

FLORISTIC COMPOSITION OF THE RUDERAL HABITATS ALONG THE NEWLY BUILT ACCESS ROADS TO PELJEŠAC BRIDGE: PRELIMINARY RESULTS

NENAD JASPRICA^{1*}, MARIJA PANDŽA² & MILENKO MILOVIĆ³

¹University of Dubrovnik, Institute for Marine and Coastal Research, HR-20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia

²Stjepan Radić St. 30, HR-22240 Tisno, Croatia

³Antun Vrančić Grammar School, Put Gimnazije St. 64, HR-22000 Šibenik, Croatia

Jasprica, N., Pandža, M. & Milović, M.: Floristic composition of the ruderal habitats along the newly built access roads to the Pelješac Bridge: Preliminary results. *Nat. Croat.*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 213-231, 2023, Zagreb.

We investigated the floristic richness of ruderal sites along the newly built access roads to Pelješac Bridge after several years of construction and three months of traffic on the roads (in autumn 2022). A clear dominance of steno-Mediterranean plants was observed, with a considerable proportion of cosmopolitans, accompanied by a high proportion of therophytes. Taxa from the vegetation classes *Artemisietae vulgaris* and *Chenopodietae* predominated. This study analyzes preliminary data and can be used as a basis for a further examination of how plant colonization processes are influenced by human activities. This report can also support comprehensive phytosociological studies of ruderal communities in this area, as well as in other regions with a Mediterranean climate.

Keywords: eastern Adriatic, floristic survey, man-made habitats, Mediterranean climate, roadsides

Jasprica, N., Pandža, M. & Milović, M.: Floristički sastav ruderalnih staništa uz novoizgrađene pristupne ceste Pelješkog mosta: preliminarni rezultati. *Nat. Croat.*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 213-231, 2023, Zagreb.

Istraživali smo floristički sastav ruderalnih staništa uz novoizgrađene pristupne ceste Pelješkog mosta nakon višegodišnjeg razdoblja njihove gradnje i tri mjeseca prometa na cestama (u jesen 2022.). Utvrđena je prevlast terofita, mediteranskih svojstava sa značajnim udjelom kozmopolita te svojstva iz vegetacijskih razreda *Artemisietae vulgaris* i *Chenopodietae*. Studija daje analizu preliminarnih podataka i može se smatrati temeljem za daljnju analizu procesa naseljavanja biljaka uvjetovanih ljudskim djelovanjem. Ovaj rad, također, može poduprijeti sveobuhvatna fitocenološka istraživanja ruderalnih zajednica na tom području, kao i u drugim područjima sa sredozemnom klimom.

Ključne riječi: antropogena staništa, istočni Jadran, mediteranska klima, pregled flore, rubovi cesta

INTRODUCTION

Land use changes are widespread at global, national, and local scales, resulting in greatly altered environmental conditions. Abiotic conditions (such as disturbances in physical conditions and climate) determine which plant species are capable of persisting in a habitat (STACHOWICZ, 2001). In addition, these conditions are best explained by

*Corresponding author: nenad.jasprica@unidu.hr

a combination of land use, soil characteristics, and socioeconomic factors that filter species based on their adaptations and functional traits (DIAZ *et al.*, 1998). In general, populations of some nitrophilous and ruderal species spread in areas of intense human activity. However, ruderal plants are also considered a type of spontaneous vegetation, and their occurrence can be significantly accelerated by the impact of human activities (e.g., BIONDI *et al.*, 2012; GUO *et al.*, 2018). On the other hand, they have a survival strategy that can adapt to local habitats and withstand intensive human intervention (OHSAWA *et al.*, 1988).

Roads are built to spur economic development or alleviate poverty. However, such engineering undertakings can affect biodiversity and conservation values (BENNETT, 2017). The negative impacts of road construction include fragmentation of complex natural ecosystems (FORMAN & ALEXANDER, 1998; VANNESTE *et al.*, 2020) and the creation of edge effects along roadsides that promote colonization by ruderal species (MULLEROVÁ *et al.*, 2011; HUGHES, 2018) to the detriment of native species that depend on specialized local habitats (LEMBRECHTS *et al.*, 2017). Many studies have found that roadsides favour non-native species and significantly alter community composition (LAZARO-LOBO & ERVIN, 2019; LI *et al.*, 2022).

In July 2022, the construction of Pelješac Bridge with its access roads was almost completed after six years of construction. The main goal of the construction of the bridge is to improve connections of the south of Croatia and the rest of the country. A total of 32.5 km of roads with associated facilities (viaducts, bridges, tunnels, underpasses, rest areas, reservoirs, etc.) were built. The construction of the access roads has changed the appearance of the landscape due to increased ground obstructions, the presence of embankments in the abutments, etc. Also, the temporary increase of human population (workers) in the container settlements and the machinery maneuvers in the area during the construction works are not to be neglected.

In this study we would like to show the floristic richness of the ruderal areas along the access road verges to Pelješac Bridge after several years of construction and three months of traffic on the roads. This study provides an analysis of preliminary data and can serve as a basis for further analysis of plant colonization processes as a result of human activity. In addition, the study can support comprehensive phytosociological studies of ruderal communities in this area as well as in other regions with a Mediterranean climate.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Study area

During the construction of the Pelješac Bridge (2.4 km long), an extensive network of access roads was built (Fig. 1). The works were completed on July 26, 2022 on a section of 22.14 km in length. The section between Prapratno Bay and the village of Zaton Doli (7.9 km in length) is still under construction and has not been included here (completion expected in May 2023).

The study area is located in the Mediterranean region, the Eastern Mediterranean subregion, the Adriatic province and the Epiro-Dalmatian sector (RIVAS-MARTÍNEZ *et al.*, 2004).



Fig. 1. Map of the study area showing the locations where the relevés were collected on the southern Croatian mainland and the Pelješac Peninsula in autumn 2022.

The climate is Mediterranean: the average annual air temperature is 15.8 °C, and the average annual rainfall is 1081.2 mm (data for the Ploče meteorological station, provided by the Croatian Meteorological and Hydrological Service for 1988 – 2019). The average monthly air temperature (25.7 °C) is highest in July, and lowest (7.0 °C) in January. The lowest air temperature (-7.2 °C) was recorded on February 15, 2012, while the highest (38.8 °C) was recorded twice: on July 24, 2007 and August 2, 2017. The amount of rainfall is highest in November (154.6 mm average) and December (143.6 mm). The total rainfall from June to August is 121.0 mm. North winds are the most frequent winds in this area. The sums of relative frequencies (in %) are the following: tramontana (N) – 49.5, burin (NNE) – 148.6 and bora (NE) – 84.7. The wind speed (average 2.4 m s^{-1}) is highest in March. The area has 2668.9 hours of sunshine per year. On average, the relative humidity is 68% (JASPRICA *et al.*, 2015). According to the bioclimatic classification of Europe (RIVAS-MARTÍNEZ *et al.*, 2011), the area in question belongs to the Mediterranean pluviseason-oceanic bioclimate and is located in the lower meso-Mediterranean belt.

