Information on measures and related costs in relation to species considered for inclusion on the Union list: *Lespedeza cuneata*

This note has been drafted by IUCN within the framework of the contract No 07.0202/2017/763436/SER/ENV.D2 "Technical and Scientific support in relation to the Implementation of Regulation 1143/2014 on Invasive Alien Species". The information and views set out in this note do not necessarily reflect the official opinion of the Commission, or IUCN. The Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this note. Neither the Commission nor IUCN or any person acting on the Commission's behalf, including any authors or contributors of the notes themselves, may be held responsible for the use which may be made of the information contained therein. Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged. This document shall be cited as:

Flory, S.L. 2018. Information on measures and related costs in relation to species considered for inclusion on the Union list*: Lespedeza cuneata.* Technical note prepared by IUCN for the European Commission.

Date of completion: 08/10/2018

Comments which could support improvement of this document are welcome. Please send your comments by e-mail to ENV-IAS@ec.europa.eu.

Species (scientific name)	*Lespedeza cuneata* (Dum.Cours.) G.Don
Species (common name)	Bush clover, perennial lespedeza, sericea lespedeza, Siberian lespedeza, Chinese lespedeza, Chinese bush clover, silky bush clover
Author(s)	S. Luke Flory, University of Florida, USA
Date Completed	08/10/2018
Reviewer	Oliver L. Pescott, Centre for Ecology and Hydrology, UK

Summary

Highlight of measures that provide the most cost-effective options to prevent the introduction, achieve early detection, rapidly eradicate and manage the species, including significant gaps in information or knowledge to identify cost-effective measures.

Lespedeza cuneata has various common names (e.g., bush clover, perennial lespedeza, sericea lespedeza) and synonyms (e.g., *Lespedeza juncea* var. *sericea* (Thunb.) Lace & Hauech (Ohashi et al., 2009; Flora of China, 2010; The Plant List, 2017; CABI, 2018). Here we identify the species as *Lespedeza cuneata* (Dum.Cours.) G.Don. It is an upright perennial herbaceous legume that is native to eastern Asia and eastern Australia and invasive throughout the Midwest and Southeast U.S.A. It occupies disturbed areas, old fields, and open woodlands in its invasive range in the U.S. totaling more than 8 million acres (Duncan et al., 2004) where it can have significant ecological effects (e.g., Brandon et al., 2004; Ohlenbusch, 2007). Currently, *L. cuneata* is not known to occur in the natural environment in the EU, although it is listed as a horticultural species in European garden floras (Cullen, 1995).

Preventing the introduction, spread, and impacts of *L. cuneata* in the EU will require measures that address both intentional (as plants for planting) and unintentional (as hay contaminant) pathways of introduction and spread. Because of its biological characteristics and dispersal and establishment mechanisms, early detection and rapid eradication are particularly important for preventing widespread invasions and impacts of *L. cuneata.* The species produces large numbers of seed, can colonize disturbed and undisturbed areas, form a seed bank, thrive on low nutrient sites, and impact native species (reviewed by Gucker, 2010 and Ohlenbusch, 2007). Importantly, mechanical management techniques such as mowing or tilling, fire, and currently available biological controls are ineffective for eradication or management and techniques that cause disturbance such as mowing and fire perhaps even exacerbate the spread of *L. cuneata* invasions (Gucker, 2010). Some chemical control measures have been developed that are moderately successful at removing *L. cuneata* but they can significantly damage native species (Ohlenbusch, 2007), thus the species is particularly difficult to control.

Prevention of intentional introductions. Given that *L. cuneata* does not currently occur in natural areas in the EU, restricting the introduction of the species is critical for preventing establishment and spread in nature. Primary uses of the species have been for forage (Hoveland & Donnelly, 1985), soil erosion control, and wildlife habitat in the Midwest and Southeast U.S. where it has been in use since the early 1900s. Currently, *L. cuneata* is bred and utilized for forage (Ohlenbusch, 2007) and it may still be in use for erosion control (e.g., in road cuts, *S. L. Flory* pers. obs.), and seed is available via online retailers in the EU. Thus, stopping the import and sale of *L. cuneata* in the EU is a top priority for preventing introductions.

Prevention of unintentional introductions. A second pathway by which *L. cuneata* might be introduced to the EU is through seed contamination of hay imported from the U.S. Although the volume of hay traded between the EU and U.S. is relatively small, the species was widely planted and is now invasive in many hay producing areas in the Midwest and Southeast of the U.S. Thus, hay imported to the EU from the U.S. where *L. cuneata* is invasive should be certified as 'weed-free', including from *L. cuneata.* Alternatively, all hay imports from infested areas could be banned.

Prevention of secondary spread. There is no evidence that *Lespedeza cuneata* currently occurs in the natural environment of the EU. However, if the species were to establish then measures to limit the spread to non-contiguous areas would include inspection and cleaning of vehicles and equipment, and possible the banning of movement of manure from infested areas. In addition, efforts should focus on early detection and rapid eradication to prevent the introduction and spread of *L. cuneata* in the EU.

Measures to support early detection. If *L. cuneata* is introduced to the EU for forage production or erosion control, as has been the case in the U.S. (Ohlenbusch, 2007), then surveillance efforts should focus on forage production areas and disturbed sites near road or other construction projects to support early detection. If *L. cuneata* is introduced unintentionally via contaminated hay imported from invaded areas in the U.S., surveillance efforts for early detection should focus on livestock production or horse boarding areas. In either case, amateur and professional botanists and managers of natural areas should be educated on the identification of *L. cuneata* and the habitats most susceptible to invasion by the species.

Rapid eradication of new introductions. It is difficult to eradicate *L. cuneata* because of its tolerance to disturbance, including mowing and clipping (Brandon et al., 2004), and its deep roots and abundant belowground resources (Guernsey, 1977), which allow it to persist under a wide range of conditions and disturbance regimes. The most promising measure to rapidly eradicate newly established populations of *L. cuneata* is through spot spraying with chemical herbicides (e.g., Altom et al., 1992).

Management of established populations. To achieve management of *L. cuneata* if it were to become widespread in the EU would require concerted efforts to map and monitor invasive populations, control dispersal to prevent further spread, and treat satellite infestations and then the core invasive population by broadcasting chemical herbicides, fire, and/or mowing (reviewed by Vermeir et al., 2002; Ohlenbusch, 2007).

Prevention of <u>intentional</u> introductions and spread – measures for preventing the species being introduced intentionally. **This table is repeated for each of the prevention measures identified.** *If the species is listed as an invasive alien species of Union concern, this table is not needed, as the measure applies anyway.*	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	**The intentional introduction of *L. cuneata* could be addressed with a ban on importing, selling, cultivating, breeding and growing the species.** **Note that if *L. cuneata* is listed as an invasive alien species of Union concern, the measures that would automatically apply in accordance with Article 7 of the EU IAS Regulation 1143/2014 would include the suggested measures described here.** *Lespedeza cuneata* is not known to currently occur in the natural environment of the EU but the species was listed as one of nearly 100 species that were considered likely to "arrive, establish, spread and have an impact on biodiversity or related ecosystem services in the EU over the next decade" by a group of invasion biologists (Roy et al., 2015). The species was first introduced to the U.S. in 1896 at an agricultural experiment station in North Carolina. It was then used widely for mine reclamation and erosion control in the 1920s-30s and then promoted as a forage starting in the 1940s. In recent decades the species still has been promoted for revegetation of mined areas in the eastern U.S. (Carter & Ungar, 2002). *Lespedeza cuneata* was bred for forage production (Hoveland & Donnelly, 1985; Min et al., 2005; Terrill et al., 2009) and planted throughout many cattle, goat, and sheep producing areas in the U.S. (Guernsey, 1977). *Lespedeza cuneata* can have high tannin levels that deter feeding by cattle and horses (Hoveland & Donnelly, 1985), in particular when plants are at a late stage of development (Fechter & Jones, 2001). However, the species also can provide a reasonably valuable source of protein (Hoveland & Donnelly, 1985) and tannin levels drop when plants dry, such as during the haying process (Terrill et al., 1989; Ohlenbusch et al., 2007). As a result, hay produced entirely from *L. cuneata* or containing a significant component of the species is considered to have value as fodder. Some still recommend *L. cuneata* as a forage species in the U.S. (Fair, 2014) and it is available for sale in very large (>20kg) quantities, despite its known problems as an invader in many areas. Thus, the species could be intentionally introduced to the EU to be used as a forage species (Cummings et al., 2007), especially because it is drought tolerant and performs well on poor quality (low nutrient) and other variable soils (Cope, 1966; Plass & Vogel, 1973; Guernsey, 1977; Ohlenbusch et al., 2007). Examples of online suppliers: http://www.pepinieredesavettes.com/pepiniere/lespedeza-cuneata,1697,theme==0,page==1?noclear http://b-and-t-world-seeds.com/carth.asp?species=Lespedeza%20cuneata&sref=40202

Banning the importation, sale, cultivation of *L. cuneata* would prevent the intentional introduction and spread of the species.

