An Overview of *Triadica sebifera* (Chinese Tallowtree) in the Southern United States, Emphasizing Pollinator Impacts and Classical Biological Control

James T. Vogt[1,*], Rabiu Olatinwo[2], Michael D. Ulyshen[1], Rima D. Lucardi[1], Daniel Saenz[3], and Jessica L. McKenney[4]

Abstract - Throughout history a great many plant species have been purposefully transported to new areas around the globe. Horticulture, the promise of new sources of plant material for industry, forage, food, and stabilization of soil are only a few of the motives for the early transcontinental exchange of plants. Many introductions have been beneficial or benign, but some plants introduced into new areas are now considered invasive and detrimentally impact the environment. *Triadica sebifera* (Chinese Tallowtree; Euphorbiaceae) is an excellent example of the best intentions leading to unanticipated negative effects many decades later. Native to eastern Asia and now naturalized and widespread in many tropical, subtropical, and temperate areas in the world, Chinese Tallowtree has proven to be one of the worst woody invasive plants. It is known for shading out native vegetation, capable of dominating areas following disturbance or even invading previously diverse undisturbed habitats. It is prevalent in the southern United States, especially along the Gulf Coast. Investigations into classical biological control of Chinese Tallowtree have yielded at least 2 promising candidates but have raised objections among beekeepers and beekeeping organizations who prize the quality honey produced from an abundant spring nectar flow. In this overview, we discuss Chinese Tallowtree's invasive characteristics, detrimental effects, potential use as a biomass crop, and demonstrated or potential direct and indirect effects on native and non-native pollinators. We review the current state of identification and screening of biological control agents and present 4 research topics that are would fill gaps in our knowledge of Chinese Tallowtree and pollinators. Classical biological control has the potential to reduce Chinese Tallowtree populations across the landscape, which would likely result in greater understory and tree diversity, benefitting native and exotic pollinators.

Introduction

Triadica sebifera (L.) Small (Chinese Tallowtree, hereafter Tallowtree; Euphorbiaceae) is a small- to medium-size tree that is native to eastern Asia. It has become widely established and naturalized in many tropical, subtropical, and temperate parts of the world and is considered invasive in the US, India, and Australia (Rojas-Sandoval 2018). Tallowtree is especially widespread and problematic across the southern US (Meyer 2011, USDA NRCS 2019). Other

[1]USDA Forest Service Southern Research Station, 320 E. Green Street, Athens, GA 30602. [2]USDA Forest Service Southern Research Station, Alexandria Forestry Center, 2500 Shreveport Highway, Pineville, LA 71360. [3]USDA Forest Service Southern Research Station, 506 Hayter Street, Nacogdoches, TX 75965. [4]Department of Entomology, Louisiana State University, Agricultural Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70803. [*]Corresponding author - james.t.vogt@usda.gov.

Manuscript Editor: Alvin Diamond

common names include Popcorn Tree, due to its clusters of white seeds (Fig. 1), Florida Aspen, and Chicken Tree. Trees of this species produce an abundance of seeds, which are rich in oils and covered with a thick layer of white, fatty material known as tallow. In China, where it has been cultivated for centuries, all parts of the tree are utilized in some manner, for food, traditional medicine, industrial applications, carvings, and furniture (Macgowan 1852). It is thought to have been introduced into the US from China in 1776 by Benjamin Franklin (Bruce et al. 1997, Randall and Marinelli 1996). In the early 1900s, the US Department of Agriculture encouraged planting of Tallowtree in the US Gulf States in hopes of establishing a soap industry (Flack and Furlow 1996). Over the last 250 years, various organizations have touted the benefits of Tallowtree, and the species has been promoted as a crop for production of edible and industrial oil as well as biomass for hydrocarbon fuels (Howes 1949, Jamieson and McKinney 1938, Scheld and Cowles 1981, Scheld et al. 1984). It has also been widely planted as a landscape tree for its colorful autumn foliage and by beekeepers as forage for honey production (Lieux 1975). For a comprehensive review of Tallowtree biology and its introduction into the US, see Bruce et al. (1997).

Tallowtree has been present in the US for nearly 250 years, but rapid expansion has occurred over the last few decades (Fig. 2; Oswalt 2010). Numerous studies

Figure 1. Ripened Chinese Tallowtree fruit. Photograph © Nancy Loewenstein, Alabama Cooperative Extension System.

have documented its impacts in a variety of habitats (e.g., see below), and its facultative wetland status allows for new colonization in many southern US ecoregions (USDA NRCS 2019). Considering its initial introduction in the late 18th century, the species underwent a founder effect and likely a lag-phase; its more recent spatial expansion may be due to a release from the lag-phase and/or sufficient disturbance allowing for increased establishment and secondary spread. This observed spread and additional establishment may also be the result of the species' high fecundity and repeated purposeful introductions; the secondary spread in the southern US over the last 70 years may also be driven by increased genetic diversity stemming from additional introductions of parental material from the native range(s) resulting in accumulation of new adaptations and/or evolution of competitive ability in the novel environment (Aikio et al. 2010, Blossey and Nötzold 1995, Crooks 2005, Elton 1958, Sakai et al. 2001). Other contributing factors to a release from a lag-phase include, but are not solely attributed to, as mentioned, increases in genetic information via secondary contact contributing to an increase in genomic response and adaptability (Sakai et al. 2001), biotic and abiotic factors (Catford et al. 2009), density-dependence (such as an Allee effect) (Pachepsky and Levine 2011, Sullivan et al. 2017), and the propagule pressure during the period(s) of introduction (Blackburn et al. 2013, Cassey et al. 2018, Catford et al. 2009, Lockwood et al. 2005).

Non-native, invasive tree species generally have profound and lasting impacts on the communities they invade (Lamarque et al. 2011). Trophic and competitive interactions may be relatively straightforward and easily observed, while more subtle effects associated with longer-term changes in flora and fauna may not be immediately apparent. Trees are particularly effective ecosystem engineers, a term coined by Jones et al. (1996, 1997:1946) for "… organisms that directly or indirectly control the availability of resources to other organisms by causing physical state changes in biotic or abiotic materials." In this overview, we consider studies that have directly addressed Tallowtree's invasiveness, role as an ecosystem engineer, likelihood of cultivation as a biomass/biofuel crop, potential for classical biological control, and potential impacts on introduced and native pollinators. We include a review of scientific and selected popular literature addressing Tallowtree and *Apis mellifera* L. (Honey Bee), as the tree is often promoted as an important nectar source for honey production. We present 4 research topics that could increase our understanding of interactions between Tallowtree and pollinators. We conclude that classical biological control efforts to reduce Tallowtree in the introduced range of the US may represent a cost-effective means of reducing negative impacts across the broader landscape.

Invasive Characteristics of Chinese Tallowtree

Life-history and evolutionary traits contribute to Tallowtree's success as an invasive, perenniating tree. Tallowtree is an r-selected species, which are generally known to be tolerant of a wide range of biotic and abiotic pressures in the naïve invasive range and exhibit high fecundity, effective dispersal, and the ability to rapidly colonize disturbed habitats—traits that help make them successful invasive



Figure 2. Chinese Tallowtree distribution in the southern United States. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Inventory and Analysis estimates of trees per acre, by county in 2000, 2010, and 2020. These estimates do not capture all infested counties but demonstrate increasing coverage and density over a 20-year span.

species. Successful invasive plants are generally ruderal and may be superior resource competitors as compared to native plants (Davis et al. 2000, Tilman 2004). Though it has been proposed that forested systems are intrinsically more resistant to invasion (Martin et al. 2009), canopy gaps resulting from stochastic and/or anthropogenic disturbances create opportunities that can result in a breakdown of local biotic resistance (Elton 1958, Martin et al. 2009). Tallowtree's ability to invade both disturbed and undisturbed habitats in the southern US as an r-selected species have been well documented.

Disturbance-mediated spread has been shown for many invasive plant species (Lozon and MacIsaac 1997) and Tallowtree is no exception. Several other environmental factors are predictors of successful Tallowtree invasion, including proximity to bodies of water, private land ownership, low elevation and slope, and younger stands (Gan et al. 2009). Fire may promote seed germination and seedling recruitment, but subsequent fires under short-term fire regimes can top-kill or kill young seedlings and saplings, while larger trees can survive low-intensity burns (Fan et al. 2021, Meyer 2011). Proximity to edge habitats such as roads and fire breaks, which can harbor mature, seed-bearing trees, can favor Tallowtree invasion (Fan et al. 2018, Yang et al. 2019). Empirical data derived from the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Inventory and Analysis program demonstrated increased coverage and northward movement of Tallowtree in east Texas, at a rate of just under 2 km/year (Suriyamongkol et al. 2016). By the mid-1990s, there were naturalized populations of Tallowtree in over half of Florida's counties; at one study site, Tallowtree had been present for only 20 years but had the greatest density of all woody species, with seedling cover exceeding that of all other woody species combined (Jubinsky and Anderson 1996). The first author has seen large areas (tens of hectares) in southern Louisiana where the only trees present a few years after cutting were Tallowtree and a few large sentinel *Quercus* (oaks). Riparian areas in California's Central Valley are also susceptible to invasion, especially downstream from areas where it has naturalized (Bower et al. 2009).