The bedrock consists mainly of carbonate rocks (RAIĆ *et al.*, 1982). The Lower Cretaceous carbonate deposits can be recognized in different types of vertically alternating lithotypes. In the lower horizon dolomites and dolomitic limestones have developed, and in the upper part there are limestones with dolomitic intercalations and interbeds. The soils are automorphic and of shallow to medium depth (BAŠIĆ, 2013). They include limestone dolomite dark soil, rendzina, brown soil on limestone and dolomite, red soil (*terra rossa*) and regosol soil (cultivated soil on red and brown soil developed on limestone and dolomite in the field). Brown soil on limestone and dolomite (calcaric cambisol), developed on pure limestone and dolomite, is the most common type of soil.

The Pelješac Peninsula is one of the Important Plant Areas (IPAs) in Croatia (JASPRICA & KOVACIĆ, 2010) and includes sites rich in endemic flora (NIKOLIĆ et al., 2015). The study area is located within the NATURA 2000 network of protected areas in Croatia (site code HR1000036 – Central Dalmatian Islands and Pelješac; HR2001364 – SE part of the Pelješac Peninsula; HR4000015 – the Bay of Mali Ston; HR5000031 – the Neretva Delta) (ANONYMOUS, 2019). Only a small part of the roads, both on the mainland and on the Pelješac Peninsula, is located within the protected area of the Mali Ston Special Nature Reserve (JASPRICA & BATISTIĆ, 2021). In accordance with legislation, the environmental impact assessment for the project Bridge: Mainland - Pelješac with access roads, including the area of the Mali Ston Special Nature Reserve, was carried out, as well as the acceptance assessment for the network NATURA 2000. In addition, the main impact assessment for the ecological network was prepared in accordance with the Law on Environmental Protection (ANONYMOUS, 2013a).

Phytogeographically, the area of interest belongs to the meso-Mediterranean vegetation belt of the *Fraxino ornii-Quercion ilicis* Biondi et al. ex Biondi, Casavecchia et Gigante 2013, with orographic exclaves (e.g., the village of Brijesta, the Prapratno Bay) of the thermo-Mediterranean *Oleo-Ceratonion siliquae* Br.-Bl. ex Guinochet et Drouineau 1944 (JASPRICA & DOLINA, 2009; sensu MUCINA et al., 2016; ŠKVORC et al., 2017).

Sampling and analysis

Field data were collected from 24 vegetation sample plots (relevés) from October 22 to November 5, 2022. Relevés were collected according to the principles of the Braun-Blanquet approach (BRAUN-BLANQUET, 1964; WESTHOFF & VAN DER MAAREL, 1980). The sites where relevés are sampled were randomly chosen along different sections of access roads (in a belt no wider than 10 m from the road) on the mainland and on the Pelješac Peninsula. The total length of the roads is 22.14 km. The geographical coordinates of the relevés are given in Appendix 1.

Taxa were determined using the standard determination keys, books and guides listed in JASPRICA & MILOVIĆ (2016), MILOVIĆ et al. (2016), etc. Their biological (*sensu* RAUNKIAER, 1934; PIGNATTI, 1982) and chorological forms (see Tab. 1) were determined according to JASPRICA et al. (2017). Species whose geographical range is restricted (endemism), IUCN status of taxa (IUCN, 2022) and invasive plant taxa were defined according to NIKOLIĆ (2023). Strictly protected taxa in Croatia were defined according to ANONYMOUS (2013b, 2016).

The nomenclature of plant taxa follows the *Euro+Med PlantBase* (EURO+MED, 2006+), except for *Silene vulgaris* (Moench) Garcke subsp. *angustifolia* Hayek and *Cistus incanus* L., for which the *Flora Croatica Database* was used (NIKOLIĆ, 2023). Taxa are assigned to vegetation units (classes) using the system of characterizing species reported by MUCINA et al. (2016) (i.e., for those plants that are considered 'characteristic species' of the classes, see Electronic Appendix S6). The nomenclature of the high-rank vegetation units also follows the syntaxonomic system proposed by MUCINA et al. (2016), and followed by ŠKVORC et al. (2017) (the EuroVegChecklist).

RESULTS

In autumn 2022, we found 128 taxa (113 species and 11 subspecies; four taxa were defined at genus rank only) over 24 phytosociological relevés collected alongside the

road verges (Tab. 1). Road sections built in the last phase (early summer 2022) were covered with gravel (e.g., Sparagović rest area) and vegetation had not yet developed during this survey (autumn 2022).

The number of taxa per relevé varied from 6 to 22 (an average of 16.1). The vegetation cover ranged from 5 to 90% (an average of 41%). There were a high number of taxa found in only one single relevé (51, i.e. 40%).

The flora was dominated by therophytes (50 taxa, i.e. 40%) and hemicryptophytes (41, 34%) followed by phanerophytes (16.13%), chamaephytes (10.8%) and geophytes (7.5%).

Mediterranean plants (52 taxa, i.e. 41%) followed by a considerable proportion of cosmopolitans (27.22%) dominated the flora (Tab. 1). South-European plants contributed 18%, while Euroasian, cultivated and adventive plants were equally represented (11 taxa in each, i.e. 9%). The occurrence of European taxa was negligible (1%).

The most frequent taxa, found in 42-58% of the relevés, were *Diplotaxis tenuifolia* (L.) DC., *Euphorbia prostrata* Aiton, *Sonchus asper* (L.) Hill subsp. *glaucescens* (Jord.) Ball, *Solanum nigrum* L. and *Bituminaria bituminosa* (L.) Stirton (Tab. 1).

Four taxa (*Carduus nutans* L. subsp. *micropterus* (Borbás) Hayek, *Aurinia sinuata* (L.) Griseb., *Chaerophyllum coloratum* L. and *Galium firmum* Tausch) were considered endemic to Croatia. In addition, three taxa strictly protected by Croatian law (*C. nutans* subsp. *micropterus*, *Ch. coloratum* L. and *G. firmum* Tausch) were also recorded. Two taxa were listed in the Red Book of Vascular Flora of Croatia (*Ch. coloratum* as Near Threatened, NT) and *Euphorbia prostrata* (Least Concern, LC). The status of *E. prostrata* needs to be revised in the Red Book of Vascular Flora of Croatia due to its invasive character.

Eleven neophytes were recorded, most of them originating in the Americas. All were classified as invasive species in Croatia. *Euphorbia prostrata*, *Sorghum halepense* (L.) Pers. and *Conyza bonariensis* (L.) Cronquist were detected most frequently (in 33-58% of the relevés) (Tab. 1).

In the phytosociological spectrum, taxa of *Artemisieta vulgaris* and *Chenopodietea* (16 taxa each, i.e. 14%) formed the largest proportion, followed by taxa of *Festuco-Brometea* (15, 13%), *Papaveretea rhoeadis* (13, 11%), and *Digitario sanguinalis-Eragrostietea minoris* (12, 10%). Taxa from the class *Sisymbrietea* contributed 8%. The proportion of the other classes was less than 8%.