The objective of this measure is to prevent the intentional introduction of *L. cuneata* to the EU as plants for planting and banning trade in the species among Member States.

Effectiveness of the measure
Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed?

Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.

Effectiveness of measures	*Effective*	X	*Neutral*		*Ineffective*	

Rationale:
The extensive problem with *L. cuneata* as an invasive species in the U.S. is thought to be almost entirely due to its intentional introduction as a forage, erosion control, and wildlife species (reviewed by Gucker, 2010 and Ohlenbusch, 2007). This same pathway – plants for planting – is expected to be the most likely mechanism by which the species would be introduced to the EU and spread among Member States. Thus, a ban on such import, planting, selling, etc should be highly effective in preventing invasions of the species in the EU.

Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative
i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment including non-targeted species, etc.

For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.

Environmental effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	
Social effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	
Economic effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	

Rationale:
There are no known environmental side effects.

There are few known social benefits to *L. cuneata* except for limited availability in horticulture (Cullen 1995) so banning the species from the EU should neutral or mixed social side effects.

There are economic benefits of the use of *L. cuneata* in the U.S. The species can be highly productive on marginal lands and provide reasonably good quality forage. Hoveland & Donnelly (1983) demonstrated that total hay production could be 6-11 t ha^{-1}, and others have shown that the high tannin levels can be beneficial for goat and sheep deworming and other purposes (Terrill et al., 2009) and increase milk quality (Min et al., 2005). However, others have noted that its problems as an invasive species override its potential benefits because other species are excluded (Weber, 2017) and mature plants can have negative impact on cattle and horses (Fechter & Jones, 2001). There are other available forages for use in the EU, thus the economic side effects of a ban are expected to be neutral or mixed.

Acceptability to stakeholders

Acceptability to stakeholders	*Acceptable*	X	*Neutral or mixed*		*Unacceptable*	

e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc. Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	*Rationale*: Currently, *L. cuneata* is not known to be used as a forage or erosion control species in the EU, thus a ban on import and sale of the species should be acceptable to stakeholders. For those that manage and seek to conserve natural areas, the ban is likely to be welcomed. However, if individuals are interested in promoting new horticultural species such as *L. cuneata* there may be a negative view of a ban and potentially loss of income.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).	The cost of inaction on banning the introduction of *L. cuneata* could be very high. If the species is widely introduced as a forage species and results in invasions, there could be significant ecological damage. For example, although *L. cuneata* was initially promoted as a benefit for wildlife in the U.S. (Schneider et al., 2006; Gucker, 2010) there appears to be little evidence that the species is more beneficial to wildlife than native plant species (Vogel, 1981). In fact, one study found that the species contained insufficient resources to facilitate bird survival during winter months (Newlon et al., 1964) and although the species provides habitat, it is thought to be of lower quality than native species dominated areas (Unger et al., 2015). Furthermore, invasions of *L. cuneata* in the U.S. can result in disruption of pollinator networks (Woods et al., 2012) and suppression of native plant diversity and abundance (Eddy & Moore, 1998; Brandon et al., 2004; Allred et al., 2010; Bauman et al., 2015). The cost of implementation of an import and sales ban is relatively low and could be combined with other listed species, and the benefit of preventing invasions may be quite high, thus the measure is expected to be highly cost-effective. No additional socio-economic aspects were considered.
Level of confidence on the information provided [2] Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	*Inconclusive* [ ] · *Unresolved* [ ] · *Established but incomplete* [ ] · *Well established* **X** *Rationale*: There is strong evidence that *L. cuneata* has been planted widely as a forage in the U.S. and that the species has become highly problematic in the Midwest and eastern U.S., thus banning introduction to the EU is well-supported.

Prevention of <u>un-intentional</u> introductions and spread – measures for preventing the species being introduced un-intentionally (cf. Article 13 of the IAS Regulation). **This table is repeated for each of the prevention measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	**To prevent the unintentional introduction of *L. cuneata* through contaminated hay, imports of hay from infested areas, including the Midwest and Southeast U.S. should be certified as 'weed free' (Clines, 2005). Alternatively, all hay imports from regions where *L. cuneata* invasions occur should be banned.** Currently, although no evidence exists suggesting that *L. cuneata* has been a contaminant of hay imported to the EU from the U.S., hay imports to the EU do occur (https://apps.fas.usda.gov/gats/default.aspx), and they could contain *L. cuneata* as a contaminant. *Lespedeza cuneata* is a prolific seed producer and hay is produced throughout the invasive range of the species in the U.S. Stems of *L. cuneata* can produce more than 1,000 seeds each and individuals can have dozens of stems. In total, seed production can be 130-390 kg of seed per acre with approximately 770,000 seeds per kg (Ohlenbusch, 2007). In total, seed production can be 300 million per acre. Additionally, plants can produce seed at a very young age, as little as 15 weeks (Farris, 2006). *Lespedeza cuneata* has been planted in pastures and for erosion control in road cuts and has escaped and invaded natural grasslands, woodlands, fencerows, margins, and pastures where it was not planted (Weber, 2017), providing ample opportunity for *L. cuneata* seeds to be incorporated into hay, including hay for export. It is expected that *L. cuneata* seeds would survive the haying process and could be introduced as viable propagules in the EU. Seed could then be spread through the hay transport process, feeding of livestock, or in the dung of animals, including trail-riding horses (Campbell et al., 2001; Stroh et al., 2009) but also native animals that might consume the seed (Eddy et al., 2003; Blocksome, 2006; Cummings et al., 2007; Quick et al., 2017). "Weed free" hay (and straw) is described as "...hay, straw or mulch that is not known to contain propagative plant parts and seeds of noxious weeds" (Clines, 2005). It is required for use in many parts of the US, including for feeding horses on National Forest lands. Importing <u>only</u> weed free hay to the EU from the US could greatly reduce the likelihood of *L. cuneata* unintentional introduction, but there is evidence that "weed free" hay may not always be free from invasive plant propagules (Dombeck et al., 2004; Clines, 2005). Alternatively, hay may be banned as an import from the US to the EU or imports may be restricted so that they only originate from outside the invasive range of *L. cuneata* in the US, although the latter policy would be difficult to enforce given the rapid range expansion of the species. **The objective of this measure is to prevent the unintentional introduction of *L. cuneata* through contaminated hay.**
Scale of application At what scale is the measure applied? What is the largest scale at which it	Weed free hay is commonly used in much of the US (https://standleeforage.com/company/standlee-difference/certified-noxious-weed-free) and also recommended as fodder for horses when using public lands for recreation in Canada (https://bcinvasives.ca/resources/programs/play-clean-go/trail-users). No information was found on the use of weed free hay in

<table>
<tr><td>has been successfully used? Please provide examples, with areas (km^2 or ha) if possible.</td><td>Europe but the measure would need to be applied at the European level because if ‘non’ weed free hay from contaminated areas could be imported to anywhere within the EU it could be moved elsewhere.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Effectiveness of the measure
Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed?

Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td><td><table><tr><td>Effectiveness of measures</td><td>Effective</td><td>X</td><td>Neutral</td><td></td><td>Ineffective</td><td></td></tr></table>
Rationale:
Demonstrating prevention is difficult because there often is not a good comparison once a policy was implemented. But, it is reasonable to expect that requiring imported hay to be free of weed contaminants could reduce the likelihood of unintentional introduction of L. cuneata (Clines, 2005), but effectiveness would depend on the degree to which “weed free” hay actually was free from L. cuneata seed.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Effort required
e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results</td><td>Requiring that all hay imported to the EU from the U.S. or other L. cuneata infested areas would need to be maintained indefinitely. To ensure that weed free hay is in fact not contaminated by L. cuneata or other invasive species would require a monitoring program. However, a weed free hay requirement would apply to all noxious weeds and invasive species that might occur in the same habitats such as Asclepias syriaca, Heracleum mantegazzianum, and Microstegium vimineum, which could greatly increase the efficiency of the measure.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Resources required [1]
e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.</td><td>The cost of implementing a weed free hay requirement to reduce the likelihood of unintentional introduction of species is not known. Resources required would include staff to develop, implement, and monitor the program. Inspections of hay imports would require staff time, and staff would need to be educated on how to examine shipments. The program also would require communication with exporters in the U.S. to ensure that hay was produced on weed free land because it would be difficult to detect small seeded species such as L. cuneata once the shipment reached the EU.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative
i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment including non-targeted species, etc.

