Species Dataform and Scoresheet for *Vitex rotundifolia* L. f. (Beach Vitex)

Species Dataform and Scoresheet for <i>Vitex rotundifolia</i> L. f. (Beach Vitex)				
Species Dataform and Scoresheet				
Vitex rotundifolia L. f. (Beach Vitex)				
Native range: Eastern Asia				
Date evaluated: February 26, 2009				
	Answer Choices	Response		
Introductory Questions		_		
1. Current federal and state regulations	Y/N	Y		
Comments: Class B state noxious weed in North Ca	arolina (NCDA).			
2. Occurrence in the horticultural trade	Y/N	Y		
Comments: Introduced in the mid 1980s as an ornamental and for dune stabilization				
(Westbrooks and Madsen 2006)				
3. North Carolina nativity	Y/N	N		
Comments: Native to Eastern Asia.				
4. Presence in natural areas	Y/N	Y		
Comments: Coastal areas of North Carolina.	· · ·			
5. Non-invasive cultivars	Y/N	N		
Comments:	2721			
	Maximum Point	Number of Points		
	Value	Assigned		
Section 1. Ecological Impact	v arac	rissigned		
1a. Impact on abiotic ecosystem processes	10	10		
Comments: Beach vitex produces a chemical that prevents the establishment of sea oats				
and other native species (Tibbetts 2007). Produces				
± ',				
soil's capacity to absorb water (Tibbetts 2007). Waxy leaves create a coating in the leaf litter that further reduces soil moisture absorption (Tibbetts 2007). In the long-term, Beach				
vitex could disrupt the beach ecosystem (Tibbetts 2		c long term, beach		
1b. Impact on plant community structure	20	20		
		_		
Comments: Forms monocultures that completely crowd out native dune plants [Sea oats				
(<i>Uniola paniculata</i>)] and federally endangered sea beach amaranth (<i>Amaranthus pumilus</i>) (Westbooks and Madsen, 2006). Outcompetes and inhibits establishment of native species				
by blocking light (Smith 208).	minutes establishmen	it of flative species		
1c. Impact on species of special concern	5	5		
Comments: Impacts native dune vegetation and fed	=			
(Amaranthus pumilus) (Westbrooks and Madsen, 2		a beach amaranin		
	5	5		
1d. Impact on higher trophic levels				
Comments: Tangles of vegetation alter sea turtle ne				
Task Force). Degrades sea turtle habitat with dense foliage and impenetrable, wiry roots				
(Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Section 1. Subrank	40	40		
Secuon 1. Suorank	40	40		
Section 2 Cumont Distribution and Detarti-1				
Section 2. Current Distribution and Potential				
for Expansion	7	1		
2a. Local range expansion	/	1		

