ALASKA NON-NATIVE PLANT INVASIVENESS RANKING FORM

Botanical name: *Prunus padus* L. and *Prunus virginiana* L.
Common name: European bird cherry and chokecherry
Assessors and Reviewers:

Gino Graziano Invasive Plants Instructor UAF Cooperative Extension Service 907-786-6315 gagraziano@alaska.edu	Joni Johnson Invasive Plant and Pesticide Use Coordinator Forest Service Alaska Region State, Private & Tribal Forestry Forest Health Protection 907.650.7466 joni.m.johnson@usda.gov
John Hudson Restoration Biologist Southeast Alaska Watershed Coalition john@sawcak.org 907-419-4677	Tim Stallard Alien Species Control, LLC (907) 347-2214 weeds.free.ak@gmail.com
Justin R. Fulkerson Botanist Alaska Center for Conservation Science University of Alaska Anchorage jrfulkerson@alaska.edu 907-786-6387	

Note: *Prunus padus* and *P. virginia* were ranked separately in 2011 and both had a relative maximum score of 74. In this re-evaluation, both species are ranked as one. From the Assessors perspective, field observers have a difficult time differentiating between the two species and reporting of the species is inconsistent. Both species have similar life history traits and environmental impacts in Alaska. Here, the updated ranking includes the previous ranking information for transparency.

Date: 1/30/2024
Date of previous ranking: 2/16/2011

OUTCOME SCORE:
Outcome score updated ranked January 2024:

A.	**Climatic Comparison**		
	This species is present or may potentially establish in the following eco-geographic regions:	**Yes**	**No**
1	South Coastal	Yes	
2	Interior-Boreal	Yes	
3	Arctic-Alpine	Yes	
	This species is unlikely to establish in any region in Alaska		

B.	**Invasiveness Ranking**	Total (Total Answered*) Possible	Total
1	Ecological impact	40 (40)	31
2	Biological characteristic and dispersal ability	25 (25)	22
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	25 (25)	23
4	Feasibility of control	10 (10)	7
	Outcome score	100 (100)[b]	83[a]
	Relative maximum score†		0.83

* For questions answered "unknown" do not include point value for the question in parentheses for "Total Answered Points Possible."
† Calculated as [a]/[b].

A. CLIMATIC COMPARISON

1.1. Has this species ever been collected or documented in Alaska?

☒ Yes- continue to 1.2
☐ No - continue to 2.1

1.2. From which eco-geographic region has it been collected or documented? Proceed to Section B. INVASIVNESS RANKING

☒ Pacific Maritime
☒ Interior-Boreal
☒ Arctic-Alpine

2024 Documentation: *Prunus padus* has been documented encroaching past shrub line in Anchorage region in 2023. Refer to the AKEPIC data portal for updated distribution in Alaska.

2011 Documentation: *Prunus padus* has been documented from Fairbanks, Salcha River, Baranof Island (UAF 2003). Widely planted as ornamental in Anchorage (I. Lapina – pers. obs., M. Shephard – pers. obs.). *Prunus virginiana* has been documented from Anchorage and Fairbanks in the Interior-Boreal ecogeographic region 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.
☐ 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.
☐ No

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

Documentation 2011 *Prunus virginiana*: *Prunus virginiana* has been documented from sites near Portland, Oregon, and Hope, British Columbia, which have 41% and 42% climatic similarities with Juneau, respectively (CLIMEX 1999, Klinkenberg 2010, USDA 2011). It has also been documented from Prince George, British Columbia, and from a site near Fort Nelson, British Columbia, which both have 56% climatic similarities with Nome (CLIMEX 1999, Klinkenberg 2010). This species is known to grow in regions in Canada where temperatures drop to -40°C (Mulligan and Munro 1981).

Documentation 2011 *Prunus padus*: Range of the species includes Ust'Tsil'ma, and Chirka-Kem' in Russia, and Røros, Norway (USDA, ARS 2004), which have relatively high climatic match with Nome (78%, 77%, and 76% respectively). However, it appears to reach its physiological limit around Anchorage as it withstands winter temperatures to -33°F and requires 110 frost free days (USDA, NRCS 2006). Nome typically has 110 frost free days, but winter temperatures reach -54°F (WRCC 2001). It is therefore unlikely to establish in the Arctic-Alpine ecoregion of Alaska.

