

Botany

Monitoring of Invasive Alien Plants in Protected Areas of Georgia

Daniel Slodowicz^{*}, David Kikodze^{**}, Manana Khutsishvili^{**}, Levan Kalatozishvili^{**},
Heinz Müller-Schärer^{*}

^{*}Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Fribourg, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland

^{**}Institute of Botany, Ilia State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

(Presented by Academy Member Giorgi Nakhutsrishvili)

ABSTRACT. Like most other areas worldwide, Georgia is facing an increasing problem with invasive alien plants (IAP). While in a first step, IAPs of Georgia have been identified (e.g. *Ambrosia artemisiifolia*, *Robinia pseudoacacia*), we now report and propose a monitoring program for IAPs. For this, we have set up twelve monitoring sites in five different Protected Areas in the west and in the east of Georgia, and collected initial baseline data. Based on the hypothesis that roads facilitate the introduction and establishment of IAPs, starting points of our monitoring sites were always roadsides and stretched away from the road. The sites being close to roads facilitated at the same time the accessibility of the sites and therefore efficiency of the data collection. The monitoring scheme was kept simple so that more data can be collected in a time and cost effective way over larger areas. For statistical analyses we used linear mixed-effect models with the nested random factors Region, Protected Area and Site, the distance from the road as the explanatory variable and the percent cover of IAPs and native plant species as the response variable. Our results show that IAPs in Protected Areas start spreading along roads and that their density decreases with the distance from the road, most notably in the tree and shrub layer. We also observed that certain areas are more affected by a higher number of IAPs (e.g. Mtirala National Park) than others.

Key words: Plant invasions, Protected areas, IUCN, Conservation, *Ambrosia artemisiifolia*

Introduction

Being situated in the Caucasus, one of the world's biodiversity hotspots, Georgia is known for its high plant biodiversity and endemism. There are some 2700 endemic plant species in the Caucasus, with 278 of them being strictly endemic to Georgia [1]. However, with 380 non-native plant species, from which 16 are invasive [2], Georgia is facing a serious problem. A recent study identified which areas of high conservation value are having a high environmental habitat suitability for nine selected invasive alien plants (IAP) in present and future climate conditions and are therefore prone to plant invasions [3]. The phenomenon of plant invasions has risen in the past century and is becoming increasingly a serious problem for agriculture, human health and the local biodiversity [4,5]. While some countries have already established procedures for the management of IAPs, e.g. USA or Switzerland [6,7], other countries are still in the process of evaluating the threats and risks caused by IAPs. To assure a cost and time efficient management plan against IAPs, a solid monitoring plan for IAPs is necessary [8].

To date there are no established monitoring programs for IAPs Georgia. A logical step is thus to establish a nationwide monitoring program in Georgia, preferably in Protected Areas to start with, where there is staff available to do the monitoring and subsequent control measures. It is crucial that the monitoring design is kept simple, so that data collection can also be done by practitioners with less experience in invasive species management, e.g. staff of Protected Areas. In this way data can be collected quickly and in a cost efficient way.

With roads being a main entry port for IAPs into the adjacent vegetation due to their high disturbance level [9,10], the invasion progress and velocity of invasion of IAPs can best be determined by monitoring the area away from the road, where IAPs are present.

We hypothesize, that the IAP cover will be higher, closer to the road and that it will diminish with further distance from the road, while the native plant cover and diversity will increase with further distance from the road. We also hypothesize, that the IAPs will further spread in the future, with cover of IAP increasing and as a consequence that of native plants decreasing further away from road.

The aim of this study was thus to develop a monitoring scheme for the spread of IAPs and apply it in several Protected Areas in east and west of Georgia, where IAPs are already

present, and secondly to collect initial baseline data. Results will get some first insights into the current situation.

Material & Methods

Study species. In our study we focused on IAPs in Georgia and on other alien plant species, which are invasive elsewhere, but not yet considered as IAP in Georgia. Among the monitored IAPs, the most noxious ones are *Ambrosia artemisiifolia* and *Robinia pseudoacacia* [3]. For the list of the monitored alien species and their status in Georgia see Appendix A.

Monitoring IAPs in Protected Areas. Based on the hypothesis that roads facilitate the introduction and establishment of IAPs [9], starting points of our monitoring sites were always roadsides. In total, 12 sites in 5 different Protected Areas were set up in July 2014 (Fig. 1).




Fig. 1 The 43 Protected Areas in Georgia (based on IUCN criteria I - VI) and the 5 Protected Areas (red dots) in which we monitored a total of 12 sites.

