

# ***Best practice for on-ground property weed detection***

*Appendix 4 – Aggregated Responses to the Weed Inspector  
Survey*

***September, 2008***



# Contents

<b>Contents</b> .....	<b><i>i</i></b>
<b>List of Figures and Tables</b> .....	<b><i>ii</i></b>
<b>1 Inspector Information</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2 Weed Spread</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3 Weed Surveillance</b> .....	<b>7</b>
3.1 Weed Surveillance Strategy .....	7
3.2 Surveillance Targets.....	20
3.3 Surveillance Methods .....	31
<b>4 Weed Identification</b> .....	<b>43</b>
4.1 Identification Practice .....	43
4.2 Identification Impediments.....	46
<b>5 Weed Recording and Reporting</b> .....	<b>47</b>
5.1 Recording and Reporting Practice.....	47
5.2 Recording and Reporting Impediments .....	53
<b>6 Detection Response</b> .....	<b>64</b>
6.1 Response Practice .....	64
6.2 Response Impediments.....	66
<b>7 Landholder Commitment</b> .....	<b>70</b>
<b>8 Improvements to On-Ground Detection</b> .....	<b>73</b>
<b>9 Further Comments</b> .....	<b>84</b>

## List of Figures and Tables

Table 3.1	Q3. What are the main land uses/types of land or situations for which you are responsible? 'Other' .....	5
Table 3.2	Q41. Please indicate how likely weeds are to spread in the area for which you have responsibility, for each of the ways listed below. 'Other' .....	6
Table 3.3	Q19. How is your surveillance strategy determined? 'Other' .....	7
Table 3.4	Q20. Please rate the effectiveness of each of the strategies below for detecting new weed incursions. 'Other' .....	8
Table 3.5	Q21. Is there a target list of new weed threats that you specifically search for on properties? Please specify.....	9
Table 3.6	Q23. What influence does declaration of a new weed under legislation have on farmer weed surveillance and reporting? .....	12
Table 3.7	Q24. What influence does the intended visit of a weed inspector have on farmer weed surveillance? .....	16
Table 3.8	Q8. Please indicate the type of property you are likely to inspect most frequently. 'Other' .....	20
Table 3.9	Q10. Please indicate the frequency with which you inspect for weeds in areas more likely to suffer a weed infestation. If so, where?.....	21
Table 3.10	Q10. Please indicate the frequency with which you inspect for weeds in areas more likely to suffer a weed infestation. 'Other'.....	24
Table 3.11	Q11. Where in the past have you found new weeds on properties? 'Other' .....	25
Table 3.12	Q9. What types of land or situations do not get inspected or are difficult to inspect? .....	26
Table 3.13	Q15. What factors prompt when you look for new weeds? 'Other' .....	31
Table 3.14	Q12. What method of transportation do you normally use to inspect paddocks for weeds? 'Other' .....	32
Table 3.15	Q13. What search methods do you normally use within paddocks to inspect for weeds? 'Other' .....	33
Table 3.16	Q16. Does your weed surveillance strategy vary between districts/regions? .....	34
Table 3.17	Q17. What weed surveillance or detection practices work particularly well for you?.....	38
Table 3.18	Q26. What is your procedure for identification of a new plant? .....	43
Table 3.19	Q27. What factors may prevent you from identifying a plant? .....	46
Table 3.20	Q29. What do you do when you find a new weed? .....	47
Table 3.21	Q30. Please describe the computerised reporting/recording/mapping system/s that you use.....	49
Table 3.22	Q31. Are there any impediments to standardised reporting of weeds in your area of responsibility? .....	53
Table 3.23	Q32. Have you experienced any hesitation on the part of landholders to report weeds? If yes, what do you believe causes this hesitation? .....	56

Table 3.24	Q33. Do you think information on the distribution of weeds on private property should be publicly available? .....	60
Table 3.25	Q34. What is the response when a new weed is found in your organisation's area of responsibility?.....	64
Table 3.26	Q36. Are you aware of particular instances of stress and burnout being linked to the inspectorial role? If yes, please describe which factors you believe are contributing to this and what could be done to avoid it. ....	66
Table 3.27	Q38. How important are the following incentives in committing farmers/landholders to detecting and eradicating new weed infestations? 'Other'	70
Table 3.28	Q39. How important are the following impediments in reducing farmer/landholder commitment to detecting and eradicating new weed infestations? 'Other' .....	71
Table 3.29	Q22. What group or groups of landholders are less likely to look for new weeds? 'Other' .....	72
Table 3.30	Q25. Are there aspects of weed surveillance on the land for which you are responsible that could be improved? .....	73
Table 3.31	Q28. On the land for which you are responsible, are there aspects of weed identification that could be improved? .....	77
Table 3.32	Q42. Are there any other ways in which you believe on-ground property weed detection strategies can be improved?.....	80
Table 3.33	Further Comments .....	84



# 1 Inspector Information

Table 1.1 Q3. What are the main land uses/types of land or situations for which you are responsible? 'Other'

What are the main land uses/types of land or situations for which you are responsible? 'Other'
Aboriginal land.
All public & freehold land.
Broad scale pastoral enterprises & aboriginal land trusts.
Coastal areas.
Crown lands.
Defence land. Advisory.
Development.
Irrigated pasture and dairy.
Local government.
Mine sites.
Natural areas.
Not responsible for management of these land types, but responsible for compliance.
Nursery.
Parkland.
Parks.
Plantations.
Rail corridor.
Urban reserves.

## 2 Weed Spread

Table 2.1 Q41. Please indicate how likely weeds are to spread in the area for which you have responsibility, for each of the ways listed below. 'Other'

Please indicate how likely weeds are to spread in the area for which you have responsibility, for each of the ways listed below. 'Other'	
<i>Response</i>	<i>Weed spread pathway</i>
Very likely.	Feral animals.
Very likely.	Quarries, landfill, etc.
Very likely.	Rare plant enthusiasts.
Not Indicated.	Bush regenerators!

## 3 Weed Surveillance

### 3.1 Weed Surveillance Strategy

Table 3.1 Q19. How is your surveillance strategy determined? 'Other'

How is your surveillance strategy determined? 'Other'
Asset protection, and community CMA based.
Biology and nature of area.
Council policy.
Driven by plants targeted by NRM groups adjoining shires.
Grant funding.
If it were not for me, it would not happen.
Information given.
Other incident responses.
Time available.
Training with other weed officers.
Type of weed, for example aquatic vine tree, etc.
Weed alert plan for Victoria.
Work plan.

