



*Risk analysis of the non-  
native Monkeyflower  
(Mimulus guttatus) in the  
Netherlands*

---

By J. Matthews, R. Beringen, F.P.L. Collas, K.R. Koopman, B. Odé, R. Pot, L.B. Sparrius, J.L.C.H. van Valkenburg, L.N.H. Verbrugge & R.S.E.W. Leuven

# Risk analysis of the non-native Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in the Netherlands

J. Matthews, R. Beringen, F.P.L. Collas, K.R. Koopman, B. Odé, R. Pot,  
L.B. Sparrius, J.L.C.H. van Valkenburg, L.N.H. Verbrugge  
& R.S.E.W. Leuven

draft report  
22 August 2012

Radboud University Nijmegen,  
Institute for Water and Wetland Research  
Department of Environmental Sciences,  
FLORON & Roelf Pot Research and Consultancy

Commissioned by  
Invasive Alien Species Team  
Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority  
Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation

# Series of Reports on Environmental Science

The series of reports on Environmental Science are edited and published by the Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Radboud University Nijmegen, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, The Netherlands (tel. secretariat: + 31 (0)24 365 32 81).

## Reports Environmental Science nr. 419

- Title: Risk analysis of the non-native Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in the Netherlands
- Authors: J. Matthews, R. Beringen, F.P.L. Collas, K.R. Koopman, B. Odé, R. Pot, L.B. Sparrius, J.L.C.H. van Valkenburg, L.N.H. Verbrugge & R.S.E.W. Leuven
- Cover photo: The Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in a stream valley at Renkum, The Netherlands (© Photo R. Beringen)
- Project manager: Dr. R.S.E.W. Leuven, Department of Environmental Science, Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Radboud University Nijmegen, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, the Netherlands, e-mail: [r.leuven@science.ru.nl](mailto:r.leuven@science.ru.nl)
- Project number: 62001590
- Client: Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, Invasive Alien Species Team, P.O. Box 43006, 3540 AA Utrecht
- Reference client: TRC/NVWA/2012/2009, order nr. 60400891, formdesk nr. 19460, specification code 6300004
- Orders: Secretariat of the Department of Environmental Science, Faculty of Science, Radboud University Nijmegen, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, the Netherlands, e-mail: [secres@science.ru.nl](mailto:secres@science.ru.nl), mentioning Reports Environmental Science nr. 419
- Key words: Dispersion; ecological effects; invasive species; management options, public health, socio-economic impacts

Printed on environmentally friendly paper

© 2012. Department of Environmental Science, Faculty of Science, Institute for Water and Wetland Research, Radboud University Nijmegen, Heyendaalseweg 135, 6525 AJ Nijmegen, The Netherlands

*All rights reserved. No part of this report may be translated or reproduced in any form of print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means without prior written permission of the publisher.*

# Contents

- Summary..... 2
- 1. Introduction..... 4
  - 1.1 Research goals ..... 4
  - 1.2 Outline and coherence of research..... 4
- 2. Methods..... 6
  - 2.1 Components of risk analysis..... 6
  - 2.2 Knowledge document..... 6
  - 2.3 Risk assessment ..... 6
    - 2.3.1 Dispersal potential, Invasiveness and ecological impacts..... 6
    - 2.3.2 Socio-economic and public health impacts..... 9
  - 2.4 Risk management options ..... 9
- 3. Risk analysis.....10
  - 3.1 Risk classification using the ISEIA protocol .....10
    - 3.1.1 Expert consensus scores .....10
    - 3.1.2 Dispersion potential or invasiveness .....10
    - 3.1.3 Colonisation of high conservation habitats .....11
    - 3.1.4 Adverse impacts on native species .....11
    - 3.1.5 Alteration of ecosystem functions .....12
    - 3.1.6 Species classification .....12
  - 3.2 Socio-economic impacts .....13
  - 3.3 Public health effects .....13
  - 3.4 Risk management options .....13
    - 3.4.1 Prevention.....13
    - 3.4.2 Elimination and control .....14
- 4. Discussion .....15
  - 4.1 Gaps in knowledge and uncertainties .....15
  - 4.2 Comparison of available risk classifications.....15
  - 4.3 Risk management .....15
- 5. Conclusions and recommendations .....17
- 6. References .....18
- 7. Acknowledgements.....19
- 8. Appendices.....20
  - Appendix 1. Knowledge document used for the risk analysis .....20

## Summary

The Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) is a semi-aquatic plant, non-native to the Netherlands. Previously, there was a lack of knowledge regarding the pathways for introduction, vectors for spread, key factors for establishment and invasiveness, (potential) effects of *M. guttatus* and management options in the Netherlands. This report is the synthesis of results obtained from a literature study, field observations and expert consultation that address this knowledge gap in the form of a knowledge document. The knowledge document was used to assess the ecological risk using the Belgian ISEIA protocol. Socioeconomic and public health risks were assessed separately as these do not form part of the ISEIA protocol. Recommendations were then made regarding management options relevant to the situation found in the Netherlands.

