ALASKA NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Botanical name: Caragana arborescens Lam.

Common name: Siberian peashrub

Assessors:

Irina Lapina	Matthew L. Carlson, Ph.D.
Botanist	Associate Professor
Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska	Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska
Anchorage,	Anchorage,
707 A Street,	707 A Street,
Anchorage, Alaska 99501	Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 257-2710	(907) 257-2790
Timm Nawrocki	Helen I. Klein
Research Technician	Research Technician
Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska	Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska
Anchorage,	Anchorage,
707 A Street,	707 A Street,
Anchorage, Alaska 99501	Anchorage, Alaska 99501
(907) 257-2798	(907) 257-2798
Lindsey A. Flagstad	
Research Technician	
Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska	
Anchorage,	
707 A Street,	
Anchorage, Alaska 99501	
(907) 257-2786	

Reviewers:

Michael Shephard	Jamie M. Snyder
Vegetation Ecologist	UAF Cooperative Extension Service,
Forest Health Protection, State & Private Forestry,	2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd. #118,
3301 'C' Street, Suite 202,	Anchorage, AK, 99508-4143
Anchorage, AK, 99503	(907) 786-6310
(907) 743-9454	
Jeff Conn, Ph. D.	Gino Graziano
Research Agronomist	Natural Resource Specialist
Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture	Plant Materials Center, Division of Agriculture, Department of
319 O'Neil Building,	Natural Resources, State of Alaska
905 Koyukuk St. – UAF Campus,	5310 S. Bodenburg Spur,
Fairbanks, Alaska 99775	Palmer, Alaska, 99645
(907) 474-7652	(907) 745-4469
Robert L. DeVelice, Ph. D.	Whitney Rapp
Vegetation Ecologist	Katmai, Lake Clark, Alagnak, and Aniakchak Planning,
Chugach National Forest, Forest Service, U.S. Department of	Research Permitting, GIS/GPS, and Invasive Species
Agriculture	National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior
3301 C Street, Suite 300	P.O. Box 7
Anchorage, Alaska 99503	King Salmon, Alaska, 99613
(907) 743-9437	(907) 246-2145
Bonnie M. Million.	
Alaska Exotic Plant Management Team Liaison	
Alaska Regional Office, National Park Service, U.S.	
Department of the Interior	
240 West 5 th Avenue	
Anchorage, Alaska, 99501	
(907) 644-3452	

Date: 3/31/2011

Date of previous ranking, if any: 8/1/2008

OUTCOME SCORE:

CLIMATIC COMPARISON This species is present or may potentially establish in the following eco-geographic regions: Pacific Maritime Yes Interior-Boreal Yes Arctic-Alpine Yes **INVASIVENESS RANKING Total** (total answered points possible¹) Total Ecological impact 40 (40) 29 Biological characteristics and dispersal ability 25 (25) 15 Ecological amplitude and distribution 25 (25) Feasibility of control 10(7)Outcome score 72^a $100 (97)^{t}$ Relative maximum score² 74 ¹ For questions answered "unknown" do not include point value for the question in parentheses for "total answered points possible." ² Calculated as $a/b \times 100$ A. CLIMATIC COMPARISON 1.1. Has this species ever been collected or documented in Alaska? \boxtimes Yes - continue to 1.2 No - continue to 2.1 1.2. From which eco-geographic region has it been collected or documented (see inset map)? Proceed to Section B. INVASIVNESS RANKING Pacific Maritime Pacific Maritime ☐ Interior-Boreal ☐ Interior-Boreal Arctic-Alpine Arctic-Alpine Collection Site Documentation: Caragana arborescens has been documented from all three ecogeographic regions of Alaska (AKEPIC 2011, UAM 2011). 2.1. Is there a 40 percent or higher similarity (based on CLIMEX climate matching, see references) between climates where this species currently occurs and: a. Juneau (Pacific Maritime region)? Yes – record locations and percent similarity; proceed to Section B. \neg No b. Fairbanks (Interior-Boreal region)? Yes – record locations and percent similarity; proceed to Section B. No c. Nome (Arctic-Alpine region)? Yes – record locations and percent similarity; proceed to Section B.