**Table 3.2 Q20. Please rate the effectiveness of each of the strategies below for detecting new weed incursions. 'Other'**

<b>Please rate the effectiveness of each of the strategies below for detecting new weed incursions. 'Other'</b>	
<i>Effectiveness.</i>	<i>Strategy.</i>
Very effective.	Community groups.
Very effective.	Liasing with other agencies and staff working in area.
Very effective.	Media releases. Property inspections.
Very effective.	New landholder to area.
Very effective.	Organising, for free, council inspection of property.
Very effective.	Reported by contractors on site.
Very effective.	Site visits.
Very effective.	Training of weed spotters.
Very effective.	Training workshops.
Very effective.	Visiting a known infestation to see the weed first hand.
Very effective.	Working with field botanists.
Somewhat effective.	Use of media.

Table 3.3 Q21. Is there a target list of new weed threats that you specifically search for on properties? Please specify...

Is there a target list of new weed threats that you specifically search for on properties? Please specify...	
<i>Response</i>	<i>Strategy</i>
Yes.	25 State prohibited weeds. 1200 Victorian Alert Weeds.
Yes.	A local weed risk assessment.
Yes.	Any of the Qld Declared Class 1 species I am familiar with, then anything noticeably weedy or different that I don't recognise, and aquatic plants.
Yes.	Any plants new to the area.
Yes.	Anything not usually found.
Yes.	Aquatic weeds. Class one and class two weeds.
Yes.	Aquatics and Parthenium weed.
Yes.	Black willow. Gorse.
Yes.	Chilean needle grass and aquatics.
Yes.	Chilean needle grass.
Yes.	Chilean needle grass, cane needle grass, and giant Parramatta grass.
Yes.	Chn. Blue heliotrope. Coolati grass.
Yes.	Coolatai grass, serrated tussock, silver leaf, prairie ground cherry, Chilean needle grass, spiny burr grass.
Yes.	Declared plants.
Yes.	Determined by weed alert and noxious weed categories.
Yes.	DPI, contact councils if any incurrence takes place.
Yes.	Feeding hay brought in from other areas.
Yes.	Fireweed, duckweed, Chilean needle grass, and basically anything that is in or new in Act or Bega, as well as alert list.
Yes.	Grass weeds from Victoria, e.g. feather grasses.
Yes.	List of restricted weeds and new weeds.
Yes.	Local knowledge.
Yes.	Morning glory, cape ivy, Madeira vine.
Yes.	New infestations, and infestations that are low in the area.
Yes.	New weed incursion list.
Yes.	Noxious weeds – regionally controlled or prohibited, and state prohibited.
Yes.	Noxious weeds environmental weeds.

Yes.	Noxious weeds for our shire.
Yes.	Parthenium weed, Coolatai grass, fireweed, etc.
Yes.	Parthenium weed, Chilean needle grass, alligator weed, boreseed.
Yes.	Serrated tussock, ludwigia, water hyacinth, sabrinia, alligator weed.
Yes.	Skeleton weed.
Yes.	Skeleton weed, Paterson's curse, arum lily, saffron thistle, WONS, anything unusual or on the declared weed list.
Yes.	Sometimes if aware of a particular threat.
Yes.	Species on NAQS prohibited list.
Yes.	Spiny burr grass, Coolatai grass, and Parthenium weed.
Yes.	State prohibited & Regional Priority Weeds.
Yes.	State prohibited and Victorian alert lists.
Yes.	State prohibited, etc, new and emerging.
Yes.	State prohibited Vic alert weeds and community weeds.
Yes.	State prohibited weeds and Victorian alert weeds.
Yes.	State prohibited weeds and Victorian alert weeds.
Yes.	State prohibited weeds for Victoria.
Yes.	State prohibited weeds.
Yes.	State prohibited weeds, and new and emerging to region.
Yes.	Usually class three weeds or higher.
Yes.	Vic weed alert/state prohibited.
Yes.	Victorian alert weeds including SPW.
Yes.	Victorian noxious weeds.
Yes.	Victorian weed alert list, declared state prohibited weeds.
Yes.	Water lettuce, hygrophilla, Parthenium weed, giant rats tail grass, alligator weed, and more.
Yes.	Weed alert, state prohibited.
Yes.	Weed ID sheets.
Yes.	Weed spotters, weed deck.
Yes.	Weeds that are identified under our PM plan.
Yes.	WONS.
Yes.	WONS, alert list, north coast priority spp.

Yes.	Word of mouth, publications.
No.	All noxious weeds.
No.	Generally noxious weeds list and other enviro. Weed known area.
No.	Look for clear species specifically, note others.
Unsure.	Not specifically. Report what we see, but our eradication programs are target specific.
Unsure.	Noxious weeds and particularly invasive species.
Unsure.	Yes, but we only look in logical places for specific weeds, but always look for anything unusual.
Not Indicated.	NA, but national alert weeds would be pertinent.

---

**Table 3.4 Q23. What influence does declaration of a new weed under legislation have on farmer weed surveillance and reporting?**

<b>What influence does declaration of a new weed under legislation have on farmer weed surveillance and reporting?</b>	
<i>Response</i>	<i>Explanation</i>
Improves them.	95% of farmers are keen to keep on top of weed control in area.
Improves them.	After inspection there is mostly an improvement with weeds.
Improves them.	All knowledge is power when you know what something is and how to manage it.
Improves them.	All new declared weeds are published, and they are informed.
Improves them.	Awareness raising, extension, publicity.
Improves them.	Can often make the landowner more aware.
Improves them.	Costs to control and assistance from federal, state, and local governments.
Improves them.	Declaration increases awareness.
Improves them.	Declarations are reinforced by media ID of new weeds.
Improves them.	Declared weeds more important.
Improves them.	Depends if they hear about it and give a dam. Each case is always different.
Improves them.	Don't like new weeds.
Improves them.	E.g. WA changing boneseed from P5 to P1/2 made large difference in reporting increased.
Improves them.	Especially if the weed is in the area.
Improves them.	Funds are made available for inspections, and reporting of such weeds is part of the responsibility of receiving funds for noxious weeds.
Improves them.	Generally because resources are provided to make aware of weed. Treat weed.
Improves them.	Give legislative support.
Improves them.	Improves if the weed can be detrimental to current farming practices.
Improves them.	Improves or makes it worse. Neighbour reporting equals improvement. Built and or authority makes it worse.
Improves them.	Improves the reporting of other farmers that may have it.
Improves them.	It becomes enforceable, which is generally what ends up being done.
Improves them.	It should increase awareness.
Improves them.	Knowledge that weed is noxious leads to action.
Improves them.	Legislation is only a last resort, just because it is declared does not mean people will take notice straight away.
Improves them.	Lends clout. Force to controlling weed.
Improves them.	Makes them more aware of the problem.