Four factors are considered as part of the ISEIA protocol: dispersion potential and invasiveness, colonisation of high conservation habitats, adverse impacts on native species and alteration of ecosystem functions.

- Dispersion potential and invasiveness: *M. guttatus* is widely distributed throughout the Netherlands. The species shows a high dispersion potential. *M. guttatus* appears to be highly fecund and is able to disperse through active and passive means employing a number of vectors over distances > 1 km per year. It is most likely that *M. guttatus* has been introduced to non-native habitats via horticulture and the ornamental plant trade and via wildflower seeds mixtures, e.g. on banks of ditches in The Hague
- Colonisation of high conservation habitats: *M. guttatus* occurs in many areas of high conservation value in the Netherlands defined according to Annex 1 of 92/43/EEC directive (i.e. Natura 2000 sites).
- Adverse impacts to native species: *M. guttatus* is able to establish itself on disturbed riparian habitats. It may outcompete ruderal or other non-native plants of a low conservation value but, due its relatively high light demand, is outcompeted by taller perennial or woody plants like Reed (*Phragmites australis*) and Willows (*Salix* sp.) at a later successional stage. It therefore poses a low risk to native species in the Netherlands.
- Alteration to ecosystem functions: *M. guttatus* displays a relatively high soil nitrogen acquisition in laboratory experiments. However, reduced soil nitrogen is beneficial to ecosystems in the Netherlands due to the excess nitrogen enrichment. No negative impacts on ecosystem function were found during the literature study or during discussions with project partners.

*M. guttatus* was rated as a low risk species for ecological impacts according to the ISEIA protocol and accorded a rating of C3 in the BFIS list classification. A C3 classification is defined as a species that is wide spread but demonstrating low environmental hazard.

There was no information found concerning the socio-economic or human health impacts of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands during the literature study or in communications with project partners.

*M. guttatus* features a low environmental hazard due to its limited competitive ability. The introduction of management measures to eliminate and control *M. guttatus* may not be justified for a plant that has a limited ecological and socio-economic impact in the Netherlands. Moreover, the local introduction of management measures may have a limited effect on *M. guttatus*' wider distribution.

*M. guttatus* was rated as a low risk species for ecological impacts according to the ISEIA protocol and accorded a rating of C3 in the BFIS list classification. Future changes in precipitation as a result of climate change will not alter the BFIS list defined invasion stage of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands. A similar distribution of *M. guttatus* in the future means that impacts on native species and ecosystem function will remain unchanged and *M. guttatus* will remain classified as a C3 species. It is therefore recommended that *M. guttatus* is not included in the Dutch Water Plant Code of Conduct.

# 1. Introduction

The non-native Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) originated from the western part of North-America and was first recorded in the Netherlands in 1836 (Mennema *et al.*, 1985). Over the past decade, this plant species showed a rapid range extension. At the start of this project, there was a lack of knowledge regarding the pathways for introduction, vectors for spread, key factors for dispersion and invasiveness, and (potential) effects and management options of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands.

To support decision making with regard to the design of measures to prevent ecological, socio-economical and public health effects, the Invasive Alien Species Team of the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation) has asked to carry out a risk analysis of *M. guttatus*. The present report assesses relevant available knowledge and data which is subsequently used to perform a risk analysis of this species.


## 1.1 Research goals

The major goals of this study are:

- To perform a risk analysis based on dispersion, invasiveness, (potential) impacts and management options of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands.
- To assess the dispersion, invasiveness and (potential) ecological, socio-economic and public health effects of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands
- To describe effective management options for control of spread, establishment and negative effects of *M. guttatus*.

## 1.2 Outline and coherence of research

The present chapter describes the problem statement, goals and research questions in order to undertake a risk analysis of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands. Chapter 2 gives the methodological framework of the project, describes the Belgian Invasive Species Environmental Impact Assessment (ISEIA, 2009) protocol and approaches used to assess socio-economic risks, public health risks and management approaches applicable in the Netherlands. Chapter 3 summarizes the results of the risk assessment, results of the literature study of socio-economic and public health risks and analyses risk management options. Chapter 4 discusses gaps in knowledge and uncertainties, other available risk analyses and explains differences between risk classifications. Chapter 5 draws conclusions and gives recommendations for further research. An appendix containing background information in the form of a knowledge document completes this report. The coherence between various research activities and outcomes of the study are visualised in a flow chart (Figure 1.1).