DISCUSSION

After the construction of the access roads to Pelješac Bridge, previously well-developed woody (*Quercetea ilicis*) and garrigue (*Onionido-Rosmarinetea*) plant communities (JASPRICA & DOLINA, 2009) were replaced by ruderal communities as early as autumn 2022. Road construction directly fragmented forest habitats. The newly disturbed zones create a new microclimate and a change in other physical conditions at different distances from the roadside. On the road verges, species of woody and garrigue vegetation were replaced to a considerable extent by taxa of the *Artemisieta vulgaris* and *Chenopodietea* classes, cosmopolitans and therophytes.

In landscapes fragmented by roads, where spontaneous colonization depends almost entirely on vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the roads, newly constructed roads provide habitats for "edge species" (SPELLERBERG, 1998). In our study, almost 93%

Tab. 1. Phytosociological relevés of ruderal stands collected three months after completion of road construction on the Pelješac Peninsula and mainland in southern Croatia. Geographical coordinates of relevés are listed in Appendix 1. Abbreviations: Life forms (LF): Ch – chamaephytes, G – geophytes, H – hemicryptophytes, P – phanerophytes, T – therophytes. Chorotypes (CHOR), and origin of invasive taxa (neophytes, displayed on a brownish background): AF – Africa, AM – Americas, Co – Cosmopolitan (widespread), CuAd – Cultivate and adventive plants, EU – European, EA – Euroasian, Med – Mediterranean, N – neotropics, SEU – South European. Threatened taxa: LC – Least Concern, NT – Near Threatened. SP – Strictly protected taxa in Croatia. The column "Classes" shows (some) phytosociological classes taxa, as reported on the website <https://www.synbiosys.alterra.nl/evc/>, on the basis of the EuroVegChecklist (MUCINA et al., 2016). Diagnostic species are defined on the class level only:

| Relevé number | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|----------------------|----------|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|
| Localities (M=mainland, PP=Pelješac Peninsula) | | | | | PP | PP | PP | PP | PP | PP |
| Altitude (m a.s.l.) | | | | | 70 | 55 | 75 | 65 | 135 | 135 |
| Aspect | | | | | . | . | E | E | . | . |
| Slope (°) | | | | | . | . | 5 | 40 | . | . |
| Plot size (mq) | | | | | 25 | 25 | 20 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Vegetation cover (%) | | | | | 30 | 40 | 40 | 60 | 50 | 20 |
| Number of taxa | | | | | 11 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 14 | 14 |
| | LF | CHOR | Status | Classes | | | | | | |
| <i>Diplotaxis tenuifolia</i> (L.) DC. | H | Co | | DIG | + | + | + | . | + | + |
| <i>Euphorbia prostrata</i> Aiton | T | CuAd | invasive, LC, AM | DIG | . | 2 | + | . | 2 | + |
| <i>Sonchus asper</i> (L.) Hill subsp. <i>glaucescens</i> (Jord.) Ball | H | Med | | CHE | . | . | + | . | . | + |
| <i>Solanum nigrum</i> L. | T | Co | | PAR, SIS | . | . | + | . | . | + |
| <i>Bituminaria bituminosa</i> (L.) Stirton | H | Med | | DRY, LYG | 2 | . | + | + | . | . |
| <i>Picris hieracioides</i> L. | H | EA | | ART | + | + | + | + | . | . |
| <i>Sorghum halepense</i> (L.) Pers. | G | Co | invasive, EU(Med) | DIG | + | . | 2 | . | + | . |
| <i>Chenopodium strictum</i> Roth | T | Co | | SIS | . | 3 | 3 | . | . | . |
| <i>Conyza bonariensis</i> (L.) Cronquist | T | CuAd | invasive, AM | CHE, DIG | . | . | + | + | + | . |
| <i>Erodium malacoides</i> (L.) L'Hér. | T | Med | | CHE | + | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Setaria viridis</i> (L.) P.Beauv. | T | EA | | DIG | . | 2 | 1 | . | + | . |
| <i>Heliotropium europaeum</i> L. | T | Med | | DIG | . | 1 | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Bidens subalternans</i> DC. | T | CuAd | invasive, AM | SIS | . | + | + | . | + | . |
| <i>Sonchus oleraceus</i> L. | T | Co | | PAR, SIS | . | . | . | + | . | + |
| <i>Conyza canadensis</i> (L.) Cronquist | T | CuAd | invasive, AM | | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Asphodelus fistulosus</i> L. | H | Med | | CHE | + | . | . | . | . | + |
| <i>Cynodon dactylon</i> (L.) Pers. | G | Co | | DIG | . | + | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Dittrichia viscosa</i> (L.) Greuter | H | Med | | ART, LYG | . | . | + | + | . | . |
| <i>Cistus incanus</i> L. | P | Med | | ROS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Lactuca serriola</i> L. | H | Co | | SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Phillyrea latifolia</i> L. | P | Med | | QUI | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Tribulus terrestris</i> L. | T | SEU | | DIG | + | + | . | . | . | . |

ART – *Artemisieta vulgaris*, ASP – *Asplenietea trichomanis*, BUL – *Poetea bulbosae*, CAK – *Cakiletea maritimae*, CHE – *Chenopodieta*, COR – *Koelerio-Corynephoretea canescens*, CRU – *Helichryso-Crucianelletea maritimae*, CYM – *Cymbalaria-Parietarietea diffusae*, DIG – *Digitario sanguinalis-Eragrostietea minoris*, DRY – *Drypidetea spinosae*, EPI – *Epilobietea angustifolii*, FES – *Festuco-Brometea*, GER – *Trifolio-Geranietae sanguinei*, LAU – *Pruno lusitanicae-Lauretea azoricae*, LAV – *Cisto-Lavanduletea stoechadis*, LYG – *Lygeo spar-ti-Stipetea tenacissimae*, MOL – *Molinio-Arrhenatheretea*, ONO – *Festuco hystricis-Ononidetea striatae*, PAR – *Papaveretea rhoeadis*, PUB – *Quercetea pubescens*, QUI – *Quercetea ilicis*, RHA – *Crataego-Prunetea*, ROS – *Ononio-Rosmarinetea*, SED – *Sedo-Scleranthesetea*, SIS – *Sisymbrietea*, THL – *Thlaspietea rotundifolii*, TRA – *Stipo-Trachynieteа distachyaе*, TUB – *Helianthemetea guttati*.