Comments: Occupies a fairly small amount of land, approximately 17 acres, along the				
coast of North Carolina and South Carolina (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). In North				
Carolina, Beach vitex has been documented in New Hanover, Pender, and Onslow				
Counties (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006).				
2b. Long-distance dispersal potential	13	13		
Comments: Viable seeds and vegetative runners spread easily by near shore waves and				
currents (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Storms may wash seeds and shoots great				
distances (Smith 2008)	T			
2c. Reproductive characteristics	8	8		
Comments: Prolific seed producer, produces vegeta				
(Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Produces dry blui	sh purple berries. Fra	gments easily and		
fragments may become established elsewhere.	T			
2d. Range of communities	6	6		
Comments: Coastal dunes (Weakley, 2008). Salt m				
Force) = Communities of the coastal zone, Estuarine system, and Marine system (Shafale				
and Weakley, 1990). Has not naturalized areas of N	orth Carolina beyon	d the Coastal Plain.		
2e. Similar habitats invaded elsewhere	6	2		
Comments: High habitat suitability and expected to grow in at least 5 U.S. hardiness zones				
(Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Occupies small percentage of potential ecological range				
in the U.S. and could grow well in coastal communities throughout the southeastern U.S.				
(Westbrooks and Madsen 2006).				
Section 2. Subrank	40	30		
Section 3. Management Difficulty				
3a. Herbicidal control	5	0		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting				
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cuttin 3b. Nonchemical control methods	g-back to the stump (Smith 2008).		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by	g-back to the stump (2 hand-pulling (Smith	Smith 2008). 2 1 2008). Seeds and		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate	g-back to the stump (2 hand-pulling (Smith	Smith 2008). 2 1 2008). Seeds and		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008).	g-back to the stump (2 hand-pulling (Smith	Smith 2008). 2 1 2008). Seeds and		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments	g-back to the stump (2 hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem	Smith 2008). 2 a 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyples.	Smith 2008). 2 a 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2008).	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyples.	Smith 2008). 2 a 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyples.	Smith 2008). 2 a 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008).	g-back to the stump (2 7 hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyple (2008).	Smith 2008). 2 2 2 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 2 2 2008 2008 2008 2008 2008 2008 20		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution	g-back to the stump (2 7 hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyple (2008).	Smith 2008). 2 2 2 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 2 2 2008 2008 2008 2008 2008 2008 20		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread each	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyple 2008). 2 sily by near shore was	Smith 2008). 2 1 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 1 nosate after being 0 2 noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyple 2008). 2 sily by near shore was	Smith 2008). 2 1 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 1 nosate after being 0 2 noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread each	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyple 2008). 2 sily by near shore was	Smith 2008). 2 1 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 1 nosate after being 0 2 noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread ea (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Cut and treated str	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyple 2008). 2 sily by near shore was	Smith 2008). 2 1 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 1 nosate after being 0 2 noved entirely from		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cuttin 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread ea (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Cut and treated str sprouting and necessary retreatment (Smith 2008).	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyph 2008). 2 sily by near shore was umps must be monited.	Smith 2008). 2 2 2 2 3 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 3 3 2008 2 4 2008 2 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread ea (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Cut and treated stream sprouting and necessary retreatment (Smith 2008). 3f. Accessibility of invaded areas	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyph 2008). 2 sily by near shore was umps must be monited.	Smith 2008). 2 2 2 2 3 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 3 3 2008 2 4 2008 2 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting. 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread ea (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Cut and treated stream sprouting and necessary retreatment (Smith 2008). 3f. Accessibility of invaded areas Comments: Removal of plants in many areas required.	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyph 2008). 2 sily by near shore was umps must be monited.	Smith 2008). 2 2 2 2 3 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 3 3 2008 2 4 2008 2 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread ea (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Cut and treated stream sprouting and necessary retreatment (Smith 2008). 3f. Accessibility of invaded areas Comments: Removal of plants in many areas required Plant Society)	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyph (2008). 2 sily by near shore was umps must be monited (2) 2 res landowner permis	Smith 2008). 2 2 2 2 3 2008). Seeds and avoid entirely from 2 3 3 2008 2 4 2008 2 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		
3a. Herbicidal control Comments: Controlled with glyphosate after cutting 3b. Nonchemical control methods Comments: Young seedlings should be removed by broken shoot fragments that may easily regenerate management area (Smith 2008). 3c. Necessity of individual treatments Comments: Plants may be controlled with cut-stem cut back as close to the ground as possible (Smith 2 3d. Average distribution Comments: Monoculture (Smith 2008). 3e. Likelihood for reestablishment Comments: Seeds and vegetative runners spread ea (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006). Cut and treated stripport sprouting and necessary retreatment (Smith 2008). 3f. Accessibility of invaded areas Comments: Removal of plants in many areas required Plant Society) 3g. Impact on native species and environment	g-back to the stump (2 y hand-pulling (Smith the plant must be rem 2 applications of glyph 2008). 2 sily by near shore was umps must be monited to the plant must be must be monited to the plant must be monited to the plant must be monited to the plant must be must be monited to the plant must be mo	Smith 2008). 2 2 2 2 3 3 2008). Seeds and noved entirely from 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3		