Tallowtree satisfies 2 of the classes of successional drivers proposed by Meiners et al. (2015): species availability and species performance. Tallowtree produces an abundance of seeds, with both local dispersal near the mother-plant and longer-distance bird-mediated dispersal, which increases species availability in locations near existing populations. Fecundity is a strong characteristic of Tallowtree favoring invasiveness, with trees producing seed 3 years after germination (McCormick 2005). The species is vagile, with a tree producing up to 100,000 seeds that are readily dispersed by water and birds (Renne et al. 2002). Tallowtree produces a seed bank that remains viable for at least 2 years (Harper 1995, Renne et al. 2001). Seeds that are placed in cold storage can germinate for as long as 7 years, although the percentage of viable seed drops substantially (Cameron et al. 2000). Furthermore, reproductive flexibility in non-native plants further contributes to nascent invasives' success in establishment and spread. In Tallowtree, local vegetative sprouting from belowground root tissue contributes to individual regeneration and persistence (Meyer 2011).

Several characteristics of Tallowtree related to species performance favor establishment and spread. Tallowtree seedlings are shade-tolerant (Jones and McLeod 1989), exhibit growth equal to or exceeding native vegetation (Bruce 1993; Hall 1993; Jones and Mcleod 1989, 1990), and can withstand occasional flooding and saltwater intrusion (Conner and Askew 1993, Jones and Sharitz 1990). While some tolerance to saltwater intrusion has been observed, Tallowtree is not adapted to high soil salinity (Barrilleaux and Grace 2000; Yang et al. 2015a, b). Relatively low rates of herbivory have been observed on Tallowtree in the US (Jones and McLeod 1989, Jones and Sharitz 1990, Seimann and Rogers 2003) as compared to China (Zhang and Lin 1994). Invasive ecotypes of Tallowtree in the US differ from their counterparts in China, in agreement with the evolution of the increased competitive ability hypothesis (EICA; Blossey and Nötzold 1995), as demonstrated in several studies (Rogers and Siemann 2004; Siemann et al. 2017; Zou et al. 2006, 2008). The invasive ecotypes allocate more resources to growth and/or reproduction and fewer resources to herbivore defense as compared to Chinese ecotypes, presumably because of decreased herbivory in the invaded range (Hartley et al. 2010). A few generalist herbivores have been documented on Tallowtree in the US (Johnson and Allain 1998, Lankau et al. 2004, Siemann and Rogers 2003) and 1 specialized herbivore, a moth (Lepidoptera: Gracillariidae), occurs throughout much of the invaded range in the US (Wheeler et al. 2017b). Pile et al. (2017) provided a comprehensive review of invasion mechanisms for Tallowtree.

Researchers have had ample opportunities to observe and quantify Tallowtree invasions following hurricanes. Hurricanes and other catastrophic weather events are relatively common perturbations in southern US forests (Vogt et al. 2020, Yang et al. 2021), altering stand dynamics and influencing succession at local to landscape scales. Following Hurricane Katrina in 2005, Chapman et al. (2008:888) noted that "the creation of large canopy gaps from wind disturbance has resulted in some areas being essentially carpeted with Tallowtree seedlings and saplings." In a floodplain area that escaped major wind damage from the storm but was inundated by floodwater for an extended period of time, Tallowtree increased in abundance and dominance due to mortality of other species (in spite of some Tallowtree mortality from flooding) and rapid recruitment following the event. This finding strengthens the case for Tallowtree's ability to withstand, and capitalize on, a wide range of biotic and abiotic conditions during stochastic events like hurricanes (Howard 2012). In a study ~5 years later, Henkel et al. (2016) documented prolific growth and recruitment of adult Tallowtree in previously uninfested, highly damaged, low-elevation areas. Following Hurricane Andrew, Conner et al. (2002) documented Tallowtree invasion in previously uninfested areas, with many of the trees at least 10 cm DBH by 1999, only 7 years after the hurricane.

Tallowtree acts as an ecosystem engineer in multiple ways. Once introduced, Tallowtree can form a dense canopy. In certain ecosystems, community resistance to invasion can be overcome without disturbance (e.g., Bruce et al. 1995). Bruce et al. (1997) documented an invasion by Tallowtree in a native Texas coastal prairie, with canopy closure within 20–25 years. Tallowtree suppresses fire regimes by changing fuel loads and via rapid decomposition of its leaves (Cameron and Spencer 1989, Grace 1998, Montez et al. 2021), and Tallowtree itself appears to be somewhat fire-adapted (Grace 1998). Rapid decay of leaves may increase nutrient input to the soil, altering nutrient cycling (Cameron and Spencer 1989), and Tallowtree leaf litter may reduce reproductive success of winter-breeding anurans by causing acute changes to the water chemistry of breeding ponds (Adams and Saenz 2012, Cotten et al. 2012, Saenz et al. 2013).

Biofuels

As recently as the 1980s through the 2000s, some people continued to advocate for Tallowtree as a crop. Scheld et al. (1980, 1984) suggested commercial production of Tallowtree as a cash and petroleum-substitute crop. Scheld and Cowles (1981) and Glumac and Cowles (1989) demonstrated Tallowtree's potential value as a woody biomass crop. Breitenbeck (2009a) reviewed the potential of Tallowtree as a biodiesel feedstock. Elsewhere, referring to southwestern Louisiana, Breitenbeck (2009b) argued that because the species is already widespread, its commercial production in this area poses little environmental threat. Tallowtree continues to be considered and evaluated as a candidate for biofuels and other uses. For example, Zappi et al. (2020) listed Tallowtree among 12 energy/lipid crop plants evaluated for suitability as bioenergy crops to be grown in highway rights-of-way. Despite tying with *Vernicia fordii* (Hemsl.) Airy Shaw (Tung Oil Tree) for second place in their assessment of growth, productivity, status as foodstock, and potential secondary co-products, Tallowtree was ultimately not recommended based upon lack of processing infrastructure, toxic tree components, and its status as a "nuisance plant" throughout the area of consideration (southeastern US). There is no question that Tallowtree is prized in its native range for many uses, and has tremendous potential as a source of biofuels, but this may be a moot point in the US. Though not yet a listed Federal Noxious Weed, several states have listed Tallowtree as "noxious" (Florida, Mississippi, and Texas; National Plant Board 2020). It is listed as invasive by state Invasive Plant Councils in Alabama, California, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee (www.se-eppc.org/alabama/, www.cal-ipc.org, floridainvasivespecies.org/index.cfm, www.gaeppc.org, www.se-eppc.org/southcarolina/, https://www.tnipc.org/). The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries lists Tallowtree as invasive (Holcomb et al. 2015). It is considered among the top 10 invasive plants in Mississippi, where the "Help Stop the Pop" program aims to assist municipalities with tree removal and educate the public (Mississippi Forest Commission 2020).

Effects on Pollinators

Observations and studies have aptly demonstrated the invasiveness of Tallowtree, and its persistence in the environment. Surprisingly, relatively few studies have documented pollination of Tallowtree and its potential effects on native pollinators. Tallowtree can be expected to have both direct and indirect effects on flower-visiting insect communities. While the direct effects involve the provision of nectar and pollen, indirect effects are likely to include displacement of native plant species. These different effects are reviewed separately below followed by suggestions for future research.

Direct effects

Tallowtree produces drooping spike-like inflorescences up to 20 cm long with female flowers at the base and male flowers along the remainder of the spike (Fig. 3; Miller et al. 2010). Trees flower prolifically and the flowers produce an abundance of pollen and nectar during the spring and early summer months. Because the pollen grains exhibit limited potential for wind dispersal (Clark 2016), Tallowtree largely depends on insects for pollination (Clark and Howard 2019).

