (reliable source; voucher not required)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes – continue to A1.2</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No – continue to A2.1</p> <p>A1.2. In which PRISMs is it known (see inset map)?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adirondack Park Invasive Program</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Capital/Mohawk</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Finger Lakes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Long Island Invasive Species Management Area</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lower Hudson</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Western New York</p> |  <p style="font-size: small;">Partnerships for Regional Invasive Species Management 2008</p> |
|--|--|

Documentation:

NEW YORK

NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

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:

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

Well established in PRISM. A ubiquitous weed, but neither seen forming large stands in the PRISM (authors' personal observations) nor any literature located to suggest thus.

Authors' personal observations; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009.

If the species does not occur and is not likely to occur with any of the PRISMs, then stop here as there is no need to assess the species.

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 type="checkbox"/> Forested wetlands/riparian <input type="checkbox"/> Ditches* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beaches and/or coastal dunes | <p>Upland Habitats</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Cultivated* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grasslands/old fields <input checked="" 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:

Railroads, forest margins, waste grounds, riverbanks.

Documentation:

Sources of information:

authors' personal observations; Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 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 |
|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Documentation: Identify ecosystem processes impacted (or if applicable, justify choosing answer A in the absence of impact information) While considered a serious problem in western North America (Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004), it is only minor (albiet ubiquitous) weed in eastern North America (Crompton et al, 1988). No literature has been located suggesting impacts to natural ecosystem processes in eastern North America.</p> <p>Sources of information: Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004.</p> | |
|--|--|

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

| |
|---|
| 0 |
|---|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Documentation: Identify type of impact or alteration: While considered a serious problem in western North America (Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004), it is only minor (albiet ubiquitous) weed in eastern North America (Crompton et al, 1988). It has not been observed to impact natural community structure in the Northeast region (authors' personal observations), nor has any literature been located suggesting impacts to natural community structure in eastern North America.</p> <p>Sources of information: Authors' personal observations; Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004.</p> | |
|--|--|

1.3. Impact on Natural Community Composition

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

- 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 species exotic to the natural community) 10
- U. Unknown

Score

| |
|---|
| 0 |
|---|

Documentation:
 Identify type of impact or alteration:
 While considered a serious problem in western North America (Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004), it is only minor (albiet ubiquitous) weed in eastern North America (Crompton et al, 1988). It has not been observed to impact natural community composition in the Northeast region (authors' personal observations), nor has any literature been located suggesting impacts to natural community composition in eastern North America.
 Sources of information:
 author's personal observations; Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004.

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:
 While considered a serious problem in western North America (Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004), it is only minor (albiet ubiquitous) weed in eastern North America (Crompton et al, 1988). No literature been located researching impacts to other species groups in eastern North America.
 Sources of information:
 Author's personal observations; Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004.

Total Possible

| |
|----|
| 20 |
|----|

 Section One Total

| |
|---|
| 0 |
|---|

2. BIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND DISPERSAL ABILITY

- 2.1. Mode and rate of reproduction (provisional thresholds, more investigation needed)
- 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

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

- 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):
 Copious seed production- reportedly as high as 33, 000 seeds per plant.
 Sources of information:
 Crompton et al, 1988; authors' pers. obs.

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

| |
|---|
| 2 |
|---|

Documentation:
 Identify dispersal mechanisms:
 Endozoochory (animal) and hydrochory (water) can occur; seeds quite small. Czamecka reported "effective dispersal."
 Sources of information:
 Crompton et al, 1988; Czarnecka, 2005.

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

| |
|---|
| 2 |
|---|

Documentation:
 Identify dispersal mechanisms:
 Historically and currently used medicinally for substance abuse and dependence, for the treatment of neurological disorders and depression, and antiviral and antibacterial effects. Also occasionally used as an ornamental. Limited sales of the plant for use in the herbal trade. Small seeds easily moved through indirect means.
 Sources of information:
 Crompton et al, 1988; Barnes et al., 2001; Fellows, 2004; Nishimura et al., 2007; Uzbay, T. I.

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

2008.

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
- U. Unknown

Score

Documentation:

Evidence of competitive ability:

Perennial, rapid and deep root system growth and rapid vegetative growth early in the Spring provides a competitive advantage over other plant species (Crompton et al, 1988).
Reported to be extremely drought resistant (Fox et al., 1999).

