Echinacea Project Research Proposal Dayvis Blasini June 23th, 2013

Assessment of the Effects of the Introduction of Non-native Echinacea Species in the Pollination of Native *Echinacea angustifolia* in Western Minnesota

Dayvis Blasini¹ and Stuart Wagenius Ph.D.² ¹Department of Biology, Northeastern Illinois University ²Division of Plant Science and Conservation, Chicago Botanic Garden Chicago, Illinois

Abstract

The narrow-leaved purple coneflower Echinacea angustifolia (Asteraceae) is the only native Echinacea species found in Minnesota tallgrass prairies. Due to high levels of habitat fragmentation in this area, many restoration projects have been developed in these tallgrass prairies recently. Some of these restoration efforts have introduced non-native Echinacea species (Echinacea pallida and Echinacea purpurea). These species could potentially have detrimental effects on the native Echinacea species, as well as on the arthropod communities that depend on this plant. A specific concern is the invasion by hybridization between native and non-native echinacea species. Last year we successfully tested the likelihood of hybridization between Echinacea pallida and Echinacea angustifolia using artificial crosses and demonstrated that each species accepts interspecific pollen and seedling results. Because we still do not have any evidence that such hybridization occurs in nature, we will identify and contrast the pollinator species that visit each echinacea species to determine the ultimate possibility of hybridization among these plant species. Simultaneously, we will study echinacea plants in the field to quantify synchrony in the time of flowering between the local and the introduced species. We will observe, record, and collect pollinators for later identification using high resolution cameras and an existing reference pollinator collection. Because both species are visited by generalist pollinators, we hypothesize that the introduced species are very likely to hybridize and may displace the native species in nature. The information we gather from this research will indicate how important it is to use local flora in restoration projects.

Background

The introduction of non-native plant species can alter the ecological functioning of an entire ecosystem. Therefore, it is crucial to know and understand the specific characteristics of a habitat before introducing new species in it. Equinacea angustifolia (Asteraceae) also known as the narrow-leaved purple coneflower has been historically the only member of the Echinacea family present in the Minnesota tallgrass prairie. However, restoration efforts in this state have introduced other varieties of echinacea (Echinacea pallida and Echinacea purpurea) instead the native Echinacea angustifolia. Since as *Echinacea pallida* as *Echinacea purpurea* are species with a broader geographic range than Echinacea angustifolia (USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2013), these species are more likely to be present in a much great variety of restoration manuals, horticultural guidebooks, and the general seed market. Consequently, the availability of their seeds will be greater while their cost will be considerably inferior. These facts may be behind the introduction of nonnative echinacea species in western Minnesota restored areas. This is a particular cause of concern since *Echinacea pallida* has been observed outcompeting Echinacea angustifolia in other areas of the United States (Snyder et al, 1994). Thus, the introduction of these non-native echinacea species could potentially have detrimental effects on the native Echinacea species, as well as on the arthropod communities that depend on this plant. A specific concern is the invasion by hybridization between native and non-native echinacea species.

Sanford et al, 2013 (unpublished) successfully tested the likelihood of hybridization between Echinacea pallida and Echinacea angustifolia using artificial crosses and demonstrated that each species accepts interspecific pollen and seedling results. Indeed, Sanford's data suggest that both species are more likely to accept pollen from interspecific mates than from intraspecific mates. Also, it was found that Echinacea angustifolia was more prone to accept interspecific pollen than Echinacea pallida. All these results confirmed the ability of Echinacea pallida to outcompete Echinacea angustifolia and consequently the probability of an invasion by hybridization. However, we still do not have any evidence of the likelihood that such hybridization would occur in nature. Therefore, we will identify and contrast the pollinator species that visit each echinacea species to determine the ultimate possibility of hybridization among these plant species. Simultaneously, we will study echinacea plants in the field to quantify synchrony in the time of flowering between species. We will observe, record, and collect pollinators for later identification using high resolution cameras and an existing reference pollinator collection. Because both species are visited by generalist pollinators (Stuart Wagenius, personal communication), we hypothesize that the introduced species are very likely to hybridize and may displace the native species in nature. Also, I will use data from previous echinacea project teams to determine the efficiency of the pollinators that are shared by the two types of echinacea plants. It will provide a much accurate view of how possible is hybridization in nature. The information we gather from this research will indicate how important it is to use local flora in restoration projects.