Most information on the value of Tallowtree to pollinators relates to Honey Bees. It is well established that Tallowtree contributes greatly to honey production

Figure 3. Chinese Tallowtree flowers. Photograph © Nancy Loewenstein, Alabama Cooperative Extension System.

in both its native and introduced range. In subtropical China, for example, a related species of *Triadica*, *T. cochinchinensis* Lour. (formerly *Sapium discolor*), is the most important nectar resource for Honey Bees (Liu et al. 2020). North American beekeepers have reported similar benefits of Tallowtree to the Honey Bee. Hayes (1977, 1979) outlined some characteristics of Tallowtree that make it attractive to beekeepers, claiming nectar availability from Tallowtree produced an average 34 to 45 kg surplus honey in a hive, but presented no data. Tallowtree is so prized by beekeepers that professional organizations supporting beekeeping in the southern US have argued against release of classical biological control agents targeting this invasive tree (e.g., Dittfurth 2018, Moore 2018, Payne 2018). In addition to citing the benefits of Tallowtree to honey production, some have expressed concern that introduced species may have unintended consequences, such as attacking multiple plant species, or pointed out that not all biological control organisms are 100% effective (e.g., Meny 2018). Others have argued for cost–benefit analysis for removal of Tallowtree across the landscape and replacement with suitable Honey Bee forage (Pollinator Stewardship Council 2018). Tallowtree appears in extension publications aimed at beekeepers in Louisiana (Pollet and Cancienne 2006), Mississippi (Harris 2019), and Georgia (Delaplane 2010). Alabama Cooperative Extension Service and Clemson Cooperative Extension (South Carolina) both list Tallowtree among non-native trees that are nectar sources but discourage planting or spreading them (Clemson Cooperative Extension 2020, Tew et al. 2018).

Compared to the debate centered on the importance of Tallowtree to Honey Bees, very little is known about the value of Tallowtree flowers to native pollinators. This is unfortunate considering the many threats facing this fauna (Goulson et al. 2015) as well as the important role native bees play in pollinating crops. As a group, native bees can contribute more to crop pollination than Honey Bees (Breeze et al. 2011, Winfree et al. 2007a), and diverse pollinator communities provide a degree of redundancy, thus reducing our dependence on any single species (Calderone 2012). Various threats to Honey Bee populations and their pollination services such as climate warming (Rader et al. 2013) and colony collapse disorder (Ellis et al. 2010) underscore the importance of native bees to food security (Winfree et al. 2007b). To our knowledge, only 1 study specifically sought to survey native insects visiting Tallowtree flowers. Clarke and Howard (2019) sampled insects from Tallowtree flowers at 4 locations in Mississippi and Louisiana. They collected only 6 species of bees visiting flowers. Of these, the Honey Bee was the most abundant species due to its numerical dominance at 1 of the 4 sites. All 5 native bee species reported in that study are opportunistic generalists with broad host ranges and represent less than 3% of the bee species known from the region (Bartholomew et al. 2006). In a broader study of non-native plants and native plants, pollinators visiting non-native plants tended to be more generalized species (Memmott and Waser 2002). Moreover, unlike some non-native plant species (Salisbury et al. 2015), Tallowtree blooms during the period of greatest flower availability (April–June; Bruce et al. 1997) and therefore provides no benefit to bees later in the season when fewer floral resources are available. In fact, tallow flowers are highly synchronous and are only available on a tree for about 10 days, after which they senesce and fall to the ground (D. Saenz, unpubl. data), so depending on flowering synchrony of a stand, the annual nectar availability is likely less than the 3-month window suggested by Bruce et al. 1997. To our knowledge, Tallowtree flowering phenology has not been fully investigated throughout its range. Landowner guidelines for enhancing pollinator abundance and reproduction stress the importance of having a variety of flowering plants that provide nectar throughout the season (e.g., Delaplane 2010).

Studies on other taxa warrant the conclusion that Tallowtree supports a depauperate arthropod fauna within its introduced range. Hartley et al. (2004) found that Diptera, Acari, and Araneida comprise the atypical arthropod fauna found in monocultures of Tallowtree in Texas. Hymenoptera (ants and wasps) were not very abundant in their study (39 individuals, 16 species), and pollinators were not mentioned at all. Predators and detritivores comprised 70% of collections overall. Fewer herbivores were found on Tallowtree than in nearby natural areas in other, previous studies. Taken together, the findings from these studies suggest Tallowtree has little direct value to native insects.

Indirect effects

Tallowtree can shade out competitors and rapidly form a closed canopy, reducing understory diversity and thereby lowering pollen and nectar availability for much of the year (Bruce et al. 1997). It is generally accepted that forests that are more open favor pollinators (Hanula et al. 2016), and previous work has documented the negative effects of thick growths of invasive shrubs on native plants (Hanula et al. 2017) as well as pollinators (Hudson et al. 2014). Open, natural areas, such as Texas coastal prairie where Tallowtree can invade and form closed-canopy monocultures (Bruce et al. 1997) provide diversity of native plants and resources for pollinators. Coastal prairie habitats and *Pinus palustris* Mill. (Longleaf Pine) savannahs are 2 sensitive communities that are limited in distribution and are susceptible to Tallowtree invasion (Grace 1998, Varner and Kush 2004). Diverse pollinator communities have been documented in Longleaf Pine savannahs (Bartholomew et al. 2006), and they benefit from stand thinning (Breland et al. 2018, Odanka et al. 2020). Conversely, the loss of understory from Tallowtree invasion may well result in decreased pollinator diversity and abundance. Pollinator abundance and pollination services are closely linked to landscape change (Kremen et al. 2007, Ricketts et al. 2008). It therefore seems likely that invasion by Tallowtree has strong indirect effects on pollinator communities, especially in areas where Tallowtree forms dense monocultures.

A second potential indirect effect of Tallowtree on pollinators involves the facilitation of Honey Bees. Honey Bees are known to compete strongly with native bees for nectar and pollen (Cane and Tepedino 2017) and, although studies investigating their various impacts on native bees have produced mixed and sometimes conflicting results (Russo 2016), a growing number of studies suggest they disrupt plant–pollinator networks (Geslin et al. 2017, Prendergast and Ollerton 2021, Valido et al. 2019). The existing literature indicates that Tallowtree flowers benefit Honey Bees but are visited by few native bee species (though at times in relative abundance) and only provide a source of nectar and pollen for a few months each year, about 10–14 days for individual trees. If they favor Honey Bees over native bees, Tallowtrees may promote Honey Bee dominance within invaded landscapes. If so, this effect would likely increase the competition native bees face when visiting other nectar and pollen sources, especially later in the year when Tallowtree is not in bloom.

Finally, mutualisms between non-native plants and pollinators may facilitate the spread of invasive plants or otherwise impact pollinator and plant communities. In North America, at least 2 invasive weeds rely heavily on Honey Bees for pollination: *Lythrum salicaria* L. (Purple Loosestrife; Mai et al. 1992) and wild populations of *Raphanus sativus* L. (Radish; Stanton 1987). Several studies outside of the United States have documented preferences of introduced bees for non-native plants over native flora (Donovan 1980, Morales and Aizen 2006, Pearson and Braiden 1990, Stimec et al. 1997, Woodward 1996). There is evidence that non-native plants in cultivation receive fewer flower visits than naturalized non-native and native plants, suggesting that successful naturalization may be linked to flower visitation (Razanajatovo et al. 2015). The extent to which Tallowtree invasion may benefit from Honey Bees is not known; however, Clark and Howard (2019) found no evidence of Honey Bee–Tallowtree mutualism, and found 4 native, generalist bees to be relatively abundant on Tallowtree flowers. As they pointed out, Honey Bee dominance at 1 of 4 sites may have been a function of proximity to cultivated hives. It is interesting to note that no other species of Apidae were captured at the Honey Bee-dominated site in their study. Additional studies will be needed to further explore these relationships.

Classical Biological Control

Classical biological control of weeds can provide a cost-effective, sustainable reduction in populations of invasive species (Clewley et al. 2012, Coulson et al. 2000). Some potentially promising classical biological control agents for Tallowtree have been identified. Three fungal pathogens and 115 species of arthropods have been reported to damage Tallowtree and related *Triadica* species in China (Zheng et al. 2006). The flea beetle *Bikasha collaris* (Baly) (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae), whose larvae feed on Tallowtree roots and adults feed on foliage, was unable to complete its life cycle on 77 non-target plant taxa (Wheeler et al. 2017a, c). A lepidopteran, *Gadirtha fusca* Pogue (Lepidoptera: Nolidae), showed high host specificity for Tallowtree in choice and no-choice tests with 78 non-target taxa (Wheeler et al. 2018b). Both *G. fusca* and *B. collaris* have been recommended for release (10 August 2016 and 19 October 2018, respectively) by the Technical Advisory Group for Biological Control Agents of Weeds (TAG), whose mission is "to facilitate biological control of weeds in North America by providing guidance to researchers and recommendations to regulating agencies for or against the release of nonindigenous biological control agents, based on considerations of potential non-target impacts and conflicts of interest" (USDA APHIS 2020). As of this writing, neither has been released.