| 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|--|
| PP | PP | PP | M | M | M | M | M | M | M | M | | | |
| 160 | 200 | 200 | 175 | 180 | 185 | 205 | 220 | 75 | 30 | 60 | 60 | 75 | 7 | 11 | 157 | 155 | 155 | | | |
| N | S | . | N | . | . | . | . | S | S | . | . | SW | SE | NE | . | SE | . | | | |
| 20 | 90 | . | 10 | . | . | . | . | 10 | 10 | . | . | 40 | 20 | 10 | . | 5 | . | | | |
| 25 | 20 | 5 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 50 | 5 | 25 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 25 | 10 | 20 | | | |
| 40 | 5 | 60 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 40 | 15 | 20 | 10 | 65 | 50 | 90 | 30 | 35 | 80 | 50 | 70 | | | |
| 20 | 6 | 12 | 15 | 11 | 6 | 15 | 15 | 20 | 23 | 19 | 18 | 15 | 24 | 25 | 15 | 13 | 22 | fN | f% | |
| + | . | 1 | + | . | . | . | . | . | 2 | + | . | 1 | + | . | + | 1 | 14 | 58 | | |
| . | . | + | . | . | . | + | . | . | + | + | 3 | . | + | 2 | . | 1 | + | 13 | 54 | |
| . | + | . | + | + | + | . | 1 | 2 | + | + | + | . | . | . | . | . | + | 12 | 50 | |
| . | + | 2 | 3 | . | . | . | + | + | + | . | + | + | + | + | . | . | . | 11 | 46 | |
| 2 | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | + | + | . | 1 | . | + | 2 | . | . | . | 10 | 42 | |
| . | . | + | 1 | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | + | 9 | 38 | |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | 1 | + | . | . | . | + | . | 1 | 8 | 33 | |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | 2 | . | + | + | + | 2 | . | . | . | . | + | . | 8 | 33 | |
| + | + | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | 2 | . | . | . | 1 | . | . | 8 | 33 | |
| + | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | 2 | . | . | 1 | . | . | 1 | + | 7 | 29 | |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | + | + | . | . | 1 | 7 | 29 | |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | + | . | + | . | + | + | . | 3 | 7 | 29 | |
| + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 1 | + | + | . | . | . | . | 7 | 29 | | |
| . | + | . | + | . | 2 | . | + | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 7 | 29 | | |
| . | . | 3 | . | . | . | . | + | 2 | + | . | . | 5 | . | 1 | . | . | 1 | 7 | 29 | |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | + | + | . | + | . | 6 | 25 | | |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | 1 | . | . | . | . | . | + | 6 | 25 | | |
| + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 2 | . | + | . | . | . | 1 | . | . | 6 | 25 | |
| + | . | . | . | + | + | . | + | + | . | . | 1 | . | . | . | . | . | 6 | 25 | | |
| + | + | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | + | . | + | + | . | . | 6 | 25 | | |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 4 | 5 | 21 | |

Tab. 1. Continued

| Relevé number | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|--------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Plantago lanceolata</i> L. | H | Co | | ART, BUL, COR, MOL | . | + | 1 | . | 2 | . |
| <i>Daucus carota</i> L. | H | EA | | ART, MOL | . | . | + | . | . | . |
| <i>Silene vulgaris</i> (Moench) Garcke subsp. <i>angustifolia</i> Hayek | H | EA | | ART | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Setaria verticillata</i> (L.) P.Beauv. | T | Co | | DIG | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Rubus ulmifolius</i> Schott | P | Med | | RHA | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Melilotus italicus</i> (L.) Lam. | T | SEU | | CHE | . | + | + | . | . | + |
| <i>Mercurialis annua</i> L. | T | Co | | PAR | . | + | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Anagallis arvensis</i> L. | T | Co | | PAR | . | . | + | . | . | . |
| <i>Taraxacum officinale</i> aggr. | H | Co | | | . | . | . | + | + | . |
| <i>Conyza sumatrensis</i> (Retz.) E. Walker | T | CuAd | invasive, AM | CHE, DIG | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Senecio vulgaris</i> L. | T | Co | | PAR, SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Medicago</i> sp. | | | | | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Portulaca oleracea</i> L. | T | Co | | DIG | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Sanguisorba minor</i> Scop. subsp. <i>balearica</i> (Nyman) Muñoz Garm. & C. Navarro | H | SEU | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Pistacia lentiscus</i> L. | P | Med | | QUI | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Ecballium elaterium</i> (L.) A. Rich. | G | Med | | CHE | + | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Echium plantagineum</i> L. | T | Med | | CHE, CRU | + | + | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Rumex pulcher</i> L. | H | SEU | | CHE | . | . | + | . | . | + |
| <i>Convolvulus arvensis</i> L. | G | Co | | PAR, SIS | . | . | . | 2 | + | . |
| <i>Dorycnium hirsutum</i> (L.) Ser. | Ch | Med | | ROS | . | . | . | 2 | . | . |
| <i>Urospermum picroides</i> (L.) Scop. ex F.W.Schmidt | T | Med | | CHE | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Verbascum thapsus</i> L. | H | EU | | ART, EPI | . | . | . | 1 | . | . |
| <i>Dactylis glomerata</i> L. subsp. <i>hispanica</i> (Roth) Nyman | H | Med | | LYG | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Hippocrepis emerus</i> subsp. <i>emeroides</i> (Boiss. & Spruner) Lassen | P | Med | | PUB | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Malva sylvestris</i> L. | H | Co | | ART, CHE, SIS | . | . | . | . | + | . |
| <i>Reseda phytœuma</i> L. | T | SEU | | SED, SIS | . | . | . | . | . | + |
| <i>Cistus salvifolius</i> L. | P | Med | | ROS, LAV | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Lactuca viminea</i> (L.) J. et C. Presl | H | SEU | | DRY, FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Sonchus tenerrimus</i> L. | T | Med | | CHE, CYM | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Scorpiurus muricatus</i> L. | T | SEU | | CHE, TUB | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Amaranthus deflexus</i> L. | T | CuAd | invasive, AM | DIG | . | + | . | . | + | . |
| <i>Erica arborea</i> L. | P | Med | | QUI, LAU | . | + | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Tagetes minuta</i> L. | T | CuAd | invasive, AM | | + | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Dorycnium pentaphyllum</i> Scop. | H | SEU | | FES, ROS | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Smilax aspera</i> L. | P | Med | | QUI | . | . | . | + | . | . |

| 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | |
|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----|
| . | . | . | . | . | . | + | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 5 | 21 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | + | + | . | 5 | 21 |
| 1 | + | + | . | 1 | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 1 | . | . | 5 | 21 |
| + | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | + | . | + | . | + | . | . | 5 | 21 |
| . | . | + | . | . | . | + | + | . | 1 | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | 5 | 21 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | r | . | . | . | + | . | . | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | + | . | . | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | r | + | . | + | . | . | + | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | + | . | . | + | . | + | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | + | . | . | . | + | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | + | . | . | + | . | . | . | + | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 4 | 17 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | + | . | . | 3 | 4 | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | + | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 3 | 13 |
| . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 2 | 8.3 |
| . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 2 | 8.3 |
| + | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | 2 | 8.3 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | 2 | 8.3 |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | + | . | . | . | . | . | 2 | 8.3 |