**Figure 1.1:** Flowchart visualising the coherence of various components of the risk analysis of the Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in the Netherlands. Chapter numbers are indicated in brackets.



## **2. Methods**

### **2.1 Components of risk analysis**

The risk analysis of the Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in the Netherlands was comprised of an ecological risk assessment using the Belgian Invasive Species Environmental Impact Assessment (ISEIA), developed by the Belgian Biodiversity Platform (Branquart, 2007; ISEIA, 2009). Separate assessments of socio-economic, public health impacts and management options were made. Background information and data used for the risk analysis was summarised in the form of a separate knowledge document (Section 2.2).

### **2.2 Knowledge document**

A literature search and data analysis describing the current body of knowledge with regard to taxonomy, habitat preference, dispersal mechanisms, current distribution, ecological and socio-economic impacts and management options for *M. guttatus* was undertaken. The results of the literature search were presented in the form of a knowledge document (Koopman *et al.*, 2012; Appendix 1) and distributed to an expert team in preparation for the risk assessment.

### **2.3 Risk assessment**

#### **2.3.1 Dispersal potential, Invasiveness and ecological impacts**

The ISEIA protocol assesses risks associated with dispersion potential, invasiveness and ecological impacts only (Branquart, 2007). The *M. guttatus* risk assessment was carried out by an expert team. This team consists of five individuals. One from the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority; one from the Dutch plant research and conservation organisation FLORON; one from the Roelf Pot Research and Consultancy firm and two from the Radboud University, Nijmegen. Each expert completed an assessment form independently, based on the contents of the knowledge documents. Following this preliminary individual assessment, the entire project team met, elucidated differences in risk scores, discussed diversity of risk scores and interpretations of key information. The results of these discussions were presented in an earlier draft of this report. Following the submission of this draft version to the expert team, further discussion led to agreement on consensus scores and the level of risks relating to the four sections contained within the ISEIA protocol (Table 2.1).

**Table 2.1:** Definitions of criteria for risk classifications per section used in the ecological risk assessment protocol (Branquart, 2007; ISEIA, 2009).


<b>1. Dispersion potential or invasiveness risk</b>	
Low	The species does not spread in the environment because of poor dispersal capacities and a low reproduction potential.
Medium	Except when assisted by man, the species doesn't colonize remote places. Natural dispersal rarely exceeds more than 1 km per year. However, the species can become locally invasive because of a strong reproduction potential.
High	The species is highly fecund, can easily disperse through active or passive means over distances > 1km / year and initiate new populations. Are to be considered here plant species that take advantage of anemochory, hydrochory and zoochory, insects like <i>Harmonia axyridis</i> or <i>Cemeraria ohridella</i> and all bird species.
<b>2. Colonisation of high conservation habitats risk</b>	
Low	Population of the non-native species are restricted to man-made habitats (low conservation value).
Medium	Populations of the non-native species are usually confined to habitats with a low or a medium conservation value and may occasionally colonise high conservation habitats.
High	The non-native species often colonises high conservation value habitats (i.e. most of the sites of a given habitat are likely to be readily colonised by the species when source populations are present in the vicinity) and makes therefore a potential threat for red-listed species.
<b>3. Adverse impacts on native species risk</b>	
Low	Data from invasion histories suggest that the negative impact on native populations is negligible.
Medium	The non-native is known to cause local changes (<80%) in population abundance, growth or distribution of one or several native species, especially amongst common and ruderal species. The effect is usually considered as reversible.
High	The development of the non-native species <u>often</u> causes local <u>severe</u> (>80%) population declines and the reduction of local species richness. At a regional scale, it can be considered as a factor for precipitating (rare) species decline. Those non-native species form long standing populations and their impacts on native biodiversity are considered as hardly reversible. Examples: strong interspecific competition in plant communities mediated by allelopathic chemicals, intra-guild predation leading to local extinction of native species, transmission of new lethal diseases to native species.
<b>4. Alteration of ecosystem functions risk</b>	
Low	The impact on ecosystem processes and structures is considered negligible.
Medium	The impact on ecosystem processes and structures is moderate and considered as easily reversible.
High	The impact on ecosystem processes and structures is strong and difficult to reverse. Examples: alterations of physico-chemical properties of water, facilitation of river bank erosion, prevention of natural regeneration of trees, destruction of river banks, reed beds and / or fish nursery areas and food web disruption.