Other herbivorous insects have also been studied as potential biological control agents. Wang et al. (2011) conducted feeding studies with 2 specialist herbivores: the weevil *Heterapoderopsis bicallosicollis* (Voss) (Attelabidae) and the moth *Gadirtha inexacta* Walker (Noctuidae) (but see below). Insects were provided seedlings of native (Chinese) and invasive (southeastern US) Tallowtree. More insects fed and developed on foliage from invasive populations, but impacts on growth of seedlings were lower. In host-suitability experiments, *H. bicallosicollis* was able to complete development on several plants native to the US and is not considered a viable candidate for biological control (Steininger et al. 2013). In another study, *G. inexacta* was shown to have a narrow host range and significantly damaged Tallowtree (Y. Wang et al. 2012). However, subsequent morphological (Pogue 2014) and molecular studies (Wheeler et al. 2018a) indicated that Y. Wang et al. (2011, 2012) had misidentified *G. inexacta* and were actually working with *G. fusca* Pogue. Another tested moth, *Sauris* nr. *purpurotincta* Galsworthy (Lepidoptera: Geometridae), was found to feed on some native southeastern plants including *Hippomane mancinella* L., which is listed as endangered in Florida; thus, the moth is not being considered for importation and release (Fung et al. 2017). A newly described gall midge, *Schizomyia triadicae* Elsayed and Tokuda (Diptera: Cecidomyiidae), forms flower bud galls on young branches of Tallowtree (Elsayed et al. 2019). Efforts to collect, identify, and screen additional insects have been hampered by the COVID-19 pandemic, but there are many other herbivorous insects on Tallowtree in its native range that could be considered as candidate biological control agents (G.S. Wheeler, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Davie, FL, pers. comm.).

A few other potentially damaging organisms have been documented on Tallowtree. The root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne javanica* (Treub) has been reported to cause damage to the tree, while root rots caused by *Armillaria mellea* (Vahl) P. Kumm., *Armillaria tabescens* (Scop.) Emel, *Pythium* spp., and *Phymatotrichopsis omnivora* (Duggar) Hennebert; leaf spots caused by *Alternaria* spp., *Pseudocercospora stillingiae* (Ellis and Everh.) J.M. Yen, A.K. Kar, and B.K. Das, and *Phyllosticta stillingiae* (Ellis and Everh.); and dieback caused by *Diploidia* spp. have been associated with Tallowtree (Bogler 2000, McCormick 2005). The potential of these organisms to contribute to integrated pest management programs for Tallowtree has not been investigated.

Biological control is not without its risks. *Cactoblastis cactorum* Berg (Lepidoptera: Pyralidae) was introduced in 1957 to Nevis in the Lesser Antilles in an effort to reduce populations of *Opuntia* (prickly pear) species (Simmonds and Bennett 1966), then to nearby islands (Tudurí et al. 1971). Initial introductions into Australia in the 1920s (Dodd 1940) were considered successful in reducing undesirable *Opuntia* species. It has since arrived in the US, and has been found in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina (USDA APHIS 2005) where it threatens native *Opuntia* species. The other well-known example of non-target effects related to classical biological control of weeds can be found in efforts to control invasive *Carduus nutans* L. (Musk Thistle) in the US. The flower head weevil *Rhinocyllus conicus* Froel. attacks many non-target thistle species, some of which are uncommon (Louda 2000).

It is possible that classical biological control of Tallowtree with herbivorous insects could provide a net benefit to pollinators in multiple ways. Huang et al. (2015) demonstrated that above- and/or belowground herbivory by *B. collaris* induced production of extrafloral nectaries (EFN) in Tallowtree, resulting in more leaves producing EFN, greater volume of nectar, and increased soluble solids in EFN. This nectar would be available well beyond flower production. In a scenario where classical biological control agents stress Tallowtree, allowing gradual recovery of native understory for nectar production, those same agents could induce increased nectar availability from Tallowtree populations.

Future Research Directions on Chinese Tallowtree and Pollinators

Beyond the value of Tallowtree to Honey Bees and honey production (Hayes 1977, 1979; Lieux 1975), there is not much evidence of benefits of Tallowtree invasion to pollinators in its invasive range in the southern US. However, few studies have investigated the direct and indirect effects of Tallowtree on pollinators. Priorities for future research include:

(1) Additional surveys of native pollinators on Tallowtree flowers.
(2) Effects of Tallowtree invasion on native plants and non-Tallowtree floral availability.
(3) Indirect effects on pollinator communities at varying levels of Tallowtree infestation.
(4) Recovery of pollinator communities following the restoration of Tallowtree-invaded sites.

Topic 4 above is of particular interest to the beekeeping industry. While a strong case can be made that Tallowtree invasion is generally detrimental to pollinators, and can render monoculture areas useless for honey production during the majority of the season, it will be important to document changes in understory composition as well as pollinator diversity and abundance following restoration efforts.

Conclusions

Invasive plants can generate a broad suite of effects such as altering fire regimes, nutrient cycling, hydrology, and energy budgets, and they can greatly reduce native vegetation in invaded areas (Mack et al. 2000). These detrimental aspects of Tallowtree invasion are well documented, although there is a need to further address ecosystem costs associated with invasion and subsequent conversion to Tallowtree monoculture (see Funk et al. 2014) and to address the specific research topics listed above. Wetland ecosystems, which are favorable for Tallowtree invasion, were estimated some 23 years ago to contribute at least \$14,785 ha^{-1} yr^{-1} in ecosystem services (Costanza et al. 1997). Costs to agricultural systems such as timber are more straightforward and easier to estimate. In a study modeling economic costs of Tallowtree invasion to the forest industry under a 20-year expansion model, H. Wang et al. (2012) predicted costs of \$200 million to $400 million depending on the level of Tallowtree control, with higher costs associated with lower control.

The potential benefits of Tallowtree as a biofuel or source of specific products derived from its seeds are not likely to materialize on an operational basis due to its status as invasive or noxious in the states where it occurs. The benefits of Tallowtree's nectar flow to Honey Bees must be weighed against its impacts on native flora and fauna as the spread of this species continues to convert both disturbed and unique, undisturbed ecosystems to Tallowtree monoculture. Given the highly invasive nature of Tallowtree, its broad distribution, and the temporary nature of control using traditional control measures (e.g., cultural/mechanical controls and/or herbicides), classical biological control may offer more cost-effective and long-term control (Wheeler and Ding 2014). Many have presented arguments for biological control of Tallowtree, including detrimental effects associated with crowding out of native pollen and nectar sources and creation of "nectar deserts" for 10 months out of the year (e.g., Bammer 2018). Investigations into biological control of Tallowtree were recommended by the Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council's Chinese Tallow Task Force in 2005 (McCormick 2005). While host specificity appears to be well-established for *G. fusca* and *B. collaris*, their success as biological control agents would depend on a wide range of factors, including potential interactions with native predators and parasitoids (Schultz et al. 2019) and the degree to which they limit growth and reproduction of Tallowtree.

While there is inherent risk in any attempt to manage or control invasive plants, including use of conventional means, biological control of weeds rarely results in non-target effects (Delfosse 2005, Simberloff and Stiling 1996, Suckling and Sforza 2014). Relatedness of native plant species has been taken into account when considering importation of classical biological control agents for Tallowtree (Wheeler and Ding 2014). As discussed in this review, Tallowtree is widely regarded as one of the worst woody invasive species in southern US ecosystems, is capable of invading some ecosystems without disturbance, frequently invades and dominates areas following disturbance, and interferes with regeneration and forest management. Tallowtree is predicted to continue spreading northward in the US (Pattison and Mack 2008). The inherent costs of doing nothing to reduce Tallowtree populations on a landscape scale are demonstrably high. Efforts to reduce Tallowtree population density, including classical biological control, could potentially result in increased tree and understory diversity to the ultimate benefit of native and exotic pollinator communities.

Acknowledgments

We thank Tracy Roof and Helen Robinson for assistance with Figure 2 and Greta Langhenry for technical editing. Nancy Loewenstein, Gregory Wheeler and 2 anonymous reviewers provided many helpful suggestions that greatly improved the manuscript. This work was funded in part by United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Research and Development and State and Private Forestry. The findings and conclusions in this publication are those of the authors and should not be construed to represent any official USDA or US Government determination or policy.

Literature Cited

Adams, C.K., and D. Saenz. 2012. Leaf litter of invasive Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) negatively affects hatching success of an aquatic breeding anuran, the Southern Leopard Frog (*Lithobates sphenocephalus*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 90:991–998.

Aikio, S., R.P. Duncan, and P.E. Hulme. 2010. Lag-phases in alien plant invasions: Separating the facts from the artefacts. Oikos 119:370–378.

Bammer, M. 2018. A reasonable argument in support of the Chinese Tallow Flea Beetle (A note on the Chinese Tallow Flea Beetle from Dr. William Kern, UF/IFAS Associate professor). University of Florida / IFAS Blogs. Available online at http://blogs.ifas.ufl.edu/entnemdept/2018/08/31/a-reasonable-argument-in-support-of-the-chinese-tallow-flea-beetle/. Accessed 21 September 2020.

Barrilleaux, T.C., and J.B. Grace. 2000. Growth and invasive potential of *Sapium sebiferum* (Euphorbiaceae) within the coastal prairie region: The effects of soil and moisture regime. American Journal of Botany 87:1099–1106.