For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td><td><table><tr><td>Environmental effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Social effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Economic effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr></table>
Rationale:
Restricting hay imports to only weed free hay could prevent L. cuneata, and other potential invasive species, invasions from occurring. If introductions from additional invasive species are reduced, which is difficult to measure, it is expected that there would be neutral or positive environmental effect. However, it is important to note that species native to the U.S. that may not be classified as ‘weeds’ in the weed free certification could still pose a potential threat as invasive species to countries in the EU.

There are no known social benefits to L. cuneata, so banning the species from the EU should not have social side effects.</td></tr>
</table>

	Presumably, there are economic benefits to importing hay from the U.S. and restricting hay to only what can be certified as weed free (Clines, 2005) would increase costs and have a negative economic benefit.
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc. Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	***Acceptability to stakeholders*** | *Acceptable* | | *Neutral or mixed* | X | *Unacceptable* | *Rationale*: The current volume of hay imports to the EU from the U.S. is not particularly large but imports do occur on a regular basis (https://apps.fas.usda.gov/gats/default.aspx). Stakeholders who benefit from importation of hay would suffer a negative effect on a weed free requirement because the cost of weed free hay is substantially higher given the necessity to monitor, identify, and remove weeds and invasive plants from hay producing areas. However, EU stakeholders who are interested in natural areas preservation and conservation, invasive plant management, and native species biodiversity will find the weed free requirement to be quite acceptable. Broad support is likely because the measure would prevent the introduction of *L. cuneata* to the EU as well as other invasive plant species.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).	The cost of inaction on preventing the unintentional introduction of *L. cuneata* through hay contamination could be high because invasions of the species cause significant ecological impacts (Newlon et al., 1964; Unger et al., 2015; Woods et al., 2012; Eddy & Moore, 1998; Brandon et al., 2004; Allred et al., 2010; Bauman et al., 2015). In addition, *L. cuneata* can replace more palatable and higher quality forage species under some conditions. One study showed that yearly losses in forage in part of Kansas, U.S. exceeded $29 million, and another showed that invasion reduced the 30-year value of grazing land by more than $500 per ha (Fechter & Jones, 2001).
Level of confidence on the information provided [2] Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	*Inconclusive* | | *Unresolved* | | *Established but incomplete* | X | *Well established* | *Rationale*: The idea behind the use of weed free hay and straw is reasonable and the measure is widely used in the US to help prevent the spread of invasive plants (https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/deschutes/learning/nature-science/?cid=stelprdb5300707) but more information is needed on how often "weed free" hay is actually free from invasive plant propagules.

Prevention of <u>secondary spread</u> of the species – measures for preventing the species spreading once they have been introduced (cf. Article 13 of the IAS Regulation). **This table is repeated for each of the prevention measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	While the species is not yet established within the EU, the secondary spread of the species in the U.S. has been attributed to seed dispersal by machinery and vehicles, livestock (through manure), wildlife (e.g. deer, rodents and birds) (Gucker, 2010), and wind. The only aspect that can be realistically managed is to reduce the risk of secondary spread to non-contiguous areas, by applying **phytosanitary measures to inspect and clean mud and plant debris from vehicles and equipment being transported from infested areas**, and possibly to ban the movement of manure from areas where the species is established. These activities would need to be coupled with targeted awareness raising activities with key sectors (e.g. agriculture and construction). There are a number of best practices often focused at specific sectors that can be applied to target the inspection and cleaning of equipment and vehicles (e.g. Halloran et al., 2013; IPPC, 2017). **The objective of this measure is to prevent the secondary spread of *L. cuneata* through movement of seed by machinery and vehicles, manure, and wildlife.**
Scale of application At what scale is the measure applied? What is the largest scale at which it has been successfully used? Please provide examples, with areas (km^2 or ha) if possible.	These inspection and cleaning measures can be applied at an individual site level, but would need to cover the entire infested area.
Effectiveness of the measure Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed? Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	***Effectiveness of measures*** — *Effective*: [ ] — *Neutral*: *X* — *Ineffective*: [ ] *Rationale*: If the inspection and cleaning activities are rigorously and consistently applied, it is presumed they would be effective in reducing the risk of secondary spread, however it is unlikely that they will stop secondary spread altogether.
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results	These activities would need to be put in place indefinitely, or until the species was eradicated.
Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	The ISPM (IPPC, 2017) state that facilities required for inspection, cleaning, and treatment of vehicles may include: surfaces that prevent contact with soil, including soil traps and wastewater management systems, temperature treatment facilities, and

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>fumigation or chemical treatment facilities. Halloran et al. (2013) detail equipment required for cleaning seed from vehicles including a pump and high pressure hose (minimum water pressure should be 90 pounds per square inch), air compressor and blower or vacuum, shovel, pry bar, and a stiff brush or broom. In addition trained staff are needed to undertake the inspections and phytosanitary measures, and suitable disposal facilities, especially if implemented within the EU.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative
i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment including non-targeted species, etc.

For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td><td><table>
<tr><td>Environmental effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Social effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr>
</table>
Rationale:
The measure would not just target L. cuneata but also other invasive plant species. However, if suitable disposal facilities are not installed there is a risk of environmental impacts, e.g. to freshwater systems, in the local area from the cleaning and treatment processes.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Acceptability to stakeholders
e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.

Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td><td><table>
<tr><td>Acceptability to stakeholders</td><td>Acceptable</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td></td><td>Unacceptable</td><td></td></tr>
</table>
Rationale:
The sectors required to undertake the inspections and cleaning will bear the brunt of the costs for implementing the measures, so there could be some resistance. This issue can be addressed through effective communication and awareness raising activities.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Additional cost information [1]
When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment.
- implementation cost for Member States
- the cost of inaction
- the cost-effectiveness
- the socio-economic aspects

Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).</td><td>No information available</td></tr>
</table>

Level of confidence on the information provided [2] Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	*Inconclusive* ☐ *Unresolved* ☐ *Established but incomplete* X *Well established* ☐ *Rationale*: While there is some information on these measures (best practices etc.) little is known about their effectiveness.

Surveillance measures to support early detection - Measures to run an effective surveillance system for achieving an early detection of a new occurrence (cf. Article 16). This section assumes that the species is not currently present in a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. **This table is repeated for each of the early detection measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	***Lespedeza cuneata* does not currently occur in natural areas in the EU so a surveillance system focusing on expert amateur and professional botanists and land managers for early detection is critical for rapid eradication of new occurrences.** New occurrences of *L. cuneata* in natural areas of the EU are most likely to be found either near forage production areas where the species has been planted or near where livestock and horses are fed hay imported from the U.S. The most susceptible habitats in these areas would be roadsides, field margins, disturbed areas (Cope, 1966; Plass & Vogel, 1973; Hoveland & Donnelly, 1983; Ohlenbusch et al., 2007), and along trails used for horseback riding (Campbell et al., 2001; Stroh et al., 2009). It will be important for amateur and professional botanists and land managers to properly identify the species (e.g., see https://www.invasive.org/browse/subinfo.cfm?sub=3033 for photos). It is a perennial herbaceous legume that can grow to a height of 0.5-1.0 m. The species has trifoliate leaves along the entire length of the stem, and stems can be sparse or denser depending on growing conditions. The leaflets are narrow and long with a small indent at the end. The length to width ratio of leaflets is diagnostic with *L. cuneata* having a ratio of 4:1-6:1 (Pramanik & Thothathri, 1983; Flora of China, 2010). *Lespedeza cuneata* flowers are off white to purple and are produced on short pedicels in leaf axils. The flower season in the U.S. is mid-summer to early autumn (Hoveland & Donnelly, 1983; Ohlenbusch et al., 2007). The species has a mixed mating system with both chasmogamous and cleistogamous flowers (Cope, 1966). Education of amateur and professional botanists and land managers about *L. cuneata* identification could be accomplished through pamphlets, email, web sites (e.g., www.bsbi.org), or social media. Systematic surveillance of susceptible habitats could focus specifically on *L. cuneata* but are not likely to be cost-effective given the relatively unlikely chance the species would be

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>encountered. Instead, regular biological recording for Atlases and Floras is likely to capture occurrences of the species. However, it would be efficient to combine educational efforts of L. cuneata with other listed or proposed species likely to occur in the same habitats (Althoff et al., 2006; Pitman, 2006), including Ailanthus altissima, Asclepias syriaca, Heracleum mantegazzianum, and Microstegium vimineum.