The ISEIA protocol contains twelve criteria that match the last steps of the invasion process (i.e., the potential for spread establishment, adverse impacts on native species and ecosystems). These criteria are divided over the following four risk sections: (1) dispersion potential or invasiveness, (2) colonisation of high conservation habitats, (3) adverse impacts on native species, and (4) alteration of ecosystem functions. Section 3 contains sub-sections referring to (i) predation / herbivory, (ii) interference and exploitation competition, (iii) transmission of diseases to native species (parasites, pest organisms or pathogens) and (iv) genetic effects such as hybridisation and introgression with native species. Section 4 contains sub-sections referring to (i) modifications in nutrient cycling or resource pools, (ii) physical modifications to habitats (changes to hydrological regimes, increase in water turbidity, light interception, alteration of river banks, destruction of fish nursery areas, etc.), (iii) modifications to natural successions and (iv) disruption to food-webs, i.e. a modification to lower trophic levels through herbivory or predation (top-down regulation) leading to ecosystem imbalance.

Each criterion of the ISEIA protocol was scored. Scores range from 1 (low risk) to 2 (medium risk) and 3 (high risk). Definitions for low, medium and high risk, according to the four sections of the ISEIA protocol are given in table 2.1. If knowledge obtained from the literature review was insufficient, then the assessment was based on expert judgement and field observation leading to a score of 1 (unlikely) or 2 (likely). If no answer could be given to a particular question (no information) then no score was given (DD - deficient data). Finally, the highest score within each section was used to calculate the total score for the species.

Consensus on the risk score of each section was reached using a hierarchical method where evidence from within the Netherlands was given priority over evidence derived from impacts occurring outside the Netherlands. It was also considered that the suitability of habitats in the Netherlands may change due to e.g. water temperature rise due to climate change. Moreover, consideration was given to the future application or non-application of management measures that will affect the invasiveness and impacts of this invasive plant in the Netherlands.

Subsequently, the Belgian Forum Invasive Species (BFIS) list system for preventive and management actions was used to categorise the species of concern (Branquart, 2007; ISEIA, 2009). This list system was designed as a two dimensional ordination (Environmental impact \* Invasion stage; Figure 2.1). This list system is based on guidelines proposed by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD decision VI/7) and the European Union strategy on invasive non-native species. Environmental impact of the species was classified based on the total risk score (global environmental risk) which is converted to a letter / list: score 4-8 (C), 9-10 (B - watch list) and 11-12 (A - black list). This letter is then combined with a number representing invasion stage: (0) absent, (1) isolated populations, (2) restricted range, and (3) widespread.



**Figure 2.1:** BFIS list system to identify species of most concern for preventive and mitigation action (Branquart, 2007; ISEIA, 2009).

### 2.3.2 Socio-economic and public health impacts

Potential socio-economic and public health impacts did not form a part in the risk analysis according to the ISEIA protocol. However, these potential risks should be considered in an integrated risk analysis. Socio-economic risks were examined as part of the literature study (Koopman *et al.*, 2012) and in discussions with project partners. Socio-economic risks occurring at present or in the future dependent on alterations in habitat suitability and management interventions were considered.

## 2.4 Risk management options

Management options were examined as part of the literature study and extensively described in the knowledge document (Appendix 1) and in discussions with project partners. A description of effective management options is given. These are specifically relevant to, and therefore recommended for, the Netherlands. Recommendations are given in the context of the Dutch Water Plant Code of Conduct which provides voluntary guidelines that recommend limitations on the sale on non-native plants in the Netherlands depending on their potential impacts. The code of conduct includes lists of species within appendices that the code applies to. Consideration as to whether *M. guttatus* should be included in these lists is given in the discussion (Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, 2010).

### 3. Risk analysis

#### 3.1 Risk classification using the ISEIA protocol

##### 3.1.1 Expert consensus scores

The total risk score attributed to the Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) was 8 out of a maximum risk score of 12 (Table 3.1). This results in an overall classification of low risk for this species.

**Table 3.1:** Consensus scores and risk classifications for Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*)

ISEIA Sections	Risk classification	Consensus score
Dispersion potential or invasiveness	high risk	3
Colonization of high value conservation habitats	high risk	3
Adverse impacts on native species	low risk	1
Alteration of ecosystem functions	low risk	1
<b>Global environmental risk</b>	<b>C - list category</b>	<b>8</b>

##### 3.1.2 Dispersion potential or invasiveness

Classification: **High.** *M. guttatus* shows a high dispersion potential in the Netherlands. The species appeared to be highly fecund and is able to disperse through active and passive means employing a number of vectors over distances > 1 km per year.