Bartholomew, C.S., D. Prowell, and C. Griswold. 2006. An annotated checklist of bees (Hymenoptera: Apoidea) in Longleaf Pine savannas of southern Louisiana and Mississippi. Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society 79:184–198.

Blackburn, T.M., T.A.A. Prowse, J.L. Lockwood, and P. Cassey. 2013. Propagule pressure as a driver of establishment success in deliberately introduced exotic species: Fact or artefact? Biological Invasions 15:1459–1469.

Blossey, B., and R. Nötzold. 1995. Evolution of increased competitive ability in invasive nonindigenous plants: A hypothesis. Journal of Ecology 83:887–889.

Bogler, D.J. 2000. Element stewardship abstract for *Sapium sebiferum*. The Nature Conservancy Arlington, VA. 10 pp. Available online at https://www.invasive.org/gist/esadocs/documnts/sapiseb.pdf. Accessed 25 January 2021.

Bower, M.J., C.E. Aslan, and M. Rejmánek. 2009. Invasion potential of Chinese Tallowtree (*Triadica sebifera*) in California's Central Valley. Invasive Plant Science and Management 2:386–395.

Breeze, T.D., A.P. Bailey, K.G. Balcombe, and S.G. Potts. 2011. Pollination services in the UK: How important are Honeybees? Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Environment 142:137–143.

Breitenbeck, G.A. 2009a. Chinese Tallow Trees as a biodiesel feedstock. Louisiana Agriculture 53:26–27.

Breitenbeck, G.A. 2009b. The Chinese Tallow Tree. Louisiana State University. 35 pp. Available online at http://southernforesthealth.net/plants/chinese-tallow-tree/the-chinese-tallow-tree/at_download/file. Accessed 25 January 2021.

Breland, S., N.E. Turley, J. Gibbs, R. Isaacs, and L.A. Brudvig. 2018. Restoration increases bee abundance and richness but not pollination in remnant and post-agricultural woodlands. Ecosphere 9:e02435.

Bruce, K.A. 1993. Factors affecting the biological invasion of the exotic Chinese Tallow Tree, *Sapium sebiferum*, in the Gulf Coast prairie of Texas. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Houston, Houston, TX. 155 pp.

Bruce, K.A., G.N. Cameron, and P.A. Harcombe. 1995. Initiation of a new woodland type on the Texas coastal prairie by the Chinese Tallow Tree (*Sapium sebiferum* (L.) Roxb.). Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club 122:215–225.

Bruce, K.A., P.A. Harcombe, and G. Jubinsky. 1997. Introduction, impact on native habitats, and management of a woody invader, the Chinese Tallow Tree, *Sapium sebiferum* (L.) Roxb. Natural Areas Journal 17:255–260.

Calderone, N.W. 2012. Insect pollinated crops, insect pollinators, and US agriculture: Trend analysis of aggregate data for the period 1992–2009. PLoS ONE 7(5):e37235.

Cameron, G.N., and S.R. Spencer. 1989. Rapid leaf decay and nutrient release in a Chinese Tallow forest. Oecologia 80:222–228.

Cameron, G.N., E.G. Glumac, and B.D. Eshelman. 2000. Germination and dormancy in seeds of *Sapium sebiferum* (Chinese Tallow Tree). Journal of Coastal Research 16:391–395.

Cane, J.H., and V.J. Tepedino. 2017. Gauging the effect of Honey Bee pollen collection on native bee communities. Conservation Letters 10:205–210.

Cassey, P., S. Delean, J.L. Lockwood, J.S. Sadowski, and T.M. Blackburn. 2018. Dissecting the null model for biological invasions: A meta-analysis of the propagule pressure effect. PLoS Biology 16:e2005987.

Catford, J.A., R. Jansson, and C. Nilsson. 2009. Reducing redundancy in invasion ecology by integrating hypotheses into a single theoretical framework. Diversity and Distributions 15:22–40.

Chapman, E.L., J.Q. Chambers, K.F. Ribbeck, D.B. Baker, M.A. Tobler, H. Zeng, and D.A. White. 2008. Hurricane Katrina impacts on forest trees of Louisiana's Pearl River Basin. Forest Ecology and Management 256:883–889.

Clark, J.W. 2016. Determining the Pollination Mechanism of a Problematic Invasive Species in the Gulf South: *Triadica sebifera*. MS Thesis. University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana. 34 pp.

Clark, J.W., and J.J. Howard. 2019. Pollination mechanisms in *Triadica sebifera* (Euphorbiaceae) in the southeastern United States. Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 146:18–26.

Clemson Cooperative Extension. 2020. Land use and forages. Available online at https://www.clemson.edu/extension/pollinators/apiculture/land-use-forages.html. Accessed 25 January 2021.

Clewley, G.D., R. Eschen, R.H. Shaw, and D.J. Wright. 2012. The effectiveness of classical biological control of invasive plants. Journal of Applied Ecology 49:1287–1295.

Conner, W.H., and G.R. Askew. 1993. Impact of saltwater flooding on Red Maple, Redbay, and Chinese Tallow seedlings. Castanea 58:214–219.

Conner, W.H., I. Mihalia, and J. Wolfe. 2002. Tree community and structure and changes from 1987 to 1999 in three Louisiana and three South Carolina forested wetlands. Wetlands 22:58–70.

Costanza, R., R. d'Arge, R. de Groot, S. Farber, M. Grasso, B. Hannon, K. Limburg, S. Naeem, R.V. O'Neill, J. Paruelo, R.G. Raskin, P. Sutton, and M. van den Belt. 1997. The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. Ecological Economics 25:3–15.

Cotten, T.B., M. A. Kwiatkowski, D. Saenz, and M. Collyer. 2012. Effects of an invasive plant, Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*), on development and survival of anuran larvae. Journal of Herpetology 46:186–193.

Coulson, J.R., P.V. Vail, M.E. Dix, D.A. Nordlund, and W.C. Kauffman (Eds). 2000. 110 years of Biological Control Research and Development in the United States Department of Agriculture: 1883–1993. US Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Beltsville, MD. 645 pp.

Crooks, J.A. 2005. Lag times and exotic species: The ecology and management of biological invasions in slow-motion. Ecoscience 12:316–329.

Davis, M.A., J.P. Grime, and K. Thompson. 2000. Fluctuating resources in plant communities: A general theory of invasibility. Journal of Ecology 88:528–534.

Delaplane, K.S. 2010. Bee conservation in the Southeast. University of Georgia Cooperative Extension Bulletin 1164, Athens, GA. 12 pp.

Delfosse, E.S. 2005. Risk and ethics in biological control. Biological control 35:319–329.

Dittfurth, L. 2018. Vice President's report. Journal of the Texas Beekeepers Association 18:4, 21.

Dodd, A.P. 1940. The biological campaign against Prickly-Pear. Brisbane, Commonwealth Prickly Pear Board, Brisbane, Australia. 117 pp.

Donovan, B.J. 1980. Interactions between native and introduced bees in New Zealand. New Zealand Journal of Ecology 3:104–116.

Ellis, J.D., J.D. Evans, and J. Pettis. 2010. Colony losses, managed colony population decline, and colony collapse disorder in the United States. Journal of Apicultural Research 49:134–136.

Elsayed, A.K., G.S. Wheeler, M. Purcell, K. Dyer, J. Zhang, and M. Tokuda. 2019. A new *Schizomyia* species (Diptera: Cecidomyiidae) inducing flower bud galls on Chinese Tallow Tree *Triadica sebifera* in its native range. Applied Entomology and Zoology 54:429–436.

Elton, C.S. 1958. The Ecology of Invasions by Animals and Plants. Springer Science+Business Media, Berlin, Germany. 181 pp.

Fan, Z., S. Yang, and X. Liu. 2018. Spatiotemporal patterns and mechanisms of Chinese Tallowtree (*Triadica sebifera*) spread along edge habitat in a coastal landscape, Mississippi, USA. Invasive Plant Science and Management 11:117–126.

Fan, Z., S. Yang, N. Cheng, X. Liu, A. Song, and L. Dong. 2021. Invasibility of fire-managed ecosystems to the Chinese Tallow Tree (*Triadica sebifera*) in the lower Gulf Coastal Plain, USA: Mechanisms and key factors at the landscape level. Forest Ecology and Management 479:118539.

Flack, S., and E. Furlow. 1996. America's least wanted purple plague, green cancer, and 10 other ruthless environmental thugs. Nature Conservancy 46:17–23.

Fung, J., K.G. Dyer, and G.S. Wheeler. 2017. Life history and host range of *Sauris* nr. *purpurotincta*, an unsuitable biological control agent for Chinese Tallowtree. Biocontrol Science and Technology 27:17–27.

Funk, J.L., V. Matzek, M. Bernhardt, and D. Johnson. 2014. Broadening the case for invasive species management to include impacts on ecosystem services. BioScience 64:58–63.