Improves them.	Media exposure, education.
Improves them.	More likely to control given consequences.
Improves them.	New weeds put in local paper.
Improves them.	Once they know it is declared, they seem to take notice, but it doesn't seem to help with the reporting part.
Improves them.	Our promotion of declared weeds as targets would be the catalyst, rather than the declaration itself.
Improves them.	People assume, since it's been declared noxious, that it must be important to control it.
Improves them.	Run compliance programs using CALP Act, 1994, gets 100% compliance eventually.
Improves them.	Serve notices.
Improves them.	The landholder will phone if they are not sure about a new weed.
Improves them.	They are made aware of their responsibilities.
Improves them.	They become more aware what the weed can do to their profitability.
Improves them.	They try to control it so it will not spread further.
Improves them.	Those educated about new weeds keep an eye out for new weeds.
Improves them.	Under legislation, landholder is responsible under the Act; hence may be further action taken.
Improves them.	Warringah is a high residential area.
Improves them.	Weed authorities can enforce compliance.
Improves them.	Without declaration, the employee is not protected.
No change.	Any new plant on a farmer's property rings alarm bells to them, weed or not.
No change.	Any new wood would be added to scope of work.
No change.	Business as usual. A farmer will report a weed causing concern, whether it is declared or not, usually.
No change.	Current legislation lacks teeth. Landholders know this and fail to act. Too political.
No change.	Declaration hasn't eradicated a weed yet!
No change.	Declaration may not be known to landowner.
No change.	Declaration probably won't alter person.
No change.	Depending on the need, it can become a burden.
No change.	Diligent farmers will report weeds more readily.
No change.	Does have an impact on urban/peri-urban dwellers, e.g. Chinese tallow and yellow bells declaration.
No change.	Extension work needs to be undertaken.
No change.	Farmer is driven by the impact of the weed on his enterprise.
No change.	Farmers in the area are generally good with regard to their legislative responsibility.

No change.	Farmers keen to eradicate weeds tend to do what they can anyway. Ones who don't, probably don't know about new declarations.
No change.	Farmers seem to be very tuned in to bad weeds.
No change.	Farmers think of weeds in terms of enterprise impacts. Not legal status.
No change.	Generally, don't know when a new species is declared. Mainly worried about the ones they have.
No change.	Generally, landholder's attitude does not change with new weed incursion.
No change.	Generally, the same farmers will continue reporting anything new. Others won't report if it doesn't affect their business.
No change.	Good farmers have diligent surveillance anyway. Bad farmers just do not care.
No change.	I don't deal much with farmers. The good ones are great.
No change.	If people are not looking, they are not going to know much about new declarations.
No change.	Landholders rarely aware of changes.
No change.	Landholders will only report a new weed if they think it will save them money, and not cause them any grief.
No change.	Majority of farmers would not know what weeds are.
No change.	Many farmers are not aware or interested in the changes.
No change.	Most are aware of changes, and few draw distinction between classifications.
No change.	Most farmers are reasonably weed conscious.
No change.	Most landholders not aware of what's declared or not. Report it if unusual.
No change.	Most landowners don't even know we have a declared list.
No change.	Most new declarations are not common, so most farmers don't know them, or see them, and therefore don't take a lot of notice.
No change.	NA.
No change.	No farmers in area. Property owners.
No change.	No farmers, nor paddocks, in the area.
No change.	Not an area I have much experience with.
No change.	Not applicable.
No change.	Not had any new declared weed in 10 years.
No change.	Not many farmers have access, or care about these issues.
No change.	Only a small percentage of farmers actively look for and report weeds.
No change.	Regardless of a species being declared or not, if landholders are not interested in control, they will not control.
No change.	They just know it's another weed; if they were interested in others before ok, if not, they don't care.
No change.	Unless a priority to pursue and undertake programs.
No change.	With little enforcement, it matters not.

Makes it worse.	Enforced removal may be too costly for farmer.
Not Indicated.	NA.
Not Indicated.	No idea.
Not Indicated.	Not relevant.
Not Indicated.	Unable to judge at this stage.
Not Indicated.	Unsure.

---

**Table 3.5 Q24. What influence does the intended visit of a weed inspector have on farmer weed surveillance?**

<b>What influence does the intended visit of a weed inspector have on farmer weed surveillance?</b>	
<i>Response</i>	<i>Explanation</i>
Improves surveillance.	A discussion with farmers helps them to identify and be aware of weeds.
Improves surveillance.	A presence is better than none. Opportunity for extension education.
Improves surveillance.	Ability to make a relationship with the farmer, and get the first hand information.
Improves surveillance.	As above.
Improves surveillance.	Awareness.
Improves surveillance.	Can action farmer to control.
Improves surveillance.	Can encourage short-term weed control.
Improves surveillance.	Can increase awareness, and give a consequence for inaction in some cases.
Improves surveillance.	Conscious of their responsibilities as a landholder.
Improves surveillance.	Cooperation and having the farmer accompany me whilst inspecting. They show a lot more interest.
Improves surveillance.	Creates heightened awareness.
Improves surveillance.	Dependent on species and requirements.
Improves surveillance.	Depends on mentality of particular farmer.
Improves surveillance.	Depends on the farmer.
Improves surveillance.	Difficult to speak on behalf of farmer.
Improves surveillance.	Doesn't happen very often, but farmers would welcome increased vigilance from a weed inspector.
Improves surveillance.	Due to perceived threat of legal action, and penalty associated with noxious weed act.
Improves surveillance.	Due to vague fear of quarantine or restriction.
Improves surveillance.	Education is valuable, even if we can only change one person's mind.
Improves surveillance.	Education, extension, help, enforcement.
Improves surveillance.	Enforcement creates encouragement.
Improves surveillance.	Experienced inspectors have a large influence on farmers.
Improves surveillance.	Farmer may learn to do a proper assessment her/himself.
Improves surveillance.	Farmers do not want to face fines.
Improves surveillance.	Generally head out when we are coming.
Improves surveillance.	Generally helps.