The Protected Areas (PA) were selected according to the following criteria: presence of IAPs, accessibility by car (roads) and no IAP eradication program in place. At each site within a PA,

we set up three transects of 2x50m in a T-shape, with the first plot being along the road and the second and third plot perpendicularly away from the road and centered at plot 1 (Fig. 2). A similar design was already applied successfully by MIREN (Mountain Invasion Research Network) in their study on non-native plants in mountain areas around the globe [10]. For each plot, we recorded % cover of IAPs and of native plants for each vegetation layer (i.e. forbs, shrubs and trees), where the maximum cover for each layer could reach in theory 100%. For a more detailed description of the procedure for the site-setup and data collection see Appendix B.




Fig. 2 T-shaped plot setup with three transect plots. Each plot is 50m long and 2m wide, with the first plot being along the road and the second and third plot perpendicularly away from the road and centered at plot 1.

Statistical Analyses. Statistical analyses were done in R [12] with the baseline data collected in the monitored sites. We used linear mixed-effect models (lme-function in R) with the nested random factors Region, Protected Area and Site. The explanatory variable was the plot ID (i.e. the distance from the road) and the response variables were the percent cover of each layer for the IAPs and natives.

Results & Discussion

We set up six monitoring sites in three Protected Areas in Eastern Georgia and six monitoring sites in two Protected Areas in Western Georgia, which were all easily accessible by car. Due to unexpected difficulties at some monitoring sites, i.e. dense scrub which made trespassing impossible (in Mtirala National Park) and uniform plant cover with no gradient (in Kobuleti Protected Area), four out of twelve sites were set up in a different way as described in our setup protocol. For this reason these four sites were excluded from the statistical analyses.

Monitoring sites differed in their number of IAPs, ranging from one IAP (Tbilisi National Park) to thirteen IAPs (Mtirala National Park) and also in the IAP identity (Table 1).

Table 1 Overview over all IAPs assessed in the 8 sites analyzed

Protected Area	IAP species tree layer	IAP species shrub layer	IAP species forb layer
Tbilisi National Park (East)		<i>Spartium junceum</i>	
Lagodekhi Managed Reserve (East)	<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i> , <i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	<i>Phytolacca americana</i>	<i>Conyza canadensis</i>
Babaneuri Nature Reserve (East)	<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>		<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i> , <i>Conyza canadensis</i>
Mtirala National Park	<i>Paulownia</i>	<i>Phytolacca</i>	<i>Hydrocotyle vulgaris</i> , <i>Conyza canadensis</i> , <i>Commelina communis</i> , <i>Miscanthus</i>

Park (West)	<i>tomentosa</i>	<i>americana</i>	<i>sinensis</i> , <i>Crassocephalum crepidioides</i> , <i>Perilla nankinensis</i> , <i>Lysimachia japonica</i> , <i>Microstegium japonicum</i> , <i>Paspalum dilatatum</i> , <i>Polygonum thunbergii</i>
-------------	------------------	------------------	--

Over all eight sites, which were included in the analysis, the only significant change between plots 1 and 2 (cf. Fig. 3; i.e. along the road and <50m away from the road, respectively) was the increase of natives (from 28.8% to 48.2%, p-value: 0.034) in the tree layer. The other layers showed no significant difference.

Between plots 1 and 3 (i.e. along the road and >50m away from the road, respectively) there was a significant decrease of IAPs (from 3.1% to 0.8%, p-value: 0.047) in the tree layer and a significant decrease of IAPs (from 10.8 to 0.8%, p-value: 0.034) in the shrub layer. There was a marginally significant increase of natives (from 18.3% to 28.3%, p-value: 0.088) in the shrub layer. No differences were observed in the plant cover of the forb layer (Fig. 3)




Fig. 3 Mean vegetation cover over all 8 sites analyzed for (A) IAPs and (B) natives.

Our results confirmed our hypothesis of the effect of distance to the road for the distribution of IAPs and natives, i.e. that the proportion of IAPs is higher closer to the road. This is well in

line with the results gained from a study conducted by MIREN [10]. The reason for the higher cover of IAPs closer to the road might be due to the higher propagule pressure by IAP along roads caused by traffic and high soil disturbance facilitating their establishment [9]. The decrease of IAP cover further away from the road can be explained through the biotic resistance hypothesis, which states that higher plant biodiversity has higher chances in resisting plant invasions than lower biodiversity [12]. We did not assess plant biodiversity in our study in order to optimize our efforts and to keep the monitoring simple. But we found that in the tree layer the cover of natives increased with further distance away from the road.

In order to consolidate our results, this monitoring will have to be expanded over more sites in Georgia and over a longer timeframe, ideally over at least 10 years. This can only be done if the monitoring design, and therefore the procedure, is kept simple in order that data collection can be kept at minimal cost and more personnel can be involved with a minimal involvement of professional botanists. Recently, a scoring system for invasive species has been established, based on their environmental and socio-economic impact [13]. Monitored IAPs could be subjected to this scoring system to render a risk assessment more meaningful.