If "No" is answered for all regions; reject species from consideration

Documentation:

B. INVASIVENESS RANKING

1. Ecological Impact

- 1.1. Impact on Natural Ecosystem Processes
 - No perceivable impact on ecosystem processes 0 Has the potential to influence ecosystem processes to a minor degree (e.g., has a b. 3
 - perceivable but mild influence on soil nutrient availability)
 - 7 Has the potential to cause significant alteration of ecosystem processes (e.g., c. increases sedimentation rates along streams or coastlines, degrades habitat important to waterfowl)
 - Has the potential to cause major, possibly irreversible, alteration or disruption 10 d. of ecosystem processes (e.g., the species alters geomorphology, hydrology, or affects fire frequency thereby altering community composition; species fixes substantial levels of nitrogen in the soil making soil unlikely to support certain
 - native plants or more likely to favor non-native species) Unknown e. Score

Documentation: Once established, Caragana arborescens decreases light availability and inhibits the regeneration of native trees and shrubs by forming dense thickets (Lapina pers. obs., Baranova pers. comm.). Roots are associated with bacteria that fix atmospheric nitrogen; thus, infestations significantly increase the availability of nitrogen in the soil (Henderson and Chapman 2006, Plants for a Future 2011). Recent increases in density in the interior-boreal ecogeographic region suggest greater impact on ecosystem processes, further studies are needed to verify.

- 1.2. Impact on Natural Community Structure
 - No perceived impact; establishes in an existing layer without influencing its 0 structure
 - b. Has the potential to influence structure in one layer (e.g., changes the density of 3 one layer)
 - Has the potential to cause significant impact in at least one layer (e.g., creation 7 c. of a new layer or elimination of an existing layer)
 - Likely to cause major alteration of structure (e.g., covers canopy, eliminating 10 d. most or all lower layers)
 - U Unknown e.

Score

8

Documentation: In several locations in south central and interior Alaska, *Caragana arborescens* has formed dense shrub layers in open meadows or forest edges (Carlson pers. obs., Conn pers. obs., Guritz 2008, Lapina pers. obs.). This species reduces the density of underlying graminoid layers (Zolotukhin 1980).

1.3. Impact on Natural Community Composition

community)

- No perceived impact; causes no apparent change in native populations 0 Has the potential to influence community composition (e.g., reduces the 3
- population size of one or more native species in the community) Has the potential to significantly alter community composition (e.g., 7 c. significantly reduces the population size of one or more native species in the

