NAME OF SPECIES: Rubus phoenicolasius	
Synonyms:	
Common Name: Wineberry, Wine Raspberry, Japanese wineberry	
A. CURRENT STATUS AND DISTRIBUTION	
I. In Wisconsin?	1. YES ☐ NO ☒
	2. Abundance:
	3. Geographic Range:
	4. Habitat Invaded: Disturbed Areas ☐ Undisturbed Areas ☐
	5. Historical Status and Rate of Spread in Wisconsin:
	6. Proportion of potential range occupied:
II. Invasive in Similar Climate Zones	1. YES ☒ NO ☐ Where (include trends): AR, CT, DC, GA, IL, IN, KY, MA, NC, NJ, NY, OH, PA, RI, TN, VA, WV (2)
III. Invasive in Similar Habitat Types	1. Upland ☐ Wetland ☒ Dune ☐ Prairie ☒ Aquatic ☐ Forest ☒ Grassland ☒ Bog ☐ Fen ☐ Swamp ☐ Marsh ☐ Lake ☐ Stream ☒ Other: field, edge of wetlands
IV. Habitat Affected	1. Soil types favored or tolerated: moist to mesic
	2. Conservation significance of threatened habitats: varies
V. Native Habitat	1. List countries and native habitat types: Temperate Asia: Japan, Korea, China (1)
VI. Legal Classification	1. Listed by government entities? CT: potentially invasive, banned; MA: prohibited (2)
	2. Illegal to sell? YES ☒ NO ☐ Notes: CT and MA
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: 2 years
	3. Length of Seed Viability:
	4. Methods of Reproduction: Asexual ☒ Sexual ☒ Notes: Resprouts when cut, tips of canes can root when touching soil.
	5. Hybridization potential: Intentionally crossed with Rubus idaeus, produces yellow fruit (3).
II. Climate	1. Climate restrictions: Prefers moist climate and sunlight (1).
	2. Effects of potential climate change:

III. Dispersal Potential	1. Pathways - Please check all that apply: Unintentional: Bird ☒ Animal ☒ Vehicles/Human ☒ Wind ☐ Water ☐ Other: Intentional: Ornamental ☐ Forage/Erosion control ☐ Medicine/Food ☒ Other:
	2. Distinguishing characteristics that aid in its survival and/or inhibit its control: Grows vigorously and forms thick stands (1).
IV. Ability to go Undetected	1. HIGH ☐ MEDIUM ☒ LOW ☐
C. DAMAGE POTENTIAL	
I. Competitive Ability	1. Presence of Natural Enemies:
	2. Competition with native species: Dense shrub thicket crowds out natives and prevents tree regeneration, very aggressive..
	2. Rate of Spread: -changes in relative dominance over time: -change in acreage over time: 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: Displaces native vegetation (1).
	2. Alteration of ecosystem/community structure? YES ☒ NO ☐ Notes:
	3. Alteration of ecosystem/community functions and processes? YES ☐ NO ☐ Notes:
	4. Allelopathic properties? YES ☐ NO ☐ Notes:
D. SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS	
I. Positive aspects of the species to the economy/society:	Notes: Provides edible fruit similar to a raspberry (1). Used to indicate viruses, such as raspberry yellow spot and wineberry latent virus (1).
II. Potential Socio-Economic Effects of Requiring Controls: Positive: Negative:	Notes: Not wide spread in Wisconsin. Not commercially grown in Wisconsin (4).
III. Direct and indirect Socio-Economic Effects of Plant :	Notes: Where infestations are dense, it limits forest regeneration, pastures and other perennial crops.
IV. Increased Costs to Sectors Caused by the Plant::	Notes:
V. Effects on human health:	Notes: Spines all over the plants make them difficult to move through.

VI. Potential socio-economic effects of restricting use:	Positive: Negative: Unknown
E. CONTROL AND PREVENTION	
I. Costs of Prevention (please be as specific as possible):	Notes:
II. Responsiveness to prevention efforts:	Notes:
III. Effective Control tactics:	Mechanical ☒ Biological ☐ Chemical ☒ Times and uses: In moist conditions, hand pulling or using a spading fork can be effective as long as root and cane pieces are successfully removed (1). Herbicide treatment of triclopyr, metsulfuron-methyl, or non-selective glyphosate should follow mowing or cutting (4)
IV. Minimum Effort:	Notes:
V. Costs of Control:	Notes: Unknown
VI. Cost of prevention or control vs. Cost of allowing invasion to occur:	Notes:
VII. Non-Target Effects of Control:	Notes:
VIII. Efficacy of monitoring:	Notes: Important
IX. Legal and landowner issues:	Notes: Uncontrolled plants will spread to near by lands

F. REFERENCES USED:

☐ UW Herbarium
☒ WI DNR (4)
☐ TNC
☒ Native Plant Conservation Alliance (1)
☐ IPANE
☒ USDA Plants (2)

Number	Reference
3	USDA extension– http://sun.ars-grin.gov/ars/PacWest/Corvallis/ncgr/cool/rub.phoenic.html
4	SAG meeting 9-17-07

Author(s), Draft number, and date completed: Ashlie Kollmansberger

Reviewer(s) and date reviewed: Kelly Kearns, 11 September 2007

Approved and Completed Date: Thomas Boos, 9-11-07