Tab. 1. Continued

| Relevé number | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|--------------|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Tussilago farfara</i> L. | G | EA | | ART | . | . | . | + | . | + |
| <i>Teucrium chamaedrys</i> L. | Ch | SEU | | FES, GER | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Cichorium intybus</i> L. | H | Co | | ART | . | . | . | . | 1 | . |
| <i>Herniaria glabra</i> L. | T | EA | | BUL, COR, POL | . | . | . | . | r | . |
| <i>Crucianella latifolia</i> L. | T | Med | | THL | . | . | . | . | . | + |
| <i>Geranium molle</i> L. | T | Co | | SIS | . | . | . | . | . | + |
| <i>Euphorbia helioscopia</i> L. | T | Co | | PAR | . | . | . | . | . | + |
| <i>Carduus nutans</i> L. subsp. <i>micropterus</i> (Borbás) Hayek | H | Med | endemic, SP | ART | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Vicia</i> sp. | | | | | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Inula verbascifolia</i> (Willd.) Hausskn. | Ch | Med | | ASP | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Cynoglossum creticum</i> Mill. | T | Med | | ART, CHE | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Bothriochloa ischaemum</i> (L.) Keng | H | SEU | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Fumaria</i> sp. | | | | | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Colutea arborescens</i> L. | P | Med | | PUB | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Aster squamatus</i> (Spreng.) Hieron. | T | CuAd | invasive, AM | ART, LYG | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Picnomon acarna</i> (L.) Cass. | H | Med | | ART, CHE | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Satureja montana</i> L. subsp. <i>variegata</i> (Host) P. W. Ball | Ch | Med | | FES, ONO | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Aurinia sinuata</i> (L.) Griseb. | Ch | Med | endemic | ASP | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Amaranthus retroflexus</i> L. | T | Co | | SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Cirsium arvense</i> (L.) Scop. | G | EA | | PAR, SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Melica ciliata</i> L. | H | EA | | FES, THL | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Centaurea</i> sp. | | | | | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Echium italicum</i> L. | H | Med | | ART, CHE | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Amaranthus viridis</i> L. | T | SEU | | DIG | + | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Ajuga chamaepitys</i> (L.) Schreb. | T | Med | | PAR | . | . | + | . | . | . |
| <i>Brachypodium retusum</i> (Pers.) P. Beauv. | T | Med | | LYG, ROS | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Clematis flammula</i> L. | P | Med | | QUI | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Rubia peregrina</i> L. | P | Med | | QUI | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Verbena officinalis</i> L. | H | Co | | MOL | . | . | . | + | . | . |
| <i>Verbascum sinuatum</i> L. | H | Med | | ART, CRU, LYG | . | . | . | . | + | . |
| <i>Hyparrhenia hirta</i> (L.) Stapf | H | Med | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | + |
| <i>Aethionema saxatile</i> (L.) W. T. Aiton | Ch | SEU | | SED, THL | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Anthemis arvensis</i> L. | T | EA | | PAR | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Helianthemum salicifolium</i> (L.) Mill. | T | SEU | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Scrophularia canina</i> L. | H | SEU | | CHE, EPI | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Eryngium amethystinum</i> L. | H | Med | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |

Tab. 1. Continued

| Relevé number | | | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|------|--------------------|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <i>Linum tenuifolium</i> L. | Ch | SEU | | FES, ONO | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Chrysopogon gryllus</i> (L.) Trin. | H | Med | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Fumana ericifolia</i> Wallr. | Ch | Med | | ROS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Asparagus acutifolius</i> L. | G | Med | | QUI | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Eryngium campestre</i> L. | H | SEU | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Geranium columbinum</i> L. | T | EA | | SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Trifolium campestre</i> Schreb. | T | Co | | SED, TRA | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Stachys cretica</i> subsp. <i>salviifolia</i> (Ten.) Rech. f. | H | Med | | ROS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Erodium cicutarium</i> (L.) L'Hér. | T | Co | | BUL, SED, SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Salvia officinalis</i> L. | Ch | Med | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Petrorhagia prolifera</i> (L.) P. W. Ball & Heywood | T | EA | | SED | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Raphanus raphanistrum</i> L. | T | SEU | | PAR | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Hippocrepis biflora</i> Spreng. | T | SEU | | TRA | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Beta vulgaris</i> subsp. <i>maritima</i> (L.) Arcang. | H | Med | | CAK | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Citrullus lanatus</i> (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai | P | CuAd | | | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Chenopodium album</i> L. | T | Co | | SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Erica manipuliflora</i> Salisb. | Ch | Med | | ROS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Euphorbia characias</i> subsp. <i>wulfenii</i> (Hoppe ex W. D. J. Koch) Radcl.-Sm. | P | Med | | ASP, QUI | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Fallopia baldschuanica</i> (Regel) Holub | P | CuAd | | PAR | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Ficus carica</i> L. | P | Med | | CYM, QUI | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Euphorbia peplus</i> L. | T | Co | | PAR | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Piptatherum miliaceum</i> (L.) Coss. | H | Med | | LYG, QUI | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Lotus corniculatus</i> L. | H | Co | | MOL | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Thelygonum cynocrambe</i> L. | T | SEU | | CHE | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Tordylium apulum</i> L. | T | Med | | CHE, TRA | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Amaranthus hybridus</i> L. | T | Co | invasive, N | SIS | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Campanula lingulata</i> Waldst. et Kit. | H | SEU | | ASP | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Microrrhinum minus</i> (L.) Fourr. subsp. <i>minus</i> | T | EU | | SIS, THL, TRA | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Chaerophyllum coloratum</i> L. | H | Med | endemic, NT, SP | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Cleistogenes serotina</i> (L.) Keng | H | SEU | | FES | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Eleusine indica</i> (L.) Gaertn. | T | CuAd | invasive, AF | DIG | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Frangula rupestris</i> (Scop.) Schur | P | Med | | PUB, RHA | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Galium firmum</i> Tausch | H | Med | endemic, SP | ASP | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Foeniculum vulgare</i> Mill. | H | Med | | ART, LYG | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| <i>Reichardia picroides</i> (L.) Roth | H | Med | | CHE, LYG | . | . | . | . | . | . |

of species occurring along roads were not previously detected in the flora of the surrounding communities (JASPRICA in NIKOLIĆ, 2023). These species could have been introduced by human dispersal mechanisms via machinery during road construction (SCHMIDT, 1989) or migrated along the roads (TIKKA *et al.*, 2001). Alternatively, it is also possible that this species group is not included in the list of surrounding species due to methodological limitations in the survey. However, according to VAN DORP *et al.* (1997), migration rates of species along narrow and unproductive landscape features such as roads should be low.

On the other hand, the results of PAUCHARD & ALABACK (2004) suggest that both alien and native species move along road corridors and that the elevation and land use of the surrounding matrix influence these invasion processes. Their findings also confirm the importance of early detection and control of invasive species and underscore the importance of considering surrounding land use when developing conservation strategies for the area as a whole.

Although this study is preliminary, the dominance of therophytes and Mediterranean taxa with a significant proportion of cosmopolitans is consistent with previous studies for anthropogenic habitats subject to intense human pressures (see e.g., JASPRICA *et al.*, 2017). This is not unexpected, as the short generation time and large number of easily dispersed seeds make therophytes very effective colonizers with a high tolerance to disturbance. In general, these taxa have a significant impact on the physiognomy of this type of man-made habitat. Several studies have also shown that some



Fig. 2. Ruderal sites along the access roads to Pelješac Bridge in autumn 2022: above the village of Komarna on the mainland (A), near the villages of Brijesta (B), Dančanje (C) and Metohija (D), and above Prapratno Bay (E-F) on the Pelješac Peninsula (photo: N. Jasprica).

native species expand their range and reach new areas along roadsides (BRAUER & GEBER, 2002; AHRENS *et al.*, 2014), which could lead to changes in biodiversity, species composition, and abundance of plant species.

