Weed (Scientific name)	**Cenchrus incertus, Cenchrus longispinus - Poaceae**			
Region	**Sydney**			
Management Area	**Sydney**			
Landuse	**1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS**			
Assumptions	**Most info here is for C. longispinus. Assume both spp. have similar characteristics.**			
Invasiveness	**Score**	**Total**		
Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?		**1.0**	Seedlings establish after moderate disturbance	Q1
Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?		**1.0**	Between 5 and 50% of weeds survive	Q2
Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?		**2.0**		Q3
(a) Time to seeding	2.0		1 year or less	
(b) Annual seed production	2.0		High	
(c) Vegetative reproduction	0.0		None	
Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100m) by natural means?		**2.0**		Q4
(a) Flying animals	0.0		Unlikely	
(b) Other wild animals	2.0		Common	
(c) Water	2.0		Common	
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely	
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		**3.0**		Q5
(a) Deliberate spread by people	0.0		Unlikely	
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	2.0		Common	
(c) Contaminated produce	2.0		Common	
(d) Domestic/farm animals	2.0		Common	
Total		**6.0**		

Impacts	Score	Total		
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		**1.0**	< 10% reduction	Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		**1.0**	< 10% 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?		**1.0**	Low	Q4
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?		**2.0**	Medium	Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		**0.0**		Q6
(a) food/shelter	0.0		Minor or no effect	
(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		**3.2**		
Potential Distribution				
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		**0.5**	<5% of land use	Q1
Comparative weed risk score		**9**		
Weed risk category		**Negligible**		

Control Costs	Score	Total		
Q1. How detectable is the weed?		**2**		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	1		similar height	
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?		**0**	high	Q2
Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?		**2**		Q3
(a) Chemical costs/ha	1		low (< $100/ha)	
(b) Labour costs/ha	1		low (< $100/ha)	
(c) Equipment costs	1		low	
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?		**0.0**	high	Q4
Total		**3.3**		

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?		**1**	2-5 years	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		frequent	
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	2		frequent	
Total		**6.4**		

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	Q1
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?		**0.0**	restricted	Q2
Total		**0.1**		

Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score	**2**	
Feasibility of coordinated control category	**Very High**	

Management priority category	**Monitor**
Calculation of overall uncertainty score	**0%**
Response	**Submit Assessment**
Positive Impacts	

References/Other comments

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

Richarson, Richardson & Shepherd http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass
see below
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass

Parsons & Cuthbertson (1992)

Compete poorly with dense vegetation.
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass

http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_spiny_burr_grass

Spines can puncture skin of humans and animals.
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_spiny_burr_grass

May increase fire risk in dense patches.
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_spiny_burr_grass

http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_spiny_burr_grass

Annual http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass

http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass

http://www.land.vic.gov.au/DPI/Vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_spiny_burr_grass

Springall NPWS, with the assistance of Sue Stevens.