

NAME OF SPECIES: *Lonicera tatarica* L. (1).

Synonyms: *Lonicera tatarica* L. f. *albiflora* (DC.) House, *Lonicera tatarica* L. var. *xanthocarpa* Endl., *Xylosteum tataricum* (L.) Medik. (1)

Common Name: Tatarian honeysuckle, bush honeysuckle (1) (2)

A. CURRENT STATUS AND DISTRIBUTION

I. In Wisconsin?

1. YES NO

2. Abundance: There are 154 documented occurrences in WI; however this species is extremely underreported. (1)

3. Geographic Range: 43 counties are recorded as having this species present, however there are counties showing no recorded occurrences which are known have this species. (1)

4. Habitat Invaded: Old fields, edges of woods, woodlands that have had past disturbances such as logging or grazing, roadsides and fence lines, prairies, grasslands, and open woodlands. Also lacustrine, riparian, mesic woods, northern hardwood forests, oak woodlands, floodplain forests, and shrub fens. (1), (4), (5).
Disturbed Areas Undisturbed Areas

5. Historical Status and Rate of Spread in Wisconsin: First documented in 1885 in Dane county (1), and probably is present in every county in the state.

6. Proportion of potential range occupied: Anecdotal evidence suggests that *L. tatarica* is found throughout WI and that most upland communities, except for undisturbed interior forests, provide ideal habitat for this species. In areas with limited intentional planting, i.e. more rural and more northern parts of the state, this species is just beginning to spread. In southern and urban parts of WI, with substantial pools of landscape plantings, some adjacent natural areas are completely dominated by this species.

II. Invasive in Similar Climate Zones

1. YES NO

Where (include trends): Found in the eastern 2/3 of Canada, and northern 2/3 of the US (8). Found in mesic Sugar Maple and Red Maple forests in VT and MA (5).

III. Invasive in Similar Habitat Types

1. Upland Wetland Dune Prairie Aquatic

Forest Grassland Bog Fen Swamp

Marsh Lake Stream Other: Forest edges, stream banks, lakeshores, old fields, savannas (4) (5). Typically they can be found in along the transition between mesic hardwood deciduous remnants and disturbed open lands such as old farm fields or pastures (7)

IV. Habitat Effected

1. Soil types favored (e.g. sand, silt, clay, or combinations thereof, pH): *L. tatarica* grows in a wide variety of soils including medium-fertility, acid, clayey, loamy and sandy soils and tolerates poor to moderately well-drained, non-calcareous to limey, and low nutrient availability soils with a lower pH limit of 5.0. However *L. tatarica* does not tolerate salt well. (4) (5)

2. Conservation significance of threatened habitats: Some of the Savanna and Barrens communities in WI under threat from this species are ranked G1- G2 and S1- S2. Some of the Upland Herbaceous communities in WI under threat from this species are ranked G2 - G3 and S1 - S3. (9).

V. Native Habitat

1. List countries and native habitat types: *L. tatarica* is native in Eurasia, spreading from eastern Europe to western Asia including Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and western China, and occurs on a wide variety of soil types, including dry, relatively cool semi-desert habitats (3) (4) (5).

VI. Legal Classification

1. Listed by government entities? Connecticut - Potentially invasive, banned; Massachusetts - Prohibited; New Hampshire - Prohibited invasive species; Vermont - Class B noxious weed (2).

2. Illegal to sell? YES NO

Notes: Currently illegal to sell in Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont; and Massachusetts in 2009 (2). However it is routinely available commercially in other states and on the internet (2). The issue of cultivars was addressed by the Mass. Dept. of Agricultural resources regarding the sales ban of some invasive species. Their findings: There are two significant challenges in determining what cultivars are not

invasive: 1. There is currently no set of protocols by which to evaluate the lack of invasiveness of a particular cultivar. 2. The processes by which cultivars are identified and labeled in the marketplace is not managed sufficiently to ensure that plants that are labeled as a particular cultivar are indeed that cultivar. (10)

B. ESTABLISHMENT POTENTIAL AND LIFE HISTORY TRAITS

I. Life History

1. Type of plant: Annual Biennial Monocarpic Perennial
Herbaceous Perennial Vine Shrub Tree

2. Time to Maturity: Not Available; however the reproductive age for the hybrid L. X bella is between 3 to 8 years of age (5).

