

NEW YORK NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Scientific name: Pyrus calleryana USDA Plants Code: PYCA80
 Common names: Callery pear
 Native distribution: China
 Date assessed: November 14, 2008
 Assessors: Steve Glenn, Gerry Moore
 Reviewers: LIISMA SRC
 Date Approved: November 19, 2008 Form version date: 22 October 2008

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	Common	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>30</u>)	13
2	Biological characteristic and dispersal ability	25 (<u>22</u>)	19
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	25 (<u>21</u>)	15
4	Difficulty of control	10 (<u>10</u>)	7
	Outcome score	100 (<u>83</u>) ^b	54 ^a
	Relative maximum score [†]		65.06
	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

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 type="checkbox"/>	Adirondack Park Invasive Program	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Capital/Mohawk	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Catskill Regional Invasive Species Partnership	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Finger Lakes	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Long Island Invasive Species Management Area	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lower Hudson	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Saint Lawrence/Eastern Lake Ontario	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Western New York	

NEW YORK

NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Documentation:

Sources of information:

Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2008.

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):

Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2008. **INFORMATION NEEDS:** presence of infestations in other PRISMs, size and abundance, germination studies, genetic analysis to identify wild escapes.

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)

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

Documentation:

Sources of information:

Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2008.

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.

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

Other potential or known suitable habitats within New York:

Possibly in wetland prairies, marsh edges; pond borders; creek floodplain, but needs verification.

Documentation:

Sources of information:

Steury & Davis, 2003; Freeman et al., 2003; Fellows, 2004; Vincent, 2005; White et al., 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2008.

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

B. INVASIVENESS RANKING

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)
 Analysis of herbarium specimens (Vincent, 2005) indicates a recent shift from the lag-phase to the spreading phase of this species, so the ecosystem-level effects have yet to be examined. This corresponds with recent field observations of BBG staff.
 Sources of information:
 Fellows, 2004; Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007; authors' personal observations.

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

7

Documentation:
 Identify type of impact or alteration:
 Little known, may impede the establishment of late- to mid-stage successional species in disturbed sites. Analysis of herbarium specimens (Vincent, 2005) indicates a recent shift from the lag-phase to the spreading phase of this species, so the community structure effects have yet to be reported on in the literature. Recent field observation have shown this species to be rapidly invading fields, thus creating a canopy layer where one was absent.
 Sources of information:
 Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

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

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

- 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

3

Documentation:
 Identify type of impact or alteration:
 Definitely outcompetes with native spp. in areas where it invades. Analysis of herbarium specimens (Vincent, 2005) indicates a recent shift from the lag-phase to the spreading phase of this species, so the community composition effects have yet to be thoroughly examined.
 Sources of information:
 Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

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

3

Documentation:
 Identify type of impact or alteration:
 Little known- analysis of herbarium specimens (Vincent, 2005) indicates a recent shift from the lag-phase to the spreading phase of this species, so the impact on other species has yet to be examined. Thorns may inhibit mammal herbivory (Culley & Hardiman, 2007) but not all escaped plants may be thorny.
 Sources of information:
 Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

Total Possible

30

 Section One Total

13

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
 - 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

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

U. Unknown

Score 4

Documentation:

Describe key reproductive characteristics (including seeds per plant):

Although possibly self-sterile, abundant fruit set has been observed in cultivars growing in urban areas more recently. This is attributed to the diversity of cultivars planted today within crossing distance of one another.

Sources of information:

Authors' personal observations; Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

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:

Eaten by birds.

Sources of information:

Fellows, 2004; Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

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:

Widely planted as an ornamental street and lawn tree with at least 20 cultivars developed. Continued to be reported to be a non- invasive as street trees as recently as 2007 (Gerhold, 2007).

Sources of information:

Fellows, 2004; Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007; Gerhold, 2007.

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

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

- C. Possesses two or more characteristics that increase competitive advantage 6
- U. Unknown

Score 6

Documentation:

Evidence of competitive ability:

Reported to have a wide substrate tolerance growing in low to high pH, wet to dry, and clay to sand (Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007). Also reported to have a medium-high salt tolerance (Zang et al., 2008). Has a short juvenile period, flowering as early as 3 years old (Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007). Reported to have a broad ecological adaptation in its native range and resistance to pollution (Culley & Hardiman, 2007). Few documented pests- studies found less than 4% defoliation rate from gypsy moths (Peterson & Smitley, 1991); and high resistance to Japanese beetle (Culley & Hardiman, 2007). Other studies have found moderate resistance to the fire blight bacterium in some cultivars (Bell et al., 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007). Thorns may inhibit deer herbivory (Culley & Hardiman, 2007). but not all escapes are thorny.

Sources of information:

Peterson & Smitley, 1991; Bell et al., 2005; Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007; Zang et al., 2008.

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 2

Documentation:

Describe growth form:

Forms dense thickets.

Sources of information:

Authors' personal observations; Vincent, 2005; White et al., 2005.

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 U

Documentation:

Describe germination requirements:

Germination studies not done.

Sources of information:

Fellows, 2004.