Gan, J., J.H. Miller, H. Wang, and J.W. Taylor Jr. 2009. Invasion of Tallow Tree into southern US forests: Influencing factors and implications for mitigation. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 39:1346–1356.

Geslin, B., B. Gauzens, M. Baude, I. Dajoz, C. Fontaine, M. Henry, L. Ropars, O. Rollin, E. Thébault, and N.J. Vereecken. 2017. Massively introduced managed species and their consequences for plant–pollinator interactions. Advances in Ecological Research 57:147–199.

Glumac, E.L., and J.R. Cowles. 1989. Woody biomass production and coppicing of the Chinese Tallow Tree. Pp. 197–210, *In* K.L. Klass (Ed.). Energy from Biomass and Wastes XII. New Orleans, Louisiana, February 1988. Institute of Gas Technology, Des Plaines, IL (abstract only).

Goulson, D., E. Nicholls, C. Botías, and E.L. Rotheray. 2015. Bee declines driven by combined stress from parasites, pesticides, and lack of flowers. Science 347:1255957.

Grace, J.B. 1998. Can prescribed fire save the endangered coastal prairie ecosystem from Chinese Tallow invasion? Endangered Species Update 15:70–76.

Hall, R.B.W. 1993. Sapling growth and recruitment as affected by flooding and canopy gap formation in a river floodplain forest in Southeast Texas. Ph.D. Dissertation. Rice University, Houston, TX. 260 pp.

Hanula, J.L., M.D. Ulyshen, and S. Horn. 2016. Conserving pollinators in North American forests: A review. Natural Areas Journal 36:427–439.

Hanula, J.L., S. Horn, and J.W. Taylor. 2017. Chinese Privet (*Ligustrum sinense*) removal and its effect on native plant communities of riparian forests. Invasive Plant Science and Management 2:292–300.

Harper, M.G. 1995. A model of invasion of Chinese Tallow Tree (*Sapium sebiferum* [L.]) into a bottomland-hardwood forest in Louisiana. M.Sc Thesis. Tulane University, New Orleans, LA. 116 pp.

Harris, J. 2019. Maximizing honey production and heating honey. Mississippi State University Extension. Publication 3382, Starkville, MS. 8 pp.

Hartley, M.K., S. DeWalt, W.E. Rogers, and E. Siemann. 2004. Characterization of arthropod assemblage supported by the Chinese Tallow Tree (*Sapium sebiferum*) in southeast Texas. Texas Journal of Science 56:369–382.

Hartley, M.K., W.E. Rogers, and E. Siemann. 2010. Comparisons of arthropod assemblages on an invasive and native trees: Abundance, diversity, and damage. Arthropod–Plant Interactions 4:237–245.

Hayes, B. 1977. Two Oriental exotics: Extraordinary nectar producers. American Bee Journal 117:363, 405.

Hayes, B. 1979. The Chinese Tallow Tree: Artificial bee pasturage story. American Bee Journal 119:848–849.

Henkel, TK., J.Q. Chambers, and D.A. Baker. 2016. Delayed tree mortality and Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) population explosion in a Louisiana bottomland hardwood forest following Hurricane Katrina. Forest Ecology and Management 378:222–232.

Holcomb, S.R., A.A. Bass, C.S. Reid, M.A. Seymour, N.F. Lorenz, B.B. Gregory, S.M. Javed, and K.F. Balkum. 2015. Louisiana wildlife action plan. Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, Baton Rouge, LA. 661 pp.

Howard, J.J. 2012. Hurricane Katrina impact on a leveed bottomland hardwood forest in Louisiana. American Midland Naturalist 168:56–69.

Howes, F.N. 1949. The Chinese Tallow Tree (*Sapium sebiferum* Roxb.): A source of drying oil. Kew Bulletin 4:573–580.

Huang, W., E. Siemann, J. Carillo, and J. Ding. 2015. Below-ground herbivory limits induction of extrafloral nectar by above-ground herbivores. Annals of Botany 115:841–846.

Hudson, J.R., J.L. Hanula, and S. Horn. 2014. Removing Chinese Privet from riparian forests still benefits pollinators five years later. Biological Conservation 167:355–362.

Jamieson, G.S., and R.S. McKinney. 1938. *Stillingia* oil. Oil and Soap 15:295–296.

Johnson, S.R., and L.K. Allain. 1998. Observations on insect use of Chinese Tallow [*Sapium sebiferum* (L.) Roxb.] in Louisiana and Texas. Castanea 63:188–189.

Jones, C.G., J.H. Lawton, and M. Shachak. 1996. Organisms as ecosystem engineers. Pp. 133–147, *In* F.B. Samson and F.L. Knopf (Eds.). Ecosystem Management. Springer, New York, NY. 462 pp.

Jones, C.G., J.H. Lawton, and M. Shachak. 1997. Positive and negative effects of organisms as physical ecosystem engineers. Ecology 78:1946–1957.

Jones, R.H., and K.W. McLeod. 1989. Shade tolerance in seedlings of Chinese Tallow Tree, American Sycamore, and Cherrybark Oak. Bulletin of the Torrey Botanical Club 116:371–377.

Jones, R.H., and K.W. McLeod. 1990. Growth and photosynthetic responses to a range of light environments in Chinese Tallowtree and Carolina Ash seedlings. Forest Science 36:851–862.

Jones, R.H., and R.R. Sharitz. 1990. Effects of root competition and flooding on growth of Chinese Tallow Tree seedlings. Canadian Journal of Forest Research 20:573–578.

Jubinsky, G., and L.C. Anderson. 1996. The invasive potential of Chinese Tallow-tree (*Sapium sebiferum* Roxb.) in the Southeast. Castanea 61:226–231.

Kremen, C., N.M. Williams, M.A. Aizen, B. Gemmill-Herren, G, LeBuhn, R. Minckley, L. Packer, S.G. Potts, et al. 2007. Pollination and other ecosystem services produced by mobile organisms: A conceptual framework for the effects of land-use change. Ecology letters 10:299–314.

Lamarque, L.J., S. Delzon, and C.J. Lortie. 2011. Tree invasions: A comparative test of the dominant hypotheses and functional traits. Biological Invasions 13:1969–1989.

Lankau, R.A., W.E. Rogers, and E. Siemann. 2004. Constraints on the utilisation of the invasive Chinese Tallow Tree, *Sapium sebiferum*, by generalist native herbivores in coastal prairies. Ecological Entomology 29:66–75.

Lieux, M.H. 1975. Dominant pollen types recovered from commercial Louisiana honeys. Economic Botany 29:87–96.

Liu, F., G. Zhang, J. Qin, W. Jiang, Q. Luo, X. Xu, F. Xi, F. Yuan, Z. Yi, H. He, W. Ye, and P. Dai. 2020. Lowering forest habitat does not reduce forage availability to the Eastern Honey Bees in summer and fall. Apidologie 51:609–619.

Lockwood, J.L., P. Cassey, and T. Blackburn. 2005. The role of propagule pressure in explaining species invasions. Trends in Ecology and Evolution 20:223–228.

Louda, S.M. 2000. Negative ecological effects of the Musk Thistle biological control agent, *Rhinocyllus conicus*. Pp. 215–243, *In* P.A. Follett and J.J. Duan (Eds.). Nontarget Effects of Biological Control Introductions. Springer, New York, NY. 316 pp.

Lozon, J.D., and H.J. MacIsaac. 1997. Biological invasions: Are they dependent on disturbance? Environmental Reviews 5:131–144.

Macgowan, J.D. 1852. Uses of the *Stillingia sebifera,* or Tallow Tree, with a notice of the pe-la, an insect-wax of China. Annals and Magazine of Natural History 10:152–157.

Mack, R.N., D. Simberloff, W.M. Lonsdale, H. Evans, M. Clout, and F.A. Bazzaz. 2000. Biotic invasions: Causes, epidemiology, global consequences, and control. Ecological Applications 10:689–710.

Mai, T.R., J. Lovett-Doust, L. Lovett-Doust, and G.A. Mulligan. 1992. The biology of Canadian weeds. 100. *Lythrum salicaria*. Canadian Journal of Plant Science 72:1305–1330.

Martin, P.H., C.D. Canham, and P.L. Marks. 2009. Why forests appear resistant to exotic plant invasions: Intentional introductions, stand dynamics, and the role of shade tolerance. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 7:142–149.

McCormick, C. 2005. Chinese Tallow management plan for Florida. Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council (now known as the Florida Invasive Species Council). 75 pp. Available online https://bugwoodcloud.org/CDN/fleppc/publications/Tallow_Plan.pdf. Accessed 4 April 2021.

Meiners, S.J., M.W. Cadotte, J.D. Fridley, S.T.A. Pickett, and L.R. Walker. 2015. Is successional research nearing its climax? New approaches for understanding dynamic communities. Functional Ecology 29:154–164.