At a recent workshop, which was held in Tbilisi in July 2015 and organized by the German Society for International Cooperation (GIZ) our monitoring scheme was presented and well received. The chances of implementing our monitoring scheme over larger areas and a longer time frame are promising.

Conclusion

To tackle most efficiently the problem of plant invasions in Georgia in view of identifying their potential risk and minimizing their impact on plant biodiversity, a proper nation-wide monitoring program for IAPs is needed. Such a monitoring program will verify whether the literature and herbarium data is still up to date on the one side, and to find out which Protected Areas are most at risk by IAPs. A recent study modeled the climatic suitability of 27 IAPs and other alien plants in Georgia for present and future climatic conditions (Slodowicz et al. 2016, in revision). Results of this study will assist authorities in selecting Protected Areas most at risk and therefore being prioritized for monitoring. We hope to have set a good baseline for decision makers and stakeholders on where and how resources for IAP management should be invested in the most efficient way [8]. With the upcoming results of the monitoring in the next

years, it can be decided in a cost-efficient way on when and where to invest in efficient prevention and mitigation strategies of IAPs [14–16].

An IAP-program will have higher chances of success, if all countries from the Caucasus collaborate in a unified framework to preserve their unique biodiversity. A good example on such collaborative work is the European COST action SMARTER (FA1203 on Sustainable management of *Ambrosia artemisiifolia* in Europe), in which scientific institutions from over 30 countries work together in finding a sustainable solution for Europe's most noxious plant invader, *Ambrosia artemisiifolia*, with Georgia as a participant of this Action.

Acknowledgments

We greatly acknowledge Grigol Deisadze (Institute of Botany, Iliia State University, Georgia) for his help with the field work, David Kharazishvili (Batumi Botanical Garden, Georgia) for his help on plant identification in the field, Sven Bacher for helping with statistics and Suzanne Lommen for her feedback during the project. We further acknowledge support from the EU COST Action FA1203 ‘Sustainable management of *Ambrosia artemisiifolia* in Europe (SMARTER).

References

1. Solomon J., Shulkina T., and Schatz G. E. (2014) Red List of Endemic Plants of the Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaidjan, Georgia, Iran, Russia, and Turkey. St. Louis, US: Missouri Botanical Garden Press.
2. Kikodze D., Memiadze N., Kharazishvili D., Manvelidze N., and Müller-Schärer H. (2010) “The alien flora of Georgia”
3. Thalmann D. J. K., Kikodze D., Khutsishvili M., Kharazishvili D., Guisan A., Broennimann O., and Müller-Schärer H. (2014) Areas of high conservation value in Georgia: present and future threats by invasive alien plants. *Biol. Invasions*, **17**: 1041–1054.
4. Pimentel D., Zuniga R., and Morrison D. (2005) Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien-invasive species in the United States. *Ecol.*

- Econ.*, **52**: 273–288.
5. Richter R., Berger U. E, Dullinger S., Essl F., Leitner M., Smith M., and Vogl G. (2013) Spread of invasive ragweed: Climate change, management and how to reduce allergy costs. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **50**: 1422–1430.
 6. Van Driesche R., Blossey B., Hoddle M, Lyon S., and. Reardon R. (2002)“Biological control of invasive plants in the Eastern United States.” *FHTET-2002-04*. Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team, USDA Forest Service, Morgantown.
 7. Bohren C. (2006) *Nachrichtenblatt des Dtsch. Pflanzenschutzdienstes*, **58**: 1–15.
 8. Maxwell B. D., Lehnhoff E., and Rew L. J. (2009) The Rationale for Monitoring Invasive Plant Populations as a Crucial Step for Management. *Invasive Plant Sci. Manag.*, **2**: 1–9.
 9. Mortensen D. A., Rauschert E. S. J., Nord A. N., and Jones B. P. (2009) Forest Roads Facilitate the Spread of Invasive Plants. *Invasive Plant Sci. Manag.*, **2**: 191–199.
 10. Seipel T., Kueffer C., Rew L. J., Daehler C. C., Pauchard A., Naylor B. J., et al. (2012) Forest Roads Facilitate the Spread of Invasive Plants. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.*, **21**: 236–246.
 11. R. R Development Core Team, (2011) *R Foundation for Statistical Computing*, **1**: 409, 2011.
 12. Kennedy T. a., Naeem S., Howe K. M., Knops J. M. H., Tilman D., and Reich P. (2002) Biodiversity as a barrier to ecological invasion. *Nature*, **417**:636–638.
 13. Kumschick S., Bacher S., Evans T., Marková Z., Pergl J., Pyšek P., Vaes-Petignat S., van der Veer G., Vilà M., and Nentwig W. (2015) Comparing impacts of alien plants and animals in Europe using a standard scoring system. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 2015.
 14. Leung B., Lodge D. M., Finnoff D., Shogren J. F., Lewis M. a, and Lamberti G. (2002) An ounce of prevention or a pound of cure: bioeconomic risk analysis of invasive species. *Proc. Biol. Sci.*, **269**: 2407–2413.
 15. Müller-Schärer H. and Schaffner U. (2008) Classical biological control: Exploiting enemy escape to manage plant invasions. *Biol. Invasions*, **10**: 859–874.
 16. Panetta F. D., Cacho O., Hester S., Sims-Chilton N., and Brooks S. (2011) Estimating and influencing the duration of weed eradication programmes. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **48**: 980–988.