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:

Pyrus communis and *Pyrus pyrifolia* documented escaping but invasive status not determined. Weldy & Werier, 2005; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2008; U.S.D.A, 2008.

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

Total Possible	22
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 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

U

Documentation:

Identify reason for selection, or evidence of weedy history:

Large stands observed and reported, but neither size nor disturbance quantified.

Sources of information:

Authors' personal observations; Vincent, 2005; White et al., 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

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

4

Documentation:

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

See A2.3

Sources of information:

Freeman et al., 2003; Fellows, Fellows, M. 2004.2004; Vincent, 2005; White et al., 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007; Brooklyn Botanic Garden. 2008.

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

2

Documentation:

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Identify type of disturbance: Studies indicate a preference for open or disturbed, high-light environments. Not yet noted in areas lacking any know disturbances. Sources of information: Culley & Hardiman, 2007.	
---	--

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: China, some cultivars reported to withstand temperatures as low as -28Celsius. Sources of information: Culley & Hardiman, 2007.	
--	--

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: CT, IL, IN, KY, MD, MI, NJ, NY, OH, PA, VA, WV. Sources of information: See known introduced range in plants.usda.gov, and update with information from states and Canadian provinces. Vincent, 2005; Culley & Hardiman, 2007; Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2008.	
---	--

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 2

Documentation: Describe distribution: Lower Hudson and LIISMA. Winters possibly currently too cold in more northern PRISMs	
--	--

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

for this species too survive. Stems known to split when exposed to cold temperatures.
Sources of information:
Brooklyn Botanic Garden, 2008.

Total Possible	21
Section Three Total	15

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:
Prominent seed bank "likely", but longevity not known to be greater than 10 years.
Sources of information:
Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

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:
Resprouts from existing trunk or root system. Does not sucker away from trunk.
Sources of information:
Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

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 4

Documentation:
Identify types of control methods and time-term required:
Few documented management strategies- mechanical removal and girdling and herbicide

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

application. Actual minimum time commitment is unknown, but no doubt significant as some sites are thickets of trees.

Sources of information:

Fellows, 2004; Culley & Hardiman, 2007.

Total Possible	10
Section Four Total	7

Total for 4 sections Possible 83

Total for 4 sections 54

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: 'Aristocrat', 'Autumn Blaze', 'Avery Park', 'Bradford', 'Burgundy Snow', 'Capital', 'Chanticleer', 'Cleprizam', 'Early Red', 'Edgewood', 'Fauriei', 'Gladzam', 'Grant St. Yellow', 'Jaczam', 'Jilzam', 'Korean Sun', 'Mepozam', 'Paradise', 'Pizzaz', 'Princess', 'Rancho', 'Redspire', 'Trinity', 'Valzam', 'Whitehouse'.

References for species assessment:

Bell, A. C., T. G. Ranney, T. A. Eaker, & T. B. Sutton. 2005. Resistance to fire blight among flowering pears and quince. *Hortscience*. 40(2):413-415.

Brooklyn Botanic Garden. 2008. AILANTHUS database. [Accessed on November 14, 2008].

Culley, T. M. & N. A. Hardiman. 2007. The beginning of a new invasive plant: a history of the ornamental Callery pear in the United States. *BioScience* 57(11):956-964.

Fellows, M. 2004. *Pyrus calleryana*. U.S. Invasive Species Impact Rank (I-Rank). NatureServe Explorer. <www.natureserve.org>. [Accessed on November 14, 2008].

Freeman, C. C., C. A. Morse, & R. L. McGregor. 2003. New vascular plant records for the grassland biome of central North America. *SIDA Contributions to Botany* 20(3):1289-1297.

Gerhold, H. D. 2007. Callery pear cultivars tested as street trees: Final report on a 12-year study *Arboriculture & Urban Forestry* 33(2):153-156.

Peterson, N. C. & D. R. Smitley. 1991. Susceptibility of selected shade and flowering trees to gypsy moth *Lepidoptera: Lymantriidae*. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 84(2):587-592.

NEW YORK NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Steury, B. W. & C. A. Davis. 2003. The Vascular Flora of Piscataway and Fort Washington National Parks, Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Maryland. *Castanea* 68(4):271-299.

United States Department of Agriculture, National Resources Conservation Service. 2008. The PLANTS Database. National Plant Data Center, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. <plants.usda.gov>. [Accessed on November 14, 2008].

Vincent, M. A. 2005. On the spread and current distribution of *Pyrus calleryana* in the United States. *Castanea*. 70(1):20-31.

Weldy, T. and D. Werier. 2005. 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. <atlas.nyflora.org/>. [Accessed on November 14, 2008].

White, J., W. F. McClain & J. E. Ebinger. 2005. Naturalized callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana* Decne.) in Illinois. *Transactions of the Illinois State Academy of Science* 98(3-4):123-130.

Zang, H., D. Song, & L. Zheng-xiang. 2008. Study on physiological characteristics and salt tolerance for seedlings of 11 tree species. *Forest Research* 21(2):168-175.

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>

NEW YORK
NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

- 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.