

Weed (Scientific name)	Chrysanthemoides monilifera subsp rotundata		
Region			
Management Area	Sydney Basin		
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?		0.0	Less than 5% of weeds survive Q2
Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?		3.0	
(a) Time to seeding	2.0		1 year or less Q3
(b) Annual seed production	2.0		High
(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	2.0		Common
(c) Water	1.0		Occasional
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		0.0	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	0.0		Unlikely Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
Total		5.3	

Impacts	Score	Total	
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		3.0	> 50% reduction Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		4.0	> 50% reduction Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		3.0	High Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		3.0	High 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?		0.0	Q6
(a) food/shelter	-1.0		Major positive effect
(b) fire regime	1.0		Major negative effect
(c) altered nutrient levels	1.0		Major negative effect
(d) soil salinity	0.0		Minor or no effect
(e) soil stability	-1.0		Major positive effect
(f) soil water table	0.0		Minor or no effect
Total		6.8	
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		73	
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 2 1 1	2	always distinct < 4 months 0.5 - 2 m similar height	Q1
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?		1	medium	Q2
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	1 4 2	4	low (< \$100/ha) very high (>\$500/ha) medium	Q3
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?		1.0	medium	Q4
Total		6.7		
Persistence	Score	Total		
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?		1	high	Q1
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?		2	6-12 months	Q2
Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?		2	> 5 years	Q3
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 0	2.0	frequent rare	Q4
Total		6.4		
Current distribution				
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?		2.0	10-20% of land use	Q1
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?		0.0	restricted	Q2
Total		1.7		
Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score		71		
Feasibility of coordinated control category		Low		

<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>0%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>References/Other comments</p>	

Source and comments

Invasion of native plant communities by Bitou Bush and Bone seed (NSW Bitou TAP) July :

Bitou Bush : Current Management and control options for bitou Bush in Australia Wons 200:

Bitou Bush : Current Management and control options for bitou Bush in Australia Wons 200:

Bitou Bush : Current Management and control options for bitou Bush in Australia Wons 200:

Invasion of native plant communities by Bitou Bush and Bone seed (NSW Bitou TAP) July :

Invasion of native plant communities by Bitou Bush and Bone seed (NSW Bitou TAP) July :

Invasion of native plant communities by Bitou Bush and Bone seed (NSW Bitou TAP) July :

Bitou Bush : Current Management and control options for bitou Bush in Australia Wons 200!

Assessed in conjunction with other LGA and Bitou Bush : Current Management and control o

Observations by LGA in conjunction with best practices guidelines produced in : Bitou Bush :

Bitou Bush : Current Management and control options for bitou Bush in Australia Wons 200!

Bitou Bush : Current Management and control options for bitou Bush in Australia Wons 200!

Invasion of native plant communities by Bitou Bush and Bone seed (NSW Bitou TAP) July :

Observations by LGA in conjunction with best practices guidelines produced in : Bitou Bush :

Observations by LGA in conjunction with best practices guidelines produced in : Bitou Bush :

