

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Weed (Scientific name)</b>   | <b>Salix spp.(except S.babylonica, S.x reichardtii, S.x calodendron)</b>  |  |
| <b>Region</b>   | <b>Sydney</b>   |  |
| <b>Management Area</b>  | <b>Blue Mountains</b>   |  |
| <b>Landuse</b>  | <b>1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS</b>   |  |
| <b>Assumptions</b>  | <b>Currently targeting Salix cinerea at a broad landscape approach in targeted subcatchments using the Stem Injection technique and complete removal.</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 |
| <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                   |
| <b>Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?</b>                      |   | <b>3.0</b>   |
| (a) Time to seeding   | 1.0   | >1-3 yrs   |
| (b) Annual seed production  | 2.0   | High   |
| (c) Vegetative reproduction   | 2.0   | Frequent   |
| <b>Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100m) by natural means?</b>                 |   | <b>2.0</b>   |
| (a) Flying animals  | 0.0   | Unlikely   |
| (b) Other wild animals  | 0.0   | Unlikely   |
| (c) Water   | 2.0   | Common   |
| (d) Wind  | 2.0   | Common   |
| <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   |
| (b) Accidentally by people and vehicles   | 0.0   | Unlikely   |
| (c) Contaminated produce  | 1.0   | Occasional   |
| (d) Domestic/farm animals   | 0.0   | Unlikely   |
| <b>Total</b>  |   | <b>6.7</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>1.0</b>    | Low                   | Q4 |
| Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?                               |              | <b>1.0</b>    | Low                   | 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  | 0.0          |               | Minor or no 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 negative effect |    |
| (f) soil water table   | 0.0          |               | Minor or no effect    |    |
| <b>Total</b>   |              | <b>6.8</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>2.0</b>    | 10-20% of land use    | Q1 |
| <b>Comparative weed risk score</b>   |              | <b>91</b>     |                       |    |
| <b>Weed risk category</b>  |              | <b>Medium</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   | 2            |              | < 4 months              |    |
| (c) Height at maturity  | 0            |              | > 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>0</b>                | Q2 |
|   |              |              | high                    |    |
| <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   | 2            |              | medium (\$100-\$249/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>5.8</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>                | Q1 |
|   |              |              | medium                  |    |
| <b>Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>                   |              |              | <b>3</b>                | Q2 |
|   |              |              | < 6 months              |    |
| <b>Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>                                      |              |              | <b>0</b>                | Q3 |
|   |              |              | < 2 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  | 2            |              | frequent                |    |
| (b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means  | 1            |              | occasional              |    |
|   | <b>Total</b> |              | <b>6.4</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>0.5</b>              | Q1 |
|   |              |              | 1-5% 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>1.3</b>              |    |
| <b>Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score</b>   |              |              | <b>46</b>               |    |
| <b>Feasibility of coordinated control category</b>  |              |              | <b>Medium</b>           |    |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Management priority category</b><br><b>Calculation of overall uncertainty score</b><br><b>Response</b> | <b>Manage sites</b><br>0%<br><b>Submit Assessment</b> |
| <b>Positive Impacts</b>   |   |
| <b>References/Other comments</b>  |   |

Richardson, F.J., Richardson, R.G. and Shepherd, R.C.H.-Weeds of the South-East-an identification guide for Australia(2006),R. J. Richardson and F.Richardson, Meredith Victoria DPI(2010) [http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7422.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7422.htm)  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/resources.htm#risk\\_assessment](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/resources.htm#risk_assessment)  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)  
discussions carried out with and amongst six Noxious Weeds Team Officers, Bushcare Officers and Environmental Management personnel.

**Source and comments**

Spreads mostly along creeklines and rivers. DPI [http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7422.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7422.htm)

Pers comm ML mlouis@bmcc.nsw.gov.au

DPI(2010) [http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7422.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7422.htm) Weeds Australia  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

DPI(2010) [http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7422.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7422.htm) Weeds Australia  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf) Richardson, Richardson & Shepherd

Still planted as a measure to reduce stream bank erosion, but this only has a temporary effect. Weeds Australia(2010)  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

Shade out terrestrial and aquatic plants. Weeds Australia(2010)  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

Thicket forming. Weeds Australia(2010)  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/resources.htm#risk\\_assessment](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/resources.htm#risk_assessment)

Weeds Australia(2010) [http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

Roots spread into beds of watercourses, which slows water flow, reduces aeration and causes flooding and erosion. DPI(2010) [http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790\\_7422.htm](http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/4790_7422.htm)

Not poisonous, Weeds Australia(2010)  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/resources.htm#risk\\_assessment](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/resources.htm#risk_assessment) but See Q6.

Shade out rivers, damaging their natural ecology, killing aquatic fauna and flora. Consume large amounts of water. Cause increased erosion and flooding. Weeds Australia(2010)  
[http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

Pers comm ML mlouis@bmcc.nsw.gov.au

Weeds Australia(2010) [http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

All sites likely to be readily accessible. Pers obs ML mlouis@bmcc.nsw.gov.au

Pers comm ML mlouis@bmcc.nsw.gov.au

Pers comm ML mlouis@bmcc.nsw.gov.au

Pers obs ML mlouis@bmcc.nsw.gov.au

Weeds Australia(2010) [http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

Weeds Australia(2010) [http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

Weeds Australia(2010) [http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows\\_Sect1.pdf](http://www.weeds.org.au/WoNS/willows/docs/Willows_Sect1.pdf)

Pers comm ML mlouis@bmcc.nsw.gov.au Bluespace Mapping

Salix sp. scattered over entire Blue Mountains LGA Bluespace Mapping

---

Weeds Australia(2010)

Weeds Australia(2010)

In this document all "Personal Communications" refers to