The objective of this measure is to facilitate early detection of L. cuneata in the EU through enhanced surveillance measures in cooperation with efforts to detect species already listed.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Scale of application
At what scale is the measure applied? What is the largest scale at which it has been successfully used? Please provide examples, with areas (km^2 or ha) if possible.</td><td>Surveillance efforts for invasive species can occur at a wide range of scales, from scouting and monitoring efforts at local natural areas by land managers to nation-wide efforts aimed at educating the general public (e.g., EDDMaps.org). Here, education about L. cuneata to enhance detection should occur across all of the EU but any targeted surveillance efforts should be focused specifically in areas likely to be susceptible such as near livestock and horse use areas where imported hay is utilized, or near forage production areas if the species is planted for grazing or hay production in the EU.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Effectiveness of the measure
Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed?

Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td><td><table><tr><td>Effectiveness of measures</td><td>Effective</td><td></td><td>Neutral</td><td>X</td><td>Ineffective</td><td></td></tr></table>
Rationale:
Certainly, surveillance efforts have been successful but it often is difficult to gauge success and surveillance efforts do not always result in improved management (Rout et al., 2014). Different surveillance protocols have been modelled to test their effectiveness (Fox et al., 2009) but no such models exist for L. cuneata. It would be difficult to develop such models, which would need to include habitat use data for the species that could be reliably applied to the EU, but such an effort could increase the effectiveness and efficiency of surveillance.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Effort required
e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results</td><td>The frequency and volume of hay imports from the U.S. to the EU is relatively low but imports do occur on a regular basis. Importantly, Lespedeza cuneata is widespread in the U.S. from as far north as New Jersey and Michigan, as far south as Florida and Texas, and as far west as Nebraska and Oklahoma. In addition, seed of the species is available online at multiple sites in the EU. So, there are multiple opportunities for L. cuneata propagules to be unintentionally or intentionally introduced to the EU. Surveillance measures will need to remain in place as long as hay is imported and seed is sold online, which should occur in most EU Member States where general botanical recording is an ongoing activity and should capture new occurrences of L. cuneata (Pescott et al., 2015).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Resources required [1]
e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.</td><td>Resources required to educate botanists and land managers conducting surveillance about L. cuneata include pamphlets, web sites, and social media, plus possibly some staff time to conduct education workshops. Such resources and events could be efficiently produced if they are combined with materials and presentations on other species likely to occur in the same habitats such as Ailanthus altissima, Asclepias syriaca, Heracleum mantegazzianum, and Microstegium vimineum.</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr>
<td>Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative
i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment including non-targeted species, etc.

For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td>
<td>

Environmental effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	
Social effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	
Economic effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	

Rationale:
The process of conducting surveillance efforts that include searches for *L. cuneata* are not expected to have direct effects on the environment.

Social side effects of surveillance efforts are expected to be neutral given that they already exist at a reasonable scale across the EU (e.g., Pescott et al., 2015).

No economic side effects of surveillance are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability to stakeholders
e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.

Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td>
<td>

Acceptability to stakeholders	*Acceptable*	X	*Neutral or mixed*		*Unacceptable*	

Rationale:
Surveillance for early detection of *L. cuneata* should not impact economic activities and the public likely would be supportive and even encouraging, thus the measure is expected to be acceptable to stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional cost information [1]
When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment.
- implementation cost for Member States
- the cost of inaction
- the cost-effectiveness
- the socio-economic aspects

Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).</td>
<td>The implementation cost is expected to be minimal because regular biological recording already occurs in many areas of the EU (e.g., Pescott et al., 2015).

Given the significant ecological cost of L. cuneata invasions in the U.S. and the economic costs of management for the species, inaction could result in considerable costs if surveillance does not facilitate early detection and rapid eradication.

No socio-economic costs are expected beyond those already described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of confidence on the information provided [2]</td>
<td>

Inconclusive		*Unresolved*		*Established but incomplete*		*Well established*	X

Rationale:</td>
</tr>
</table>

Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	The information here on biology of *L. cuneata* and the most likely pathways for introduction (intentionally via plants for planting and unintentionally via hay contaminant) and where it might be found is reasonably well established, but it is not known how useful such information is for conducting effective surveillance measures. Regular biological recording already occurs in much of the EU and is known to be effective at identifying new species occurrences (Pescott et al., 2015).

Rapid eradication for new introductions - Measures to achieve eradication at an early stage of invasion, after an early detection of a new occurrence (cf. Article 17). This section assumes that the species is not currently present in a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. **This table is repeated for each of the eradication measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	**If surveillance results in detection of new populations of *L. cuneata* that are at an early stage of invasion, the best measure for rapid eradication is spot treatment with chemical herbicides.** It is important to note that EU/national/local legislation on the use of plant protection products and biocides needs to be respected and authorities should check to ensure chemicals are licensed for use in their respective countries/regions. To spot treat *L. cuneata,* herbicides are applied with a hand-pump or CO2 pressurized backpack sprayer (Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009) or other hand operated spray equipment such as a tank mounted on the back of an ATV unit. Plants should be sprayed to run-off and applied only to the target plant while avoiding overspray onto co-occurring desirable species. Multiple herbicides have been evaluated for their effectiveness at controlling *L. cuneata* (e.g., Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009). Results vary among different chemicals and across *L. cuneata* plant life history stages. Triclopyr and fluroxypyr have provided the most consistent control of the species across different life stages, including seedlings and adult plants (Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009). Various herbicide concentrations have been tested. Altom et al. (1992) tested triclopyr at 0.56 and 1.12 kg per ha and fluroxypyr at 0.56kg per ha on variably-sized *L. cuneata* plants that ranged from 10-50 cm in height in a pasture setting. Both herbicides provided effective control, usually with >90% plant necrosis. Koger et al. (2002) found similar results when testing triclopyr at 560 and 840 g ae/ha and fluroxypyr at 210 and 560 g ae/ha. – less than 4% of plot density remained compared to controls. Farris and Murray (2009) demonstrated that triclopyr, metsulfuron-methyl, glyphosate, and 2,4-D amine plus picloram (tank-mix) all controlled more than 80% of *L. cuneata* after four months but that only triclopyr, applied when the plants were larger controlled 100% of seedlings.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Herbicides for spot treatment are generally mixed with a crop oil concentrate at 1.0% (v/v) or a nonionicsurfactant at 0.25% (v/v). It is illegal to use an herbicide in a manner inconsistent with the label's instructions; therefore, read the label carefully and follow instructions.

The objective of this measure is to rapidly eradicate new introductions of L. cuneata using spot treatment of chemical herbicides.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Scale of application
At what scale is the measure applied? What is the largest scale at which it has been successfully used? Please provide examples, with areas (km^2 or ha) if possible.</td><td>Research has been conducted on herbicides for L. cuneata control on plots that ranged from 5-15 sq m plots (Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009) but there is no reason to believe that the effectiveness of treatments would vary based on the scale of applications as long as products could be applied homogenously throughout the treated area. Larger invaded areas likely would be treated more effectively with CO2 pressurized backpack sprayers or with tanks and booms mounted on all-terrain vehicles (ATVs).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Effectiveness of the measure
Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed?

Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td><td><table><tr><td>Effectiveness of measures</td><td>Effective</td><td>X</td><td>Neutral</td><td></td><td>Ineffective</td><td></td></tr></table>
Rationale:
There is strong evidence that spot treatment of L. cuneata with herbicides is effective for rapid eradication. The most consistently effective chemicals are triclopyr and fluroxypyr, which can result in 90-100% control of seedlings and adult plants four to 12 months after treatment (Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Effort required
e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results</td><td>Spot treatment can achieve eradication of L. cuneata in as little as four months if the plants are at the seedling stage (Farris & Murray, 2009) but the measure is less effective on mature, more established individuals so returning to an invaded area for retreatment probably will be necessary. Furthermore, because L. cuneata can create a persistent seedbank, sites may need to be monitored for 3-5 years (Ohlenbusch, 2007) to determine if new seedlings emerge and need to be treated. Preemergence herbicides may be considered for infested areas with large seed banks (Farris & Murray, 2009).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Resources required [1]
e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.</td><td>Certified pesticide applicators, chemical herbicides, adjuvants such as crop oil or nonionic surfactant to improve application and effectiveness, spraying equipment and personal protective equipment are required. Costs vary widely based on the pay rate of staff, price of herbicide and other chemicals, and the type of spraying equipment used. One study from 1997 estimated costs at $6.15-15.75 per acre (ca. €5.35-13.70), depending on the chemical used (Vermeire et al., 2002). There is also cost involved in mapping infested areas and returning to the area for retreatment.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative
i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health,</td><td><table><tr><td>Environmental effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Social effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Economic effects</td><td>Positive</td><td>X</td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td></td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

