

Impact Assessment Record

Scientific name: *Coprosma repens* Hook. f.

Common name: Mirror Bush

QUESTION	COMMENTS	RATING	CONFIDENCE
Social			
1. Restrict human access?	Densely growing shrub to small tree, serious weed in coastal areas that can completely smother all other vegetation (Blood 2001), and is capable of forming dense colonies (DPIWE 2001). Likely to restrict access to some degree, but no specific reference was found.	M	M
2. Reduce tourism?	Densely growing shrub to small tree, serious weed in coastal areas that can completely smother all other vegetation (Blood 2001), occurring in widespread medium to large populations (Carr et al 1992). Not described as impacting on recreational use, but likely to have a minor negative affect on the aesthetics of an area.	ML	MH
3. Injurious to people?	Not described as possessing any properties injurious to people.	L	M
4. Damage to cultural sites?	Has been observed germinating and establishing in brickwork (B. Mitchard pers. com.). Could have a structural impact but this is not confirmed.	M	M
Abiotic			
5. Impact flow?	Not described as establishing in flowing water or riparian environments (Carr et al 1992), so is unlikely to impact on water flow.	L	MH
6. Impact water quality?	Documented as growing within permanent wetlands (Carr et al 1992), but this is likely to be around the margins. It is unlikely this species would impact on water quality.	L	M
7. Increase soil erosion?	Described as a plant suitable for sand bank restoration and slope stabilisation (NZERN 2001). Potential to decrease the probability of soil erosion.	L	M
8. Reduce biomass?	'...impedes the growth and regeneration of indigenous overstorey species Muyt 2001)'. It could slightly decrease the long term biomass of a community by suppressing larger woody species.	MH	MH
9. Change fire regime?	Described as a plant that is 'hard to burn' (NSW RFS) and therefore because it invades ecosystems such as heathland, (Carr et al 1992) which are adapted to fire (Groves 1994), it could reduce fire intensity, and maybe also frequency in these ecosystems. However, the level of impact is not clear.	M	M
Community Habitat			
10. Impact on composition (a) high value EVC	EVC= Coast Banksia Woodland (BCS= E); CMA= West Gippsland; Bioreg= Strzelecki Ranges; CLIMATE potential=VH. 'Canopy of mature plant will completely smother all other vegetation (Blood 2001)'. '...capable of forming dense colonies in native bushland, displacing native flora and fauna (DPIWE 2001)'. Potential to form monoculture; displacing all species within a strata/layer.	H	MH
(b) medium value EVC	EVC= Coastal Headland Scrub (BCS= D); CMA= West Gippsland; Bioreg= Gippsland Plain; CLIMATE potential=VH. 'Canopy of mature plant will completely smother all other vegetation (Blood 2001)'. '...capable of forming dense colonies in native bushland, displacing native flora and fauna (DPIWE 2001)'. Potential to form	H	MH

Impact Assessment Record

Scientific name: *Coprosma repens* Hook. f.

Common name: Mirror Bush

QUESTION	COMMENTS	RATING	CONFIDENCE
	monoculture; displacing all species within a strata/layer.		
(c) low value EVC	EVC= Heathy Woodland (BCS= LC); CMA= Corangamite; Bioreg= Otway Plain; CLIMATE potential=VH 'Canopy of mature plant will completely smother all other vegetation (Blood 2001)'. '...capable of forming dense colonies in native bushland, displacing native flora and fauna (DPIWE 2001)'. Potential to form monoculture; displacing all species within a strata/layer.	H	MH
11. Impact on structure?	'Canopy of mature plant will completely smother all other vegetation (Blood 2001)'. Capable of forming dense colonies in native bushland (DPIWE 2001) and impedes the growth and regeneration of indigenous overstorey species (Muyt 2001). In certain communities such as heathland, could have major effect on all layers forming monoculture.	H	MH
12. Effect on threatened flora?	Described as a 'significant weed' in Coastal Moonah Woodland that is listed as a threatened community under the FFG Act 1988 (Turner & Tonkinson 2003). However, its impact on specific threatened species was not found described.	MH	M
Fauna			
13. Effect on threatened fauna?	Described as a 'significant weed' in Coastal Moonah Woodland, listed as a threatened community under the FFG Act 1988 (Turner & Tonkinson 2003). '...capable of forming dense colonies in native bushland, displacing native flora and fauna (DPIWE 2001)'. Potential to also impact on threatened fauna, though not specifically documented.	MH	ML
14. Effect on non-threatened fauna?	'...capable of forming dense colonies in native bushland, displacing native flora and fauna (DPIWE 2001)'. Reduction in habitat for fauna leading to a reduction in numbers of individuals.	MH	M
15. Benefits fauna?	Consumed by birds, including the Silver gull (Carr et al 1993), and possibly possums (Muyt 2001). In New Zealand described as a food source for lizards (Whittaker 1987). Likely to provide some assistance as a food source to desirable species.	MH	MH
16. Injurious to fauna?	Not found documented as possessing any properties injurious to fauna.	L	M
Pest Animal			
17. Food source to pests?	Seed possibly dispersed by foxes (Muyt 2001). Potential to provide food to one serious pest.	MH	MH
18. Provides harbor?	As a densely growing shrub/tree (Blood 2001), capable of forming dense colonies (DPIWE 2001) it has the capacity to provide harbour to serious pests such as rabbits or foxes, however, nothing was specifically described.	M	M

Impact Assessment Record

Scientific name: *Coprosma repens* Hook. f.

Common name: Mirror Bush

QUESTION	COMMENTS	RATING	CONFIDENCE
Agriculture			
19. Impact yield?	Not described as a weed of agriculture.	L	M
20. Impact quality?	Not described as a weed of agriculture.	L	M
21. Affect land value?	Not described as a weed of agriculture.	L	M
22. Change land use?	Not described as a weed of agriculture.	L	M
23. Increase harvest costs?	Not described as a weed of agriculture.	L	M
24. Disease host/vector?	Not described as a weed of agriculture.	L	M