

Scientific Name: *Dipsacus fullonum*

Common name: Wild teasel

QUESTION	COMMENTS	REFERENCE	RANKING
<b>Social</b>			
1. Restrict human access?	“An erect biennial herb to 2 m high.” It is widespread in medium to large populations in riparian vegetation and saline and subsaline wetland. Dense patches may make access to waterways difficult.	P & C (2001) Carr <i>et al</i> (1992)	<b>MH</b>
2. Reduce tourism?	“An erect biennial herb to 2 m high.” It is widespread in medium to large populations in riparian vegetation and saline and subsaline wetland. Its presence in dense patches may affect some recreational activities.	P & C (2001) Carr <i>et al</i> (1992)	<b>MH</b>
3. Injurious to people?	The stems are armed with slightly downward curved prickles, and stem leaves are toothed with prickles on lower side of midvein. In dense patches, the prickles may cause some discomfort to humans. Prickles present all year.	P & C (2001)	<b>MH</b>
4. Damage to cultural sites?	Dense patches would create a negative visual effect.		<b>ML</b>
<b>Abiotic</b>			
5. Impact flow?	A terrestrial species, it does occur on streambanks. However, it is not known to affect water flow.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
6. Impact water quality?	Terrestrial species.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
7. Increase soil erosion?	A biennial with a fleshy taproot to 75 cm; large rosettes that remain until the following year. Dense patches not likely to affect soil erosion.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
8. Reduce biomass?	It is widespread in medium to large populations in riparian vegetation and saline and subsaline wetland. Biomass may increase.	Carr <i>et al</i> (1992)	<b>L</b>
9. Change fire regime?	“...dead stems remain standing for many months, even years.” Dense patches may increase the frequency of fire risk.	P & C (2001)	<b>ML</b>
<b>Community Habitat</b>			
10. Impact on composition (a) high value EVC	EVC=Creekline grassy woodland (E); CMA=Glenelg Hopkins; Bioreg=Victorian Volcanic Plain; VH CLIMATE potential. Is widespread, occurring in medium to large populations. A biennial to 2 metres, the deep roots and large rosettes allow the weed to compete with other plants. Infestations may affect species in both lower and mid strata.	Carr <i>et al</i> (1992) P & C (2001)	<b>MH</b>
(b) medium value EVC	EVC=Sedgy riparian woodland (E); CMA=Glenelg Hopkins; Bioreg=Central Victorian Uplands; VH CLIMATE potential. Impact as in 10(a) above.	Carr <i>et al</i> (1992) P & C (2001)	<b>MH</b>
(c) low value EVC	Does not appear likely to occur in any low value EVC in Victoria.		<b>L</b>
11. Impact on structure?	“The deep roots and large rosettes compete with pasture plants for moisture and nutrients as well as for light.” In Victoria, it is widespread in medium to large populations. Dense patches are likely to have a major effect on lower stratum.	P & C (2001) Carr <i>et al</i> (1992)	<b>ML</b>
12. Effect on threatened flora?			

Scientific Name: *Dipsacus fullonum*

Common name: Wild teasel

QUESTION	COMMENTS	REFERENCE	RANKING
<b>Fauna</b>			
13. Effect on threatened fauna?			
14. Effect on non-threatened fauna?	"The deep roots and large rosettes compete with pasture plants for moisture and nutrients as well as for light, while the spines on leaves and stems discourage grazing by livestock." Competition with other plants and prickly property of plant may reduce available fodder for fauna species.	P & C (2001)	<b>ML</b>
15. Benefits fauna?	No known benefits.		<b>H</b>
16. Injurious to fauna?	Not documented to cause injury. The prickly nature of the plant may cause some discomfort.		<b>ML</b>
<b>Pest Animal</b>			
17. Food source to pests?	Not known as a food source to pests.		<b>L</b>
18. Provides harbor?	Not known to provide harbor.		<b>L</b>
<b>Agriculture</b>			
19. Impact yield?	"The deep roots and large rosettes compete with pasture plants for moisture and nutrients as well as for light, while the spines on leaves and stems discourage grazing by livestock." Effect on yield not documented, however, "It sometimes invades pastures, particularly on fertile damp soils, and this is the reason for its proclamation in Victoria." Consider possibly minor impact (< 5%).	P & C (2001)	<b>ML</b>
20. Impact quality?	Not known as a weed of cropping or to affect the quality of agricultural produce.		<b>L</b>
21. Affect land value?	Limited infestations in Victorian agricultural situations. Ploughing is an effective method of controlling the plant. Not likely to affect land value.	P & C (2001)	<b>L</b>
22. Change land use?	With minimal impact on agricultural activity, change in land use not required.		<b>L</b>
23. Increase harvest costs?	No data available.		<b>L</b>
24. Disease host/vector?	None evident.		<b>L</b>