*M. guttatus* disperses naturally by seed setting, occurring in early July in the Netherlands, and fragmented parts (vegetative reproduction). The seeds of *M. guttatus* are buoyant after release and in dynamic floodplains seeds are dispersed during high flow events after the initial seed setting period (e.g. in winter; Goodson *et al.*, 2002). At an average daily flow velocity of 0.28 m s<sup>-1</sup> seeds can be transported for 1 km. However, some seeds retain buoyancy longer at average daily flow velocities of 0.82 m s<sup>-1</sup> and were able to disperse over a distance of 3 km (Truscott *et al.*, 2006). Fragments can occur year round and survive up to 6 weeks which, in combination with high flow velocities, means that *M. guttatus* is able to disperse over very large distances throughout the year. Dispersal through wind can only occur over short distances of several meters, whereas dispersal by animals like deer, birds and cattle can disperse seeds over 1 km and possibly even further (Truscott *et al.*, 2006; Vickery Jr. *et al.*, 1986; Waser *et al.*, 1982).

*M. guttatus* is mainly used as an ornamental plant and therefore it is most likely that the species has been introduced to non-native habitats via horticulture and the ornamental plant trade (Tokarska-Guzik & Dajdok, 2010; Often *et al.*, 2003). It is also introduced via wildflower seeds mixtures, e.g. on banks of ditches in The Hague (R. Pot, unpublished observation in 2001).

### 3.1.3 Colonisation of high conservation habitats

Classification: **High**. Table 3.2 shows that *M. guttatus* occurs in many areas of high conservation value defined according to Annex 1 of 92/43/EEC directive (i.e. Natura 2000 sites).

**Table 3.2:** Occurrence of the Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in Natura-2000 areas.

Confirmed <sup>1</sup>	Possible <sup>2</sup>
Arkemheen	<i>Achter de Voort, Agelerbroek &amp; Voltherbroek</i>
Broekvelden, Vettenbroek & Polder Stein	<i>Biesbosch</i>
Duinen Den Helder-Callantsoog	<i>Deurnsche Peel &amp; Mariapeel</i>
Gelderse Poort	<i>Dwingelderveld</i>
Kampina & Oisterwijkse Vennen	<i>Haringvliet</i>
Kennemerland-Zuid	<i>Lonnekermeer</i>
Loevestein, Pompveld & Kornsche Boezem	<i>Maasduinen</i>
Loonse en Drunense Duinen & Leemkuilen	<i>Nieuwkoopse Plassen &amp; De Haeck</i>
Meijendel & Berkheide	<i>Oude Maas</i>
Meinweg	<i>Uiterwaarden Zwarte Water en Vecht</i>
Noordhollands Duinreservaat	
Oostelijke Vechtplassen	
Polder Westzaan	
Roerdal	
Uiterwaarden Waal	
Veluwe	
Witte Veen	

1: Records with detailed coordinates and growing site within the boundaries of the Natura-2000 area; 2: Observations with a kilometre square record and Natura-2000 area within this kilometre grid.

Although only few records contain detailed information on biotopes, available data show that the species may occur in the following habitat types:

- H2190 Humid dune slacks
- H3130 Oligotrophic to mesotrophic standing waters with vegetation (Littorelletea uniflorae)
- H3270 Rivers with muddy banks with *Chenopodium rubri* p.p. and *Bidention* p.p. vegetation

The species may also occur on banks of water courses of plain levels with habitat type H3260 (*Ranunculion fluitantis* and *Callitricho-Batrachion*).

### 3.1.4 Adverse impacts on native species

Classification: **Low**. Herbivory and predation are not relevant impact criteria for this plant species. No negative effects resulting from the influence of *M. guttatus* on native species due to parasites and diseases were discovered during the literature study. *M. guttatus* is related to a number of hybrids as part of a species complex, however there was no evidence found that *M. guttatus* hybridises with native species in the Netherlands. Therefore, the risk classification is based on the competition sub-section. During our field


surveys in the Netherlands it has been observed that *M. guttatus* is able to establish itself on disturbed riparian habitats but is eventually overgrown, through the course of vegetation succession, by taller perennial or woody plants like Reed (*Phragmites australis*) and Willows (*Salix* sp.). Evidence from other countries supports these observations. *M. guttatus* establishes quickly in disturbed habitats at an early successional stage. It may out-compete ruderal or other non-native plants of a low conservation value but due its relatively high light demand is outcompeted by species that establish in later successional stages (Truscott *et al.*, 2008a; Truscott *et al.*, 2008b; Hejda *et al.*, 2009). *M. guttatus* poses no threat to national species richness and does not have a serious impact on the plant community in the Czech republic and in Tasmania and New Zealand (Truscott *et al.*, 2008b; Hejda *et al.*, 2009). In Scotland, *M. guttatus* has been shown to induce local species replacement, however this example is not relevant to the Netherlands due to climatic differences (R. Pot, unpublished results).

