NAME OF SPECIES: Lepidium latifolium			
Synonyms:			
Common Name: Perennial Peppe	rweed		
A. CURRENT STATUS AND DISTRI	A. CURRENT STATUS AND DISTRIBUTION		
I. In Wisconsin?	1. YES NO		
	2. <u>Abundance</u> : very low		
	3. <u>Geographic Range</u> : 1 known site in Brown County. (1).		
	4. <u>Habitat Invaded</u> : roadside near warehouse Disturbed Areas ☐ Undisturbed Areas ☐		
	5. <u>Historical Status and Rate of Spread in Wisconsin</u> : unknown		
	until 2007.		
	6. <u>Proportion of potential range occupied</u> : < then .1%		
II. Invasive in Similar Climate	1. YES NO		
Zones	Where (include trends): Troublesome in Western States, now		
	spreading in some eastern and midwestern states.		
III. Invasive in Similar Habitat	1. Upland Wetland Dune Prairie Aquatic		
Types	Forest Grassland Bog Fen Swamp Marsh Lake Stream Other: Roadsides, pastures,		
	hayfields, floodplains, ditches, (1).		
IV. Habitat Effected	1. Soil types favored (e.g. sand, silt, clay, or combinations thereof,		
	<u>pH</u>]:		
	2. Conservation significance of threatened habitats: Can shade		
	natural and agricultural areas.		
V. Native Habitat	List countries and native habitat types: Europe and Asia		
VI. Legal Classification	1. <u>Listed by government entities?</u> Yes. Noxious in AK, CA, CO, HI,		
	ID, MT, NV,, NM, UT, WA, WY. Regulated in CT, MA, OR, SD.		
	2. <u>Illegal to sell?</u> YES NO		
B. ESTABLISHMENT POTENTIAL A	Notes: In states where listed		
I. Life History	1. <u>Type of plant</u> : Annual ☐ Biennial ☐ Monocarpic Perennial ☐ Herbaceous Perennial ☑ Vine ☐ Shrub ☐ Tree ☐		
	2. <u>Time to Maturity</u> : Flowers in second year. New rosettes form		
	after seed production. (1).		
	3. <u>Length of Seed Viability</u> :		
	4. Methods of Reproduction: Asexual ⊠ Sexual ⊠		
	Please note abundance of propagules and and other important		
	information: Resprouts from roots up to 10' away. High seed		
	production (6.4 billion seeds/acre) but few seedlings observed in field (2).		
	5. <u>Hybridization potential</u> :		
II. Climate	1. <u>Climate restrictions</u> :		
	2. Effects of potential climate change:		

III. Dispersal Potential	1. <u>Pathways - Please check all that apply:</u> <u>Intentional</u> : Ornamental Forage/Erosion control Medicine/Food: Other:
	Unintentional: Bird ☐ Animal ☐ Vehicles/Human ☐ Wind ☐ Water ☐ Other: Appears to be brought in accidentally with long distance shipping. Can spread by root fragments with tillage, or through movement of infested hay (3).
	2. <u>Distinguishing characteristics that aid in its survival and/or inhibit its control</u> :
IV. Ability to go Undetected	1. HIGH ☑ MEDIUM ☐ LOW ☐ New to WI so very few know what it looks like.
C. DAMAGE POTENTIAL	
I. Competitive Ability	1. Presence of Natural Enemies:
	2. <u>Competition with native species</u> : Highly competative in western states. No info on its impacts in WI.
	3. Rate of Spread: HIGH(1-3 yrs) ☑ MEDIUM (4-6 yrs) ☐ LOW (7-10 yrs) ☐ Notes: Large seed production in second year.
II. Environmental Effects	1. Alteration of ecosystem/community composition? YES NO Notes:
	2. <u>Alteration of ecosystem/community structure?</u> YES NO Notes:
	3. <u>Alteration of ecosystem/community functions and processes?</u> YES NO Notes:
	4. <u>Allelopathic properties?</u> YES NO Notes:
D. SOCIO-ECONOMIC Effects	
I. Positive aspects of the species to the economy/society:	Notes: None.
II. Potential socio-economic effects of restricting use:	Notes: None.
III. Direct and indirect effects:	Notes:
IV. Increased cost to a sector:	Notes: Can be destructive in pastures and alfalfa.
V. Effects on human health:	Notes:
E. CONTROL AND PREVENTION	
I. Costs of Prevention (including education; please be as specific as possible):	Notes: Monitoring and early detection and control are critical. Education of farmers and others will be important.

II. Responsiveness to prevention efforts:	Notes: Good species for monitoring and early detection.
III. Effective Control tactics:	Mechanical 🛛 Biological 🔲 Chemical 🖂
	Times and uses: Carefully timed mowing can reduce seed set, but
	herbicide use in bud to early flowering stage is needed for eradication.
IV. Minimum Effort:	Notes:
V. Costs of Control:	Notes: Control at the one known site in Green Bay is minimal
	now - infestation small.
VI. Cost of prevention or control	Notes: At current stage of invasion, cost of prevention/control is
vs. Cost of allowing invasion to	negligible compared to potential costs of infestation.
occur:	
VII. Non-Target Effects of	Notes: Selective herbicides can be useful.
Control:	
VIII. Efficacy of monitoring:	Notes: Very important.
_	
IX. Legal and landowner issues:	Notes: UWEX Brown co. staff are working with landowners to
	control.

UW Herbarium	
■ WI DNR	
☐ TNC	
☐ Native Plant Conservation Allia	nce

F. REFERENCES USED:

USDA Plants

☐ IPANE

Number	Reference	
1.	University of Wisconsin Extension. Perennial Pepperweed. Mark Renz A3832. 2007.	
2.	Young, J.A., D.E. Palmquiste, and R. Blank. 1998. The ecology and control of perennial pepperweed	
	(<i>Lepidium latifolium</i> L.) Weed Technol. 12:402-405.	
3.	Renz, M.J. 2002. The Biology, Ecology and Control of Perennial Pepperweed (<i>Lepidium latifolium</i> L.)	
	Dissertation Univ. of California, Davis. Pages 129.	
4.	Young, J.A., C.D. Clements, and R.R. Blank. 2002. Herbicide residues and perennial grass on established	
	perennial pepperweed sites. J. Range Manage. 55:194-196.	

Author(s), Draft number, and date completed: Kelly Kearns 9/10/07

Reviewer(s) and date reviewed: Mark Renz

Approved and Completed Date: