

<b>Weed (Scientific name)</b>	<b>Olea europaea subsp. cuspidata - Oleaceae</b>		
<b>Region</b>	<b>Sydney</b>		
<b>Management Area</b>			
<b>Landuse</b>	<b>1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS</b>		
<b>Assumptions</b>	<b>Also to cover private rural landholdings. Sydney-wide consensus from Weeds Committe Representatives.</b>		
<b><i>Invasiveness</i></b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?</b>		<b>3.0</b>	Seedlings establish within dense vegetation or weeds Q1
<b>Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	Between 5 and 50% of weeds survive Q2
<b>Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?</b>		<b>2.0</b>	
(a) Time to seeding	0.0		>3 yrs/never Q3
(b) Annual seed production	2.0		High
(c) Vegetative reproduction	1.0		Infrequent
<b>Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100m) by natural means?</b>		<b>2.0</b>	
(a) Flying animals	2.0		Common Q4
(b) Other wild animals	1.0		Occasional
(c) Water	1.0		Occasional
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
<b>Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100 m) by human means?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	1.0		Occasional Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
<b>Total</b>		<b>6.0</b>	

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		<b>3.0</b>	> 50% reduction Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		<b>4.0</b>	> 50% reduction Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		<b>3.0</b>	High Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		<b>3.0</b>	High Q4
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?		<b>0.0</b>	None Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		<b>2.0</b>	Q6
(a) food/shelter	1.0		Major negative effect
(b) fire regime	1.0		Major negative effect
(c) altered nutrient levels	0.0		Minor or no effect
(d) soil salinity	?		Do not know
(e) soil stability	0.0		Minor or no effect
(f) soil water table	0.0		Minor or no effect
<b>Total</b>		<b>7.9</b>	
<b>Potential Distribution</b>			
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		<b>10.0</b>	>80% of land use Q1
<b>Comparative weed risk score</b>		<b>474</b>	
<b>Weed risk category</b>		<b>Very high</b>	

<b>Control Costs</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. How detectable is the weed?</b> (a) Distinguishing features (b) Period of year shoot growth visible (c) Height at maturity (d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	0 0 0 2	<b>1</b>	always distinct > 8 months > 2 m below canopy
<b>Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?</b>		<b>1</b>	medium
<b>Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?</b> (a) Chemical costs/ha (b) Labour costs/ha (c) Equipment costs	4 4 3	<b>5</b>	very high (>\$500/ha) very high (>\$500/ha) high
<b>Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	medium
<b>Total</b>		<b>6.7</b>	
<b>Persistence</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?</b>		<b>2</b>	medium
<b>Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>		<b>0</b>	>2 years
<b>Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>		<b>2</b>	> 5 years
<b>Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?</b> (a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means (b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	2 1	<b>2.0</b>	frequent occasional
<b>Total</b>		<b>5.5</b>	
<b>Current distribution</b>			
<b>Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?</b>		<b>4.0</b>	20-40% of land use
<b>Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	scattered
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.2</b>	
<b>Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score</b>		<b>152</b>	
<b>Feasibility of coordinated control category</b>		<b>Negligible</b>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Management priority category</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Calculation of overall uncertainty score</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Response</b></p>	<p>Manage weed</p> <p>1%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Positive Impacts</b></p>	
<p><b>References/Other comments</b></p>	

In spite of the outcome of the co-ordinated control score above, representatives evaluating this weed considered that as a woody weed, it is still feasible to control this plant in targeted sites (does) from monocultures. It is imperative to control this weed to conserve biodiversity, and for the sustainable productivity of rural lands.

Re: Sources: Many of the questions above answered as a group by: C Williams & J Vollmer - Sydney North WC, M Costigan & D Whiteman - Sydney West/Blue Mountains WC, J Hill - S assistance of Sue Stevens

**Source and comments**

pers. obs. SS	
see below	
6 years to fruiting <a href="http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp">http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp</a>	
<a href="http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp">http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp</a>	
<a href="http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp">http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp</a> vegetatively by cuttings and pieces. Sainty Weed Deck.	Spreads

pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

[http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full\\_table.asp](http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp)

[http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full\\_table.asp](http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp)

pers. obs. SS Can increase fire heat and intensity. Level of impact on water table will depend on density of infestation.

[http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full\\_table.asp](http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp)

pers. obs. SS Weed Deck	Sainty

6 years to fruiting <a href="http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp">http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp</a>	
Evidence a persistent seed bank is formed. <a href="http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp">http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp</a>	

Intense infestations on Cumberland Plain, but also outbreaks on shale.	

---

uations (i.e. specific asset protection) to maintain biodiversity as this species can (and  
Sydney Central SC, M Thulow South-western Sydney WC and L Kaye -NPWS, with the