The phytosociological spectrum, and in particular the considerable contribution of taxa of *Artemisietea vulgaris* and *Chenopodietea*, among others, suggests, at least in part, that the flora of the sites studied lacks links to the plant communities of its biogeographical context (e.g., DUNNETT & HITCHMOUGH, 2004). Interestingly, the most common taxa (e.g., *Diplotaxis tenuifolia*, *Sonchus asper* subsp. *glaucescens*, *Solanum nigrum*, *Parietaria judaica*, etc.) are associated with different classes. This was also discussed by JASPRICA & MILOVIĆ (2020) and is related to the type of habitat disturbance. However, it is important to emphasize that some roadsides are subjected to periodic disturbances that promote communities with a low stability (JANTUNEN *et al.*, 2006). Furthermore, in many cases, roadsides provide only a limited area for vegetation establishment, which may reduce the probability of stable populations being established (LÁZARO-LOBO & ERVIN, 2019). In addition, roads and other anthropogenic disturbances can result in the absence of complete native communities and the presence of only a selection of species (ARMSTRONG *et al.*, 2019). Microsites suitable for the establishment of many local plant species could also be scarce along roadsides within a small area (PETRŮ & MENGES, 2004).

In our case, the percentage contribution of the neophytes (9%) has also documented roads as corridors for the spread of non-native plants (HANSEN & CLEVENGER, 2005). In general, the pattern of neophytes is most influenced by site conditions (ŠILC *et al.*, 2012).

Our study includes a floristic and ecological survey on only a relatively small area. Nevertheless, it can contribute to the overall knowledge of the flora of roadsides at the beginning of a colonization period, when anthropogenic influence and spontaneous overgrowth of vegetation are still low. However, from a purely scientific point of view, it would be interesting to determine species richness and plant sociology at the same sites over longer periods of road traffic. Seasonality of the survey could play a large role, and a survey in the spring after the road is completed could reveal annual species that are absent later in autumn. Our analysis will then help develop a broader understanding of the management and conservation potential of this habitat type.

In summary, roadside characteristics and species requirements strongly influence the role of roadsides as habitat, corridors, or barriers for plant species. In general, the positive effect of roadsides on non-native/weed species is overwhelmingly supported, while their effect on native species in the early stages of plant colonization across the Mediterranean is still not known. Some authors (e.g., LÁZARO-LOBO & ERVIN, 2019) suggest that the effects on native species are, on average, more positive than might have been expected. We suggest that native plant species should be used in roadside revegetation, especially in sections where new open habitats are created and in other parts that are sensitive to additional fragmentation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The first author warmly thanks his colleagues and friends Dr. Mirna Batistić (Institute of Marine and Coastal Research, University of Dubrovnik, Dubrovnik) and Dr. Vinicije B. Lupis (Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar, Dubrovnik Regional Centre) who, as members of the main board of the Pelješac Bridge Association (HR: Glavni

odbor Udruge Pelješki most) from Dubrovnik, actively participated in raising awareness among scientific and professional circles and the wider public about the necessity and importance of the continued construction of the Pelješac Bridge for the Republic of Croatia and the European Union and its territorial integrity (2012–2016). The authors also thank Steve Latham (United Kingdom) for improving the English, two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and efforts in improving this report. The authors also thank the Croatian Meteorological and Hydrological Service for providing climatological data from the meteorological station in the town of Ploče for the period 1988–2019.

Received November 27, 2022

REFERENCES

- AHRENS, C.W., MEYER, T.H & AUER, C.A., 2014: Distribution models for *Panicum virgatum* (Poaceae) reveal an expanded range in present and future climate regimes in the northeastern United States. American Journal of Botany **101**, 1886–1894.
- ANONYMOUS, 2013a: Zakon o zaštiti okoliša [Environmental Protection Act] Official Gazette (OG). 80.
- ANONYMOUS, 2013b: Pravilnik o strogo zaštićenim vrstama [Ordinance on strictly protected species]. Official Gazette (OG). 144.
- ANONYMOUS, 2016: Pravilnik o izmjenama i dopunama Pravilnika o strogo zaštićenim vrstama [Ordinance on amendments to the Ordinance on strictly protected species]. Official Gazette (OG). 73.
- ANONYMOUS, 2019: Uredba o ekološkoj mreži i nadležnostima javnih ustanova za upravljanje područjima ekološke mreže [Regulation on the ecological network and the competences of public institutions for the management of ecological network areas]. Official Gazette (OG). 80.
- ARMSTRONG, A., CHRISTIANS, R., ERICKSON, V., HOPWOOD, J., HORNING, M., KRAMER, A., MOORE, L., REMLEY, D., ROBERTS, S., SKINNER, M., STEINFELD, D., TEUSCHER, T. & WHITE, A., 2019: Roadside revegetation: An integrated approach to establishing Native plants and pollinator habitat. Federal Highway Administration, Washington D.C.
- BAŠIĆ, F., 2013: The soils of Croatia. World soils book series. Springer, Dordrecht.
- BENNETT, V.J., 2017: Effects of road density and pattern on the conservation of species and biodiversity. Current Landscape Ecology Reports **2**, 1–11.
- BIONDI, E., CASAVECCHIA, S. & PESARESI, S., 2012: Nitrophilous and ruderal species as indicators of climate change. Case study from the Italian Adriatic coast. Plant Biosystems **146**, 134–142.
- BRAUER, J. & GEBER, M.A., 2002: Population differentiation in the range expansion of a native maritime plant, *Solidago sempervirens* L. International Journal of Plant Sciences **163**, 141–150.
- BRAUN-BLANQUET, J., 1964: Pflanzensoziologie. Grundzüge der Vegetationskunde. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- DÍAZ, S., CABIDO, M. & CASANOVES, F., 1998: Plant functional traits and environmental filters at a regional scale. Journal of Vegetation Science **9**, 113–122.
- DUNNETT, N. & HITCHMOUGH, J.D. (eds.), 2004: The dynamic landscape: Design ecology and management of naturalistic urban planting. Spon Press, London.
- EURO-MED, 2006+ [continuously updated]: Euro+Med PlantBase - the information resource for Euro-Mediterranean plant diversity. Published at <http://www.europlusmed.org> [Last access: 20 November 2022].
- FORMAN, R.T.T. & ALEXANDER, L.E., 1998: Roads and their major ecological effects. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics **29**, 207–231.
- GRIME, J.P., 1979: Plant strategies and vegetation processes. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
- GUO, W.Y., VAN KLEUNEN, M., WINTER, M., WEIGELT, P., STEIN, A., PIERCE, S., PERGL, J., MOSER, D., MAUREL, N., LENZNER, B., KREFT, H., ESSL, F., DAWSON, W. & PYŠEK, P., 2018: The role of adaptive strategies in plant naturalization. Ecology Letters **21**, 1380–1389.
- HANSEN, A.J. & CLEVINGER, A.P., 2005: The influence of disturbance and habitat on the presence of non-native plant species along transport corridors. Biological Conservation **125**, 249–259.