### 3.1.5 Alteration of ecosystem functions

Classification: **Low**. No information on modification of natural succession and direct disruption to food webs by *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands or in other countries was found during the literature study. Moreover no evidence of physical modifications to habitats occurring in the Netherlands was found during the literature study. Therefore, the risk classification is based on the modifications in nutrient cycling and resource pools subsection. In laboratory experimentation, *M. guttatus* has a higher soil nitrogen acquisition than *Lamium amplexicaule*. Reduced availability of nitrogen to *L. amplexicaule* may reduce its floral display and the attractiveness of its nectar to pollinators. However, reduced soil nitrogen is beneficial to ecosystems in the Netherlands due to the excess nitrogen enrichment that has occurred through the fertilization of agricultural land.

### 3.1.6 Species classification

The species classification corresponds to the global environmental risk score of the ISEIA (Table 3.1) combined with the current distribution of the non-native species within the country in question. The species classification for *M. guttatus* is C3 (Figure 3.1). This indicates a non-native species that is widespread but features a low environmental hazard (ecological risk).



**Figure 3.1:** Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) species classification according to the BFIS list system.

However, habitat alteration resulting from climate change may result in a future re-grading of risk. Future changes in precipitation pattern due to climate change may cause a reduced river water level and desiccation in summer that will have a negative impact on *M. guttatus* distribution. On the other hand, an increase in the area of floodplain could result in increased habitat availability. However, *M. guttatus* is already widely distributed in the Netherlands and poses a low risk to native species and has a low impact on ecosystem functions. It is expected, therefore, that impacts on native species and alterations to ecosystem functions will not alter from the present situation. This would lead to the same low global environmental risk classification as is seen today (Table 3.3). In this theoretical scenario *M. guttatus* would remain in the C3 classification within the BFIS list system.

**Table 3.3:** The Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) species theoretical classification according to potential future habitat scenario.

ISEIA Sections	Risk classification	Consensus score
Dispersion potential or invasiveness	high risk	3
Colonization of high value conservation habitats	high risk	3
Adverse impacts on native species	low risk	1
Alteration of ecosystem functions	low risk	1
<b>Global environmental risk</b>	<b>C - list category</b>	<b>8</b>

### 3.2 Socio-economic impacts

No socio-economic effects have been reported for Central or Northern Europe. However, *M. guttatus* is able to invade drainage ditches, which can lead to economic problems (Gudžinskas, personal observation cited in Tokarska-Guzik & Dajdok, 2010).

### 3.3 Public health effects

There was no information found concerning the public health impacts of *M. guttatus* during the literature study or in communications with project partners.

### 3.4 Risk management options

#### 3.4.1 Prevention

Public awareness is an important component in a strategy aimed at controlling or removing an invasive species from a catchment area. This is especially true of species such as *M. guttatus* where the sale of plants and seeds is a major factor in the extension of its non-native range. Awareness leaflets, press releases, calendars, lakeside notifications and an information website, warning of the environmental, economic and social hazards posed by this plant will contribute to public awareness (Caffrey & O'Callaghan, 2007).



### **3.4.2 Elimination and control**

There is no experience with species-specific elimination or control measures in the Netherlands. The best option for elimination or control is mowing before the ripening of the seeds. In the Netherlands the ripening of seeds has already been observed in early July. Therefore, mowing before July is advised. However, it is expected that mowing will not be an effective measure for perennial plants. If the plants appear to be perennial or hybrids then no management at all is recommended. This will allow vegetation succession to overgrow the plants and is the next best option to reduce the population size.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1 Gaps in knowledge and uncertainties

A lack of information in the literature on the (potential) impact of the Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in the Netherlands has resulted in a reliance on expert knowledge and field observations to judge the level of certain impacts.

There is lack of experience in managing *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands therefore recommendations had to be made on expert knowledge and experience with other similar species.

The ISEIA protocol is limited to an assessment of invasiveness and ecological impacts. No assessment of socio-economic impacts or impacts to human health are considered and are not considered in the calculation of global environmental risk score. Socio-economic impacts or impacts to human health were therefore considered separately.

Risk criteria in the ISEIA protocol were sometimes restrictive, as there was an absence of quantitative data that allowed the criteria to be assessed e.g. 1 km per year dispersal criterion for the 'dispersion or invasiveness' section.