and/or shifting the community composition towards exotic species) e. Unknown Documentation: Caragana arborescens appears to significantly reduce populations and grasses in mixed birch-spruce forests in western Russia, where it is (Zolotukhin 1980, Baranova pers. comm.). It can replace native shrubs in the deciduous forests in Canada (Henderson and Chapman 2006). 1.4. Impact on associated trophic levels (cumulative impact of this species on microbes, and other organisms in the community it invades) a. Negligible perceived impact b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor reduce nesting or foraging sites) c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moder in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introduce components such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations of extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or populations.	Score [pulations of native t is non-native ne understories of on the animals, ful eduction in erate reduction duces injurious
shrubs and grasses in mixed birch-spruce forests in western Russia, where it is (Zolotukhin 1980, Baranova pers. comm.). It can replace native shrubs in the deciduous forests in Canada (Henderson and Chapman 2006). 1.4. Impact on associated trophic levels (cumulative impact of this species on microbes, and other organisms in the community it invades) a. Negligible perceived impact b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor redensing or foraging sites) c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moder in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introduction components such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations of extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or populations.	t is non-native ne understories of on the animals, further duction in the erate reduction duces injurious
shrubs and grasses in mixed birch-spruce forests in western Russia, where it is (Zolotukhin 1980, Baranova pers. comm.). It can replace native shrubs in the deciduous forests in Canada (Henderson and Chapman 2006). 1.4. Impact on associated trophic levels (cumulative impact of this species on microbes, and other organisms in the community it invades) a. Negligible perceived impact b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor red nesting or foraging sites) c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moder in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introducomponents such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations of extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or populations.	t is non-native ne understories of on the animals, further duction in the erate reduction duces injurious
 deciduous forests in Canada (Henderson and Chapman 2006). 1.4. Impact on associated trophic levels (cumulative impact of this species on microbes, and other organisms in the community it invades) a. Negligible perceived impact b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor rednesting or foraging sites) c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moder in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introductomponents such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations of extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or populations. 	on the animals, fur eduction in erate reduction duces injurious
 microbes, and other organisms in the community it invades) a. Negligible perceived impact b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor rednesting or foraging sites) c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moder in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introduction components such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations of extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or populations. 	eduction in erate reduction duces injurious
 a. Negligible perceived impact b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor rednesting or foraging sites) c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moder in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introducomponents such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or population. 	erate reduction duces injurious
 b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor red nesting or foraging sites) c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moder in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introdu components such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or popula 	erate reduction duces injurious
 in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introduced components such as spines, toxins) d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or populations. 	luces injurious
d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations (extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or population).	
significant reduction in nesting or foraging sites)	
e. Unknown	
	Score
provides a food source for many animals, including grasshoppers, birds, and defenders and Chapman 2006). It also provides cover for wildlife (Graham	
	Total Possible
	Total
	Total
ological Characteristics and Dispersal Ability	
ological Characteristics and Dispersal Ability 2.1. Mode of reproduction	
 2.1. Mode of reproduction a. Not aggressive (produces few seeds per plant [0-10/m²] and not ablareproduce vegetatively). 	ble to
 2.1. Mode of reproduction a. Not aggressive (produces few seeds per plant [0-10/m²] and not ablareproduce vegetatively). b. Somewhat aggressive (reproduces by seed only [11-1,000/m²]) 	
 2.1. Mode of reproduction a. Not aggressive (produces few seeds per plant [0-10/m²] and not ablareproduce vegetatively). b. Somewhat aggressive (reproduces by seed only [11-1,000/m²]) c. Moderately aggressive (reproduces vegetatively and/or by a moder of seed [<1,000/m²]) 	erate amount
 2.1. Mode of reproduction a. Not aggressive (produces few seeds per plant [0-10/m²] and not ablareproduce vegetatively). b. Somewhat aggressive (reproduces by seed only [11-1,000/m²]) c. Moderately aggressive (reproduces vegetatively and/or by a moder of seed [<1,000/m²]) d. Highly aggressive (extensive vegetative spread and/or many seeded [>1,000/m²]) 	erate amount
 2.1. Mode of reproduction a. Not aggressive (produces few seeds per plant [0-10/m²] and not ablareproduce vegetatively). b. Somewhat aggressive (reproduces by seed only [11-1,000/m²]) c. Moderately aggressive (reproduces vegetatively and/or by a moder of seed [<1,000/m²]) d. Highly aggressive (extensive vegetative spread and/or many seeded) 	erate amount

relatively unimportant for the expansion of populations compared to sexual reproduction, and

populations in Alberta, Canada, included large numbers of seedlings and immature plants (Henderson and Chapman 2006).

2.2.	Inna	te potential for long-distance dispersal (wind-, water- or animal-dispersal)		
	a.	Does not occur (no long-distance dispersal mechanisms)		0
	b.	Infrequent or inefficient long-distance dispersal (occurs occasionally desp	ite	2
		lack of adaptations)		
	c.	Numerous opportunities for long-distance dispersal (species has adaptation	ns	3
		such as pappus, hooked fruit coats, etc.)		
	d.	Unknown		U
	u.	Chriown	Score	0
			Score	U
Doc	nimai	ntation: Pods open forcefully, dispersing seeds short distances from the par	rant nlant	C
		a Plant Life 2010).	ent plant	.5
(IVIC	mana	a Fidult Effe 2010).		
2 3	Pote	ntial to be spread by human activities (both directly and indirectly – possib	10	
		sms include: commercial sale of species, use as forage or for revegetation, o		
		ghways, transport on boats, common contaminant of landscape materials, e	-	
aioi	a.	Does not occur	(C.).	0
	b.	Low (human dispersal is infrequent or inefficient)		1
	C.	Moderate (human dispersal occurs regularly)		2
	d.	High (there are numerous opportunities for dispersal to new areas)		3
	e.	Unknown	_	U
			Score	2
Doc	nime	ntation: Caragana arborescens is cultivated in Alaska and Yukon (Welsh	1974) It	
		from cultivation (Henderson and Chapman 2006, AKEPIC 2011, UAM 201		
	_	sold in nurseries (Duke 1983, I. Lapina – pers. obs., WDNR 2003).	1), 1015	
Cuii	Circij	sold in harsenes (Bake 1905, ii Bapina persi oosi, ii Birit 2005).		
2.4.	Allel	opathic		
	a.	No		0
	b.	Yes		2
	c.	Unknown		Ū
	С.	Chalown	Score	2
			Score	
Dog	um o	ntation: Leachates from <i>Caragana arborescens</i> have been shown to inhibit	the group	#h
		ination: Leachates from Caragana arborescens have been shown to himble ination of Elymus repens (Zolotukhin 1980).	. the grow	vuii
and	germ	ination of Etymus repens (Zolotukinii 1980).		
2 5	Com	petitive ability		
4. J.	a.	Poor competitor for limiting factors		0
	a. b.	Moderately competitive for limiting factors		
		, ,		1 3
	C.	Highly competitive for limiting factors and/or able to fix nitrogen		
	d.	Unknown		U
			Score	3