- HUGHES, A.C., 2018: Have Indo-Malaysian forests reached the end of the road? *Biological Conservation* **223**, 129-137.
- IUCN, 2022: IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee. 2022. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. Version 15.1. Prepared by the Standards and Petitions Committee. Available from <https://www.iucnredlist.org/documents/RedListGuidelines.pdf> [Last access: 20 November 2022].
- JANTUNEN, J., SAARINEN, K., VALTONEN, A. & SAARNIO, S., 2006: Grassland vegetation along roads differing in size and traffic density. *Annales Botanici Fennici* **43**, 107-117.
- JASPRICA, N. & BATIĆ, M., 2021: Doprinos Instituta u Dubrovniku poznavanju i zaštiti Malostonskog zaljeva [The contribution of the Institute in Dubrovnik to the knowledge and protection of the Mali Ston Bay]. In: JASPRICA, N. & BATIĆ, M. (eds.), 108-113. Sedamdeseta godišnjica Instituta u Dubrovniku. Sveučilište u Dubrovniku, Dubrovnik.
- JASPRICA, N. & DOLINA, K., 2009: Prioritetna područja Mljet i Pelješac [Priority areas Mljet and Pelješac]. In: Kartiranje flore Dalmacije. Prioritetna područja: otok Pag, estuarij Krke, otok Vis i pučinski otoci, Pelješac i Mljet, dok Cetine. Očuvanje i održivo korištenje biološke raznolikosti na dalmatinskoj obali (Mitić, B. et al., eds.), 129-178. COAST, UNDP, Split.
- JASPRICA, N. & KOVACIĆ, S., 2010: Pelješac. In: NIKOLIĆ, T., TOPIĆ, J. & VUKOVIĆ, N. (eds.), Botanički važna područja Hrvatske, 335-340. Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu i Školska knjiga d.o.o., Zagreb.
- JASPRICA, N. & MILOVIĆ, M., 2016: The vegetation of the islet of Badija (south Croatia), with some notes on its flora. *Natura Croatica* **25**, 1-24.
- JASPRICA, N. & MILOVIĆ, M., 2020: Flora of the cobbled streets and pavements in the Mediterranean Old City of Dubrovnik during the COVID-19 lockdown. *Natura Croatica* **29**, 19-28.
- JASPRICA, N., MILOVIĆ, M., DOLINA, K. & LASIĆ, A., 2017: Analyses of flora of railway stations in the Mediterranean and sub-Mediterranean areas of Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Natura Croatica* **26**, 271-303.
- LÁZARO-LOBO, A. & ERVIN, G.N., 2019: A global examination on the differential impacts of roadsides on native vs. exotic and weedy plant species. *Global Ecology and Conservation* **17**, e00555.
- LEMBRECHTS, J.J., ALEXANDER, J.M., CAVIERES, L.A., HAIDER, S., LENOIR, J., KUEFFER, C., McDougall, K., NAYLOR, B.J., NUNEZ, M.A., PAUCHARD, A., REW, L.J., NIJS, I. & MILBAU, A., 2017: Mountain roads shift native and non-native plant species- ranges. *EcoGraphy* **40**, 353-364.
- LI, H., LUO, P., YANG, H., LI, T., LUO, C., WU, S., JIA, H. & CHENG, Y., 2022: Effect of road corridors on plant diversity in the Qionglai mountain range, China. *Ecological Indicators* **134**, 108504.
- MILOVIĆ, M., KOVACIĆ, S., JASPRICA, N. & STAMENKOVIĆ, V., 2016: Contribution to the study of Adriatic island flora: Vascular plant species diversity in the Croatian Island of Olib. *Natura Croatica* **25**, 25-54.
- MUCINA, L., BÜLTMAN, H., DIERSSEN, K., THEURILLAT, J.-P., DENGLER, J., ČARNI, A., ŠUMBEROVÁ, K., RAUS, T., DI PIETRO, R., GAVILÁN GARCIA, R., CHYTRÝ, M., IAKUSHENKO, D., SCHAMINÉE, J.H.J., BERGMEIER, E., SANTOS GUERRA, A., DANIÉLS, F.J.A., ĚRMakov, N., VALACHOVIĆ, M., PIGANTI, S., RODWELL, J.S., PALLAS, J., CAPELO, J., WEBER, H.E., LYSENKO, T., SOLOMESHCH, A., DIMOUPOULOS, P., AGUIAR, C., FREITAG, H., HENNEKENS, S.M. & TICHÝ, L., 2016: Vegetation of Europe: Hierarchical floristic classification system of plant, lichen, and algal communities. *Applied Vegetation Science* **19**, 3-264.
- MULLEROVÁ, J., VÍTKOVÁ, M. & VÍTEK, O., 2011: The impacts of road and walking trails upon adjacent vegetation: effects of road building materials on species composition in a nutrient poor environment. *Science of the Total Environment* **409**, 3839-3849.
- NIKOLIĆ, T. (ed.), 2023: Flora Croatica Database. Available from: <http://hirc.botanic.hr/fcd>. Botanički zavod, Prirodoslovno-matematički fakultet, Sveučilište u Zagrebu [Last access: 12 April 2023].
- NIKOLIĆ, T., MILOVIĆ, M., BOGDANOVIC, S. & JASPRICA, N. (eds.), 2015: Endemi u hrvatskoj flori [Endemics in the Croatian flora]. Alfa d.d., Zagreb.
- OHSAWA, M., DA, L.J. & OTUKA, T., 1988: Urban vegetation - its structure and dynamics. In: OBARA, H. (ed.), Integrated studies in urban ecosystems as the basis of urban planning. Kagawa Nutrition College, Kagawa.
- PAUCHARD, A. & ALABACK, P.B., 2004: Influence of elevation, land use, and landscape context on patterns of alien plant invasions along roadsides in protected areas of south-central Chile. *Conservation Biology* **18**, 238-248.
- PETRŮ, M. & MENGES, E.S., 2004: Shifting sands in Florida scrub gaps and roadsides: dynamic microsites for herbs. *American Midland Naturalist* **151**, 101-113.