Improves surveillance.	Gives us a chance to make him aware of the reason the weed is targeted/is a threat.
Improves surveillance.	Heightens awareness of their responsibility.
Improves surveillance.	Helps make them aware of new and emerging weeds.
Improves surveillance.	Improved education about weeds.
Improves surveillance.	Improved knowledge of noxious weeds.
Improves surveillance.	Improves line of communication.
Improves surveillance.	In the past, when a weed inspector has visited to assess and provide advice, these areas have had higher priority of surveillance.
Improves surveillance.	Increased awareness particularly in relation to new and emerging.
Improves surveillance.	Increases awareness to any problems.
Improves surveillance.	Inspectors that have knowledge of the Weed Alert Program can help inform farmers of the need to report new weeds.
Improves surveillance.	It does spur a few into action when they see something happening. Which encourages a few to do something. Not a high priority for many landholders.
Improves surveillance.	It generally makes the weed more of a priority.
Improves surveillance.	Jogs peoples memory, and provides an incentive to do the work.
Improves surveillance.	Know we are coming so they have a look around.
Improves surveillance.	Knowledge of what is a priority weed.
Improves surveillance.	Landholders are generally cooperative if they expect a reasonable attitude from inspector.
Improves surveillance.	Lets them know that you are aware of weed, that you want to help them, and give suggestions, etc.
Improves surveillance.	Likely to encourage control work.
Improves surveillance.	Makes them aware it is important.
Improves surveillance.	Many are glad to see we are out there doing something.
Improves surveillance.	Many query a particular plant that they have observed on the property.
Improves surveillance.	Most are compliant with current legislation.
Improves surveillance.	Most farmers keen to keep up to date on weed control.
Improves surveillance.	Most landowners only carry out weed control after my visit.
Improves surveillance.	Neighbours talk. Letters out beforehand to instil work required.
Improves surveillance.	Obviously he would want to have weed numbers reduced, or some program in place, before the inspection.
Improves surveillance.	Often find a weed they don't know much about.
Improves surveillance.	Part of job is to educate landholder, so should improve landholders' surveillance.
Improves surveillance.	Particular if awareness of new weeds are involved.
Improves surveillance.	Partnership with majority of landholders.

Improves surveillance.	Picks up people who have let weed surveillance slip, or those who never consider it.
Improves surveillance.	Possibility of being fined, etc, raises farmer and landholder awareness and reporting efforts.
Improves surveillance.	Provides timely advice, and identifies opportunity to match any official programs available, i.e. blue mountains council verses Railcorp program.
Improves surveillance.	Recent control work is usually evident after a two-week prior notification of an inspection.
Improves surveillance.	S45 NW Act gives warning of visit, prompts action in some cases.
Improves surveillance.	Showing that inspectors are there to help, not hinder.
Improves surveillance.	Sometimes have reports of new finds before inspection.
Improves surveillance.	They are onto it straight away in most cases.
Improves surveillance.	They become more aware of the weed and want to impress.
Improves surveillance.	They know that we will require control if we detect weeds, so try to control before we inspect.
Improves surveillance.	They know they have somebody to report weed incursions to.
Improves surveillance.	They like new information.
Improves surveillance.	They like to find weeds on their property before we do.
Improves surveillance.	Try to work with landholder and understand their limitations.
Improves surveillance.	Usually they have a look around before you arrive and look for new weeds.
Improves surveillance.	Visit is an education and awareness opportunity. Some farmers do improve, others may not.
Improves surveillance.	Want to show you their weed problems if they know you are coming.
No change.	An interruption is time away from usual farming jobs.
No change.	As above.
No change.	As my employer is not a LEAD agency, no one gives a shit if we inspect, but they care if it's affecting their property from Crown land.
No change.	Depends on their generational attitude.
No change.	Education on why landowners need to survey can change their practices, but us intending to visit does nothing.
No change.	If not done in routines, maintenance it is unlikely to be done.
No change.	It can improve communication with landholder and council.
No change.	Legislation is a toothless tiger.
No change.	Most couldn't care less if they were inspected or not.
No change.	NA.
No change.	No farms and no surveillance program in place.
No change.	No formal weed inspectors employed.
No change.	Not an area I have much experience with.

No change.	They go on the defensive, don't seem to realise we are there to help.
No change.	Usually know what about. May be more inclined to mention it.
No change.	Usually they know.
No change.	Very few change their practices before a visit.
Makes it worse.	Usually slash paddocks making finding weed more difficult.
Not Indicated.	85% residents comply with notifications.
Not Indicated.	Can do all three.
Not Indicated.	Most farmers are good weed managers.
Not Indicated.	NA.
Not Indicated.	NA.
Not Indicated.	Once again, my area of control is not in a rural agricultural setting.
Not Indicated.	Unsure.

---

## 3.2 Surveillance Targets

Table 3.6 Q8. Please indicate the type of property you are likely to inspect most frequently. 'Other'

Please indicate the type of property you are likely to inspect most frequently. 'Other'
All properties inspected regularly.
Bordering good bushland.
Complaints – only within road reserve.
Inspections only carried out if a complaint has been received.
Priority programs.
Properties identified for subdivision.
River.
Specified programs on priority weeds.
Subject to flooding.
Those chosen for sale.
Those for sale.
Those requesting advice and/or assistance.
Those who are part of a community program who are recalcitrant, or have very large infestations.
Those with CMA community support.