B. INVASIVENESS RANKING

1. Ecological Impact

1.1. Impact on Natural Ecosystem Processes

a.	No perceivable impact on ecosystem processes	0
b.	Has the potential to influence ecosystem processes to a minor degree (e.g., has a perceivable but mild influence on soil nutrient availability)	3
c.	Has the potential to cause significant alteration of ecosystem processes (e.g., increases sedimentation rates along streams or coastlines, degrades habitat important to waterfowl)	7
d.	Has the potential to cause major, possibly irreversible, alteration or disruption 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)	10
e.	Unknown	U

Score: **7**

Documentation:

2024: Riparian European bird cherry contributed two to three times fewer terrestrial invertebrates to adjacent salmon streams relative to native deciduous trees (Roon et al 2016). Score is unchanged at 7. Both species (*P. padus* and *P. virginiana*) are found co-occurring at the same sites.

2011 *Prunus padus*: European bird cherry likely reduces light, soil moisture and nutrient availability for other species (J. Conn – pers. com.). Very little is known about this species' impact on ecosystem processes, however. Score 7.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* The impacts of *Prunus virginiana* on ecosystem processes are unknown. Score U.

1.2. Impact on Natural Community Structure

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

Score **7**

Documentation:
2024: Observations of change in forest canopy structure to monoculture stands in disturbed areas and natural forests within the Anchorage greenbelts. Prunus has been observed to remove/eliminate most understory structure (e.g., *Cornus canadensis*) including shrub and herbaceous strata. The potential negative impact to native tree recruitment, growth and successional rate is unknown and requires research (Prunus re-ranking group 2024 – pers. obs.). Score is unchanged.
2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry can create tall shrub layer eliminating native willow layer and all layers below (M. Shephard – pers. obs.). Score 7.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* is capable of forming tall, dense thickets on forest edges (Johnson 2000). It grows up to 6 m tall in British Columbia (Klinkenberg 2010), is tolerant of partial shade (Mulligan and Munro 1981, Johnson 2000), and grows in wooded areas throughout its range (Buell and Cantlon 1951, Vilkitis 1974), suggesting that this species has the potential to form new tall shrub layers in forests. This species can contribute to tall shrub layers that reduce the survival of native tree seedlings (Lorimer et al. 1994). Score 7.

1.3. Impact on Natural Community Composition

a.	No perceived impact; causes no apparent change in native populations	0
b.	Has the potential to influence community composition (e.g., reduces the population size of one or more native species in the community)	3
c.	Has the potential to significantly alter community composition (e.g., significantly reduces the population size of one or more native species in the community)	7
d.	Likely to cause major alteration in community composition (e.g., results in the extirpation of one or more native species, thereby reducing local	10

biodiversity and/or shifting the community composition towards exotic species)

e. Unknown U

Score **10**

Documentation:

2024: Eliminates understory species (e.g., grasses, shrubs, willows, *Cornus canadensis*, native trees) changing the forest plant community (Prunus re-ranking group 2024 – pers. obs.). *Prunus* sp. not yet eaten by moose whereas neighboring native trees have higher browsing than typical/normal (Prunus re-ranking group 2024 – pers. obs.). Score is unchanged.

2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry replaces willows and other shrubs in riparian communities. It may also delay germination and growth of shade intolerant trees (M. Carlson, M. Shephard, and P. Spencer – pers. obs.). Score 10.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* is a tall shrub or tree (Klinkenberg 2010), and it therefore likely outshades underlying vegetation. In combination with other tall shrub species, it reduced the survival of native *Quercus* (oak) seedlings in Wisconsin (Lorimer et al. 1994). Score 5.

1.4. Impact on associated trophic levels (cumulative impact of this species on the animals, fungi, microbes, and other organisms in the community it invades)

a. Negligible perceived impact 0

b. Has the potential to cause minor alteration (e.g., causes a minor reduction in nesting or foraging sites) 3

c. Has the potential to cause moderate alteration (e.g., causes a moderate reduction in habitat connectivity, interferes with native pollinators, or introduces injurious components such as spines, toxins) 7

d. Likely to cause severe alteration of associated trophic populations (e.g., extirpation or endangerment of an existing native species or population, or significant reduction in nesting or foraging sites) 10

e. Unknown U

Score **7**

Documentation:

2024: Riparian EBC supported four to six times less terrestrial invertebrate biomass on its foliage relative to native deciduous trees (Roon et al. 2016). Documented cases of toxicity to moose in Anchorage (Prunus re-ranking group 2024 – pers. obs.). Score unchanged.

