

MN NWAC Risk Assessment Worksheet (04-2011)	Common Name	Latin Name
	British Yellowhead	<i>Inula britannica</i> L.
Reviewer	Affiliation/Organization	Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
Anthony Cortilet	Minnesota Department of Agriculture	05/02/2011

Box	Question	Answer	Outcome
1	Is the plant species or genotype non-native?	Europe and temperate Asia	Box 3
3	Is the plant species, or a related species, documented as being a problem elsewhere?	Yes; Netherlands, Soviet Union; Michigan	Box 6
6	Does the plant species have the capacity to establish and survive in Minnesota?	Yes; USDA Risk Assessment and climate modeling places ideal habitat in Zone 4 –specifically WI;	
	A. Is the plant, or a close relative, currently established in Minnesota?	Yes; populations have been established and survived 2+ years in MN at Mall of America (Hosta Beds) and State Capitol Garden (Hosta Beds) ; EDD Maps shows locations in Pine, Carlton, St. Louis, Hennepin, Jackson, and Faribault Counties – MDA has only confirmed Ramsey and Hennepin Counties having populations outside of nurseries.	Box 7
7	Does the plant species have the potential to reproduce and spread in Minnesota?	Yes; Climate modeling shows that states like MN, WI, and MI have the required climates for <i>Inula</i> to reproduce and spread.	
	A. Does the plant reproduce by asexual/vegetative means?	Yes; rhizomes or fragments of rhizomes	Question 7B
	B. Are the asexual propagules effectively dispersed to new areas?	Yes, through distribution of hostas	Question 7I
	I. Do natural controls exist, species native to Minnesota, that are documented to effectively prevent the spread of the plant in question?	Not known	Box 8
8	Does the plant species pose significant human or livestock concerns or has the potential to significantly harm agricultural production, native ecosystems, or managed landscapes?		

Box	Question	Answer	Outcome
	A. Does the plant have toxic qualities, or other detrimental qualities, that pose a significant risk to livestock, wildlife, or people?	None are known at this time.	Question 8B
	B. Does, or could, the plant cause significant financial losses associated with decreased yields, reduced crop quality, or increased production costs?	Not Likely. Habitats required for successful establishment are considered to be wet or moist. River and stream margins, wetlands, marshes, wet woods, wet grasslands, etc.	Question 8C
	C. Can the plant aggressively displace native species through competition (including allelopathic effects)?	Not known at this time in North America. One occurrence for Maryland cited in a USDA Risk Assessment, but indicates the plant is not spreading from the field it established in. Sites at Mall of America and State Capital in Twin Cities, MN have not shown any spread. Not known to be allelopathic.	Question 8D
	D. Can the plant hybridize with native species resulting in a modified gene pool and potentially negative impacts on native populations?	Not known at this time.	Question 8E
	E. Does the plant have the potential to change native ecosystems (adds a vegetative layer, affects ground or surface water levels, etc.)?	Not known yet in the U.S. No supporting information based on establishment in NY state and Canada dating back to the early 1900s.	Question 8F
	F. Does the plant have the potential to introduce or harbor another pest or serve as an alternate host?	Not known at this time.	The species is not currently believed to be a risk.

Final Results of Risk Assessment

	Review Entity	Comments	Outcome
	NWAC Listing Subcommittee	Not enough is known in the literature or from observations, based on other US states, of this species being extremely invasive. It does establish and can survive MN winters, but also appears to be fairly easy to eradicate. Most of its spread is associated with hosta plantings. Not deemed to be a serious threat to MN at this time for listing under a noxious category.	Suggested to place on species of concern list.

Box	Question	Answer	Outcome
	NWAC Full-group		List as Species of Concern
	MDA Commissioner	No listing	No Listing
		File Number: MDARA00011BRITYEL_11_30_2011	

References:

- 1) Polly Lehtonen and R. A. Schall. USDA, APHIS, PPQ. *Inula britannica* L. (British elecampane) Weed Risk Assessment. 2000; Revised 2009. 15 pages. http://www.aphis.usda.gov/plant_health/plant_pest_info/weeds/downloads/wra/InulabritannicaWRA.pdf
- 2) USDA Plants Database Profile for *Inula britannica* L.: <http://plants.usda.gov/java/profile?symbol=INBR>
- 3) EDD Maps locations of *Inula britannica* L.: <http://www.eddmaps.org/google/index.cfm?sub=9410>
- 4) Alabama Cooperative Extension System ANR-1227. *Inula britannica* L., an aggressive weed alert. <http://www.aces.edu/pubs/docs/A/ANR-1227/ANR-1227.pdf>
- 5) Kentucky Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey. *Inula britannica* Survey 2005. http://www.ca.uky.edu/caps/inula_past.asp
- 6) Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center. British Yellowhead, *Inula britannica*. <http://threatsummary.forestthreats.org/threats/threatSummaryViewer.cfm?threatID=231>
- 7) West Virginia Department of Agriculture. Pest Alert. *Inula britannica* L.: http://www.wvagriculture.org/images/Plant_Industries/Inula.pdf
- 8) Federal Noxious Weed Disseminules of the U.S. *Inula britannica* L.: http://keys.lucidcentral.org/keys/v3/FNWE2/key/FNW_Seeds/Media/Html/fact_sheets/Inula_britannica.htm