

QUESTION	COMMENTS	REFERENCE	RANKING
<b>Social</b>			
1. Restrict human access?	Shrub 1 to 3 metres high and wide. It is highly invasive in many ecosystems including coastal dunes, and can dominate vegetation. “Dense stands can restrict recreational activities.”	Muyt (2001) Blood (2001)	<b>H</b>
2. Reduce tourism?	Dominant presence of weed and difficulty in accessing recreational facilities would have a major impact on tourism.	Muyt (2001) Blood (2001)	<b>H</b>
3. Injurious to people?	No prickles, spines or burrs. The fruit is edible.	Blood (2001)	<b>L</b>
4. Damage to cultural sites?	It is a shallow rooted plant with no distinct taproot. Infestations would seriously affect the aesthetics of a cultural site.	P & C (2001)	<b>MH</b>
<b>Abiotic</b>			
5. Impact flow?	Terrestrial species. It does not tolerate waterlogged soils.	Muyt (2001)	<b>L</b>
6. Impact water quality?	Terrestrial species.	Muyt (2001)	<b>L</b>
7. Increase soil erosion?	Originally planted to stabilise disturbed sandy soils (due to sandmining). Dense, broad evergreen cover protects soil from wind erosion.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
8. Reduce biomass?	It dominates native species such as <i>Acacia longifolia</i> (>2 m height), <i>Correa alba</i> (1.5 m height), <i>Leucopogon parviflorus</i> (2 m height), potentially increasing biomass.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
9. Change fire regime?	No data available that suggests infestations change the fire regime.		<b>L</b>
<b>Community Habitat</b>			
10. Impact on composition (a) high value EVC	EVC=Grassy woodland (E); CMA=Corangamite; Bioreg=Otway Plain; VH CLIMATE potential “Dense stands [of <i>C. monilifera</i> ] eliminate most indigenous ground-flora and prevent virtually all overstorey regeneration.” Displaces species across all strata with major impact on ground-flora.	Muyt (2001)	<b>MH</b>
(b) medium value EVC	EVC=Valley grassy forest (D); CMA=East Gippsland; Bioreg=East Gippsland Uplands; VH CLIMATE potential “...its ability to establish in areas of native vegetation ranging from mallee scrub to wet sclerophyll forests.” “Dense stands [of <i>C. monilifera</i> ] eliminate most indigenous ground-flora and prevent virtually all overstorey regeneration.” Displaces species across all strata with major impact on ground-flora.	P & C (2001) Muyt (2001)	<b>MH</b>
(c) low value EVC	EVC=Lowland forest (LC); CMA=East Gippsland; Bioreg=East Gippsland Lowlands; VH CLIMATE potential Impact as in 10(a) above	P & C (2001) Muyt (2001)	<b>MH</b>
11. Impact on structure?	“Dense stands [of <i>C. monilifera</i> ] eliminate most indigenous ground-flora and prevent virtually all overstorey regeneration.” In some areas of the NSW coast it now forms almost pure stands.	Muyt (2001) P & C (2001)	<b>MH</b>
12. Effect on threatened flora?	Direct threat to native orchid <i>Pterostylis truncata</i> (brittle greenhood) in the You Yang ranges. Threatens ANZECC rated rare or threatened native plant species	P & C (2001) Groves et al 2003	<b>H</b>

Scientific Name: *Chrysanthemoides monilifera*

Common name: Boneseed/Bitou bush

QUESTION	COMMENTS	REFERENCE	RANKING
<b>Fauna</b>			
13. Effect on threatened fauna?			
14. Effect on non-threatened fauna?	Dense stands destroy or drastically alter the habitat of native birds and animals. In NSW it has replaced plant species known to be important food sources for migratory birds.	P & C (2001)	<b>MH</b>
15. Benefits fauna?	May provide alternative food source.	P & C (2001)	<b>MH</b>
16. Injurious to fauna?	No evidence of the plant parts being toxic.		<b>L</b>
<b>Pest Animal</b>			
17. Food source to pests?	Rabbits and foxes are both known to eat the fruit.	P & C (2001)	<b>H</b>
18. Provides harbor?	A dense, perennial and dominating shrub that is a source of food for both rabbits and foxes. It can provide harbor throughout the year.	P & C (2001)	<b>H</b>
<b>Agriculture</b>			
19. Impact yield?	It does not affect agriculture detrimentally and is rarely found in pastures. It does not persist when grazed and trampled by stock nor when cultivated.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
20. Impact quality?	Not a significant weed of agriculture.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
21. Affect land value?	Not a significant weed of agriculture.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
22. Change land use?	Not a significant weed of agriculture.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
23. Increase harvest costs?	No evidence.		<b>L</b>
24. Disease host/vector?	None evident.		<b>L</b>

Groves, Rh (Convener), Hoskings, JR, Batianoff, GN, Cooke, DA, Cowie, ID, Johnson, RW, Keighery, GJ, Lepschi, BJ, Mitchell, AA, Moerkerk, M, Randall, RP, Razefelds, AC, Walsh, NG, and WaterhouseB. (2003) Weed categories for natural and agricultural ecosystems management. Bureau of Rural Sciences, Canberra