Research Questions:

What effects can have the introduction of *Echinacea pallida* and *Echinacea purpurea* in restored prairies of western Minnesota

- 1- Is hybridization between Minnesota nonnative *Echinacea* species and *Echinacea angustifolia* possible in the prairies of western Minnesota?
- 2- Is pollinator fidelity of Echinacea angustifolia visitors decreased by the presence of other echinacea species in the same habitat?
- 3- Do pollen limitation in Echinacea angustifolia increase with other echinacea species in the same habitat?

Methods:

Pollinator visitation will be observed at Hegg Lake Wildlife Area (HLWMA). This site provides the most ideal conditions since it has *Echinacea pallida* and *Echinacea angustifolia* populations in close proximity. In this site, we will find the same set of environmental conditions for pollinators and plants. Therefore, Hegg Lake Wildlife Area (HLWMA) is the most indicated site to assess if both species of plants share pollinators and synchrony in flowering. Identification of pollinators will be done through observation of ten minutes at two meters from the plant. We will take video combined with observation. It will add more data in the same period of observation time. It also will help to identify pollinators more accurately. Synchrony among these species will be assessing by recording and contrasting flowering dates between the two different species populations. An existing pollinator collection and online insect database will provide the guide to identify pollinator species. Data will be collected in a spreadsheet designed for this research (See next page).

Identification Keys:

http://echinacea.umn.edu/summer/field_guide_to_Echinacea_visitors.pdf http://echinacea.umn.edu/insects/EchinaceaInsects.htm

	[Data Colle	ection		
Plant Specie: Ec	hinacea angu	ustifolia (
	hinacea palli				
Time :		uu ()			
Plant Tag #:					
	Visit	ation	Weather Conditions	Pollinator collected	Vial Number
Pollinator	Count	Time	(Cloudy, Sunny, or Windy)	(Y/N)	
Andrenidae					
Andrena rudbeckiae					
Andrena rudbeckiae					
Pseudopanurgus albitarsis					
Ceratina calcarata/dupla					
Melissodes bidentis					
Melissodes subillata					
Melissodes trinodis					
Apis mellifera					
Bombus fervidus					
Colletidae					
Colletes kincaidii					
Hylaeus cressoni					
Hylaeus modestus					
Formicidae					
Formica sp.					
Lasius sp.					
Halictidae					
Agapostemon virescens					
Augochlorella aurata					
Lasioglossum heterognatum					
Lasioglossum near rowheri					
Lasioglossum pilosum					
Lasioglossum pruinosum					
Lasioglossum pectorale					
Halictus ligatus					
Agapostemon texanus					
Lasioglossum imitatum					
Lasioglossum tegulare					
Lasioglossum albipenne					
Lasioglossum admirandus					
Halictus confusus					
Halictus rubicundus					
Megachilidae					
Megachile brevis					
Diptera					
Sarcophagidae					
Sarcophagidae sp.					
Scathophagidae					
Scathophagidae sp.					
Syrphidae					
Eristalis? sp. 1.					
Eristalis? sp. 2.					
Helophilus? sp.					
Sphaerophoria? sp1					
Sphaerophoria? s					

Literature Cited

1. Sanford-Long, S. (2013). Cross Pollination and the Potential for Hybridization between Native and Nonnative Echinacea (Middlebury College). Unpublished paper.

2. Snyder, Kristin M.; Baskin, Jerry M.; Baskin, Carol C. 1994. Comparative ecology of the narrow endemic Echinacea tennesseensis and two geographically widespread congeners: relative competitive ability and growth characteristics. International Journal of Plant Sciences. 155(1): 57-65. [49219].

3. USDA. Natural Resources Conservation Service, PLANTS profile for Echinacea angustifolia. [Internet]. [Cited 2013 June 20]. http://plants.usda.gov/java/profile?symbol=ECAN2

4. USDA. Natural Resources Conservation Service, PLANTS profile for Echinacea pallida. [Internet]. [Cited 2013 June 20]. http://plants.usda.gov/java/profile?symbol=ECPA

5. USDA. Natural Resources Conservation Service, PLANTS profile for Echinacea purpurea. [Internet]. [Cited 2013 June 20]. http://plants.usda.gov/java/profile?symbol=ECPU

6. Walck, J., Hemmerly. T., and Hindayati, S., 2002. The Endangered Tennessee Purple Coneflower, Echinacea Tenessensis (Asteraceae), Its Ecology and Conservation. Native Plant Journal. 3(1): 54-64.

7. Wagenius, S., and Pimm S. (2010). Reproduction of Echinacea angustifolia in fragmented prairie is pollen-limited but not pollinator limited. Ecology, 91(3): 733-742