environment including non-targeted species, etc. For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	*Rationale*: Eradicating *L. cuneata* by spot treating with herbicides can have positive environmental side effects if native species are released from competition with the invader and more widespread invasions are prevented. In one study, removal of *L. cuneata* by spot treating with triclopyr allowed more desirable forage grass species to return to the previously invaded area compared to untreated control plots, however, another weedy species also colonized the plots (*Ambrosia psilostachya,* Altom et al., 2002). Thus, as with many invasive plant species removal efforts, control of secondary invaders may be necessary to achieve restoration of native species or success of forage species. As with many herbicides, there may be nontarget effects on co-occurring native species but no such effects have been documented in the literature. Instead, the positive response of desirable species (e.g., Altom et al., 2002) suggests that any nontarget effects are less than the positive response of desirable species when they are released from competition with *L. cuneata.* No social side effects of spot treatment for eradication of *L. cuneata* such as herbicide runoff have been documented. There could be positive economic side effects of spot treatment with herbicides if eradication of newly established *L. cuneata* is achieved and desirable species, such as more palatable forages, positively respond to removal of the invasive competitor (Altom et al., 2002).
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc. Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	***Acceptability to stakeholders*** | *Acceptable* | | *Neutral or mixed* | **X** | *Unacceptable* | *Rationale*: The general public may have a negative view on the use of chemical herbicides to control invasive *L. cuneata,* particularly if newly established populations are large and require extensive applications. The image of a manager in personal protection gear applying chemicals can generate fear, especially if the public is unaware of why chemicals are being applied. Thus, it is important to provide interpretative signs and to inform the public as to what is being done and why. If citizens understand that the invader, including *L. cuneata* or other species that may be treated in the same habitat can cause significant ecological damage, and that it is increasingly difficult, expensive, and damaging to treat the larger the infestation, concerns can be alleviated.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects	As with inaction for preventing introductions and not quickly identifying new occurrences through surveillance, failing to rapidly eradicate populations can result in widespread populations that are costly to manage. Because the cost of herbicide applications are strongly correlated with the size of the infestation, it is much more cost-effective to locate and treat populations when they are small (Kettenring & Adams, 2011). In addition, it is more cost effective to treat other species likely to occur in the same habitats such as *Ailanthus altissima, Asclepias syriaca, Heracleum mantegazzianum,* and *Microstegium vimineum.* Of course, specific treatment protocols will need to be followed for each species.

Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).	No socio-economic aspects are expected beyond those already described.
Level of confidence on the information provided [2] Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	*Inconclusive* ☐ *Unresolved* ☐ *Established but incomplete* ☐ *Well established* **X** *Rationale*: Measures to rapidly eradicate *L. cuneata* with herbicides are well established and have been tested across multiple habitats, plant life history stages, and geographic areas (Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009). Studies consistently show that triclopyr and fluroxypyr can result in 90-100% control of seedlings and adult plants less than a year after treatment. Moreover, under some conditions such as higher fertility desirable species can return to treated areas, assuming other secondary invaders are controlled (Koger et al., 2002).

Management - Measures to achieve management of the species once it has become widely spread within a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. (cf. Article 19), i.e. **not** at an early stage of invasion (see Rapid eradication table above). These measures can be aimed at eradication, population control or containment of a population of the species. **This table is repeated for each of the management measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	**The most effective measure to achieve management of established populations of *L. cuneata* is through broadcast application of herbicides, similar to efforts described above for rapid eradication but applied at a broader scale and with other considerations. Given the high seed production of *L. cuneata,* management efforts will also require mapping and monitoring, and prevention of seed dispersal from the established invasion.** It is important to note that EU/national/local legislation on the use of plant protection products and biocides needs to be respected and authorities should check to ensure chemicals are licensed for use in their respective countries/regions. If *L. cuneata* were to become widespread in a Member State, the only known management measure likely to be effective focuses on the use of herbicides, although other integrated measures can be helpful under particular circumstances. Fire has been explored as a management tool (see separate table below) but it is not effective because it removes plant residue that would otherwise inhibit *L. cuneata* germination and establishment and does not affect established *L. cuneata* plants. However, an appropriate use of fire could be to remove senesced plant material and residue so that returning *L. cuneata* plants are exposed and can be more effectively treated.

	Thus, herbicide applications alone or in combination with fire or mowing are thought to be most effective for management of widespread invasions. The same products and rates used for spot treatment in rapid eradication should be effective at the management scale: Altom et al. (1992) tested triclopyr at 0.56 and 1.12 kg per ha and fluroxypyr at 0.56kg per ha on variably-sized *L. cuneata* plants that ranged from 10-50 cm in height in a pasture setting. Both herbicides provided effective control, usually with >90% plant necrosis. Koger et al. (2002) found similar results when testing triclopyr at 560 and 840 g ae/ha and fluroxypyr at 210 and 560 g ae/ha. – less than 4% of plot density remained compared to controls. Farris and Murray (2009) demonstrated that triclopyr, metsulfuron-methyl, glyphosate, and 2,4-D amine plus picloram (tank-mix) all controlled more than 80% of *L. cuneata* after four months but that only triclopyr, applied when the plants were larger controlled 100% of seedlings. Herbicides for management are generally mixed with a crop oil concentrate at 1.0% (v/v) or a nonionic surfactant at 0.25% (v/v). It is illegal to use an herbicide in a manner inconsistent with the label's instructions; therefore, read the label carefully and follow instructions. Local and federal regulations on the use of chemical herbicides also may apply. **The objective of this measure is to manage widespread and established populations of *L. cuneata* through the use of chemical herbicides.**
Scale of application At what scale is the measure applied? What is the largest scale at which it has been successfully used? Please provide examples, with areas (km^2 or ha) if possible.	Management of *L. cuneata* with herbicides has been tested on plots that ranged in size from 5-15 sq m (Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009) with similar results. The effectiveness of treatments should not vary based on the scale of applications as long as products can be applied homogenously throughout the treated area. Larger invaded areas likely would be treated more effectively with equipment mounted on all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) or trucks than with backpack sprayers on foot.
Effectiveness of the measure Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed? Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	***Effectiveness of measures*** — *Effective*: **X** — *Neutral*: — *Ineffective*: *Rationale*: There is good evidence that *L. cuneata* can be managed with herbicides. The most consistently effective chemicals are triclopyr and fluroxypyr, which can result in 90-100% control of seedlings and adult plants four to 12 months after treatment (Altom et al., 1992; Koger et al., 2002; Farris & Murray, 2009). However, depending on the scale of the established invasion, the abundance of co-occurring species, and the difficulty of the invaded terrain, initial treatment efforts over large areas may not be as successful as has been demonstrated on small research plots and retreatment probably will be required.
Effort required	Repeated monitoring and follow up treatments would likely be needed to achieve effective management of *L. cuneata* (Ohlenbusch, 2007; Gucker, 2010). There is evidence that control of populations can be achieved in as little as four months if the plants are at the seedling stage (Farris & Murray, 2009) but the measure is less effective on mature, more established individuals.

e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results

Furthermore, because *L. cuneata* can create a persistent seedbank, sites may need to be monitored for 3-5 years (Ohlenbusch, 2007) to determine if new seedlings emerge and need to be treated. Pre-emergence herbicides may be considered for infested areas with large seed banks (Farris & Murray, 2009) or fire might be effective at reducing seed bank size (Gucker, 2010; Ohlenbusch, 2007).

Resources required [1]
e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.

To manage widespread established *L. cuneata* invasions, certified pesticide applicators, chemical herbicides, adjuvants such crop oil or nonionic surfactant to improve application and effectiveness, spraying equipment and personal protective equipment are required. Costs vary widely based on the pay rate of staff, price of herbicide and other chemicals, and the type of spraying equipment used. One estimate suggests the cost of herbicide application for treating *L. cuneata* is $18-$36 USD/acre (ca. €16-31) (Alexander et al., 2018), although these numbers may underestimate total costs associated with mapping infested areas and returning to the area for monitoring and retreatment.

Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative
i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment including non-targeted species, etc.

For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.

Environmental effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	
Social effects	*Positive*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Negative*	
Economic effects	*Positive*	X	*Neutral or mixed*		*Negative*	

Rationale:
Managing *L. cuneata* with herbicides may have positive environmental side effects if native species are released from competition with the invader and more widespread invasions are prevented. In one study, removal of *L. cuneata* by spot treating with triclopyr allowed more desirable forage grass species to return to the previously invaded area compared to untreated control plots, however, another weedy species also colonized the plots (*Ambrosia psilostachya,* Altom et al., 2002). Thus, as with many invasive plant species removal efforts, control of secondary invaders may be necessary to achieve restoration of native species or success of forage species.