3. Length of Seed Viability: One study found 12-year-old Tatarian honeysuckle seed to be still viable (5).

4. Methods of Reproduction: Asexual Sexual

Please note abundance of propagules and other important information: Not well researched, but some bush honeysuckles have been found to produce seeds in the 10,000's of thousands per plant (5). Seed production of non-native Lonicera in the United States is equivalent or greater than in their native ranges in Asia due to horticultural breeding or hybridization (7). Research on asexual reproduction for the bush honeysuckles is sparse. In the commercial trade greenwood and hardwood cuttings are used to propagate stocks of bush honeysuckles (4).

5. Hybridization potential: L. tatarica and L. morrowii have produced a hybrid L. x bella which is a vigorous invasive shrub in WI (1). In addition to Bell's honeysuckle other hybrids have been developed between L. tatarica and other species of honeysuckles and some have been found in WI (1) (5).

II. Climate

1. Climate restrictions: L. tartarica is adapted to USDA zones 3 (or even 2) -8. (5)

2. Effects of potential climate change: NA

III. Dispersal Potential

1. Pathways - Please check all that apply:

Intentional: Ornamental Forage/Erosion control Medicine/Food:
Other: L. tatarica was first introduced to the US in 1752, and numerous times since (7). There are at least 14 known cultivars of L. tatarica available for ornamental planting (5). It has been used as a windbreak, shelterbelt, or hedge species, as well for range restoration, soil stabilization, streambank reclamation, and for strip mine site reclamation(4) (5). From the 1960's through 1984 the USDA Soil Conservation Service (now NRCS) was recommending this species for planting. (5) (7)

Unintentional: Bird Animal Vehicles/Human

Wind Water Other:

2. Distinguishing characteristics that aid in its survival and/or inhibit its control: These include high seed and biomass productivity, effective seed dispersal, extended growth period and absence of natural controls (7). Bush honeysuckles have the advantage of longer leaf life span which is usually 4 weeks longer than native shrub species. One WI study comparing the carbon gain of L. x bella and Cornus racemosa found the L. x bella made 47% of its carbon gain during the 4 weeks of the year when it had leaves and C. racemosa did not. On average the bush honeysuckles leaf out 2 weeks before native shrubs and retain their leaves at least 2 weeks longer than native shrubs. The dispersal of seeds by birds is prolific and extremely difficult to control. (4) (5) The ability of these species to sprout from root crowns gives the plants an advantage during mechanical management (5).

IV. Ability to go Undetected

1. HIGH MEDIUM LOW

C. DAMAGE POTENTIAL

I. Competitive Ability

1. Presence of Natural Enemies: A non-native aphid, *Hyadaphis tataricae*, feeds on bush honeysuckles causing lowered plant vigor and may prevent flowering and fruit development. According to the USGS this insect species is still expanding its range so it may be of some control value in the future. (5)

2. Competition with native species: Forest regeneration following disturbance can be severely impeded by this species. In a study in New England, the *L. tatarica*-*L. morrowii*-*L. X bella* complex reduced the richness and cover of herb communities and the establishment of new seedlings. Seedlings that predate *L. tatarica* establishment were more tolerant of its presence. Annual herbs were entirely suppressed (4). Competition, especially for light, is the most commonly described means by which bush honeysuckles effect native plants (5).

3. Rate of Spread:

HIGH(1-3 yrs) MEDIUM (4-6 yrs) LOW (7-10 yrs)

Notes:

II. Environmental Effects

1. Alteration of ecosystem/community composition?

YES NO

Notes: In a study of an invasion of bush honeysuckles in 3 sugar maple-dominated stands in Vermont, plus a red maple-dominated forest in northwestern Massachusetts, it was found that tree seedling (<1 m tall) density declined significantly ($p < 0.01$) with increasing honeysuckle cover. Average seedling density at all sites was $>5 \text{ m}^{-2}$ where honeysuckle was not present, but was $<1 \text{ m}^{-2}$ when honeysuckle cover was $>90\%$. Herb species richness and herbaceous cover both declined significantly ($p < 0.05$) with increasing honeysuckle cover. Some evidence indicates that where native shrubs and invasive bush honeysuckles co-occur, bush honeysuckles may be stronger competitors. (5)