- PIGNATTI, S., 1982: Flora d'Italia 1–3. Edagricole, Bologna.
- RAIĆ, V., PAPEŠ, J., AHAC, A., KOROLIJA, B., BOROVIĆ, I., GRIMANI, I. & MARINČIĆ, S., 1982: Osnovna geološka karta SFRJ 1:100 000 [Basic geological map of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia]. List Ston K33-48. Geoinženjering-OOUR Institut za geologiju, Sarajevo, Zagreb (1972-1980); Institut za geološka istraživanja, Zagreb (1967-1968); Savezni geološki institut, Beograd.
- RAUNKIAER, C., 1934: The life forms of plants and statistical plant geography. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- RIVAS-MARTÍNEZ, S., PENAS, A. & DIAZ, T.E., 2004. Mapa Biogeográfico de Europa [Biogeographic map of Europe]. Available from: <http://webs.ucm.es/info/cif/form/maps.htm>. Cartographic Service, University of Leon [Last access: 20 November 2022].
- RIVAS-MARTÍNEZ, S., SÁENZ, S. R. & PENAS, A., 2011: Worldwide bioclimatic classification system. Global Geobotany 1, 1-634.
- SCHMIDT, W., 1989: Plant dispersal by motor cars. *Vegetatio* 80, 147-152.
- ŠILC, U., VRBNIČANIN, S., BOŽIĆ, D., ČARNI, A. & DAJIĆ STEVANOVIĆ, Z., 2012: Alien plant species and factors of invasiveness of anthropogenic vegetation in the Northwestern Balkans - a phytosociological approach. *Central European Journal of Biology* 7, 720-730.
- ŠKVORC, Ž., JASPRICA, N., ALEGRO, A., KOVAČIĆ, S., FRANJIĆ, J., KRSTONOŠIĆ, D., VRANEŠA, A. & ČARNI, A., 2017: Vegetation of Croatia: Phytosociological classification of the high-rank syntaxa. *Acta Botanica Croatica* 76, 200-224.
- SELLERBERG, I.F., 1998: Ecological effects of roads and traffic: A literature review. *Global Ecology and Biogeography Letters* 7, 317-333.
- STACHOWICZ, J.J., 2001: Mutualism, facilitation, and the structure of ecological communities: positive interactions play a critical, but underappreciated, role in ecological communities by reducing physical or biotic stresses in existing habitats and by creating new habitats on which many species depend. *BioScience* 51, 235-246.
- TIKKA, P.M., HÖGMANDER, H. & KOSKI, P.S., 2001: Road and railway verges serve as dispersal corridors for grassland plants. *Landscape Ecology* 16, 659-666.
- VAN DORP, D., SCHIPPERS, P. & VAN GROENENDAEL, J.M., 1997: Migration rates of grassland plants along corridors in fragmented landscapes assessed with a cellular automation model. *Landscape Ecology* 12, 39-50.
- VANNESTE, T., GOVAERT, S., DE KESEL, W., VAN DEN BERGE, S., VANGANSBEKE, P., MEEUSSEN, C., BRUNET, J., COUSINS, S.A.O., DECOCQ, G., DIEKMANN, M., GRAAE, B.J., HEDWALL, P.-O., HEINKEN, T., HELSEN, K., KAP'AS, R.E., LENOIR, J., LIIRA, J., LINDMO, S., LITZA, K., NAAF, T., ORCZEWSKA, A., PLUE, J., WULF, M., VERHEYEN, K., DE FRENNE, P. & BISWAS, S., 2020: Plant diversity in hedgerows and road verges across Europe. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 57, 1244-1257.
- WESTHOFF, V. & VAN DER MAAREL, E., 1980: The Braun-Blanquet approach. In: WHITTAKER, R.H. (ed.), Classification of plant communities, 287-399. 2nd ed. Junk/The Hague, Boston, London.

Appendix 1

Geographical coordinates of the relevés.

Tab. 1. Pelješac Peninsula (rels. 1-16, 21.-23.10.2022.): Rel. 1: 42.819598 N, 17.675894 E; Rel. 2: 42.823061 N, 17.680233 E; Rel. 3: 42.820327 N, 17.678168 E; Rel. 4: 42.822764 N, 17.669930 E; Rel. 5: 42.831298 N, 17.646754 E; Rel. 6: 42.830941 N, 17.647079 E; Rel. 7: 42.832278 N, 17.643281 E; Rel. 8: 42.836610 N, 17.631972 E; Rel. 9: 42.836455 N, 17.632419 E; Rel. 10: 42.840928 N, 17.605257 E; Rel. 11: 42.965626 N, 17.517887 E; Rel. 12: 42.848267 N, 17.592109 E; Rel. 13: 42.858439 N, 17.574851 E; Rel. 14: 42.865243 N, 17.567148 E; Rel. 15: 42.907982 N, 17.537841 E; Rel. 16: 42.919828 N, 17.527414 N; Mainland (rels. 17-24): (rels. 17-21, 29.10.2022.) 5.11.2022.), Rel. 17: 42.947245 N, 17.535142 E; Rel. 18: 42.947295 N, 17.534535 E; Rel. 19: 42.945445 N, 17.537004 E; Rel. 20: 42.941675 N, 17.537230 E; Rel. 21: 42.942405 N, 17.540717 E; (rels. 22-24, 5.11.2022.) Rel. 22: 42.964867 N, 17.517650 E; Rel. 23: 42.965223 N, 17.517555 E; Rel. 24: 42.841608 N, 17.602865 E.

Appendix 2

Syntaxa quoted in the text and table (in alphabetical order).

- Artemisietea vulgaris* Lohmeyer et al. in Tx. ex von Rochow 1951
Asplenietea trichomanis (Br.-Bl. in Meier et Br.-Bl. 1934) Oberd. 1977
Cakiletea maritimae Tx. et Preising in Tx. ex Br.-Bl. et Tx. 1952
Chenopodieteа Br.-Bl. in Br.-Bl. et al. 1952
Cisto-Lavanduletea stoechadis Br.-Bl. in Br.-Bl. et al. 1940
Crataego-Prunetea Tx. 1962
Cymbalario-Parietarietea diffusae Oberd. 1969
Digitario sanguinalis-Eragrostietea minoris Mucina, Lososová et Šilc in Mucina et al. 2016
Drypidetea spinosae Quézel 1964
Epilobietea angustifolii Tx. et Preising ex von Rochow 1951
Festuco hystricis-Ononidetea striatae Rivas-Mart. et al. 2002
Festuco-Brometea Br.-Bl. et Tx. ex Soo 1947
Fraxino orni-Quercion ilicis Biondi et al. ex Biondi, Casavecchia et Gigante 2013
Helianthemetea guttati Rivas Goday et Rivas-Mart. 1963
Helichryso-Crucianelletea maritimae Géhu et al. in Sissingh 1974
Koelerio-Corynephoretea canescens Klika in Klika et Novák 1941
Lygeo sparti-Stipetea tenacissimae Rivas-Mart. 1978 nom. conserv. propos. (*Thero-Brachypodieteа Br.-Bl.* in Br.- Bl. et al. 1947)
Molinio-Arrhenatheretea Tx. 1937
Oleo-Ceratonion siliquae Br.-Bl. ex Guinochet et Drouineau 1944
Ononido-Rosmarinetea Br.-Bl. in A. Bolòs y Vayreda 1950
Papaveretea rhoeadis S. Brullo et al. 2001 nom. conserv. propos.
Poetea bulbosae Rivas Goday et Rivas-Mart. in Rivas-Mart. 1978
Pruno lusitanicae-Lauretea azoricae Oberd. ex Rivas-Mart. et al. 1977
Quercetea ilicis Br.-Bl. ex A. Bolós et O. de Bolós in A. Bolós y Vayreda 1950
Quercetea pubescentis Doing-Kraft ex Scamoni et Passarge 1959
Sedo-Scleranthetea Br.-Bl. 1955
Sisymbrietea Gutte et Hilbig 1975
Stipo-Trachynietea distachyae S. Brullo in S. Brullo et al. 2001
Thlaspietea rotundifolii Br.-Bl. 1948
Trifolio-Geranietea sanguinei T. Müller 1962