No social side effects of broadcast application of *L. cuneata* such as herbicide runoff have been documented.

There could be positive economic side effects of treatment with herbicides if eradication of newly established *L. cuneata* is achieved and desirable species, such as more palatable forages, positively respond to removal of the invasive competitor (Altom et al., 2002).

Acceptability to stakeholders
e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.

Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an 'X'), and

Acceptability to stakeholders	*Acceptable*		*Neutral or mixed*	X	*Unacceptable*	

Rationale:
There may be a negative public perception of broad scale management of *L. cuneata* with herbicides, particularly if invasions are in visible areas and treatments result in dead vegetation when the surrounding resident plants are green – which is likely. In addition, applicators in personal protection gear applying chemicals can generate fear and concern, especially if the public is

provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	unaware of why chemicals are being applied. Thus, it is important to provide interpretative signs and to inform the public as to what is being done and why. Conversely, if people are educated about the impacts of *L. cuneata* and other problematic species and that it is increasingly difficult, expensive, and damaging to treat the larger the infestation, concerns may be alleviated.
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).	Inaction on management of widespread invasions of *L. cuneata* will likely result in greater ecological damage and invasions in new areas. It is more cost-effective to locate and rapidly eradicate populations but even when management level is reached it is important to treat satellite populations to prevent them from growing and dispersing seed to additional areas. No socio-economic aspects are expected beyond those already described.
Level of confidence on the information provided [2] Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	*Inconclusive* [ ] *Unresolved* [ ] *Established but incomplete* [X] *Well established* [ ] *Rationale*: Information on how to manage *L. cuneata* invasions at local scales is well established and there is little reason to believe larger scale management would differ significantly. Some considerations for broader scale management are the total area invaded (with larger areas more plants are more likely to be missed in the treatment process), the abundance of co-occurring species (that might make finding and treating plants difficult), and the difficulty of the invaded terrain. Recommendations are available on management measures (Ohlenbusch, 2007; Gucker, 2010) but they have not been well quantified for established populations over large areas.

Management - Measures to achieve management of the species once it has become widely spread within a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. (cf. Article 19), i.e. **not** at an early stage of invasion (see Rapid eradication table above). These measures can be aimed at eradication, population control or containment of a population of the species. **This table is repeated for each of the management measures identified.**

Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	**There is some limited evidence that prescribed fire could be used to help manage widespread invasions of *L. cuneata.*** The use of prescribed fire for managing invasive plants often has been considered (Brooks et al., 2004) but in many cases the effectiveness of the measure for invasive plant management produces mixed results (Keeley, 2006). The same is true for *L. cuneata* – some studies have shown that fire can reduce germination or kill seedlings but other studies have shown that fire promotes *L. cuneata* (Gucker 2010; Vermeire et al., 2002). It is known that adult *L. cuneata* plants readily resprout after fire (Diller, 2002; Vermeire et al., 2002), indicating that fire is not a useful management measure for mature plants. A recent comprehensive study demonstrated that under lab conditions *L. cuneata* seed germination was inhibited but in the field, fire promoted germination (Wong et al., 2012). In addition, they found only minimal effects of fire on seedlings. Altogether, Wong et al. (2012) concluded that fire may be helpful for controlling seedlings that emerge after adult plants have been removed with herbicide but that otherwise fire was not a particularly useful management measure for *L. cuneata.* In a separate study where fire was applied to management units that were ~5.5ha (14 acres) in size researchers found that fire applied during the summer resulted in very good control of *L. cuneata* and other invasive plants compared to fires applied during the spring (Alexander et al., 2018). **The objective of using fire as a management measure is to reduce the size of *L. cuneata* populations and inhibit seed dispersal.**
Scale of application At what scale is the measure applied? What is the largest scale at which it has been successfully used? Please provide examples, with areas (km^2 or ha) if possible.	Prescribed fire generally can be applied at large scales (10s of km2). The largest scale where fire has been used successfully to achieve some level of control of *L. cuneata* is ~5.5ha (14 acres) but there is no reason to believe that application at larger scales would produce different results.
Effectiveness of the measure Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed? Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	***Effectiveness of measures*** — *Effective*: [ ] — *Neutral*: **X** — *Ineffective*: [ ] *Rationale*: The use of fire to manage *L. cuneata* has produced mixed results (Gucker, 2010) and some studies have shown that invasive populations may actually be promoted by fire (Wong et al., 2012), thus further study is needed about the timing, intensity, and other aspects of fire before it is widely implemented as a management measure.
Effort required e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results	The appeal of fire as a management tool is that it requires relatively little time to complete a management treatment given the scale at which it can be applied and the cost to conduct treatments. A single treatment may reduce seedling numbers (Wong et al., 2012) although repeated burning may be needed to reduce the abundance of *L. cuneata* and other invasive plants (Alexander et al., 2004).

Resources required [1] e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.	Extensive resources may be required to conduct prescribed fires, including trained staff, specialized equipment, and machinery (to install fire breaks).
Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment including non-targeted species, etc. For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	***Environmental effects*** — *Positive* [ ] — *Neutral or mixed* [X] — *Negative* [ ] ***Social effects*** — *Positive* [ ] — *Neutral or mixed* [X] — *Negative* [ ] ***Economic effects*** — *Positive* [ ] — *Neutral or mixed* [X] — *Negative* [ ] *Rationale*: If fire inhibits other invasive plants (e.g., Alexander et al., 2004), or if the targeted ecosystem is fire adapted such that application of fire promotes native species diversity independent of invasive plant suppression, then fire would have a positive environmental effect. However, if fire is applied to an ecosystem that is not fire adapted then native species may be harmed. Fire may be viewed positively if people understand the conservation value of fire in particular ecosystems but more likely, fire would be viewed negatively, especially if access to areas is restricted when the measure is applied or if smoke drifts into nearby residential or commercial areas (McCaffrey, 2006). Additionally, the visual appeal of burned areas would temporarily be reduced.
Acceptability to stakeholders e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc. Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an 'X'), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	***Acceptability to stakeholders*** — *Acceptable* [ ] — *Neutral or mixed* [X] — *Unacceptable* [ ] *Rationale*: Some stakeholders may consider fire to be an acceptable management practice if they are well-educated on the conservation value of fire such as how it can maintain diversity and native plant communities in fire-adapted systems (e.g., Brockaway and Lewis, 1997). However, more likely, recreational users such as hikers and bird watchers, might view fire as unacceptable (McCaffrey, 2006).
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).	The cost of applying prescribed fire is very low on a per area basis, assuming that trained staff and equipment area available. In one case, the cost was estimated at only $1USD/acre (ca. €0.87) (Alexander et al., 2004).

Level of confidence on the information provided [2] Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	*Inconclusive* ☐ *Unresolved* ☐ *Established but incomplete* **X** *Well established* ☐ *Rationale*: There is good evidence that fire may both inhibit (Alexander et al., 2004) and promote (Wong et al., 2012) *L. cuneata,* thus more information is needed to determine where, when, and under what conditions fire is an effective measure to manage this invasive species.

Management - Measures to achieve management of the species once it has become widely spread within a Member State, or part of a Member State's territory. (cf. Article 19), i.e. **not** at an early stage of invasion (see Rapid eradication table above). These measures can be aimed at eradication, population control or containment of a population of the species. **This table is repeated for each of the management measures identified.**	
Measure description Provide a description of the measure, and identify its objective	**Mowing may be used to manage widespread invasions of *L. cuneata.*** Mowing with a string trimmer or rotary mower that is self-propelled or tractor mounted has variable results for the control of *L. cuneata.* Mowing may be combined with herbicide application so that adult plants can be removed and herbicide application is more effective on resprouting plants or germinating seedlings (Gucker, 2010). However, mowing is non-selective so establishment of desirable native species may be difficult (Vermeir et al., 2002; Ohlenbusch, 2007). **The objective of using mowing as a management measure is to reduce the size of *L. cuneata* populations and inhibit seed dispersal.**
Scale of application At what scale is the measure applied? What is the largest scale at which it has been successfully used? Please provide examples, with areas (km^2 or ha) if possible.	Mowing can be applied at large scales – up to many ha – depending on the size of the mowing equipment available.

<table>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of the measure
Is it effective in relation to its objective? Has the measure previously worked, failed?