Memmott, J., and N.M. Waser. 2002. Integration of alien plants into a native flower–pollinator visitation web. Proceedings Royal Society of London B 269:2395–2399.

Meny, J. 2018. Bee keepers concerned about program aimed at Tallow Trees. Growing America. Available online at https://www.growingamerica.com/news/2018/06/bee-keepers-concerned-about-program-aimed-tallow-trees. Accessed 7 October 2020.

Meyer, R. 2011. *Triadica sebifera*. *In* Fire Effects Information System. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fire Sciences Laboratory. Available online at https://www.fs.fed.us/database/feis/plants/tree/triseb/all.html. Acccessed 25 January 2021.

Miller, J.H., E.B. Chambliss, and N.J. Loewenstein. 2010. A field guide for the identification of invasive plants in southern forests (slightly revised 2012, 2013, and 2015). General Technical Report SRS–119. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC. 126 pp.

Mississippi Forest Commission. 2020. Popcorn Tree control program. Available online at https://www.mfc.ms.gov/programs/urban-community-forestry/popcorn-tree-control-program/. Accessed 30 October 2020.

Montez, R. D., D. Saenz, A. Martynova-Van Kley, J. Van Kley, A. Nalian, and K. Farrish. 2021. The influence of Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) leaf litter on water quality and microbial community composition. Aquatic Ecology 55:265–282.

Moore, C. 2018. President's report. Journal of the Texas Beekeepers Association 18:3.

Morales, C.L., and M.A. Aizen MA. 2006. Invasive mutualisms and the structure of plant–pollinator interactions in the temperate forests of north-west Patagonia, Argentina. Journal of Ecology 94:171–180.

National Plant Board. 2020. Laws and regulations. Available online at https://nationalplantboard.org/laws-and-regulations/. Accessed 21 September 2020.

Odanaka, K., J. Gibbs, N.E. Turley, R. Isaacs, and L.A. Brudvig. 2020. Canopy thinning, not agricultural history, determines early responses of wild bees to Longleaf Pine savanna restoration. Restoration Ecology 28:138–146.

Oswalt, S.N. 2010. Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera* (L.) Small) population expansion in Louisiana, East Texas, and Mississippi. Research Note SRS–20. US Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC. 5 pp.

Pachepsky, E., and J.M. Levine. 2011. Density dependence slows invader spread in fragmented landscapes. American Naturalist 177:18–28.

Pattison, R.R., and R.N. Mack. 2008. Potential distribution of the invasive tree *Triadica sebifera* (Euphorbiaceae) in the United States: Evaluating CLIMEX predictions with field trials. Global Change Biology 14:813–826.

Payne, S. 2018. Louisiana beekeepers oppose introduction of beetle to control Tallow Trees. Louisiana Farm Bureau News. Available online at https://voiceoflouisianaagriculture.org/news/2018/1/15/louisiana-beekeepers-oppose-introduction-of-beetle-to-control-tallow-trees. Accessed 21 September 2020.

Pearson, W.D., and V. Braiden. 1990. Seasonal pollen collection by Honeybees from grass/shrub highlands in Canterbury, New Zealand. Journal of Apicultural Research 29:206–213.

Pollinator Stewardship Council. 2018. A reasonable discussion in support of the Chinese Tallow Tree, pollinator forage, and local economies. Pollinator News. Akron, OH. Pp. 3–6. Available online at http://pollinatorstewardship.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Sept.-28-2018-Pollinator-News.pdf. Accessed 31 March 2021.

Pile, L.S., G.G. Wang, J.P. Stovall, E. Siemann, G.S. Wheeler, and C.A. Gabler. 2017. Mechanisms of Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) invasion and their management implications: A review. Forest Ecology and Management 404:1–13.

Pogue, M.G. 2014. A new species of *Gadirtha* Walker (Nolidae, Eligminae): A proposed biological control agent of Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera* (L.) Small) (Euphorbiaceae) in the United States. ZooKeys 382:13–25.

Pollet, D.K., and E.A. Cancienne. 2006. Beginning with bees. Louisiana State University Agricultural Experiment Station, Baton Rouge, LA. Publication 1846. 24 pp.

Prendergast, K.S., and J. Ollerton. 2021. Impacts of the introduced European Honeybee on Australian bee–flower network properties in urban bushland remnants and residential gardens. Austral Ecology [Early View]. https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.13040.

Rader, R., J. Reilly, I. Bartomeus, and R. Winfree. 2013. Native bees buffer the negative impact of climate warming on Honey Bee pollination of watermelon crops. Global Change Biology 19:3103–3110.

Randall, J.M., and J. Marinelli. 1996. Invasive Plants: Weeds of the Global Garden. Brooklyn Botanic Garden, New York, NY. 111 pp.

Razanajatovo, M., C. Föhr, M. Fischer, D. Prati, and M. van Kleunen. 2015. Non-naturalized alien plants receive fewer flower visits than naturalized and native plants in a Swiss botanical garden. Biological Conservation 182:109–116.

Renne, I.J., T.P. Spira, and W.C. Bridges. 2001. Effects of habitat, burial, age, and passage through birds on germination and establishment of Chinese Tallow Tree in coastal South Carolina. Journal of the Torrey Botanical Society 128:109–119.

Renne, I.J., W.C. Barrow Jr, L.A. Johnson Randall, and W.C. Bridges Jr. 2002. Generalized avian dispersal syndrome contributes to Chinese Tallow Tree (*Sapium sebiferum*, Euphorbiaceae) invasiveness. Diversity and Distributions 8:285–295.

Ricketts, T.H., J. Regetz, I. Steffan-Dewenter, S.A. Cunningham, C. Kremen, A. Bogdanski, B. Gemmill-Herren, S.S. Greenleaf, A.M. Klein, M.M. Mayfield, L.A. Morandin, A. Ochieng′, and B.F. Viana. 2008. Landscape effects on crop pollination services: Are there general patterns? Ecology Letters 11:499–515.

Rogers, W.E., and E. Siemann. 2004. Invasive ecotypes tolerate herbivory more effectively than native ecotypes of the Chinese Tallow Tree, *Sapium sebiferum*. Journal of Applied Ecology 41:561–570.

Rojas-Sandoval, J. 2018. *Triadica sebifera* (Chinese Tallow Tree). CABI, Wallingford, UK. Available online at https://www.cabi.org/isc/datasheet/48351. Accessed 11 October 2020.

Russo, L. 2016. Positive and negative impacts of non-native bee species around the world. Insects 7:69.

Saenz, D., E.M. Fucik, and M.A. Kwiatkowski. 2013. Synergistic effects of the invasive Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) and climate change on aquatic amphibian survival. Ecology and Evolution 3:4828–4840.

Sakai, A.K., F.W. Allendorf, J.S. Holt, D.M. Lodge, J. Molofsky, K.A. With, S. Baughman, R.J. Cabin, et al. 2001. The population biology of invasive species. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 32:305–332.

Salisbury, A., J. Armitage, H. Bostock, J. Perry, M. Tatchell, and K. Thompson. 2015. Enhancing gardens as habitats for flower-visiting aerial insects (pollinators): should we plant native or exotic species? Journal of Applied Ecology 52: 1156–1164.

Scheld, H.W., and J.R. Cowles. 1981. Woody biomass potential of the Chinese Tallow Tree. Economic Botany 35:391–397.

Scheld, H.W., N.B. Bell, G.N. Cameron, J.R. Cowles, C.R. Engler, A.D. Krikorian, and E.B. Schultz. 1980. The Chinese Tallow Tree as a cash and petroleum-substitute crop. Pp. 97–112, *In* Tree Crops for Energy Co-Production on Farms. Publication SERI/CP-622-1086. US Department of Energy and Solar Energy Research Institute, Washington, DC. 272 pp.

Scheld, H.W., J.R. Cowles, C.R. Engler, R. Kleiman, and E.B. Schultz Jr. 1984. Seeds of Chinese Tallow Tree as a source of chemicals and fuels. Pp. 81–101, *In* E.B. Schultz Jr. and R.P. Morgan (Eds.). Fuels and Chemicals from Oilseeds: Technology and Policy Options. AAAS Selected symposium 91. Westview Press, Boulder, CO. 254 pp.

Schulz, A.N., R.D. Lucardi, and T.D. Marisco. 2019. Successful invasions and failed biocontrol: The role of antagonistic species interactions. BioScience 69:711–724.

Siemann, E., and W.E. Rogers. 2003. Herbivory, disease, recruitment limitation, and success of alien and native tree species. Ecology 84:1489–1505.

Siemann, E.S. J. Dewalt, J. Zou, and W.E. Rogers. 2017. An experimental test of the EICA hypothesis in multiple ranges: Invasive populations outperform those from the native range independent of insect herbivore suppression. AoB Plants 9:plw087. https://doi.org/10.1093/aobpla/plw97.