**Table 3.7 Q10. Please indicate the frequency with which you inspect for weeds in areas more likely to suffer a weed infestation. If so, where?**

<b>Please indicate the frequency with which you inspect for weeds in areas more likely to suffer a weed infestation. If so, where?</b>	
<i>Frequency of inspection</i>	<i>Location/s inspected</i>
Frequently.	Adjacent paddocks.
Frequently.	Adjacent roadside. Known infestation.
Frequently.	Bushland. Water courses.
Frequently.	Channel system.
Frequently.	Garden beds. Roadsides. Fence lines.
Frequently.	High-risk aquatic areas.
Frequently.	Lake. Foreshores. Creeks. Gullies.
Frequently.	Land feeding sites, stock campsites.
Frequently.	Machinery routes. Fodder stores. Feed areas.
Frequently.	Near highways.
Frequently.	Pathways.
Frequently.	Property boundaries. Drains.
Frequently.	Railways. Water courses.
Frequently.	Riparian areas, watering points, animal shelters, lick troughs, etc.
Frequently.	River highways local roads.
Frequently.	Rivers. Drains.
Frequently.	Road edges and watercourses.
Frequently.	Road reserves. Water courses.
Frequently.	Roads.
Frequently.	Roads. Dams. Creek lines. Road frontage.
Frequently.	Roads. Tracks. Watercourses.
Frequently.	Roadsides. Arable areas.
Frequently.	Roadsides. Drainage with connection to roadside drains. Railways.
Frequently.	Roadsides. Water courses. Stock transportation.
Frequently.	Roadway. Hand feeding areas. Channels.
Frequently.	Roadways.

Frequently.	Roadways.
Frequently.	Roadways.
Frequently.	Roadways.
Frequently.	Roadways. Stockyards.
Frequently.	Soak areas. Watercourses.
Frequently.	Specific areas along rail line.
Frequently.	Swamp areas. Riparian areas.
Frequently.	Water bodies near built up areas. Cattle sale yards. Highway corridor.
Frequently.	Watercourse and roadway.
Frequently.	Watercourses.
Frequently.	Watercourses around sheds, etc.
Frequently.	Watercourses or low grazing/cropping pressure.
Frequently.	Watercourses. Degraded areas.
Frequently.	Watercourses. Roadsides, boundaries with neighbouring infestations.
Frequently.	Watercourses. Roadways. Worked soil.
Frequently.	Water. Drainage areas, corridors. Gullies.
Frequently.	Water. Riparian flood zones.
Frequently.	Water. Roads.
Frequently.	Watercourse, roadsides fence lines, feed lots.
Frequently.	Watercourses. Roadways. Camping areas.
Frequently.	Waterways.
Frequently.	Waterways.
Frequently.	Waterways. Cattle yards.
Frequently.	Waterways. Roadsides.
Frequently.	Where documented and mapped.
Frequently.	Yards. Track. Creeks. Rivers.
Occasionally.	Depends on property and reason for visit.
Occasionally.	Near known sites.
Occasionally.	Properties adjoining waterways.
Occasionally.	Riversides. Stock movement areas. Cropping and machine movement areas.

Occasionally.	Roadways.
Occasionally.	Roadways. Creeks.
Occasionally.	Stockyards. Tips.
Occasionally.	Watercourse.
Occasionally.	Watercourses.
Occasionally.	Watercourses gullies and hills, etc.
Occasionally.	Watercourses. Boundaries.
Not Indicated.	Watercourses, roadways etc.

---

**Table 3.8 Q10. Please indicate the frequency with which you inspect for weeds in areas more likely to suffer a weed infestation. 'Other'**

<b>Please indicate the frequency with which you inspect for weeds in areas more likely to suffer a weed infestation. 'Other'</b>	
<i>Frequency of inspection</i>	<i>Location/s inspected</i>
Frequently.	Along tracks.
Frequently.	At risk areas (e.g. Parthenium feedlots).
Frequently.	Feeding paddocks.
Frequently.	High conservation areas.
Frequently.	Inspect areas requested by landowner.
Frequently.	Markets & nurseries.
Frequently.	Nurseries and markets.
Frequently.	Over the fence observations.
Frequently.	Road reserve.
Frequently.	Stockyards access, roads, waterways, stock tracks and camps.
Frequently.	Target areas.
Frequently.	Waterways.
Frequently.	Where reported.
Occasionally.	Prone to flooding. Occasionally in last ten years. Frequently in wet years.
Occasionally.	Waterways.

**Table 3.9 Q11. Where in the past have you found new weeds on properties? 'Other'**

<b>Please indicate the frequency with which you inspect for weeds in areas more likely to suffer a weed infestation. 'Other'</b>	
<i>Frequency finding new weeds</i>	<i>Location/s</i>
Frequently.	Camps.
Frequently.	Cattle yards, watering points, communal living areas on aboriginal land, refuse sites, outstations.
Frequently.	downwind of known infestations and water movement.
Frequently.	Forestry.
Frequently.	In haysheds in fodder.
Frequently.	Internal plantation road.
Frequently.	Machinery disturbed areas, downstream of known infestations.
Frequently.	Near gardens.
Frequently.	Neglected nurseries, e.g. neglected <i>Clidemia hirta</i> .
Frequently.	Properties adjacent to infested roadways.
Frequently.	Regeneration sites and cleared areas.
Frequently.	Sheep & cattle yards.
Frequently.	Storm water.
Occasionally.	Back yard.
Occasionally.	Bushland where garden waste is dumped.
Occasionally.	Council parks and national parks.
Occasionally.	Crop paddock. New pasture.
Occasionally.	Feeding areas.
Occasionally.	Firebreaks. Forestry tracks through machine movement.
Occasionally.	Gardens.
Occasionally.	On farm brought in by stock or feed.
Occasionally.	Public reserves.
Occasionally.	Rail corridor.
Occasionally.	Reserves.
Occasionally.	Volunteered information from landholder.
Occasionally.	Where materials and refuse have been dumped.

Table 3.10 Q9. What types of land or situations do not get inspected or are difficult to inspect?

What types of land or situations do not get inspected or are difficult to inspect? Up to three responses			
State	First	Second	Third
NSW.	Some river ways.	Pine forests.	
NSW.	Absentee landowners.		
NSW.	All properties get inspected.		
NSW.	Anywhere near a cliff.	Anywhere with poor access.	Anywhere where it is dangerous.
NSW.	Aquatic situation.	Inaccessible by vehicle.	Forested.
NSW.	Areas adjacent to rail corridor that pose a safety hazard.	NPWS.	Crown lands.
NSW.	Areas out of site, i.e. not near trails or tacks, etc.		
NSW.	Areas that are hard to access.		
NSW.	Backyards inside residence.	Crown lands.	
NSW.	Badly infested, i.e. very disturbed areas.		
NSW.	Cliff lines. Escarpments.	Offshore islands.	
NSW.	Commonwealth and state owned land.	Industrial estates.	
NSW.	Creeks. Riparian edges.	Degraded rural properties.	Cliff edges. Liability issues re: unstable floater sandstone rock escarpments.
NSW.	Crown land.	River bends.	TSR.
NSW.	Dangerously steep.	Undisturbed bushland.	Regularly turned productive land.
NSW.	Dense forests.	Water courses.	
NSW.	Forestry.	Bushland.	Well-controlled land.
NSW.	Forests.	National parks.	
NSW.	Forests NSW.	NPWS.	
NSW.	Government land, e.g. railways and crown land, etc.	NPWS land	
NSW.	Governmental areas.	Areas with poor to low accessibility.	Areas under development
NSW.	Hard to access.	Absent land owners land.	Bushland areas.
NSW.	Heavily timbered areas.	Steep cliff faces.	State forests.
NSW.	Hilly areas.		
NSW.	Inaccessible bushland & gullies.	Good quality bushland away from edge imparts.	