### 4.2 Comparison of available risk classifications

Formal risk assessments have been conducted in two countries: Belgium and Ireland.

In Belgium an ecological risk assessment according to the ISEIA method was performed, resulting in placing *M. guttatus* on a watch list (B2 species; score 10 out of 12). The higher risk obtained for *M. guttatus* in Belgium maybe a function of a greater habitat suitability and resultant higher level of invasiveness (Baus *et al.*, 2010) .

In Ireland a risk assessment for the hybrid: *M. x robertsii* was performed according to the IS Ireland Risk Assessment method, which resulted in a low risk score of 10 (Anonymous, 2007).

In the United Kingdom, Natural England carried out an assessment using a rapid screening process designed to be applicable to larger numbers of plants (Horizon scanning). *Mimulus cupreus* x *guttatus* (*M. x burnetii*), a hybrid of *M. guttatus*, was characterised as low risk requiring no further assessment (Natural England, 2011).

### 4.3 Risk management

Banning of sale of plants and seeds via the plant trade continues to be potentially the most effective method of controlling the spread of invasive plant species. However, *M. guttatus* is already widely distributed in the Netherlands, reducing the relevance of measures that prevent further introductions to the wider environment. *M. guttatus* features a low environmental hazard due to its limited competitive ability. The introduction of management measures to eliminate and control *M. guttatus* may not be

justified for a plant that has a limited ecological and socio-economic impact in the Netherlands. Moreover, the local introduction of management measures may have a limited effect on *M. guttatus*' wider distribution.

*M. guttatus* is classified in the low risk category of the ISEIA protocol. The species is widely distributed in the Netherlands and poses a low risk to native species and has a low impact on ecosystem functions. Future changes in precipitation as a result of climate change will not alter the invasion stage of the species in the Netherlands. A similar distribution of *M. guttatus* in the future means that impacts on native species and ecosystem functions will remain unchanged. It is therefore recommended that *M. guttatus* is not included in the Dutch Water Plant Code of Conduct.

## 5. Conclusions and recommendations

The main conclusions and recommendations of the risk analysis of non-native Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in the Netherlands are as follows:

- *M. guttatus* is widely distributed throughout the Netherlands. The species shows a high dispersion potential. *M. guttatus* appears to be highly fecund and is able to disperse through active and passive means employing a number of vectors over distances > 1 km per year. It is most likely that *M. guttatus* has been introduced to non-native habitats via horticulture and the ornamental plant trade and via wildflower seeds mixtures, e.g. on banks of ditches in The Hague
- *M. guttatus* occurs in many areas of high conservation value in the Netherlands defined according to Annex 1 of 92/43/EEC Habitats directive (i.e. Natura 2000 sites).
- *M. guttatus* is able to establish itself on disturbed riparian habitats. It may outcompete ruderal or other non-native plants of a low conservation value but, due its relatively high light demand, is outcompeted by taller perennial or woody plants like Reed (*Phragmites australis*) and Willows (*Salix* sp.) at a later successional stage. It therefore poses a low risk to native species in the Netherlands.
- *M. guttatus* displays a relatively high soil nitrogen acquisition in laboratory experiments. However, reduced soil nitrogen is beneficial to ecosystems in the Netherlands due to the excess nitrogen enrichment.
- *M. guttatus* was rated as a low risk species for ecological impacts according to the ISEIA protocol and accorded a rating of C3 in the BFIS list classification.
- There was no information found concerning the socio-economic or human health impacts of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands during the literature study or in communications with project partners.
- The introduction of management measures to eliminate and control *M. guttatus* may not be justified for a plant that has a limited ecological and socio-economic impact in the Netherlands. Moreover, the local introduction of management measures may have a limited effect on *M. guttatus*' wider distribution.
- Future changes in precipitation as a result of climate change will not alter the BFIS list defined invasion stage of *M. guttatus* in the Netherlands. A similar distribution of *M. guttatus* in the future means that impacts on native species and ecosystem function will remain unchanged and *M. guttatus* will remain classified as a C3 species.
- It is recommended that *M. guttatus* is not included in the Dutch Water Plant Code of Conduct.