following management techniques (Smith 2008).				
Section 3. Subrank	20	13		
Section 4. Benefits and Value				
4a. Estimated wholesale value	-7	-2		
Comments: The annual estimated wholesale value a	attributed to this spec	eies is \$2,346,600		
(Trueblood 2009).				
4b. Percentage of total sales	-5	0		
Comments: Among the producers that sell this species, the highest percentage of total sales				
attributed to this species from any one grower is estimated to be <1% (Trueblood 2009).				
4d. Ecosystem services	-1	0		
Comments: Planted for dune stabilization but sprea	d aggressively as an	invasive species		
(Weakley 2008). Beach vitex lacks the fibrous root system of native plants that are better-				
suited for erosion control (Carolinas Beach Vitex T	ask Force). Economi	c value in dune		
stabilization outweighed by economic cost in the lost value and marketing of ocean front				
properties and negative impact on multi-million dollar federal beach renourishment				
projects (Westbrooks and Madsen 2006)				
4e. Wildlife habitat	-1	0		
Comments:				
4f. Cultural and social benefits	-1	0		
Comments:				
Section 4. Subrank	-15	-2		
Overall Score	100	81		

Overall Recommendation: Highly invasive in coastal areas and not recommended for horticultural use in coastal areas – These species present relatively high ecological impact, distribution and invasive potential, and management difficulty in relation to economic value. (Overall Score: 67 - 100)

Summary: Vitex rotundifolia (Beach vitex) is highly invasive in coastal areas of North Carolina and may not be recommended for horticultural use by the North Carolina Nursery and Landscape Association in coastal areas. Beach Vitex has some of the most severe environmental impacts among all species examined in the assessment process, but these impacts are limited to coastal areas. Beach Vitex seriously impacts ecosystem processes, plant community structure, native plant species, and higher trophic levels in coastal areas of North Carolina. Beach Vitex has high invasive potential on the coast. The difficulty of managing Beach Vitex is moderate to high considering the availability of control methods and time and labor required to effectively treat this species. Beach Vitex has low economic value to the nursery industry.

References:

Carolina Beach Vitex Task Force. Beach Vitex: Carolinas newest coastal menace. (http://www.northinlet.sc.edu/resource/vitex_files/bv%20brochure%20sept%2007_v2.pdf) Accessed: February 26, 2009.

North Carolina Department of Agriculture (NCDA) Plant Industry Divisions - Plant Protection Section (http://www.ncagr.gov/plantindustry/plant/weed/noxweed.htm) Accessed: February 26, 2009.

Shafale, M.P. and A.S. Weakley. (1990) Classification of the Natural Communities of North Carolina. 3rd Approximation. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program. Raleigh, NC.

Smith, C. (2008) Invasive Plants of North Carolina. North Carolina Department of Transportation

South Carolina Native Plant Society. Hawaiian plant threatens South Carolina dunes. (http://www.scnps.org/) Accessed: February 26, 2009.

Tibbetts, J.H. (2007) Knocking Back Biological Invaders. Coastal Heritage. 21: 3 - 13.

Trueblood, C.E. (2009) Chapter 3. An estimate of the commercial value of potentially invasive ornamental nursery crops grown in North Carolina. In An Invasive Species Assessment System for the North Carolina Horticultural Industry, a thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of North Carolina State University. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.

Weakley, A.S. "Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, northern Florida, and surrounding areas." University of North Carolina. Working draft. 7 April 2008.

Westbrooks, R.G. and J. Madsen. (2006) Federal regulatory weed risk assessment beach vitex (*Vitex rotundifolia* L. f.) assessment summary.

Trueblood, C.E. 2009. Results of the North Carolina Invasive Species Assessment System and Individual Species Evaluations. In An Invasive Species Assessment System for the North Carolina Horticultural Industry. MS Thesis. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, pp. 175-178.