NSW.	Intractable non-arable areas. Aerial surveyed.	No history of weed incursion.	
NSW.	Irrigation company channel systems.	State forests.	RLPB reserves.
NSW.	Isolated steep hilly terrain.	Cropping due to access.	
NSW.	Large property areas. Time. Quality of inspection.		
NSW.	NA.		
NSW.	National parks.	State forests.	
NSW.	No easy access.	Land not highly used. Weeds therefore not reported.	
NSW.	Not applicable to this area.		
NSW.	Pine forests are inspected when logging or planting.		
NSW.	Private large holdings. Access issues.	Public large holdings.	16000 rate papers – 1 officer. Lots of gaps.
NSW.	Private property.	Car parks.	Public property. Childcare centres. Retirement homes.
NSW.	Private property.	Industrial sites.	Farms.
NSW.	Private property.		
NSW.	Properties furthest from base.		
NSW.	Properties not backing council land, i.e. private.	Smaller sized properties.	Properties not easily accessible or visible, i.e. two properties with adjoining backyards.
NSW.	Properties with good weed control history.	Weed infestations where control options are questionable.	Weed resilient bush land.
NSW.	Railway is hard to inspect entirely with legal clearance issues.	Waterways, e.g. the Murrumbidgee can be difficult to inspect when there are low water levels.	
NSW.	Railway land.	Urban housing blocks.	State forest.
NSW.	Railway property.		
NSW.	Remote.	Urban.	
NSW.	Residential and urban yards.	Isolated sections of large cattle and sheep stations.	High security areas of mine sites.
NSW.	Riparian zones adjacent forest.		
NSW.	River country.	National parks.	State forest.
NSW.	River country.		
NSW.	River inspections. Murray river.		
NSW.	River weed access as weirs.		
NSW.	Rural bushland reserves, as they are hard to get into.	Reserves with water across, only as I do not have a boat.	Reserves with steep terrain.
NSW.	Rural semi-rural lands.	Rear of residential blocks.	Crown land.

NSW.	Some hilly country.	Areas when in flood.	Most area ok most of the time.
NSW.	Some larger rural properties.		
NSW.	State rail property.	RTA land.	Waterways.
NSW.	Steep hills.	Pine forestry.	National parks next to private land.
NSW.	Steep terrain.	Heavily timbered.	
NSW.	Steep topography.	Areas bordered by private property, i.e. OHS hazards.	
NSW.	Swamps.	National parks.	Water courses.
NSW.	Those clearly visible from roads.	Urban lots.	Those with no history of weeds.
NSW.	Unmanned properties.		
NSW.	Urban unless requested.	Those with significant timber and forests.	Crown land and national parks.
NSW.	Waterways in drainage areas.		
NSW.	Waterways.	Crown land and scrub.	Urban properties.
NSW.	Waterways.	Mountains.	
NSW.	Western division area, west of Lachlan river, due to large size.	Heavily wooded creek areas.	Rocky hill areas.
NSW.	Wet boggy areas. Done in summertime.		
NSW.	Wetlands are very difficult.	Overgrown private lands with no access.	
NSW.	Extremely rugged terrain.	Restricted areas, e.g. in catchments.	
NT.	Aboriginal land.	Pastoral land.	Freehold land.
NT.	The more isolated aboriginal land trusts. Many are quite remote. Do not have time. Resources available.		
Qld.	Absentee landholders.	Difficult terrain properties.	
Qld.	Crown lands.	Small urban allotments.	
Qld.	Land with no history.	Some council lands.	Some properties that are inaccessible.
Qld.	Low lying areas with swamps, etc, and crocodiles.	Small creek systems.	Alternate lifestyle people.
Qld.	Mining leases,		
Qld.	Properties where landowners are not concerned about weeds.		
Qld.	State forest.	National park.	
Qld.	Very steep gradient. Rocky. Only by air.	Difficult to inspect rainforest national park areas due to access/time/resources.	
SA.	Coastal.	Private forestry plantations.	National or conservation parks.

SA.	Glenelg river is difficult.	Some coastal reserves are inaccessible.	
SA.	Hard to access locations.		
SA.	Inaccessible hills and ranges.	Pastoral areas.	Riverine. Murray river.
SA.	Inside forest plantations.	Inside vineyards.	Along all railway land where no access tracks along the line.
SA.	Non-compliant or difficult landholders.	Absentee landholders.	Large properties.
SA.	Scrub reserves.	Absentee landowners.	
SA.	Urban properties.	Hobby farms.	Inaccessible coastal areas. Native veg. parks.
TAS.	Large properties.	Forestry areas. Due to size.	
TAS.	Private property.	Very dense vegetation.	Known weed free sites not likely to become invaded.
TAS.	Those a long way from the office.	Those with hostile owners.	Those whom we cannot help in any way.
TAS.	Those inaccessible by foot.		
TAS.	Those with poor access.	Uninterested landholders.	Basically not enough staff time to inspect all.
Vic.	All land suspected of having state prohibited weeds gets inspected.		
Vic.	Aquatic plant situations.		
Vic.	Areas where an officer's safety would be at risk.		
Vic.	Crown land.	Valley. Gorges.	
Vic.	Different soils.	Dense native vegetation.	
Vic.	Forest.	Grassland.	Rivers.
Vic.	Inspect all land and situations.	Do not inspect if there has been a recent death.	
Vic.	Low priority weeds species.		
Vic.	Native veg. parks. Coast. State forest.	Rocky outcrop. Rise country.	Linear reserves. Rail lines.
Vic.	None.		
Vic.	Parks Victoria.		
Vic.	Private property where people won't let us in.	Waterways.	Industrial areas.
Vic.	Properties where access requires landowner presence.	Properties with difficult landowners.	
Vic.	Public land, other govt. organization – DSE.		
Vic.	Rocky outcrops.		
Vic.	Rocky steep terrain.	Hard limited access.	
Vic.	Steep gullies.		