Documentation: *Caragana arborescens* is extremely well-suited for growth in most of Alaska (HDR Alaska 2009). Roots are associated with bacteria that fix atmospheric nitrogen (Henderson and Chapman 2006, Plants for a Future 2011).

2.6. Forms dense thickets, has a climbing or smothering growth habit, or is otherwally a support of the support	vise taller than
the surrounding vegetation. a. Does not grow densely or above surrounding vegetation	0
b. Forms dense thickets	1
c. Has a climbing or smothering growth habit, or is otherwise taller than the surrounding vegetation	
d. Unknown	U
	Score 2
Documentation: <i>Caragana arborescens</i> can grow up to 4.5 m tall (Klinkenberg 2 forms dense, impenetrable thickets (Lapina pers. obs.).	010), and it
2.7. Germination requirements	
a. Requires sparsely vegetated soil and disturbance to germinate	0
b. Can germinate in vegetated areas, but in a narrow range of or in special conditions	2
c. Can germinate in existing vegetation in a wide range of conditions	3
d. Unknown	Score U
the edges of aspen and birch stands (Viereck and Little 2007). This species has spunderstories of deciduous forests in Alberta, Canada, where it competes with nativ (Henderson and Chapman 2006).	
2.8. Other species in the genus invasive in Alaska or elsewhere	
a. No	0
b. Yes c. Unknown	3 U
C. Ulikilowii	Score 0
Documentation: No other <i>Caragana</i> species are known to occur as non-native we 2011).	eeds (USDA
2.9. Aquatic, wetland, or riparian species	
a. Not invasive in wetland communities	0
b. Invasive in riparian communities	1
c. Invasive in wetland communitiesd. Unknown	3 U
u. Ulikliowii	Score 1
	Score 1
Documentation: Caragana arborescens has been documented growing on a streat Alaska (UAM 2011).	m gravel bar in

3. Ecological A	Amplitude and Distribution	
	he species highly domesticated or a weed of agriculture?	
a.	Is not associated with agriculture	0
b.	Is occasionally an agricultural pest	2
c.	Has been grown deliberately, bred, or is known as a significant agricultural pe	
d.	Unknown	U
	Sec	ore 4
erosion Klinker windbre	entation: Caragana arborescens was introduced to Europe and North America frontrol and as an ornamental plant for hedges (Henderson and Chapman 2006, aberg 2010). It is widely planted in the U.S. and Canada, including Alaska, for eaks, hedges, and outdoor screening (Welsh 1974, Duke 1983, Henderson and Chapman arctic regions, it is a supplementary fodder for reindeer herds (Duke 1983).	
3.2. Kn	own level of ecological impact in natural areas	
a.	Not known to impact other natural areas	0
b.	Known to impact other natural areas, but in habitats and climate zones	1
	dissimilar to those in Alaska	
c.	Known to cause low impact in natural areas in habitats and climate zones similar to those in Alaska	3
d.	Known to cause moderate impact in natural areas in habitat and climate zones	4
a.	similar to those in Alaska	·
e.	Known to cause high impact in natural areas in habitat and climate zones	6
	similar to those in Alaska	
f.	Unknown	U
	Sec	ore 5
Midwes region of adjacen	entation: Caragana arborescens invades grasslands and woodland edges in the stern U.S. (MNDNR 2011). It also invades forests in the Interior-Boreal ecogeogof western Russia (Lapina pers. obs.). A population of approximately 50 plants in t forest and increased to approximately 60,000 plants over the course of 75 years, Canada (Henderson and Chapman 2006).	nvaded ar
3.3. Roi a. b.	le of anthropogenic and natural disturbance in establishment Requires anthropogenic disturbance to establish May occasionally establish in undisturbed areas, readily establishes in naturall disturbed areas	0 ly 3

Documentation: Most recorded infestations of *Caragana arborescens* in Alaska are associated with anthropogenically disturbed areas. However, this species has also been documented from a naturally disturbed stream gravel bar (UAM 2011), and it has been found establishing in forested areas with no perceivable human or natural disturbances (Lapina pers. obs.). It has spread into the understories of deciduous forests in Alberta, Canada, where it competes with native shrubs (Henderson and Chapman 2006).