2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry can cause reduction of high quality willow-dominated foraging sites for moose (M. Carlson, M. Shephard – pers. com.). Six species of insect visit flowers of bird cherry (Leather 1996). Fruits are desirable to birds (Snow and Snow 1988). Twenty-three species of phytophagous insect were found on European bird cherry in Britain (Leather 1985). Score 7.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* Many mammals, including bears, moose, coyotes, pronghorn, bighorn sheep, elk, and deer, are known to feed on *Prunus virginiana* in North America (Johnson 2000). The fruits provide a food source for many species of birds and small mammals (Vilkitis 1974, Meyer and Witmer 1998). This species contains a cyanogenic glycoside and can be toxic to mammals with segmented stomachs (rumens), including

moose, deer, sheep, goats, and cattle (Mulligan and Munro 1981, Johnson 2000, Harms 2011). *Prunus virginiana* has been responsible for poisoning moose calves in Anchorage (Grant pers. obs., Graziano pers. obs.). Poisoning from *Prunus* species usually occurs after the plants freeze (Harms 2011). *Prunus virginiana* is associated with many plant diseases and insect pests in North America (Vilkitis 1974). Score 7.

Total Possible: 40
Total: 31

2. Biological Characteristics and Dispersal Ability

2.1. Mode of reproduction

a.	Not aggressive (produces few seeds per plant [0-10/m^2] and not able to reproduce vegetatively).	0
b.	Somewhat aggressive (reproduces by seed only [11-1,000/m^2])	1
c.	Moderately aggressive (reproduces vegetatively and/or by a moderate amount of seed [<1,000/m^2])	2
d.	Highly aggressive (extensive vegetative spread and/or many seeded [>1,000/m^2])	3
e.	Unknown	U

Score **3**

Documentation:

2024: No new data. Score is unchanged.

2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry reproduces by seeds and bare roots. Also it is propagated by cuttings. This plant has very extensive seed production (USDA, NRCS 2006). Score 3.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* reproduces sexually by seeds and vegetatively from suckers on extensive lateral root systems (Mulligan and Munro 1981). Plants in open areas produce more seeds than plants in shaded areas (Johnson 2000). In riparian habitats in western Montana, *Prunus virginiana* produced between 600 and 3,000 seeds per plant (Parciak 2002). Once established, populations grow quickly and form dense thickets by vegetative spread (Vilkitis 1974). Score 3.

2.2. Innate 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 despite lack of adaptations)	2
c.	Numerous opportunities for long-distance dispersal (species has adaptations such as pappus, hooked fruit coats, etc.)	3
d.	Unknown	U

Score **3**

Documentation:

2024: Black bears have been observed to consume *Prunus padus* fruits on Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson in Anchorage. Bear scat has with *Prunus* cherries been observed approximately 0.5 to 1 mile from the feeding source (Stallard- pers. Obs.). Score is unchanged.

2011 *Prunus padus:* Fruits of European bird cherry are dispersed by birds (Snow and Snow 1988). Seeds also falls beneath the trees and may be dispersed by small mammals (Leather 1996). Score 3.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* Fruits are attractive to many mammals and birds, and seeds can be dispersed after being ingested (Webb and Wilson 1985, Meyer and Witmer 1998, Johnson 2000). In riparian habitats in western Montana, birds dispersed seeds a substantial distance beyond *Prunus virginiana* populations; approximately 40% of seeds were dispersed 6.4 m to 15 m away from canopies of this species (Parciak 2002). Large volumes of seeds can be dispersed in the scat of black bears (Auger et al. 2002). Score 3.

2.3. Potential to be spread by human activities (both directly and indirectly – possible mechanisms include: commercial sale of species, use as forage or for revegetation, dispersal along highways, transport on boats, common contaminant of landscape materials, etc.).

a.	Does not occur	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 **3**

Documentation:
2024: No new data. Score is unchanged.
2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry is widely planted as an ornamental in southern Alaska (Welsh 1974). Cultivars have been developed (USDA. NRCS 2006). Score 3.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* is planted as an ornamental shrub or tree in Alaska (Dinstel 2008) and has been documented outside of cultivation (AKEPIC 2011). Score 3.

2.4. Allelopathic

a.	No	0
b.	Yes	2
c.	Unknown	U

Score **0**

Documentation:
2024: No new data. Field observations of large bare soil beneath dense stands of *P. padus*, but no direct study to confirm allelopathy (Prunus reranking group 2024). Score is unchanged.
2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry is not listed as allelopathic (USDA, NRCS 2006). Score 0.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* The allelopathic potential of *Prunus virginiana* is unknown. However, field observations in the Garhwal Himalaya area, bioassays with plant extracts, and bioassays with isolated compounds suggest that *P. armeniaca* may produce allelopathic chemicals (Rawat et al. 1998). *Prunus serotina*, *P. cornuta*, and *P. pumila* are also noted as having potential allelopathic effects (Coder 1998). Score U.

