

Weed (Scientific name)	<i>Rhaphiolepis</i> spp		
Region	Sydney		
Management Area	Wollondilly Shire LGA		
Landuse	1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS		
Assumptions	The plant is actively promoted and sold by the nursery industry and is used widely in landscaping. Current control methods include hand treatment as part of routine maintenance of natural areas		
Invasiveness	Score	Total	
Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?		2.0	Seedlings establish within open 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?		1.0	
(a) Time to seeding	1.0		>1-3 yrs Q3
(b) Annual seed production	1.0		Low
(c) Vegetative reproduction	0.0		None
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	0.0		Unlikely
(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	1.0		Occasional
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
Total		4.7	

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?		1.0	Low	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?		1.0	Low	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	?		Do not know	
(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		4.7		
Potential Distribution				
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		6.0	40-60% of land use	Q1
Comparative weed risk score		133		
Weed risk category		High		

Control Costs		Score	Total	
Q1. How detectable is the weed?			2	Q1
(a) Distinguishing features	2			
(b) Period of year shoot growth visible	0			
(c) Height at maturity	1			
(d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	2			
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?			1	Q2
Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?			3	Q3
(a) Chemical costs/ha	2			
(b) Labour costs/ha	2			
(c) Equipment costs	1			
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?			1.0	Q4
Total			5.8	
Persistence		Score	Total	
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?			0	Q1
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?			?	Q2
Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?			?	Q3
Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?			3.0	Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	2			
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	2			
Total			5.0	
Current distribution				
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?			1.0	Q1
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?			0.0	Q2
Total			0.8	
Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score			24	
Feasibility of coordinated control category			High	

<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>Contain spread</p> <p>8%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>References/Other comments</p>	

Bibliography: 1. Groves R.H 2005 Jumping the Garden Fence, A CSIRO Report for the WWF. Boden & Associates, WM Lonsdale. 2. Swarbrick and Skarratt 1994, cited in S Csurshes & R Edwards 1998 National Weeds Program- potential environmental weeds in Australia. Candidate Species for Preventative Control).3. University of Fl as class 5 in NSW and nationally and in some areas, class 4 due to it's ability to tolerate a wide range of conditions. At present it would appear to be a sleeper weed but is already beginnir by birds.

Other information was taken from personal experience from bushland managers who are members of the Sydney Weeds Committees at a workshop 09-10/12/09

Note: If using the Cut & Paste method to fill in the yellow cells please paste the text into the formula bar and not directly into the cell.

Source and comments

nstate.edu/dept/ldplants/rhind.htm

Hand removal is difficult due to tough taproot so may reshoot. Cut & paint with Glyphosate effectively kills the plant (personal experience of contributors. Uncertain re foliar spray.

Gardening sites report that plants reach maturity in 10-20yrs. Species vary but generally produce 1 or two seeds. (Statemaster.com 2009.

<http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Raphiolepis>. C) no evidence of vegetative reproduction in literature search or personal experience

Attractive to birds (Swarbrick and Skarratt 1994)

http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/rhaphiolepis_indica_htmlwra.htm

Rhaphiolepis indica was assessed as class 3, Low risk using this risk assessment model can form dense hedge effect.

Reported habitat for small birds (personal comment bushland manager Karin Nippard, Pittwater Council). No information on fire except that one area in USA listed it as fire prone (<http://74.125.153.132/search?q=cache:CnOPwkSVg68J:www.lagunacoastfiresafecouncil.org/Written%2520Plan%252003-05-07.doc+raphiolepis+AND+response+or+tolerance+or+tolerant+%22to+fire%22&cd=8&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=au>) Website accessed 15/12/10

Tolerates a wide range of both temperature and soil type. 2009
<http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Raphiolepis>

or may be similar height as canopy depending on veg type. 0.5-3m is the usual height.
(Swarbrick and Skarratt 1994)

scattered occurrences across Sydney (Sydney Weeds Committee pers. Communication 10/12/09). Hand treatment by cut and paint methods to individual plants as part of bush regeneration works is labour intensive but special machinery unlikely to be required.

Readily dies with cut & paint with Glyphosate

Difficulty finding information. I have seen plants of 15cm height with flowers. Gardening sites mention that the plant reaches maturity at 10-20 yrs but do not mention sexual maturity age. Most examples of this plant sold commercially would be from cuttings,

Common in all residential areas and scattered in some bushland reserves across Sydney (distribution unknown). Has been found in bushland in Wollondilly in the SW and Pittwater to NE (Sydney Weeds Committee)

lorida 1999 Factsheet. It is recommended that at the very least this plant should be listed
ing to cost \$ in controlling in some bushland areas where it has been brought in presumably