Adaptive reproductive system- is a facultative apomict as well producing seeds via out-crossing pollination (Crompton et al, 1988; Pank et al., 2003; Barcaccia et al., 2006).

An investigation of North American populations found "substantial genetic variation" (Maron et al., 2004), perhaps enhancing ecological amplitude.

Sources of information:

Crompton et al, 1988; Fox et al., 1999; Pank et al., 2003; Maron et al., 2004; Barcaccia et al., 2006.

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

Documentation:

Describe growth form:

Neither observed forming thickets or possessing a smothering habit in the CT-NJ-NY area, nor any literature found suggesting this.

Sources of information:

author's 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

Documentation:

Describe germination requirements:

Germination rates as high as 98% have been reported (Perez-Garcia et al., 2006); but the role of disturbance or vegetative competition was not addressed.

Sources of information:

Perez-Garcia et al., 2006.

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

- A. No 0
- B. Yes 3

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

U. Unknown

Score

| |
|---|
| 0 |
|---|

Documentation:

Species:

None- U.S.D.A., 2009; Weldy & Werier, 2009.

Total Possible

| |
|----|
| 22 |
|----|

Section Two Total

| |
|----|
| 14 |
|----|

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 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

| |
|---|
| 0 |
|---|

Documentation:

Identify reason for selection, or evidence of weedy history:

A ubiquitous weed, but neither seen forming large stands in the region by authors nor any literature located to suggest this.

Sources of information:

Authors' personal observations; Fellows, 2004.

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 two or more of the habitats given at A2.3, with at least one a natural habitat. 1
- C. Known to occur in three or more of the habitats given at A2.3, with at least two a natural habitat. 2
- D. Known to occur in four or more of the habitats given at A2.3, with at least three a natural habitat. 4
- E. Known to occur in more than four of the habitats given at A2.3, with at least four a natural habitat. 6
- U. Unknown

Score

| |
|---|
| 6 |
|---|

Documentation:

Identify type of habitats where it occurs and degree/type of impacts:

See A2.3.

Sources of information:

Authors' personal observations; Crompton et al, 1988; Fellows, 2004; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2009.

3.3. Role of disturbance in establishment

- A. Requires anthropogenic disturbances to establish. 0

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

- 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 2

Documentation:
 Identify type of disturbance:
 Readily establishes in disturbed areas, not known to require anthropogenic disturbance.
 Sources of information:
 Author's personal observations; Fellows, 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
- U. Unknown

Score 3

Documentation:
 Describe what part of the native range is similar in climate to New York:
 Northern Europe.
 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:
 Documented from all northeastern states and provinces.
 Sources of information: See known introduced range in plants.usda.gov, and update with information from states and Canadian provinces.
 U.S.D.A., 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

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

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

- 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:

Seeds reported to be viable in the soil for up to 10 but not more than 10 years.

Sources of information:

Fellows, 2004.

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:

Perennial with rhizomes but not extensive underground root system.

Sources of information:

Crompton et al, 1988

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

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

U. Unknown

Score

| |
|---|
| 0 |
|---|

Documentation:

Identify types of control methods and time-term required:

Species does not occur in large stands and management is not known to be required at this time.

Chemical: 2,4-D esters, glyphosate, terbacil, dichlobenil, karbutilate, and metobromuron have been reported as effective in controlling *H. perforatum* (Crompton et al, 1988). A single application of fluoroxyppy, triclopyr, and picloram were reported effective in Australia (Campbell & Nicol, 2000).

Fire: Ineffective, shown to promote vegetative regrowth and seed germination (Crompton et al, 1988). Although one Oregon study (Clark & Wilson, 2001) found burning combined with hand-removal "particularly reduced" the cover of *Hypericum perforatum*.

Biocontrol: Several insect enemies of *H. perforatum* have been used in western North America with varying degrees of success. Insect and fungal pathogens have been documented attacking *H. perforatum* in eastern North America (Crompton et al, 1988); with *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* showing promise as a potential mycoherbicide (Hildebrand & Jensen, 1991).