2.5. Competitive ability

a.	Poor competitor for limiting factors	0
b.	Moderately competitive for limiting factors	1
c.	Highly competitive for limiting factors and/or able to fix nitrogen	3
d.	Unknown	U

Score **3**

Documentation:

2024: No new data. Score is unchanged.

2011 *Prunus padus:* In Anchorage, Alaska European bird cherry appears to be successfully competing in largely intact native habitats, with numerous seedlings being recruited (M. Shephard – pers. com.). Adult trees are drought and frost tolerant (Malyugin 1980). Score 3.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* is highly competitive, and populations grow quickly through prolific vegetative spread (Vilkitis 1974). Score 3.

2.6. Forms dense thickets, has a climbing or smothering growth habit, or is otherwise 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	2
d.	Unknown	U

Score **1**

Documentation:

2024: Observations of monoculture stands in disturbed areas and also generally thick stands (both composition and structure) in Anchorage when left uncontrolled. *Prunus* rarely becomes taller than native forested trees. Some instances of *P. padus* wrapping around and choking/smothering native trees (Prunus re-ranking group 2024 -pers. obs.).

2011 *Prunus padus:* This shrub or tree does not form dense thickets, but grows taller than most surrounding species (Welsh 1974). Score 0.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* can form thickets and grows up to 6 m tall in British Columbia (Klinkeberg 2010), enabling it to overtop and outshade surrounding vegetation. Score 2.

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	U

Score **3**

Documentation:

2024: No new data. Score is unchanged.

2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry is found germinating well in mixed forests that were disturbed several decades ago (M. Shephard – pers. com). Score 3.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* Seeds can germinate under open and closed forest canopies (Johnson 2000). Score 3.

2.8. Other species in the genus invasive in Alaska or elsewhere

a.	No	0
b.	Yes	3
c.	Unknown	U

Score **3**

Documentation:

2024: No new data. Score is unchanged.

2011 *Prunus padus:* *Prunus virginiana* L. and *P. serotina* Ehrh. are considered invasive in Northeast (Rice 2006, USDA, NRCS 2006). Score 3.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus padus* is known to occur as a non-native tree in Alaska with an invasiveness rank of 74 (AKEPIC 2011). Score 3.

2.9. Aquatic, wetland, or riparian species

a.	Not invasive in wetland communities	0
b.	Invasive in riparian communities	1
c.	Invasive in wetland communities	3
d.	Unknown	U

Score **3**

Documentation:

2024: *Prunus* is occurring more frequently and increasing severity of infestation on wetlands in Anchorage and Interior Alaska. Additionally, infestations are occurring more frequently in riparian areas. In Southeast Alaska, *Prunus* has been found in residual outwash channels of previous glacier processes and growing within the water table (Prunus re-ranking group 2024 – pers. obs.). Score changed to 3.

2011 *Prunus padus:* In its native range European bird cherry inhabits wet woodland, meadows, riverbanks, and forest clearcuts (British Trees 2004, Gubanov et al. 1995). It is common along riparian areas of Anchorage. Score 1.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* has invaded riparian communities along Chester Creek and Campbell Creek in Anchorage (AKEPIC 2011). It is not likely to invade wetland communities because it does not grow well in areas that have poor drainage or are subject to prolonged flooding (Johnson 2000). Score 1.

Total Possible: 25

Total: 22

3. Ecological Amplitude and Distribution

3.1. Is the 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 pest	4
d.	Unknown	U

Score **4**

Documentation:
2024: No new data. Score is unchanged.
2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry has been grown for food and as an ornamental plant (USDA, ARS 2004, Welsh 1974). Score 4.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* has been grown deliberately in its native range for revegetation of wildlife habitat and mine spoils and for soil stabilization (Johnson 2000). It is planted as an ornamental shrub or tree in Alaska (Dinstel 2008). Score 4.

3.2. Known 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 dissimilar to those in Alaska	1
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 similar to those in Alaska	4
e.	Known to cause high impact in natural areas in habitat and climate zones similar to those in Alaska	6
f.	Unknown	U

Score **4**

Documentation:
2024: No new data. Reranking group agrees score to be 4.
2011 *Prunus padus:* There are observed impacts in riparian communities in Alaska that have been invaded by European bird cherry (M. Shephard – pers. obs.). No information was found relating to impacts in habitats outside of Alaska. Score 3.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* was one of the species comprising a tall shrub layer that reduced the survival of *Quercus* (oak) seedlings in Wisconsin (Lorimer et al. 1994). This species is known to be poisonous to wild ruminants in North America, including areas similar to Alaska, such as British Columbia (Mulligan and Munro 1981, Johnson 2000, Klinkenberg 2010). Score 4.

