

Weed (Scientific name)	Paspalum quadrifarium		
Region	Sydney		
Management Area	Holroyd		
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?		1.0	Between 5 and 50% 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	2.0		Frequent
Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100m) by natural means?		2.0	
(a) Flying animals	1.0		Occasional Q4
(b) Other wild animals	1.0		Occasional
(c) Water	1.0		Occasional
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		3.0	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	2.0		Common Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	2.0		Common
(c) Contaminated produce	1.0		Occasional
(d) Domestic/farm animals	1.0		Occasional
Total		8.0	

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?		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?		1.0	Low Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		2.0	Q6
(a) food/shelter	1.0		Major negative effect
(b) fire regime	1.0		Major negative 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		6.3	
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		303	
Weed risk category		Very high	

Control Costs		Score	Total	
Q1. How detectable is the weed?			2	Q1
(a) Distinguishing features	0		always distinct	
(b) Period of year shoot growth visible	0		> 8 months	
(c) Height at maturity	1		0.5 - 2 m	
(d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	2		below canopy	
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?			0	Q2
			not present	
Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?			4	Q3
(a) Chemical costs/ha	3		high (\$250-\$500/ha)	
(b) Labour costs/ha	4		very high (>\$500/ha)	
(c) Equipment costs	1		low	
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?			2.0	Q4
			low	
	Total		6.7	
Persistence		Score	Total	
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?			2	Q1
			medium	
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?			3	Q2
			< 6 months	
Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?			2	Q3
			> 5 years	
Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?			2.0	Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	2		frequent	
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	1		occasional	
	Total		8.2	
Current distribution				
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?			0.0	Q1
			0% of area	
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?			0.0	Q2
			not present	
	Total		0.0	
Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score			0	
Feasibility of coordinated control category			Very 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>Eradication</p> <p>0%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>References/Other comments</p>	

Source and comments

Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.
Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.
Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.
Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.

Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.

Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.

Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.

Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.

Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.

Field observation
Sydney Regional Weeds Committees.

Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.
Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.
Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.
Sydney-Wide Grasses Management Plan. Ku-ring-gai Council. Pittwater Council. RBG Plantnet. Sydney Weeds Organisation.

Field observation
Field observation