## 6. References

- Anonymous, 2007. Invasives Database December 2007, Invasive species. Ireland. <http://invasivespeciesireland.com/toolkit/risk-assessment/>.
- Baus, E., Branquart, E., Vanderhoeven, S., Van Landuyt, W., Van Rossum, F. & Verloove, F., 2010. <http://ias.biodiversity.be/species/show/116>, last accessed: 21-08-2012.
- Branquart, E., (ed.), 2007. Guidelines for environmental impact assessment and list classification of non-native organisms in Belgium. Belgian Biodiversity Platform, Belgium.
- Caffrey, J.M. & O'Callaghan, D., 2007. A Guide to the Identification of Aquatic Invasive Species in Ireland. Central Fisheries Board, Swords, Dublin *cited in*: Caffrey, J. & Acavedo, S., 2007. Status and Management of Lagarosiphon major in Lough Corrib 2007. Central Fisheries Board, Ireland.
- Goodson, M., Gurnell, A.M., Angold, P.G. & Morrissey, I.P., 2002. Riparian seed banks along the lower River Dove, UK: their structure and ecological implications. *Geomorphology*, 47, 45-60.
- Hejda, M., Pyšek, P. & Jarošík, V., 2009. Impact of invasive plants on the species richness, diversity and composition of invaded communities. *Journal of Ecology*, 97, 393-403.
- ISEIA, 2009. Guidelines for environmental impact assessment and list classification of non-native organisms in Belgium. Version 2.6. [http://ias.biodiversity.be/documents/ISEIA\\_protocol.pdf](http://ias.biodiversity.be/documents/ISEIA_protocol.pdf), last accessed: 14-06-2012.
- Koopman, K.R., Beringen, R., Collas F.P.L., Matthews, J., Odé, B., Pot, R., Sparrius, L.B., van Valkenburg, J.L.C.H., Verbrugge, L.N.H. & Leuven, R.S.E.W., 2012. Knowledge document for risk analysis of the non-native Monkeyflower (*Mimulus guttatus*) in the Netherlands. Reports Environmental Science nr. 416, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.
- Mennema, J., Quené-Boterbrood, A.J. & Plate, C.L., 1985. Atlas van de Nederlandse Flora 2. Zeldzame en vrij zeldzame planten. Bohn, Scheltema & Holkema, Utrecht.
- Natural England, 2011. *Horizon-scanning for invasive non-native plants in Great Britain*. Natural England Commissioned Report NECR053.H. <http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/40015?category=47020>, last accessed: 18-07-2012.
- Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority, 2010. Covenant Waterplanten. <http://www.vwa.nl/onderwerpen/gevaren/dossier/invasieve-waterplanten/convenant-waterplanten>, last accessed: 17-08-2012.
- Often, A., Berg, T. & Stabbeorp, O., 2003. Nurseries are stepping-stones for expanding weeds [Planteskoler er springbrett for nye ugrasarter]. *Blyttia*, 61, 37-47.
- Tokarska-Guzik, B., 2005. The establishment and spread of alien plant species (kenophytes) in the flora of Poland, No 2372. University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland.
- Tokarska-Guzik, B. & Dajdok, Z., 2010. [website] NOBANIS- Invasive Alien Species Fact Sheet- *Mimulus guttatus*, *Online Database of the North European and Baltic Network on Invasive Alien Species*, Viewed on July 14, 2012.
- Truscott, A.-M., Palmer, S.C.F., Soulsby, C. & Hulme, P.E., 2008a. Assessing the vulnerability of riparian vegetation to invasion by *Mimulus guttatus*: relative importance of biotic and abiotic variables in determining species occurrence and abundance. *Diversity and Distributions*, 14, 412-421.
- Truscott, A.-M., Palmer, S.C.F., Soulsby, C., Westaway, S. & Hulme P.E., 2008b. Consequences of invasion by the alien plant *Mimulus guttatus* on the-species composition and soil properties of riparian plant communities in Scotland. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, 10, 231-240.
- Truscott, A.-M., Soulsby, C., S.C.F., Palmer, L. Newell & Hulme, P.E., 2006. The dispersal characteristics of the invasive plant *Mimulus guttatus* and the ecological significance of increased occurrence of high-flow events. *Journal of Ecology*, 94, 1080-1091.
- Vickery Jr., R.K., 1964. Barriers to gene exchange between members of *Mimulus guttatus* complex (Scrophulariaceae). *Evolution*, 18, 52-69.
- Waser, N.M., Vickery Jr., R.K. & Price, M.V., 1982. Patterns of seed dispersal and population differentiation in *Mimulus guttatus*. *Evolution*, 36, 753-761.

## 7. Acknowledgements

We thank the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (Invasive Alien Species Team) of the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation) for financial support of this study and all volunteers and organisations that contributed to the knowledge report on *M. guttatus*. Dr. Trix Rietveld-Piepers of the Invasive Alien Species Team delivered constructive comments on an earlier draft of this report.

## **8. Appendices**

### **Appendix 1. Knowledge document used for the risk analysis**