3.3. Role of anthropogenic and natural disturbance in establishment

a.	Requires anthropogenic disturbance to establish	0
b.	May occasionally establish in undisturbed areas, readily establishes in naturally disturbed areas	3
c.	Can establish independently of natural or anthropogenic disturbances	5
e.	Unknown	U

Score **5**

Documentation:
2024: No new data. Score is unchanged.
2011 *Prunus padus:* In South-central Alaska European bird cherry has established on sites that were disturbed in the last 50 years (M. Shephard – pers. com). Grazing favors young saplings establishment (Leather 1996). Score 5.
2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* often establishes in early successional habitats, such as logged or burned areas (Johnson 2000). It was a prominent initial

colonizer of a clear-cut hardwood forest in Ontario (Brown 1994). However, this species can establish under closed canopies. Seedlings can survive and mature in partially shaded habitats (Mulligan and Munro 1981, Johnson 2000). Score 5.

3.4. Current global distribution

a.	Occurs in one or two continents or regions (e.g., Mediterranean region)	0
b.	Extends over three or more continents	3
c.	Extends over three or more continents, including successful introductions in arctic or subarctic regions	5
e.	Unknown	U

Score **5**

Documentation:

2024: *Prunus virginia* has been documented in Australia, North America, Europe, and Asia (GBIF 2024). *Prunus padus* has been documented in South America, subarctic Iceland, subarctic and arctic Norway, and north eastern subarctic and arctic regions of Russia (GBIF 2024).

2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry is native to Europe, temperate Asia, and Northern Africa. It is naturalized in North America (USDA, ARS 2004). Score 3.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* is native to much of North America (Johnson 2000, Klinkenberg 2010) and its range extends into subarctic Canada in the Mackenzie District of Northwest Territories as far north as 62°N (Mulligan and Munro 1981). Score 0.

3.5. Extent of the species' U.S. range and/or occurrence of formal state or provincial listing

a.	Occurs in 0-5 percent of the states	0
b.	Occurs in 6-20 percent of the states	2
c.	Occurs in 21-50 percent of the states and/or listed as a problem weed (e.g., "Noxious," or "Invasive") in one state or Canadian province	4
d.	Occurs in more than 50 percent of the states and/or listed as a problem weed in two or more states or Canadian provinces	5
e.	Unknown	U

Score **5**

Documentation:

2024: *Prunus padus* is found in 34 US states (GBIF 2024).

2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry occurs in Alaska, Illinois, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware (USDA, NRCS 2006). It is not considered a noxious weed in North America (Rice 2006). Score 2.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* is native in most of North America and found in 44 states of the U.S. and throughout much of Canada (USDA 2011). It is not considered a noxious weed in any states of the U.S. or provinces of Canada. Score 5.

Total Possible: 25

Total: 23

4. Feasibility of Control

4.1. Seed banks

a.	Seeds remain viable in the soil for less than three years	0
b.	Seeds remain viable in the soil for three to five years	2
c.	Seeds remain viable in the soil for five years or longer	3
e.	Unknown	U

Score **0**

Documentation:

2024: There is a significant decline in seed viability from one-year-old to two-year old *Prunus padus* seeds (79% to 27%) and suggests that seed will be minimally viable after three years (Flagstad et. al 2010). Seeds of European bird cherry are viable for less than 3 years (Granström 1987; this is corrected from 2011 reading of the paper). Recruitment of new seedlings occur in controlled sites in Hope suggesting longer than three year viability (Frank Gwartney – pers. obs.).

2011 *Prunus padus:* Seeds of European bird cherry are viable for less than 1 year (Granström 1987). Score 0.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* *Prunus virginiana* forms persistent seed banks (Johnson 2000); however, the exact amount of time seeds remain viable has not been documented. After 2 years in seed traps in Alaska, only 27% of seeds of a similar species, *Prunus padus*, were viable (Flagstad et al. 2010). Score U.

4.2. Vegetative regeneration

a.	No resprouting following removal of aboveground growth	0
b.	Resprouting from ground-level meristems	1
c.	Resprouting from extensive underground system	2
d.	Any plant part is a viable propagule	3
e.	Unknown	U

Score **3**

Documentation:

2024: Cut pieces of firewood logs, branches can generate new shoots (Prunus-reranking group 2024 pers. obs.). Score changed to 3.