Vic.	Terrain that's not possible to traverse by foot/car, e.g. Steep gorges.		
Vic.	Those outside target areas.	Those we cannot access due to legislation.	
Vic.	Those with low priority species.	Those with only agricultural weeds.	
Vic.	Town & township blocks.	Bocks under 2ha.	
Vic.	Urban areas.		
Vic.	Urban township.	Forests.	
Vic.	Waterways.	Broad acre farms >200 acres.	Parks. Reserves.
Vic.	Waterways.	Bushland.	Lilly areas.
Vic.	We inspect all land types.		
Vic.	Where target weeds are endemic.	Heavy bushland.	
WA.	Absentee owners.	Heavily wooded.	Heavily infested properties.
WA.	Deep native bushland.	Waterways with thick vegetation.	Very high terrain.
WA.	Inaccessible reserves and scrub.	Dense plantations and tagasaste pastures.	Along some rivers and creeks.
WA.	Native bushland.		
WA.	State forests.	Isolated private property.	Absentee landowners with padlocked front gates.

### 3.3 Surveillance Methods

Table 3.11 Q15. What factors prompt when you look for new weeds? 'Other'

What factors prompt when you look for new weeds? 'Other'	
<i>Frequency prompted</i>	<i>Factor/s</i>
Frequently.	After new report in an area.
Frequently.	As per strategic work plan.
Frequently.	Complaints.
Frequently.	Curiosity.
Frequently.	Day to day activities.
Frequently.	Do not actively look for new weeds.
Frequently.	Noxiousness of weed.
Frequently.	Opportunities for on-ground control.
Frequently.	Reports from weed spotters.
Frequently.	When instructed.
Occasionally.	Alert lists.
Occasionally.	Complaints.
Occasionally.	Cyclone.
Occasionally.	Programmed inspections.

Table 3.12 Q12. What method of transportation do you normally use to inspect paddocks for weeds? 'Other'

What method of transportation do you normally use to inspect paddocks for weeds? 'Other'	
<i>Frequency transport used</i>	<i>Transport type</i>
Frequently.	Landowner's vehicle.
Frequently.	On property vehicle.
Frequently.	Boat.
Frequently.	Boat.
Frequently.	Farmer's vehicle.
Occasionally.	Kayak.
Occasionally.	Boat.
Occasionally.	Boat.
Occasionally.	Boat.
Occasionally.	Canoe, boat.
Occasionally.	Canoe.
Occasionally.	Bicycle.
Occasionally.	Wish horseback were approved here.

Table 3.13 Q13. What search methods do you normally use within paddocks to inspect for weeds? 'Other'

What search methods do you normally use within paddocks to inspect for weeds? 'Other'	
<i>Frequency search method used</i>	<i>Search Method Type</i>
Frequently.	Binoculars.
Frequently.	By request.
Frequently.	Don't assess paddocks.
Frequently.	Follow logical paths to inspect whole property.
Frequently.	Normally in areas such as watering points, living areas, and along drainage lines, transport corridors.
Frequently.	Travel area once a month.
Frequently.	View whole property.
Frequently.	Waterways.
Occasionally.	Aerial grids.
Never.	Private property inspections involve 1/4 acre blocks usually.
Not Indicated.	No paddocks. Urban only.

**Table 3.14 Q16. Does your weed surveillance strategy vary between districts/regions?**

<b>Does your weed surveillance strategy vary between districts/regions?</b>	
<i>Response</i>	<i>Reason/s</i>
Yes.	Areas close to the office are surveyed more frequently because they take less time.
Yes.	Areas that are adjacent to world heritage areas, and catchment special areas, generally get more of my personnel attention to detail.
Yes.	Areas where known key weeds are found targeted. Areas exposed to NW and SW winds.
Yes.	Areas where targeted weeding can occur are checked more often.
Yes.	Areas with drier climate tend to have fewer weed species.
Yes.	Because I hold more than one position, my workload is shared, and not enough time is available for pest management.
Yes.	Because of weather conditions.
Yes.	Because some areas are inaccessible for up to 6 months of the year.
Yes.	Cane growing. Perimeter only. Hobby farms. Whole property. Large properties. Key sites as per question 11.
Yes.	Climate; topography; distance; farming practices.
Yes.	Climatically and geographically, the area of land is significantly different from one end to another.
Yes.	Cropping country is inspected mainly from roads using binoculars. Un-arable mountains inspected from vantage points with binoculars.
Yes.	Depends a lot on the terrain and soil type of property visited, and the type of farming activity that is carried out on that land.
Yes.	Depends on climate, rainfall. Species. Topography. Time of year, etc.
Yes.	Depends on demographic built up areas. Look in gardens. Nurseries. Markets. Rural. Look on roadsides and in paddocks.
Yes.	Depends on the weed, most are driven by seasonal conditions, have to wait for decent rainfall events, or when known weeds are flowering.
Yes.	Depends on weed seasonality and workload.
Yes.	Depends on weed type and terrain.
Yes.	Depends upon seasonal conditions. More weeds in high-rainfall areas.
Yes.	Different regions have different problems, different land classes, and uses. Experience different problems.
Yes.	Different regions mean different weeds. E.g. serrated tussock requires walking and careful survey, gorse. Blackberry is usually larger, and can be seen from a distance.
Yes.	Different soil types. E.g. spiny burr grass grows mainly on light sandy soils. Also highways with transporting of hay.
Yes.	Different weeds.
Yes.	Different weeds grow in the north compared to the south.
Yes.	Different weeds in different regions, urban versus rural LCAs.
Yes.	Different weeds in different sections of county council.