Can establish independently of natural or anthropogenic disturbances

5

U

Score

3.4. Current global distribution

Unknown

c.

e.

a.	Occurs in one or two continents or regions (e.g., Mediterranean region)		(
b.	Extends over three or more continents		3
c.	Extends over three or more continents, including successful introductions arctic or subarctic regions	in	4
e.	Unknown		J
		Score	5
(eFloras (Hender	Pentation: Caragana arborescens is native to Siberia, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, 2008, Klinkenberg 2010). It has been introduced to Europe and North Ame son and Chapman 2006). It grows as far north in Norway as 68.5°N (Vasculum Trondheim 2011).	erica	na
	ent of the species' U.S. range and/or occurrence of formal state or provincia	l listing	
a.	Occurs in 0-5 percent of the states		(
b.	Occurs in 6-20 percent of the states Occurs in 21-50 percent of the states and/or listed as a problem weed (e.g.		2
c.	"Noxious," or "Invasive") in one state or Canadian province	,	2
d.	Occurs in more than 50 percent of the states and/or listed as a problem we	ed in	4
	two or more states or Canadian provinces		
e.	Unknown	_	J
		Score	4
(USDA		nces of	
(USDA	2011). It is not considered a noxious weed in any states of the U.S. or proving		
(USDA Canada.	2011). It is not considered a noxious weed in any states of the U.S. or proving Total P	ossible	i i
asibility 4.1. Seed a. b. c. e.	2011). It is not considered a noxious weed in any states of the U.S. or proving Total P of Control d banks Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer	Possible Total	Ţ
asibility 4.1. Seed a. b. c. e.	Total P of Control d banks Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer Unknown entation: The amount of time seeds remain viable in the soil is unknown.	Possible Total	Ţ
asibility 4.1. Seed a. b. c. e.	Total P of Control d banks Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer Unknown	Possible Total	i I
asibility 4.1. Seed a. b. c. e.	Total P of Control d banks Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer Unknown entation: The amount of time seeds remain viable in the soil is unknown.	Possible Total	U
asibility 4.1. Seed a. b. c. e. Docume 4.2. Veg a. b. c.	Total P of Control d banks Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer Unknown entation: The amount of time seeds remain viable in the soil is unknown. etative regeneration No resprouting following removal of aboveground growth Resprouting from ground-level meristems Resprouting from extensive underground system	Possible Total	U T
asibility 4.1. Seed a. b. c. e. Docume 4.2. Veg a. b. c. d.	Total P of Control d banks Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer Unknown entation: The amount of time seeds remain viable in the soil is unknown. etative regeneration No resprouting following removal of aboveground growth Resprouting from ground-level meristems Resprouting from extensive underground system Any plant part is a viable propagule	Possible Total	()
asibility 4.1. Seed a. b. c. e. Docume 4.2. Veg a. b. c.	Total P of Control d banks Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer Unknown entation: The amount of time seeds remain viable in the soil is unknown. etative regeneration No resprouting following removal of aboveground growth Resprouting from ground-level meristems Resprouting from extensive underground system	Possible Total	U T

Documentation: *Caragana arborescens* can produce new shoots from the root crowns (Henderson and Chapman 2006).

1 2	7 1	-	· cc ·	. ,
43	I evel	Ωt	ettort	required
1.5.	Levei	v_{j}	$c_{jj}ori$	required

- a. Management is not required (e.g., species does not persist in the absence of repeated anthropogenic disturbance)
 b. Management is relatively easy and inexpensive; requires a minor investment of human and financial resources
 c. Management requires a major short-term or moderate long-term investment of human and financial resources
 d. Management requires a major long-term investment of human and financial
 4
- d. Management requires a major, long-term investment of human and financial resources

e. Unknown

Documentation: *Caragana arborescens* can be weakened by repeated prescribed burning. Glyphosate or triclopyr applied to cut stumps provide effective control. Spraying basal bark with triclopyr is also effective (MNDNR 2011). In natural areas, control efforts may need to be repeated for up to ten years (Henderson and Chapman 2006).