2011 *Prunus padus:* European bird cherry readily resprouts after removal of aboveground growth (Heiligmann 2006). New shoots are commonly developed, especially during the early years of establishment (Leather 1996). Score 2.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* Plants can regenerate from root crowns and lateral root fragments (Johnson 2000). Score 2.

4.3. Level of effort required

a.	Management is not required (e.g., species does not persist in the absence of repeated anthropogenic disturbance)	0
b.	Management is relatively easy and inexpensive; requires a minor investment of human and financial resources	2
c.	Management requires a major short-term or moderate long-term investment of human and financial resources	3
d.	Management requires a major, long-term investment of human and financial resources	4
e.	Unknown	U

Score **4**

Documentation:

2024: Larger sites definitively need a long-term investment. State-wide management has shifted to an understanding of a long-term investment for control (Prunus re-ranking group 2024 pers. obs.).

2011 *Prunus padus:* Several control techniques can be used for control of undesirable shrubs and trees like a bird cherry. Cutting, frilling, or girdling can be used for control of bird cherry. Combination of mechanical treatments with herbicide applications is generally more effective (Heiligmann 2006). Score 3.

2011 *Prunus virginiana:* Seedlings and young saplings can be controlled by digging plants out. Mature plants are difficult to control without the use of herbicides. Plants under 3 m tall are susceptible to foliar applications of 2, 4-, 5-T amine, ammonium sulphamate, 1:1 mixtures of 2, 4-D and 2, 4, 5-T, 1:1 mixtures of 2, 4-D and Dichlorprop, and 2:1 mixtures of 2, 4-D and Dicamba. Plants over 3 m tall can be controlled with herbicide applications on the basal 30 cm of bark, exposed roots, and/or cut stumps (Mulligan and Munro 1981). Score 3.

Total Possible: 10
Total: 7

Total for four sections possible: 100
Total for four sections: 83

References:

AKEPIC database. Alaska Exotic Plant Information Clearinghouse Database. 2011. Available: http://akweeds.uaa.alaska.edu/

Auger, J., S. Meyer, and H. Black. 2002. Are American Black Bears (*Ursus americanus*) Legitimate Seed Dispersers for Fleshy-fruited Shrubs? The American Midland Naturalist. 147(2). 352-367 p.

British-Trees. 2004. Unsworth Associates Ltd. http://www.british-trees.com/index.htm [May 19, 2004].

Brown, D. 1994. The development of woody vegetation in the first 6 years following clear-cutting of a hardwood forest for a utility right-of-way. Forest Ecology and Management. 65(2). 171-181 p.

Buell, M., and J. Cantlon. 1951. A study of two forest stands in Minnesota with an interpretation

of the prairie-forest margin. Ecology. 32(2). 294-316 p.

Carlson M.L., Ph.D., Assistant Research Professor – Botany, Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska Anchorage, 707 A Street, Anchorage, Alaska. Tel: (907) 257-2790 – Pers. obs.

CLIMEX. 1999. CLIMEX for Windows, Predicting the effects of climate on plants and animals. Version 1.1a. CISRO Publishing. Collingwood, Australia.

Coder, K. 1998. Potential Allelopathy in Different Tree Species. Warnell School of Forest Resources, University of Georgia. Athens, GA. [18 February 2011] http://www.forestry.uga.edu/about/index.php

Conn, J. Weed Scientist, USDA Agricultural Research Service PO Box 757200 Fairbanks, Alaska 99775 tel: (907) 474-7652; fax (907) 474-6184 – Pers. comm.

Dinstel, R. 2008. Chokecherries. Health, Home, and Family Development, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Alaska Fairbanks. Fairbanks, AK. [16 February 2011] http://www.uaf.edu/ces/publications-db/catalog/hec/FNH-00113.pdf

Flagstad, L., H. Cortés-Burns, E. Johnson, L. Simpson, and A. Brownlee. 2010. Viability of European bird cherry (*Prunus padus* L.) seed after two-year retention in traps along the Chester and Campbell Creek Trails, Anchorage, Alaska. Report for Municipality of Anchorage. Anchorage, AK. 12 p.

GBIF.org (20 January 2024) GBIF Occurrence Download https://doi.org/10.15468/dl.bzmwec

Granström, A. 1987. Seed viability of fourteen species during five years of storage in a forest soil. Journal of Ecology, 75, p.321-331.