2. Alteration of ecosystem/community structure?

YES NO

Notes: In many U.S. forests, previously open understories are now near-impenetrable masses of *Lonicera tatarica*, or the hybrid cross of *L. tartarica* and *Lonicera morrowi*, *Lonicera x bella* (8). Where native shrubs and invasive bush honeysuckles co-occur, bush honeysuckles may be creating different nesting habitat for birds with effects on nest production. In northern Illinois, nests built in Amur honeysuckle had significantly ($p < 0.001$) higher daily nest mortality rate compared with nests built in native species. Reasons offered for increased nest predation in Amur honeysuckle included lower nest height (compared with many native shrubs and trees), absence of sharp thorns (compared with native hawthorns (*Crataegus* spp.)), and branch architecture that may facilitate predator (e.g. raccoon) movement. Unfortunately, Amur honeysuckle may provide more attractive nest sites due to its early leaf flush and sturdy branches. In fact, American robins significantly ($r^2 = 0.912$, $p < 0.01$) increased their use of Amur honeysuckle over the 6-year study period. (5)

3. Alteration of ecosystem/community functions and processes?

YES NO

Notes: Reduction of light availability for ground flora and seedlings. In a studies of the effects of the understory dominance by bush honeysuckles could ultimately alter successional patterns in forests by limiting the richness, density and frequency of native ground flora and tree seedlings (4)(5)(7). There are also suggestions that bush honeysuckle invasion could have ecosystem level effects. Net primary production of dense open-grown Amur honeysuckle thickets (up to $1350 \text{ g m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in northern Kentucky) may have large impacts on carbon and nutrient budgets of invaded sites (5)

4. Allelopathic properties? YES NO

Notes: Some sources indicate that this is suspected in the bush honeysuckles (11), but all the research to date has been on *L. maackii* (7) (14).

D. SOCIO-ECONOMIC Effects

I. Positive aspects of the species to the economy/society:	Notes: A popular landscaping plant due to the flower, fruits, smells, and low effort to grow (4). Currently available for sale by nurseries and Conservation Districts around the US. A simple Internet search for any of the bush honeysuckles brings up the websites of a number of nurseries and Conservation Districts in WA and OR that sell these species for ornamental and wildlife uses.
II. Potential socio-economic effects of restricting use:	Notes: Because of the species popularity the horticultural industry has significantly invested in developing and maintaining stocks of this plant. A proven invasive, formerly a popular landscape shrub. Its popularity has waned since the appearance of the honeysuckle witches' broom aphid. The cultivar 'Arnold Red' is listed as being grown by 9 wholesale nurseries in the 2006 Wisconsin Nursery Association's Wholesale Source Book.
III. Direct and indirect effects :	Notes: Suppression of tree seedlings and alteration of forest regeneration would have effects on the forestry industry (4) (5). Effects on forest understory vegetation and on bird survival could have negative effects on outdoor recreation and bird watching. A study in NY found that some birds with yellow in their coloring that had been fed <i>L. morrowii</i> berries had the yellow colored feathers change to orange. This could have effects on bird social behavior (mate selection) (12).
IV. Increased cost to a sector:	Notes: The costs to the horticultural industry would be that of replacing a popular ornamental with non-invasive alternatives, developing those as nursery stocks and educating the public about them. The forestry industry would bear the costs of honeysuckle inventory, mapping, control and mapping. They would also bear the costs in terms of lowered productivity.
V. Effects on human health:	Notes: Possibly some bush honeysuckle fruits are toxic, but this is not confirmed (13).

E. CONTROL AND PREVENTION

I. Costs of Prevention (including education; please be as specific as possible):	Notes: NA
II. Responsiveness to prevention efforts:	Notes: In northern and rural parts of WI where there is a second home growth occurring, preventing the use of invasive bush honeysuckles in landscape plantings will slow the spread into surrounding forests and natural areas. This would provide land managers an opportunity to control current infestations. In southern WI some infestations of bush honeysuckles are well beyond the control phase.
III. Effective Control tactics:	Mechanical <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological <input type="checkbox"/> Chemical <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Times and uses: The most effective and least damaging method is the cut-stump method where honeysuckle shrubs are cut and the stumps painted with herbicide, usually in fall. This needs to be followed by monitoring and foliar spraying of seedlings. Usually for 3 or more years. Ripping out of plants is effective but labor intensive. Also, the resulting soil disturbance creates more habitat for invasives to return or move in too. Rx fire in prairies and savannas can be used, however there needs to be enough fine fuels in the understory to carry flames. In addition, fire needs to be used repeatedly to be effective in setting back the sprouting from root crowns. Quickly repeating fires may have a negative impact on native species. (4) (5).
IV. Minimum Effort:	Notes: Cutting and stump treating larger individuals along with foliar spraying of seedlings, followed by several follow-up years of surveying for seedlings is the minimum effort required to control an infestation. Depending on the size of the infestation the original treatment could be a very costly and time consuming effort. (4) (5)
V. Costs of Control:	Notes: Control cost approximately \$500-\$700 /acre in forested sites in Southern WI(15). The Ottawa National Forest in the UP of Michigan spent \$230/acre to treat a