Please select one of the categories of effectiveness (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>Effectiveness of measures</td><td>Effective</td><td></td><td>Neutral</td><td>X</td><td>Ineffective</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Rationale:
Repeated mowing multiple times per year at low heights (<30 cm, preferably lower; Vermeire et al., 2007) can reduce seed production (Barnewitz et al., 2002) but may result in rapid resprouting, and possibly increased vigor of adult plants (Diller, 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort required
e.g. period of time over which measure need to be applied to have results</td>
<td>Significant effort is required to repeatedly apply mowing multiple (3-4) times per year. The amount of time required to complete each mowing event depends on the scale of the invasion and the size of the equipment used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources required [1]
e.g. cost, staff, equipment etc.</td>
<td>Mowing requires trained staff who can operate equipment safely and equipment such as a string trimmer, manual or self-propelled rotary mower, or tractor mounted mower.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side effects (incl. potential) – both positive and negative
i.e. positive or negative side effects of the measure on public health, environment including non-targeted species, etc.

For each of the side effect types please select one of the impact categories (with an ‘X’), and provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>Environmental effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td></td><td>Negative</td><td>X</td></tr>
<tr><td>Social effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Economic effects</td><td>Positive</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Negative</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Rationale:
Mowing can have significant negative environmental effects by causing damage to non-target species such as native forbs, grasses, and tree seedlings (Vermeir et al., 2002; Ohlenbusch, 2007).

Mowing may have positive social effects if people consider mowed areas to have a desirable appearance. However, mowing may suppress desirable native species that are important to botanists or bird watchers.

If areas invaded by L. cuneata are used as pasture then mowing may reduce desirable grasses used for forage, resulting in a negative economic effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability to stakeholders
e.g. impacted economic activities, animal welfare considerations, public perception, etc.

Please select one of the categories of acceptability (with an ‘X’), and</td>
<td>
<table>
<tr><td>Acceptability to stakeholders</td><td>Acceptable</td><td></td><td>Neutral or mixed</td><td>X</td><td>Unacceptable</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Rationale:
Given the widespread use of mowing to maintain areas, the measure likely would be acceptable to stakeholders unless the goal for an area is to promote high native plant diversity or natural succession to forest (i.e., mowing would suppress tree seedling establishment).</td>
</tr>
</table>

provide a rationale, with supporting evidence and examples if possible.	
Additional cost information [1] When not already included above, or in the species Risk Assessment. - implementation cost for Member States - the cost of inaction - the cost-effectiveness - the socio-economic aspects Include quantitative &/or qualitative data, and case studies (incl. from countries outside the EU).	The implementation cost for mowing would be relatively low because many land managers likely already have trained staff and equipment to apply the measure. However, the measure may not be particularly cost-effective because it may have to be repeated indefinitely for an established invasion (Vermeir et al., 2002; Ohlenbusch, 2007).
Level of confidence on the information provided [2] Please select one of the confidence categories along with a statement to support the category chosen. See *Notes* section at the bottom of this document. **NOTE – this is not related to the effectiveness of the measure**	*Inconclusive* [ ] *Unresolved* [ ] *Established but incomplete* [X] *Well established* [ ] *Rationale*: There is significant information demonstrating that repeated mowing at low heights can reduce the performance and seed production of adult *L. cuneata* plants. However, there also exists evidence that plants readily resprout after mowing and that seedlings emerge quickly after treatment. More information on how best to integrate mowing with herbicide applications to achieve effective management of *L. cuneata* would be helpful.

Bibliography [3]

See guidance section

Allred, B. W., Fuhlendorf, S. D., Monaco, T. A., & Will, R. E. (2010). Morphological and physiological traits in the success of the invasive plant *Lespedeza cuneata*. *Biological Invasions*, 12(4), 739-749.

Althoff, D. P., Gipson, P. S., Pontius, J. S., & Woodford, P. B. (2006). Plant community and bare ground trends on Fort Riley, Kansas: implications for monitoring of a highly disturbed landscape. *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science*, 109(3/4), 101-119.

Altom, J. V., Stritzke, J. F., & Weeks, D. L. (1992). Sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata*) control with selected postemergence herbicides. *Weed Technology*, *6*(3), 573-576.

Bauman, J. M., Cochran, C., Chapman, J., & Gilland, K. (2015). Plant community development following restoration treatments on a legacy reclaimed mine site. *Ecological Engineering*, 83, 521-528.

Barnewitz, E., Klinkenborg, A., & Scheibel, J. (2012). Effects of goat grazing and mowing on seed density and seed mass of Lespedeza cuneata. *Tillers*, *6*, 21-25.

Blocksome, C. E. B. (2006), *Sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata*): seed dispersal, monitoring, and effect on species richness* (Doctoral dissertation). Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University.

Brandon, A. L., Gibson, D. J., & Middleton, B. A. (2004). Mechanisms for dominance in an early successional old field by the invasive non-native *Lespedeza cuneata* (Dum. Cours.) G. Don. *Biological Invasions*, 6(4), 483-493.

Brockway, D. G., & Lewis, C. E. (1997). Long-term effects of dormant-season prescribed fire on plant community diversity, structure and productivity in a longleaf pine wiregrass ecosystem. *Forest Ecology and Management 96* (1/2), 167-183.

Brooks, M. L., D'antonio, C. M., Richardson, D. M., Grace, J. B., Keeley, J. E., DiTomaso, J. M., ... & Pyke, D. (2004). Effects of invasive alien plants on fire regimes. *AIBS Bulletin*, *54*(7), 677-688.

CABI (2018). *Lespedeza juncea var. sericea* (Sericea lespedeza). Invasive Species Compendium. Accessed August 2018. Retrieved from https://www.cabi.org/isc/

Campbell, J. E., & Gibson, D. J. (2001). The effect of seeds of exotic species transported via horse dung on vegetation along trail corridors. *Plant Ecology*, 157(1), 23-35.

Carter, C. T., & Ungar, I. A. (2002). Aboveground vegetation, seed bank and soil analysis of a 31-year-old forest restoration on coal mine spoil in southeastern Ohio. *The American Midland Naturalist*, 147(1), 44-59.

Clines, J. (2005). Preventing weed spread via contaminated hay and straw. In *Proceedings of the California Invasive Plants Council Symposium* (pp. 4-6).

Cope, W. A. (1966). Cross-pollination in sericea lespedeza. *Crop Science*, 6(5), 469-470.

Cullen, J. (1995). *Lespedeza*. In J. Cullen, S. G. Knees, & H. S. Cubey (Eds.), *European Garden Flora Vol. IV.* (pp.494-495). UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cummings, D. C., Bidwell, T. G., Medlin, C. R., Fuhlendorf, S. D., Elmore, R. D., & Weir, J. R. (2007). Ecology and management of Sericea lespedeza. *NREM-2874. Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service*.

Diller, A. (2012). The effects of burning and mowing on the growth of Lespedeza cuneata. *Tillers*, *1*, 37-39.

Dombeck, M. P., Williams, J. E., & Wood, C. A. (2004). Wildfire policy and public lands: integrating scientific understanding with social concerns across landscapes. *Conservation biology*, *18*(4), 883-889.

Duncan, C. A., Jachetta, J. J., Brown, M. L., Carrithers, V. F., Clark, J. K., DiTomaso, J. M., Lym, R. G., McDaniel, K. C., Renz, M. J., & Rice P. M. (2004). Assessing the economic, environmental, and societal losses from invasive plants on rangeland and wildlands. *Weed Technology*, 18, 1411-1416.

Eddy, T., & Moore, C. (1998). Effects of sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata* (Dumont) G. Don) invasion on oak savannas in Kansas. *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, 86, 57–62.

Eddy, T. A., Davidson, J. & Obermeyer, B. (2003). Invasion dynamics and biological control prospects for sericea lespedeza in Kansas. *Great Plains Research*, 217-230.

Farris, R. L., & Murray, D. S. (2009). Control of seedling sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata*) with herbicides. *Invasive Plant Science and Management*, *2*(4), 337-344.

Fechter, R. H., & Jones, R, (2001). Estimated economic impacts of the invasive plant sericea lespedeza on Kansas grazing lands. Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics, 33, 630.

Flora of China (2010). *Volume 10 Online:* Lespedeza cuneata. Retrieved from http://www.efloras.org/florataxon.aspx?flora_id=2&taxon_id=200012191. Accessed 27th September 2017.

Fox, J. C., Buckley, Y. M., Panetta, F. D., Bourgoin, J., & Pullar, D. (2009). Surveillance protocols for management of invasive plants: modelling Chilean needle grass (Nassella neesiana) in Australia. *Diversity and Distributions*, *15*(4), 577-589.