Grant, A., Invasive Plant Program Instructor, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Alaska, Fairbanks. 1675 C Street, Anchorage, AK 99501. Tel: (907) 786-6315 – pers. obs.

Graziano, G., Natural Resource Specialist, Plant Materials Center, Division of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources, State of Alaska, 5310 S. Bodenburg Spur, Palmer, Alaska, 99645. Tel: (907) 745-4469 – pers. obs.

Gubanov, I.A., K.V. Kiseleva, V.S. Novicov, V.N. Tihomirov. 1995. Flora of vascular plants of central European Russia. Moscow Argus. 558 pp.

Harms, C. 2011. Moose Die from Chokecherry Poisoning. Release No. 11-09. Alaska Department of Fish and Game Press. Juneau, AK.

Heiligmann, R.B. 2006. Controlling undesirable trees, shrubs, and vines in your woodland. Ohio State University Extension Fact Sheet. School of Natural Resources. Available: http://ohioline.osu.edu.

Johnson, K. 2000. *Prunus virginiana*. In: Fire Effects Information System [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. [16 February 2011] Available: http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/

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

Leather, S.R. 1985. Does the bird cherry have its "fair share" of insect pests? An appraisal of the species – area relationships of the phytophagous insects associated with British *Prunus* species. Ecological Entomology 10: 43-56.

Leather, S.R. 1996. Biological flora of the British Isles. *Prunus padus* L. Journal of Ecology 84: 125-132.

Lorimer, C., J. Chapman, and W. Lambert. 1994. Tall understory vegetation as a factor in the poor development of oak seedlings beneath mature stands. Journal of Ecology. 82(2). 227-237 p.

Malyugin, I.E. 1980. Promising speices of cherry for amenity planting in Donbass. Rastitel'nye Resursy 16: 145-150. (In Russian).

Meyer, G., and M. Witmer. 1998. Influence of Seed Processing by Frugivorous Birds on Germination Success of Three North American Shrubs. The American Midland Naturalist. 140(1). 129-139 p.

Mulligan, G., and D. Munro. 1981. The Biology of Canadian Weeds. 51. *Prunus virginiana* L. and *P. serotina* Ehrh. Canadian Journal of Plant Science. 61(4). 977-992 p.

Parciak, W. 2002. Environmental variation in seed number, size, and dispersal of a fleshy-fruited plant. Ecology. 83(3). 780-793 p.

Rawat, M., G. Pant, D. Prasad, R. Joshi, and C. Pande. 1998. Plant growth inhibitors (Proanthocyanidins) from *Prunus armeniaca*. Biochemical Systematics and Ecology. 26(1). 13-23 p.

Rice, P.M. INVADERS Database System (http://invader.dbs.umt.edu). Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812-4824.

Roon, D. A., Wipfli, M. S., & Wurtz, T. L. 2014. Effects of invasive European bird cherry (*Prunus padus*) on leaf litter processing by aquatic invertebrate shredder communities in urban Alaskan streams. Hydrobiologia, 736, 17-30.

Roon, D. A., Wipfli, M. S., Wurtz, T. L., & Blanchard, A. L. 2016. Invasive European bird cherry (*Prunus padus*) reduces terrestrial prey subsidies to urban Alaskan salmon streams. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 73(11), 1679-1690.

Shephard, M., Vegetation Ecologist, USDA, Forest Service, Forest Health Protection, State and Private Forestry, 3301 C Street, Suite 522, Anchorage, Alaska 99503 Tel: (907) 743-9454 - Pers. com.

Snow, B. and D. Snow. 1988. Birds and berries. A study of an ecological interaction. T&AD Poyser, Calton. Pp. 56-57.

Spencer, P. Ph.D., Ecologist, National Park Service, Alaska Region - Biological Resources Team, 240 W. 5th Ave, #114, Anchorage, AK 99501 tel: (907) 644-3448 – Pers. obs.

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

USDA, NRCS. 2006. ***The PLANTS Database***, Version 3.5 (http://plants.usda.gov). Data compiled from various sources by Mark W. Skinner. National Plant Data Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70874-4490 USA.

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

USDA, ARS, National Genetic Resources Program. *Germplasm Resources Information Network - (GRIN)* [Online Database]. National Germplasm Resources Laboratory, Beltsville, Maryland. URL: http://www.ars-grin.gov/var/apache/cgi-bin/npgs/html/taxon.pl?27512 (06 May 2004).

Vilkitis, J. 1974. Common Chokecherry. In: Gill, J., and W. Healy (eds.). Shrubs and Vines of Northeastern Wildlife. General Technical Report NE-9. Northeastern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Upper Darby, PA.

