

| | | | |
|---|---|--------------|---|
| Weed (Scientific name) | Coprosma repens - Rubiaceae | | |
| Region | Sydney | | |
| Management Area | Sydney | | |
| Landuse | 1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS | | |
| Assumptions | | | |
| <i>Invasiveness</i> | Score | Total | |
| Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants? | | 3.0 | Seedlings establish within dense vegetation or weeds Q1 |
| Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use? | | 2.0 | Between 50 and 95% of weeds survive Q2 |
| Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use? | | 1.0 | |
| (a) Time to seeding | 0.0 | | >3 yrs/never Q3 |
| (b) Annual seed production | 1.0 | | Low |
| (c) Vegetative reproduction | 1.0 | | Infrequent |
| Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100m) by natural means? | | 2.0 | |
| (a) Flying animals | 2.0 | | Common Q4 |
| (b) Other wild animals | 1.0 | | Occasional |
| (c) Water | 1.0 | | Occasional |
| (d) Wind | 0.0 | | Unlikely |
| Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means? | | 2.0 | |
| (a) Deliberate spread by people | 2.0 | | Common Q5 |
| (b) Accidentally by people and vehicles | 0.0 | | Unlikely |
| (c) Contaminated produce | 1.0 | | Occasional |
| (d) Domestic/farm animals | 0.0 | | Unlikely |
| Total | | 6.7 | |

| Impacts | Score | Total | |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants? | | 2.0 | 10 - 50% reduction Q1 |
| Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation? | | 3.0 | 25 - 50% reduction Q2 |
| Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use? | | 2.0 | Medium Q3 |
| Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water? | | 2.0 | Medium Q4 |
| Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people? | | 0.0 | None Q5 |
| Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health? | | 1.0 | |
| (a) food/shelter | 1.0 | | Major negative effect Q6 |
| (b) fire regime | 0.0 | | Minor or no effect |
| (c) altered nutrient levels | 0.0 | | Minor or no effect |
| (d) soil salinity | 0.0 | | Minor or no effect |
| (e) soil stability | 0.0 | | Minor or no effect |
| (f) soil water table | 0.0 | | Minor or no effect |
| Total | | 5.3 | |
| Potential Distribution | | | |
| Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed? | | 2.0 | 10-20% of land use Q1 |
| Comparative weed risk score | | 70 | |
| Weed risk category | | Medium | |

| Control Costs | Score | Total | |
|--|------------------|---------------|--|
| Q1. How detectable is the weed? (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 | 1 | always distinct > 8 months > 2 m below canopy |
| Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment? | | 1 | medium |
| Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control? (a) Chemical costs/ha (b) Labour costs/ha (c) Equipment costs | 3 3 1 | 4 | high (\$250-\$500/ha) high (\$250-\$500/ha) low |
| Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk? | | 1.0 | medium |
| Total | | 5.8 | |
| Persistence | Score | Total | |
| Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed? | | 3 | low |
| Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules? | | ? | do not know |
| Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules? | | 2 | > 5 years |
| Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations? (a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means (b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means | 2 1 | 2.0 | frequent occasional |
| Total | | 7.7 | |
| Current distribution | | | |
| Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed? | | 0.1 | <1% of land use |
| Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered? | | 1.0 | scattered |
| Total | | 0.9 | |
| Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score | | 41 | |
| Feasibility of coordinated control category | | Medium | |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">Management priority category</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Calculation of overall uncertainty score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Response</p> | <p>Manage sites</p> <p>4%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p> | |
| <p>References/Other comments</p> | |

Re: Sources: Many questions were answered as a group by: A MacKenzie & L McGee - Sydney Central WC, N Booth, D Simmons & M Costigan Sydney West/Blue Mountains WC, and M

Source and comments

pers. obs. SS
<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/6affdc2c4841bfbc25760800811e14?OpenDocument&ExpandSection=3>
see below

pers. obs. SS
<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/6affdc2c4841bfbc25760800811e14?OpenDocument&ExpandSection=3>
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

Capable of forming dense colonies and monocultures.
<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/6affdc2c4841bfbc25760800811e14?OpenDocument&ExpandSection=3>

<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/6affdc2c4841bfbc25760800811e14?OpenDocument&ExpandSection=3>

<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/a17f0a46ac9eb743ca2576080082246e?OpenDocument>

pers. obs. SS
<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/a17f0a46ac9eb743ca2576080082246e?OpenDocument>

http://www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/WRA/full_table.asp
<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/a17f0a46ac9eb743ca2576080082246e?OpenDocument>

Potential for use in slope stabilisation, but can shade out soil-binding groundcovers. Hard to burn, could reduce fire intensity in heath.

<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/a17f0a46ac9eb743ca2576080082246e?OpenDocument> Dominance in heath can reduce honeyeater forage and increase carnivorous/frugivorous bird food supplies.

pers. obs. SS
<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/6affdc2c4841bfbc25760800811e14?OpenDocument&ExpandSection=3>

<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/a17f0a46ac9eb743ca2576080082246e?OpenDocument>

<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/a17f0a46ac9eb743ca2576080082246e?OpenDocument>

<http://land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/06855d653214895b4a256acd007bf8b5/a17f0a46ac9eb743ca2576080082246e?OpenDocument>

Widespread along coast.

Springall NPWS, with the assistance of Sue Stevens.