Sources of information:

Crompton et al, 1988;Hildebrand & Jensen, 1991; Campbell & Nicol, 2000; Clark & Wilson, 2001.

| | |
|--------------------|----|
| Total Possible | 10 |
| Section Four Total | 3 |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| Total for 4 sections Possible | 77 |
| Total for 4 sections | 36 |

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: 'Hyperipharm', 'Hyperisol', 'Hyperviol 7', 'Taubertal', 'Topaz'

References for species assessment:

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

- Barcaccia, G., F. Arzenton, T. F. Sharbel, S. Varotto, P. Parrini & M. Lucchin. 2006. Genetic diversity and reproductive biology in ecotypes of the facultative apomict *Hypericum perforatum* L. *Heredity*. 96(4):322-334.
- Barnes, J., L. A. Anderson & J. D. Phillipson. 2001. St John's wort (*Hypericum perforatum* L.): A review of its chemistry, pharmacology and clinical properties. *Journal of Pharmacy & Pharmacology*. 53(5):583-600.
- Brooklyn Botanic Garden. 2009. AILANTHUS database. [Accessed on May 8 2009].
- Campbell, M. H. & H. I., Nicol. 2000. Effect of split applications of herbicides on the control of *Hypericum perforatum* L. (St. John's wort) and regeneration of native grasses and annual clovers on non-arable land. *Plant Protection Quarterly*. 15(3):119-122.
- Clark, D. L. & M. V. Wilson. 2001. Fire, mowing, and hand-removal of woody species in restoring a native wetland prairie in the Willamette Valley of Oregon. *Wetlands*. 21(1):135-144.
- Crompton, C. W., I. V. Hall, K. I. N. Jensen & P. D. Hildebrand. 1988. The biology of Canadian weeds. 83. *Hypericum perforatum* L. *Canad. J. Plant Sci.* 68:149-162.
- Czarnecka, J. 2005. Seed dispersal effectiveness in three adjacent plant communities: xerothermic grassland, brushwood and woodland. *Annales Botanici Fennici*. 42(3):161-171.
- Fellows, M. 2004. *Hypericum perforatum*. U.S. Invasive Species Impact Rank (I-Rank). NatureServe Explorer. <www.natureserve.org>.[Accessed on May 8 2009].
- Fox, L. R., S. P. Ribeiro, V. K. Brown, J. G. Masters & I. P. Clarke. 1999. Direct and indirect effects of climate change on St John's wort, *Hypericum perforatum* L. (*Hypericaceae*). *Oecologia* (Berlin). 120(1):113-122.
- Hildebrand, P. D. & K. I. N. Jensen. 1991. Potential for the biological control of St. Johns-wort (*Hypericum perforatum*) with an endemic strain of *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides*. *Canadian J. Plant Pathology*. 13(1):60-70.
- Maron, J. L., M. Vila, R. Bommarco, S. Elmendorf & P. Beardsley. 2004. Rapid evolution of an invasive plant. *Ecological Monographs*. 74(2):261-280.
- Nishimura, T., S. M. Zobayed, T. Kozai, & E. Goto. 2007. Medicinally important secondary metabolites and growth of *Hypericum perforatum* L. plants as affected by light quality and intensity. *Environment Control in Biology*. 45(2):113-120.
- Pank, F., F. Matzk, U. Kaestner, W. D. Bluethner, E. F. de Garcia, A. Meister, U. Ryschka & G. Schumann. 2003. Reproductive diversity and strategies for breeding in St. John's wort (*Hypericum perforatum* L.). *Euphytica*. 134(1):77-84.
- Perez-Garcia, F., M. Huertas, E. Mora, B. Pena, F. Varela & M. E. Gonzalez-Benito. 2006. *Hypericum perforatum* L. Seed germination: interpopulation variation and effect of light, temperature, presowing treatments and seed desiccation. *Genetic Resources & Crop Evolution*. 53(6):1187-1198.
- Tutin, T. G. & V. H. Heywood. 1968. *Flora Europaea*. Vol. 2. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK. 455 pp.

NEW YORK

NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

United States Department of Agriculture, National Resources Conservation Service. 2009. The PLANTS Database. National Plant Data Center, Baton Rouge, Louisiana [Accessed on May 8 2009].

Uzbay, T. I. 2008. *Hypericum perforatum* and substance dependence: A review. *Phytotherapy Research*. 22(5):578-582.

Weldy, T. & D. Werier. 2009. *New York Flora Atlas*. [S. M. Landry and K. N. Campbell (original application development), Florida Center for Community Design and Research. University of South Florida]. New York Flora Association, Albany, New York. [Accessed on May 8 2009].

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 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.

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

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.