VI. Cost of prevention or control vs. Cost of allowing invasion to occur:	dense patch of bush honeysuckle (16). Notes: NA
VII. Non-Target Effects of Control:	Notes: Depending on the time of year that herbicides are used there can be some non-target injury. Because of the early leaf-on and late leaf-off of the non-native bush honeysuckles this can be somewhat avoided. (4) (5)
VIII. Efficacy of monitoring:	Notes: Because it is easy to identify this plant, monitoring natural areas and removing it as soon as the initial plant shows up is easy. This is the most efficient and least expensive way to control bush honeysuckle spread. (4) (5)
IX. Legal and landowner issues:	Notes: This species is a widely planted and popular ornamental (4). As this species may occur on some private land, some access issues will arise and cooperation with landowners for management will be necessary (8).

F. REFERENCES USED:

- UW Herbarium
- WI DNR
- TNC
- Native Plant Conservation Alliance
- IPANE
- USDA Plants

- | Number | Reference |
|--------|--|
| 1 | Wisconsin State Herbarium. 2007. WISFLORA: Wisconsin Vascular Plant Species (http://www.botany.wisc.edu/wisflora/). Dept. Botany, Univ. Wisconsin, Madison, WI 5370 |
| 2 | USDA, NRCS. 2007. The PLANTS Database (http://plants.usda.gov , 28 February 2007). National Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70874-4490 USA |
| 3 | USDA, ARS, National Genetic Resources Program. Germplasm Resources Information Network [Online Database]. National Germplasm Resources Laboratory, Beltsville, Maryland. URL: http://grin.gov/cgi-bin/npgs/html/taxon.pl?22644 (17 March 2007) |
| 4 | Batcher, Michael S. and Shelly A. Stiles. 2000. Element Stewardship Abstract for <i>Lonicera n. Maxim</i> (Amur honeysuckle), <i>Lonicera morrowii</i> A. Gray (Morrow's honeysuckle), <i>Lonicera t. honeysuckle</i> , <i>Lonicera x bella</i> Zabel (Bell's honeysuckle), The Bush honeysuckles. The Nature Conservancy. http://tncweeds.ucdavis.edu/esadocs/documnts/loni_sp.pdf |
| 5 | Munger, Gregory T. 2005. <i>Lonicera</i> spp. In: Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Produced by the USDA Forest Service, Fire Sciences Laboratory) (http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/ [2007, February 28]) |
| 6 | WDNR Natural Heritage Inventory Working List. http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/land/er/v |
| 7 | Rich, Roy. Beautiful Species to Hate: Non-native Bush Honeysuckles: Invasive <i>Lonicera</i> species. http://horticulture.coafes.umn.edu/vd/h5015/00papers/rich.htm |
| 8 | NatureServe. 2006. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. NatureServe, Arlington, Virginia. Available http://www.natureserve.org/explorer . (Accessed 11 April 2007) |
| 9 | WDNR Natural Heritage Inventory Working List. http://www.dnr.state.wi.us/org/land/er/v |
| 10 | Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources. 2005. http://www.mass.gov/agr/farmproducts/DAR_Response_Invasives.htm |
| 11 | Tennessee Exotic Pest Plant Council. http://www.tneppc.org/Manual/Bush_Honeysuckles . |
| 12 | Czarapata, Elizabeth J. 2005. Invasive Plants of the Upper Midwest: An Illustrated Guide to Identification and Control. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI. |
| 13 | Produced by the USDA Forest Service, Forest Health Staff, Newtown Square, PA. Invasive Plant Species List. http://www.na.fs.fed.us/fhp/invasive_plants |
| 14 | http://www.ext.vt.edu/departments/envirohort/factsheets/shrubs/amurhon.html |
| 15 | Steve Richter, Director of Conservation, Land Management The Nature Conservancy, Wisconsin. |
| 16 | Ian Shackleford, US Forest Service, Ottawa National Forest. 11 April, 2007. |
| 17 | Ed Hasselkus, UW Emeritus Horticulture Professor. Comments on Invasive Plant Classification |

Author(s), Draft number, and date completed: Mariquita Sheehan, 4th Draft, 11 April 2007

Reviewer(s) and date reviewed: Dean G. Edlin 7-30-07

Approved and Completed Date: Thomas Boos, 9-06-07