

# Washington Invasive Ranking System

Washington Natural Heritage Program

## *Clematis vitalba* (Old Man's Beard)

Assessed by

Regina Johnson (Assistant Natural Areas Ecologist, Westside, Washington Dept. of Natural Resources)  
3 January 2024 (WIRS Version 1.5)

---

Ecological Impact Rank: **Moderate (55)**

Confidence: **High (67)**

---

Management Difficulty Rank: High (75)

Confidence: Moderate (50)

Biological Characteristics of Invasiveness: High (83)

Confidence: Moderate (64)

Concern Related to Distribution and Abundance: High (82)

Confidence: Moderate (50)

---



**Photo Credit:** David Giblin 2020, used under Creative Commons license (Burke Herbarium, University of Washington, 2024).

### Ranking Notes


Rapid assessment only, based primarily on professional expertise.

### Legal Listings

[Washington State Weed Board](#): List C

[Washington Invasive Species Council](#): No

### Section 1: Distribution and Abundance



**Figure 1.** Distribution of counties where *Clematis vitalba* has been documented in Washington State (CPNWH, 2023; EDDMapS, 2023; iNaturalist Contributors, 2023).

### Q1: Current Range Size in Washington

Rating: Moderate

Confidence: Moderate

This species is found in 36% of counties in Washington (CPNWH, 2023; EDDMapS, 2023; iNaturalist Contributors, 2023).

Source: Herbarium records and other observations

### Q2: Current Trend in Total Range

Rating: High

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q3: Proportion of Potential Range Currently Unoccupied**

Rating: Moderate

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q4: Local Range Expansion or Change in Abundance**

Rating: High

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q5: Diversity of Ecosystems Invaded**

Ecosystem types: Forest & Woodland

Rating: Low

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Section 2: Biological Characteristics**

**Q6: Aggressive Mode of Reproduction**

Rating: Yes

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q7: Innate Potential for Long-Distance Dispersal**

Rating: Yes

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q8: Potential to be Spread by Human Activities**

Rating: Yes

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Q9: Allelopathy**

Rating: Unknown

Confidence: Not Rated

Source:

**Q10: Competitive for Limiting Abiotic Factors**

Rating: No

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q11: Growth Form**

Rating: Yes

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Q12: Germination Requirements**

Rating: Unknown

Confidence: Not Rated

Source:

**Q13: Invasiveness of Other Plants in Genus**

Rating: Yes

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Q14: Shade Tolerance**

Rating: High

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Q15: Disturbance Tolerance**

Rating: Yes

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Q16: Propagule Persistence**

Rating: Unknown

Confidence: Not Rated

Source:

**Q17: Palatability**

Rating: Yes, plant is unpalatable

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Section 3: Ecological Impact**

**Q18: Impact on Ecosystem Abiotic Processes**

Abiotic Processes: Light availability

Rating: Moderate

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Q19: Impact on Ecosystem Structure**

Rating: Moderate

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Q20: Impact on Ecosystem Composition**

Rating: Moderate

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q21: Impact on Particular Native Species**

Rating: Insignificant

Confidence: Low

Source: Professional expertise

**Q22: Observed Ability to Invade Undisturbed Ecosystems**

Rating: Low

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q23: Observed Ability to Invade Naturally Disturbed Ecosystems**

Rating: Yes

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Section 4: Management Difficulty**

**Q24: General Management Difficulty**

Rating: Moderate

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q25: Minimum Time Commitment**

Rating: High

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q26: Impacts of Management on Native Species**

Rating: Moderate

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q27: Inaccessibility of Invaded Areas**

Rating: High

Confidence: Moderate

Source: Professional expertise

**Q28: Sociopolitical Implications of Management**

Rating: Moderate/Low

Confidence: High

Source: Professional expertise

**Additional Comments**

None

**References**

Burke Herbarium, University of Washington. 2024. Burke Herbarium Image Collection. <https://burkeherbarium.org/imagecollection>. Accessed: December 17, 2024.

Consortium of Pacific Northwest Herbaria (CPNWH). 2023. Consortium of Pacific

Northwest Herbaria Specimen Database.  
<http://www.pnwherbaria.org/index.php>.  
Accessed: October 17, 2023.

EDDMapS. 2023. Early Detection & Distribution  
Mapping System. The University of Georgia  
- Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem  
Health. <http://www.eddmaps.org>. Accessed:  
October 15, 2023.

iNaturalist Contributors. 2023. iNaturalist Research-  
grade Observations, Accessed via GBIF.org.  
<https://doi.org/10.15468/ab3s5x>. Accessed:  
October 5, 2023.