Gucker, C. (2010). (Revised from Munger, G. T., 2004) *Lespedeza cuneata*. In Fire Effects Information System, [Online]. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Stations, Fire Sciences Laboratory (Producer). Retrieved from http://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis. Accessed September 2017.

Guernsey, W. J. (1977). *Sericea lespedeza: its use and management.* USDA Farmers' Bulletin 2245.

Halloran, J., Anderson, H. & Tassie, D. (2013). Clean Equipment Protocol for Industry. Inspecting and cleaning equipment for the purposes of invasive species prevention. Peterborough Stewardship Council and Ontario Invasive Plant Council. Peterborough, ON. https://www.ontarioinvasiveplants.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Clean-Equipment-Protocol_June2016_D3_WEB-1.pdf Accessed October 2018.

Hoveland, C. S., & Donnelly, E. D. (1985). The Lespedezas. In *Forages: The science of grass agriculture* (M. E. Heath *et al.et al.* eds). Fourth ed. (pp.128-135). Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa.

IPPC. (2017). ISPM 41. International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment. UN FAO IPPC. https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2017/05/ISPM_41_2017_En_2017-05-15.pdf Accessed October 2018.

Keeley, J. E. (2006). Fire management impacts on invasive plants in the western United States. *Conservation Biology*, *20*(2), 375-384.

Kettenring, K. M., & Adams, C. R. (2011). Lessons learned from invasive plant control experiments: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of applied ecology*, *48*(4), 970-979.

Koger, C. H., Stritzke, J. F., & Cummings, D. C. (2002). Control of sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata*) with triclopyr, fluroxypyr, and metsulfuron. *Weed Technology*, *16*(4), 893-900.

McCaffrey, S. M. (2006). The public and wildland fire management: social science findings for managers. Gen. Tech. Rep. NRS-1. Newtown Square, PA: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northern Research Station. 202 p.

Newlon, C. F., Baskett, T. S., Breitenbach, R. P., & Stanford, J. A. (1964). Sustaining values of emergency foods for bobwhites. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 532-542.

Ohashi, H., Nemoto, T., & Ohashi, K. (2009). A revision of *Lespedeza* subgenus *Lespedeza* (Leguminosae) of China. *Journal of Japanese Botany*, 84(3), 143-166.

Ohlenbusch, P. D. *et al.* (2007). *Sericea lespedeza: history, characteristics and identification.* Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service. MF-2408.

Pescott, O. L., Walker, K. J., Pocock, M. J., Jitlal, M., Outhwaite, C. L., Cheffings, C. M., ... & Roy, D. B. (2015). Ecological monitoring with citizen science: the design and implementation of schemes for recording plants in Britain and Ireland. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, *115*(3), 505-521.

Pitman, W. D. (2006) Stand characteristics of sericea lespedeza on the Louisiana Coastal Plain. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 115(1), 295-8.

Plass, W. T., & Vogel, W. G. (1973). *Chemical properties and particle-size distribution of 39 surface-mine spoils in southern West Virginia*. USDA Forest Service Research Paper NE-276.

Pramanik, A., & Thothathri, K. (1983). Notes on the taxonomy, distribution and ecology of *Lespedeza juncea* complex with special reference to India. *Journal of Japanese Botany*, 58(11), 331-337.

Quick, Z. I., Houseman, G. R., & Büyüktahtakin, İ. E. (2017). Assessing wind and mammals as seed dispersal vectors in an invasive legume. *Weed Research*, 57(1), 35-43.

Rout, T. M., Moore, J. L., & McCarthy, M. A. (2014). Prevent, search or destroy? A partially observable model for invasive species management. *Journal of applied ecology*, *51*(3), 804-813.

Roy, H. E., Adriaens, T., Aldridge, D. C., Bacher, S., Bishop, J. D. D., Blackburn, T. M., Branquart, E., Brodie, J., Carboneras, C., Cook, E. J., Copp, G. H., Dean, H. J., Eilenberg, J., Essl, F., Gallardo, B., Garcia, M., García-Berthou, E., Genovesi, P., Hulme, P. E., Kenis, M., Kerckhof, F., Kettunen, M., Minchin, D., Nentwig, W., Nieto, A., Pergl, J., Pescott, O., Peyton, J., Preda, C., Rabitsch, W., Roques, A., Rorke, S., Scalera, R., Schindler, S., Schönrogge, K., Sewell, J., Solarz, W., Stewart, A., Tricarico, E., Vanderhoeven, S., van der Velde, G., Vilà, M., Wood, C. A., & Zenetos, A. (2015). *Invasive Alien Species - Prioritising prevention efforts through horizon scanning* ENV.B.2/ETU/2014/0016. European Commission.

Schneider, J., Maehr, D. S., Alexy, K. J., Cox, J. J., Larkin, J. L., & Reeder, B. C. (2006). Food habits of reintroduced elk in southeastern Kentucky. *Southeastern Naturalist*, 5(3), 535-546.

Stroh, E. D., & Struckhoff, M. A. (2009). Exotic plant species associations with horse trails, old roads, and intact native communities in the Missouri Ozarks. *Natural Areas Journal*, 29(1), 50-56.

Terrill, T. H., Windham, W. R., Hoveland, C. S., & Amos, H. E. (1989). Forage preservation method influences on tannin concentration, intake, and digestibility of sericea lespedeza by sheep. *Agronomy journal*, *81*(3), 435-439.

Terrill, T. H., Dykes, G. S., Shaik, S. A., Miller, J. E., Kouakou, B., Kannan, G., Burke, J. M., & Mosjidis, J. A. (2009). Efficacy of sericea lespedeza hay as a natural dewormer in goats: dose titration study. *Veterinary Parasitology*, 163(1), 52-56.

Vermeire, L. T., Bidwell, T. G., & Stritzke, J. F. (2002). *Ecology and management of sericea lespedeza*. Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Oklahoma State University. PSS-2874.

The Plant List (2017) *Lespedeza juncea var.* sericea *(Thunb.) Lace & Hauech.* Accessed 27th September 2017. Retrieved from http://www.theplantlist.org/tpl1.1/record/ild-32600

Unger, A. M., Tanner, E. P., Harper, C. A., Keyser, P. D., Van Manen, F. T., Morgan, J. J., & Baxley, D. L. (2015). Northern bobwhite seasonal habitat selection on a reclaimed surface coal mine in Kentucky. *Journal of the Southeastern Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies*, 2, 235-246.

Vogel, W.G. (1981). *A guide for revegetating coal mine soils in the eastern United States. General Technical Report NE-68.* Broomall, PA: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Northeastern Forest Experiment Station.

Weber, E. (2017). *Invasive plant species of the world: a reference guide to environmental weeds*. Wallingford (United Kingdom) and Cambridge (Massachusetts): CABI Publishing.

Wong, B. M., Houseman, G. R., Hinman, S. E., & Foster, B. L. (2012). Targeting vulnerable life-stages of sericea lespedeza (*Lespedeza cuneata*) with prescribed burns. *Invasive Plant Science and Management*, *5*(4), 487-493.

Woods, T. M., Jonas, J. L., & Ferguson, C. J. (2012). The invasive *Lespedeza cuneata* attracts more insect pollinators than native congeners in tallgrass prairie with variable impacts. *Biological Invasions*, 14(5), 1045-1059.

Notes

1. Costs information. The assessment of the potential costs shall describe those costs quantitatively and/or qualitatively depending on what information is available. This can include case studies from across the Union or third countries.

2. Level of confidence[1]: based on the quantity, quality and level of agreement in the evidence.



- **Well established**: comprehensive meta-analysis[2] or other synthesis or multiple independent studies that agree.
- **Established but incomplete**: general agreement although only a limited number of studies exist but no comprehensive synthesis and, or the studies that exist imprecisely address the question.
- **Unresolved**: multiple independent studies exist but conclusions do not agree.
- **Inconclusive**: limited evidence, recognising major knowledge gaps

3. Citations and bibliography. The APA formatting style for citing references in the text and in the bibliography is used.
e.g. Peer review papers will be written as follows:
In text citation: (Author & Author, Year)
In bibliography: Author, A. A., & Author, B. B. (Publication Year). Article title. *Periodical Title*, Volume(Issue), pp.-pp.

(see http://www.waikato.ac.nz/library/study/referencing/styles/apa)

---

[1] Assessment of confidence methodology is taken from IPBES. 2016. Guide on the production and integration of assessments from and across all scales (IPBES-4-INF-9), which is adapted from Moss and Schneider (2000).

[2] A statistical method for combining results from different studies which aims to identify patterns among study results, sources of disagreement among those results, or other relationships that may come to light in the context of multiple studies.