Total Possible	7
Total	5

Score

Total for four sections possible

Total for four sections

72

References:

AKEPIC database. Alaska Exotic Plant Information Clearinghouse Database. 2011. Available: http://akweeds.uaa.alaska.edu/ Baranova O., Botanist, Udmurt State University, 1 Universitetskay, Izhevsk, Russia. Tel: 011-7-3412-755-772 – pers. comm.

Carlson, M., Associate Professor, Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska Anchorage, 707 A Street, Anchorage, Alaska. Tel: (907) 257-2790 – pers. obs.

- Conn, J. Weed Scientist, USDA Agricultural Research Service P.O. Box 757200 Fairbanks, Alaska 99775 tel: (907) 474-7652; fax (907) 474-6184. Pers. obs.
- Duke, J. 1983. Handbook of energy crops. Unpublished. Center for New Crops and Plants Products, Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, Purdue University. West Lafayette, IN. [June 8, 2004] http://www.hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/default.html
- eFloras. 2008. Published on the Internet http://www.efloras.org [accessed 31 March 2011]. Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis, MO & Harvard University Herbaria, Cambridge, MA.
- Guritz, J. 2008. Survey and mapping of 14 invasive and exotic plants on the University of Alaska Fairbanks Campus. Cooperative Extension Service, University of Alaska Fairbanks. 35 p.
- Graham, E. 1941. Legumes for erosion control and wildlife. Miscellaneous Publication No. 412. Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Washington, D.C. 153 p.
- HDR Alaska. 2009. *Caragana arborescens* Siberian Peashrub 2050 Future Predicted Range. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior. 1 page map. [31 March 2011] http://alaska.fws.gov/
- Henderson, D., and R. Chapman. 2006. *Caragana arborescens* Invasion in Elk Island National Park, Canada. Natural Areas Journal. 26(3). 261-266 p.
- Invaders Database System. 2011. University of Montana. Missoula, MT. http://invader.dbs.umt.edu/
- Klinkenberg, B. (Editor). 2010. Caragana arborescens Lam. In: E-Flora BC: Electronic Atlas of the Plants of British Columbia. Lab for Advanced Spatial Analysis, Department of Geography, University of British Columbia. Vancouver, BC. [31 March 2011] Available: http://www.geog.ubc.ca/biodiversity/eflora/index.shtml

Lapina, I., Botanist, Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska Anchorage, 707 A Street, Anchorage, Alaska. Tel: (907) 257-2710 – pers. obs.

MNDNR. 2011. Siberian peashrub (*Caragana arborescens*). Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. [31 March 2011] http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/invasives/terrestrialplants/woody/siberianpeashrub.html

Montana Plant Life. 2010. Siberian Pea-shrub. Caragana arborescens Lam. [31 March 2011] http://montana.plant-life.org/

Plants for a Future. 2011. [31 March 2011] Available: http://www.pfaf.org/user/default.aspx

UAM. 2011. University of Alaska Museum, University of Alaska Fairbanks. Available: http://arctos.database.museum/home.cfm

USDA. 2011. The PLANTS Database. National Plant Data Center, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Baton Rouge, LA. http://plants.usda.gov

Vascular Plant Herbarium, Trondheim. 2011. Accessed through GBIF (Global Biodiversity Information Facility) data portal (http://data.gbif.org/datasets/resource/7978, 2011-03-31). Natural History Museum, University of Oslo. Trondheim, Norway.

Viereck, L. and E. Little. 2007. Alaska trees and shrubs. Second Ed. University of Alaska Press. Fairbanks, Alaska. 359 p.

Welsh, S. 1974. Anderson's Flora of Alaska and Adjacent Parts of Canada. Brigham Young University Press. Provo, UT. 724 p.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources: abstract. Non-native plants, 2003. http://www.dnr.state.wi.us.

Zolotukhin, A. 1980. Allelopathic effect of shrubs used in steppe forestation on couch grass, Agropyron repens. Ekologiya. 11(4). 13-17 p. (Russian with English abstract).