

|   |  |              |  |
|---|--|--------------|--|
| <b>Weed (Scientific name)</b>   | <b>Ulex europaeus - Fabaceae</b>                           |              |  |
| <b>Region</b>   | <b>Sydney</b>  |              |  |
| <b>Management Area</b>  | <b>Sydney</b>  |              |  |
| <b>Landuse</b>  | <b>1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS</b>            |              |  |
| <b>Assumptions</b>  | <b>Data for many questions copied from DPI assessment.</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>1.0</b>   | Seedlings establish after moderate disturbance <span style="float: right;">Q1</span> |
| <b>Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?</b> |  | <b>3.0</b>   | 95% + weeds survive common management <span style="float: right;">Q2</span>          |
| <b>Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?</b>                      |  | <b>2.0</b>   |  |
| (a) Time to seeding   | 1.0  |              | >1-3 yrs <span style="float: right;">Q3</span>                                       |
| (b) Annual seed production  | 2.0  |              | High   |
| (c) Vegetative reproduction   | 0.0  |              | None   |
| <b>Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100m) by natural means?</b>                 |  | <b>2.0</b>   |  |
| (a) Flying animals  | 1.0  |              | Occasional <span style="float: right;">Q4</span>                                     |
| (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   | 0.0  |              | Unlikely <span style="float: right;">Q5</span>                                       |
| (b) Accidentally by people and vehicles   | 1.0  |              | Occasional   |
| (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>2.0</b>   | Medium 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  | 1.0          |              | Major negative 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    |
| <b>Total</b>   |              | <b>7.4</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>0.5</b>   | <5% of land use Q1    |
| <b>Comparative weed risk score</b>   |              | <b>22</b>    |                       |
| <b>Weed risk category</b>  |              | <b>Low</b>   |                       |

| <b>Control Costs</b>  |              | <b>Score</b> | <b>Total</b>          |    |
|---|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|----|
| <b>Q1. How detectable is the weed?</b>  |              |              | <b>2</b>              | Q1 |
| (a) Distinguishing features   | 1            |              | sometimes distinct    |    |
| (b) Period of year shoot growth visible   | 1            |              | 4-8 months            |    |
| (c) Height at maturity  | 1            |              | 0.5 - 2 m             |    |
| (d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation   | 2            |              | below canopy          |    |
| <b>Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?</b>              |              |              | <b>1</b>              | Q2 |
|   |              |              | medium                |    |
| <b>Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?</b>                         |              |              | <b>4</b>              | Q3 |
| (a) Chemical costs/ha   | 3            |              | high (\$250-\$500/ha) |    |
| (b) Labour costs/ha   | 4            |              | very high (>\$500/ha) |    |
| (c) Equipment costs   | 1            |              | low                   |    |
| <b>Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?</b>     |              |              | <b>1.0</b>            | Q4 |
|   |              |              | 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>3</b>              | Q1 |
|   |              |              | low                   |    |
| <b>Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>                   |              |              | <b>1</b>              | Q2 |
|   |              |              | 1-2 years             |    |
| <b>Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>                                      |              |              | <b>2</b>              | Q3 |
|   |              |              | > 5 years             |    |
| <b>Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?</b>    |              |              | <b>2.0</b>            | Q4 |
| (a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means  | 1            |              | occasional            |    |
| (b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means  | 1            |              | occasional            |    |
|   | <b>Total</b> |              | <b>7.3</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>0.1</b>            | Q1 |
|   |              |              | <1% 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>            | Q2 |
|   |              |              | scattered             |    |
|   | <b>Total</b> |              | <b>0.9</b>            |    |
| <b>Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score</b>   |              |              | <b>44</b>             |    |
| <b>Feasibility of coordinated control category</b>  |              |              | <b>Medium</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>Limited Action</p> <p>0%</p> <p><b>Submit Assessment</b></p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Positive Impacts</b></p>   |   |
| <p><b>References/Other comments</b></p>  |   |

Re: Sources: Information on Invasiveness and Impacts sources from WRMA on DI&I website <http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/agriculture/pests-weeds/weeds/wrm-system>  
group by: J Vollmer & S Granger - Sydney North WC, D Walker & K Harper Sydney Central WC, and N Booth & D Simmons Sydney West/Blue Mountains WC, with the assistance of Sue

**Source and comments**

|           |
|-----------|
| see below |
|           |
|           |
|           |
|           |
|           |

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Most infestations currently occur in Blue Mountains, where score was 10%-20% of land use suitable.

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

|  |
|--|
|  |
| Scattered in Blue Mountains, particularly in upper Mountains. Uncommon in rest of Sydney region. |

---

Questions on distribution, costs and persistence were answered as a  
Stevens.