Webb, S., and M. Willson. 1985. Spatial heterogeneity in post-dispersal predation on *Prunus* and *Uvularia* species. Oecologia. 67(1). 150-153 p.

Welsh, S.L. 1974. Anderson's flora of Alaska and adjacent parts of Canada. Brigham University Press. 724 pp.

Wilken, D.H. 1993. *Prunus*. *In* J. C. Hickman (ed.) The Jepson Manual of Higher Plants of California. University of California Press, Berkley. Pp. 1400.

WRCC - Western Regional Climate Center 2001. Desert Research Institute. http://www.wrcc.dri.edu [16 April 2001].

Original Assessors and Reviewer for *Prunus padus*

Assessors:

Irina Lapina Botanist, Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska Anchorage, 707 A Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501 tel: (907) 257-2710; fax (907) 257-2789	Matthew L. Carlson, Ph.D. Assistant Research Professor, Botany Alaska Natural Heritage Program, University of Alaska Anchorage 707 A Street Anchorage, Alaska 99501

Reviewers:

Michael Shephard Vegetation Ecologist Forest Health Protection State & Private Forestry 3301 C Street, Suite 202, Anchorage, AK 99503 (907) 743-9454; fax 907 743-9479	Julie Riley Horticulture Agent, UAF Cooperative Extension Service 2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd. #118 Anchorage, AK 99508-4143 tel: (907) 786-6306
Jeff Conn, Ph.D. Weed Scientist, USDA Agricultural Research Service PO Box 757200 Fairbanks, Alaska 99775 tel: (907) 474-7652; fax (907) 474-6184	Jamie M. Snyder UAF Cooperative Extension Service 2221 E. Northern Lights Blvd. #118 Anchorage, AK 99508-4143 tel: (907) 786-6310 alt. tel: (907) 743-9448
Page Spencer, Ph.D. Ecologist, National Park Service, Alaska Region - Biological Resources Team, 240 W. 5th Ave, #114, Anchorage, AK 99501 tel: (907) 644-3448	

Original Assessors and Reviewer for *Prunus virginiana*

Assessors:

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

Reviewers:

Ashley Grant Invasive Plant Program Instructor Cooperative Extension Service, University of Alaska Fairbanks 1675 C Street, Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 786-6315	Bonnie M. Million. Alaska Exotic Plant Management Team Liaison Alaska Regional Office, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior 240 West 5th Avenue Anchorage, Alaska, 99501 (907) 644-3452
Gino Graziano Natural Resource Specialist Plant Materials Center, Division of Agriculture, Department of Natural Resources, State of Alaska 5310 S. Bodenburg Spur, Palmer, Alaska, 99645 (907) 745-4469	Whitney Rapp Katmai, Lake Clark, Alagnak, and Aniakchak Planning, Research Permitting, GIS/GPS, and Invasive Species National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior P.O. Box 7 King Salmon, Alaska, 99613 (907) 246-2145

OUTCOME SCORE for *Prunus virginiana* in 2011:
CLIMATIC COMPARISON

A.	**Climatic Comparison**		
	This species is present or may potentially establish in the following eco-geographic regions:	**Yes**	**No**
1	South Coastal	Yes	
2	Interior-Boreal	Yes	
3	Arctic-Alpine	Yes	
	This species is unlikely to establish in any region in Alaska		

B.	**Invasiveness Ranking**	Total (Total Answered*) Possible	Total
1	Ecological impact	40 (30)	19
2	Biological characteristic and dispersal ability	25 (23)	21
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	25 (25)	18
4	Feasibility of control	10 (7)	5
	Outcome score	100 (85)[b]	63[a]
	Relative maximum score†		**.74**

OUTCOME SCORE for *Prunus padus* in 2011

A.	**Climatic Comparison**		
	This species is present or may potentially establish in the following eco-geographic regions:	**Yes**	**No**
1	South Coastal	Yes	
2	Interior-Boreal	Yes	
3	Arctic-Alpine		No
	This species is unlikely to establish in any region in Alaska		

B.	**Invasiveness Ranking**	Total (Total Answered*) Possible	Total
1	Ecological impact	40 (40)	31
2	Biological characteristic and dispersal ability	25 (25)	21
3	Ecological amplitude and distribution	25 (25)	17
4	Feasibility of control	10 (10)	5
	Outcome score	100 (100)[b]	74[a]
	Relative maximum score†		**0.74**

* For questions answered "unknown" do not include point value for the question in parentheses for "Total Answered Points Possible."

† Calculated as $^{a}/_{b}$.