Appendices

Appendix A: List of alien plants

Alien plants in Georgia, which were found in the 5 protected areas that we monitored.

Scientific name	Family	Status	Notes from available literature sources
<i>Hydrocotyle vulgaris</i>	Apiaceae	naturalized	Common in Adjara, Guria, Samegrelo, Abkhazia
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>	Asteraceae	invasive	Widespread in lowland regions of Georgia
<i>Conyza canadensis</i>	"	naturalized	Common in all regions of Georgia
<i>Crassocephalum crepidioides</i>	"	invasive	Abundant in Adjara
<i>Commelina communis</i>	Commelinaceae	naturalized	Very common in Abkhazia, Samegrelo, Guria, Adjara
<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	Fabaceae	naturalized	Almost throughout Georgia, common along the roads, forest edges, etc.
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	"	invasive	Widespread in Georgia
<i>Spartium junceum</i>	"	naturalized	Expands area of distribution in Tbilisi area; found in Kartli and Abkhazia
<i>Perilla nankinensis</i>	Lamiaceae	invasive	Very common on Abkhazia, Samegrelo, Imereti, Guria, Adjara
<i>Paulownia tomentosa</i>	Paulowniaceae	subspontaneous	Tends to expand distributional area in Adjara
<i>Phytolacca americana</i>	Phytolaccaceae	naturalized	Wide distributional area in Adjara, Abkhazia, Guria, Imereti; found in Kakheti, Kartli, Tbilisi area
<i>Microstegium japonicum</i>	Poaceae	adventive	Very common in Adjara
<i>Miscanthus sinensis</i>	"	invasive	Very common in Adjara, records from Abkhazia, Samegrelo, Guria
<i>Paspalum dilatatum</i>	"	invasive	Very common species in Adjara, Abkhazia and Guria
<i>Polygonum thunbergii</i>	Polygonaceae	naturalized	Widespread in lowlands of Adjara, Abkhazia, Guria, Samegrelo, found in Imereti

<i>Lysimachia japonica</i>	Primulaceae	adventive	Rather abundant in Adjara
<i>Ailanthus altissima</i>	Simaroubaceae	invasive	Very widespread in all regions of Georgia

Annex B: Plot setup within a site

Transects of three plots are to be set up in each site with the first plot being along the road and the second and third plot perpendicularly away from the road and centered at plot 1 (Fig. 2). Each plot is 50m x 2m.

Procedure to follow:

- Find an appropriate starting point for Plot 1 (along road), e.g. a tree
- Take the GPS coordinates, take a picture and mark this point with a label
- Roll out the 50 m tape
- At the end of the plot (after 50m) repeat step 2.
- With a 2m long pole (or folding rule), walk from one end of the plot to the other along the tape.
- Record the % cover for IAPs and natives per layer (trees, shrubs...) inside the plot
- Go to the center of plot 1 at 25m --> starting point for plot 2
- Repeat steps 2.-6. for plots 2 and 3
- Now that you have a good overview of the site, write down some characteristics of the site, i.e. site description with site map, most characteristic native species
- If necessary take additional pictures of the site for better recognition later
- Collect your material and continue to the next site

Research work by authors and their contribution

Daniel D. Slodowicz is a graduate student from the University Fribourg in Switzerland. The present manuscript is part of his MSc thesis. His research interest focuses on the potential distribution of invasive alien plants and conservation of plant biodiversity threatened by plant

invaders. He was mainly responsible for the field work, data collection, analysis and wrote a first version of the manuscript

David Kikodze, deputy director of Ilia State University Institute of Botany(IoB) helped with the monitoring design, the selection of the study sites and assisted in a pilot study. He further provided important feedback during the analysis and the writing of the manuscript.

Manana Khutsishvili, head of national herbarium at IoB and Levan Kalatozishvili, Researcher at Ilia State Universty helped with field work and data collection.

Heinz Müller-Schärer's research interest is in ecological and evolutionary aspects of plant-antagonist interactions, especially in the context of plant invasion and range extension, and biological control. He initiated and designed this project, assisted in a pilot study, supervised the project and helped with writing-up.