Simberloff, D., and P. Stiling. 1996. How risky is biological control? Ecology 77:1965–1974.

Simmonds, F.J., and F.D. Bennett. 1966. Biological control of *Opuntia* spp. by *Cactoblastis cactorum* in the Leeward Islands (West Indies). Entomophaga 11:183–189.

Stanton, M.L. 1987. Reproductive biology of petal color variants in wild populations of *Raphanus sativus*: I. Pollinator response to color morphs. American Journal of Botany 74:178–187.

Steininger, M.S., S.A. Wright, J. Ding, and G.S. Wheeler. 2013. Biology and host range of *Heterapoderopsis bicallosicollis*: A potential biological control agent for Chinese Tallow, *Triadica sebifera*. Biocontrol Science and Technology 23:816–828.

Stimec, J., C.D. Scott-Dupree, and J.H. McAndrews. 1997. Honey bee, *Apis mellifera*, pollen foraging in southern Ontario. Canadian Field-Naturalist 111:454–456.

Suckling, D.M., and R.F.H. Sforza. 2014. What magnitude are observed non-target impacts from weed biocontrol? PloS ONE 9:p.e84847.

Sullivan, L.L., B. Li, T.E.X. Miller, M.G. Neubert, and A.K. Shaw. 2017. Density dependence in demography and dispersal generates fluctuating invasion speeds. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 114:5053–5058.

Suriyamongkol, T., E. McGrew, L. Culpepper, K. Beck, H.H. Wang, and W.E. Grant. 2016. Recent range expansions by Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera* (L.) Small), the most prevalent invasive tree in the forestlands of eastern Texas. Southeastern Naturalist 15:68–75.

Tew, J.E., S. Enloe, N. Loewenstein, and K. Smith. 2018. Nectar- and pollen-producing plants of Alabama: A guide for beekeepers. Alabama Cooperative Extension Service. Available online at https://www.aces.edu/blog/topics/bees-pollinators/nectar-and-pollen-producing-plants-of-alabama-a-guide-for-beekeepers/. Accessed 4 April 2021.

Tilman, D. 2004. Niche tradeoffs, neutrality, and community structure: A stochastic theory of resource competition, invasion, and community assembly. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 101:10854–10861.

Tudurí, J.C.G., L.F. Martorell, and S.M. Gaud. 1971. Geographical distribution and host plants of the cactus moth, *Cactoblastis cactorum* (Berg) in Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands. Journal of Agriculture of the University of Puerto Rico 55:130–134.

US Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA APHIS). 2005. Pest Alert: Cactus Moth (*Cactoblastis cactorum*). United States Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Plant Protection and Quarantine Program Aid No. 1879. Washington, DC. 2 pp.

USDA APHIS. 2020. TAG Charter. Available online at https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/import-information/permits/regulated-organism-and-soil-permits/biological-control-organism-permits/sa_tag/ct_charter. Accessed 4 April 2021.

US Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA NRCS). 2019. PLANTS database. Available online at https://plants.sc.egov.usda.gov/java/. Accessed 4 April 2021.

Valido, A., M.C. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, and P. Jordano. 2019. Honeybees disrupt the structure and functionality of plant-pollinator networks. Scientific Reports 9: 1-11.

Varner, J.M., III, and J.S. Kush. 2004. Remnant old-growth Longleaf Pine (*Pinus palustris* Mill.) savannas and forests of the southeastern USA: Status and threats. Natural Areas Journal 24: 141–149.

Vogt, J.T., K.J.K. Gandhi, D.C. Bragg, R. Olatinwo, and K.D. Klepzig. 2020. Interactions between weather-related disturbance and forest insects and diseases in the southern United States. General Technical Report SRS–255. US Department of Agriculture Forest Service, Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC. 37 pp.

Wang, H.H., W.E. Grant, J. Gan, W.E. Rogers, T.M. Swannack, T.E. Koralewski, J.H. Miller, and J.W. Taylor. 2012. Integrating spread dynamics and economics of timber production to manage Chinese Tallow invasions in southern US forestlands. PLoS ONE 7:e33877.

Wang, Y., W. Huang, E. Siemann, J. Zou, G.S. Wheeler, J. Carrillo, and J. Ding. 2011. Lower resistance and higher tolerance of invasive host plants: Biocontrol agents reach high densities but exert weak control. Ecological Applications 21:729–738.

Wang, Y., L. Zhu, X. Gu, G.S. Wheeler, M. Purcell, and J. Ding. 2012. Pre-release assessment of *Gadirtha inexacta*, a proposed biological control agent of Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) in the United States. Biological Control 63:304–309.

Wheeler, G.S., and J. Ding. 2014. Is Chinese Tallowtree, *Triadica sebifera*, an appropriate target for biological control in the United States? Invasive Plant Science and Management 7:345–359.

Wheeler, G.S., J.G. Duncan, and S. Wright. 2017a. Predicting spillover risk to non-target plants pre-release: *Bikasha collaris*, a potential biological control agent of Chinese Tallowtree (*Triadica sebifera*). Biological Control 108:16–21.

Wheeler, G.S., K. Dyer, S.D. Hight, and S.A. Wright. 2017b. Seasonal abundance of the adventive Chinese Tallowtree herbivore *Caloptilia triadicae* (Lepidoptera: Gracillariidae) and its parasitoids. Florida Entomologist 100:52–56.

Wheeler, G.S., M.S. Steininger, and S. Wright. 2017c. Quarantine host range of *Bikasha collaris*, a potential biological control agent of Chinese Tallowtree (*Triadica sebifera*) in North America. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 163:184–196.

Wheeler, G.S., K. Dyer, E. Broggi, J. Ding, M. Purcell, and P. Madeira. 2018a. Molecular comparisons of native range collections of *Gadirtha fusca*, a potential biological control agent of Chinese Tallowtree. Biocontrol Science and Technology 28:796–804.

Wheeler, G.S., E. Jones, K. Dyer, N. Silverson, and S.A. Wright. 2018b. Quarantine host range and natural history of *Gadirtha fusca*, a potential biological control agent of Chinese Tallowtree (*Triadica sebifera*) in North America. Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata 166:894–906.

Winfree, R., N.M. Williams, H. Gaines, J.S. Ascher, and C. Kremen. 2007a. Wild bee pollinators provide the majority of crop visitation across land-use gradients in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, USA. Journal of Applied Ecology 45:793–802.

Winfree, R., N.M. Williams, J. Dushoff, and C. Kremen. 2007b. Native bees provide insurance against ongoing Honey Bee losses. Ecology Letters 10:1105–1113.

Woodward, D.R. 1996. Monitoring for impact of the introduced leafcutting bee, *Megachile rotunda* (F.) (Hymenoptera: Megachilidae), near release sites in south Australia. Australian Journal of Entomology 35:187–191.

Yang, Q. B. Li, and E. Seimann. 2015a. Positive and negative biotic interactions and invasive *Triadica sebifera* tolerance to salinity: A cross-continent comparative study. Oikos 124:216–224.

Yang, Q. B. Li, and E. Seimann. 2015b. The effects of fertilization on plant–soil interactions and salinity tolerance of invasive *Triadica sebifera*. Plant and Soil 394:99–107.

Yang, S., Z. Fan, X. Liu, A.W. Ezell, M.A. Spetich, S.K. Saucier, S. Gray, and S.G. Hereford. 2019. Effects of prescribed fire, site factors, and seed sources on the spread of invasive *Triadica sebifera* in a fire-managed coastal landscape in southeastern Mississippi, USA. Forests 10:175.

Yang, S., Z. Fan, X. Liu, and A.W. Ezell. 2021. Predicting the spread of Chinese Tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) in the southeastern United States forestland: Mechanisms and risk factors at the regional scale. Forest Ecology and Management 482:118892.

Zappi, M.E., A. Zappi, E. Revellame, W. Sharp, D.L. Fortela, R. Hernandez, T. Chambers, K. Ritter, and D. Gang. 2020. An assessment of the potential to produce commercially valuable lipids on highway right-of-way land areas located within the southeastern United States. Sustainability 12:5225.

Zhang, K., and Y. Lin. 1994. Chinese Tallow. China Forestry Press, Beijing, China. 460 pp.

Zheng, H., Y. Wu, J. Ding, D. Binion, W. Fu, and R. Reardon. 2006. Invasive Plants Established in the United States that are Found in Asia and Their Associated Natural Enemies. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team publication 2005-15 2. 175 pp.

Zou, J., W.E. Rogers, S.J. DeWalt, and E. Seimann. 2006. The effect of Chinese Tallow tree (*Sapium sebiferum*) ecotype on soil–plant system carbon and nitrogen processes. Oecologia 150:272–281.

Zou, J., W.E. Rogers, and E. Seimann. 2008. Increased competitive ability and herbivory tolerance in the invasive plant *Sapium sebiferum*. Biological Invasions 10: 291–302.