

Species Assessment Group - Summary of group ratings Date: _____

Species: Frangula alnus

Members of the SAG:

| Ratings for Criteria - 1st round | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | Total # | Average |
|---|------------|---|---|------------|---|---|---|-------|---|----|----------------|----|----|----|--------------------------|---------|---------|
| 1. Current status and distribution | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Establishment potential | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Damage potential | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Prevention and control potential | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Socio-economic impacts | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | ii | 4 | | | | | | | | |
| Totals - 1st round | Prohibited | | | Restricted | | | | Watch | | | Non-restricted | | | | Insufficient Information | | |
| Number of votes for each classification | | | | xxxxxxx | | | | x | | | | | | | | | |

Comments:1 - This species is a big threat to northern forests though it is not as widespread as in the south. There is still a good opportunity to contain this species in northern WI. It is locally abundant in north and is spread by birds. 2 - Damage potential is extremely high in high quality calcareous wetlands 3 - Very invasive in wetlands. Ron williams (fine line) and asplenifolia are two commercially important cultivars, the asplenifolia has been shown in research from Vermont to have very low seed viability, less than 5%. Ron Williams (fine line) has not been scientifically proven to produce non-viable seed, tests are inconclusive. Ron Williams does produce a lot of fruit. 4 - Possible permit for interstate sales, one large nursery sells \$30,000 to \$40,000 per year out of state. Concerned that native species of buckthorn could be extincted in WI. 5 - associating frangula with cathartica could lower demand, guilt by association. 7 - Possible exemption for asplenifolia cultivar.

| Ratings for Criteria - 2nd round | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | Total # | Average |
|---|------------|---|---|------------|---|---|---|-------|---|----|----------------|----|----|----|--------------------------|---------|---------|
| 1. Current status and distribution | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Establishment potential | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Damage potential | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Prevention and control potential | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Socio-economic impacts | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Totals - 2nd round | Prohibited | | | Restricted | | | | Watch | | | Non-restricted | | | | Insufficient Information | | |
| Number of votes for each classification | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Final Recommended Classification : Restricted

Final Comments/Rationale: Exemption or permit for asplenifolia cultivar, and possibly Ron Williams if it is shown scientifically to be non-viable. Establishing the non-viability of Ron Williams should be a priority. Request for information should come from an official source. Final rating for Ron Williams cultivar should be ii.