Yes.	Different weeds. Different locations varying landscape. Topography.
Yes.	Difficult time of year and seasons.
Yes.	Due to classification, e.g. regionally prohibited.
Yes.	Due to our council area being half cropping and half grazing.
Yes.	Due to species and climate differences.
Yes.	Forests NSW is broken into regions. Each region manages this differently, depending on resourcing and location, etc. The forest I manage is only 40ha, and we have an active bush regeneration program with volunteers and staff.
Yes.	Geographical. Rainfall.
Yes.	Growth habits related to weed biology.
Yes.	Helicopter transects, smaller intervals, wet tropics compared dry tropics, and access issues influence how surveillance is undertaken.
Yes.	High priority weeds receive greater share of resources.
Yes.	High-risk areas for particular weeds are a common sense approach. Useless searching hilltops for aquatic weeds.
Yes.	It is by nature random. Am usually looking at a number of issues.
Yes.	LCAs have differing degrees of priority when it comes to seed control.
Yes.	More comprehensive closer to town. Less so in isolated outback areas, e.g. 120,000ha property between Isobar and Ivanhoe.
Yes.	More frequent inspections in areas with new landowners or high turnover of properties. Coastal districts have higher turnover.
Yes.	Most come from complaints from neighbours; I also inspect where there is bush regeneration works being undertaken near property boundaries.
Yes.	Officers all work in varied ways; no consistent operating procedures for the state.
Yes.	Plateau country in Dorriggo versus different weeds and different management in steep valleys.
Yes.	Seasonal condition and weed species present vary from district to district.
Yes.	Seasonal conditions.
Yes.	Some areas are harder to inspect due to rocky areas. Creeks and steep areas.
Yes.	Some areas carry different weeds.
Yes.	Some areas more prone to infestations than others.
Yes.	Some parts of the area are quite weedy, while other parts are quite free of weeds.
Yes.	Some target weeds are easier to see, e.g. gorse. Serrated tussock in south difficult to see.
Yes.	Terrain and weather patterns.
Yes.	Terrain. Access. Sight lines vary greatly. Flat and alpine areas, and likely infested areas of target weeds, vary. Survives only in drainage. Wetter points in irrigation areas. But anywhere in hills.
Yes.	This council is in sub tropical, and other areas around us are dryer and more arid.

Yes.	This council is responsible for channel resources, so when the seasonal aquatic weeds appear, they take priority.
Yes.	This LCA has two irrigation areas with smallholding enabling inspection from landowners. There is also a large dry land area that requires on property inspections, due to the large size of the holdings.
Yes.	Topographical access difficulties. Geographical. Climatic variation between weed spp. present across shire.
Yes.	We have a wet rainforest region and a dry savannah region. The wetter is weedier.
Yes.	We have flood irrigation areas. Dry area farming and river red gum forests.
Yes.	Weed infestations vary in different areas where core infestations are known to be close by.
Yes.	Weeds away from normally inspected areas special visit required.
Yes.	Yes. Noxious weeds are classified from 1-4. Different regions vary.
No.	A consistent method of approach is adopted by councils in our region.
No.	All inspections are done on priority weeds on target areas priority properties and compliance programs.
No.	All the same.
No.	Apply same method and observation generally.
No.	As mentioned, most weed issues are complaints based, so little strategy is employed.
No.	Because we are on an island, our borders are defined. Know where most weeds are.
No.	Climatic conditions are similar in my area.
No.	Follow standard procedures all over state.
No.	For specific weeds, the process is the same. Different regions will have different weed problems.
No.	It varies between weeds not regions.
No.	No strategy is in place for proactive surveillance.
No.	No terrain is similar. Weeds are same. Possible new occurrence and spread modes all similar.
No.	No. Topography is basically the same throughout the shire.
No.	Only changes between weed species, i.e. blackberry and gorse mainly occur along watercourses. Grass species occur in open paddocks.
No.	Only have one region.
No.	Only one district to cover.
No.	Our data collection guidelines. Methodology aligns with national standard. We require consistency in data collection.
No.	Our region has a biodiversity plan that maps our woods, and provides medium to long-term strategy.
No.	Properties with a heavy infestation of noxious weeds are inspected more frequently.
No.	Routine and systematic weeds inspections carried out throughout entire area.
No.	Seasonal conditions.

No.	Simply inspect property for target weeds, growth habits, etc.
No.	Small municipality.
No.	The main strategy is the same, but the weeds do vary within the region.
No.	The same type of inspection is carried out at each location.
No.	Uniform land type and land use.
No.	Urban plants in backyards.
No.	Work under a set of work procedures as set out by employer.
Unsure.	Define weed surveillance strategy.
Unsure.	Every area differs due to time, workload, or experience in identification, whether it is a priority, and also dependant upon accessibility.
Unsure.	I am unaware to how other regions survey infestations, but I think it would be similar.
Unsure.	Unsure of other councils' programs.
Not Indicated.	Most surveillance is via opportunistic sightings, drive-bys, or complaints.

*Table 3.15 Q17. What weed surveillance or detection practices work particularly well for you?*

What weed surveillance or detection practices work particularly well for you?
A combination of regular inspections and complaints management, and liaison with Blue Mountains Western Sydney Woods Committee.
Ability to notice something out of place in the landscape. Knowledge of area and likely locations for infestations. Lot of travelling through area.
Aerial using helicopter GPS and laptop GIS mapping. Roadside visual targeting of properties.
Aerial with helicopter surveys. Canoe for riparian zones.
Always look out for known weeds or something unusual.
An ability to observe the unusual.
Assistance of landholder. Land managers to report and monitor on their land.
Blanket inspections of an area.
Buffer, delimiting, helicopter, boat.
Combination of aerial photos and field surveys.
Community groups. Newspaper articles. Roadside inspections.
Community involvement. Reportable and refined inspection procedures and documentation.
Community network of weed spotters. Analysis of weed spread pathways to target programs. Inspect neighbouring properties of known infestations.
Community weed spotters for targeted weeds.
Comparing historical data, and then targeting high-risk areas.
Complaints.
Complaints from neighbours.
Complete inspections of the entire property, taking into account all factors of weed, i.e. climate, lifecycle.
Conducting awareness about weeds. Walking along and across the area. Networking with relevant people. Stakeholders.
Contractor reporting and feedback. Volunteer reporting and feedback. Foot patrols of all sites managed. Focus private property inspections around areas of good bushland.
Cooperation with landholders is very beneficial.
Correctly maintained infestation files are a must.
Cover whole property. Look in known areas.
DA submission proactive inspections. Prior to any consent. Regular foot/drive patrols. River/waterways patrols and Inspections.
Driving, lots of driving. With such a large area to try to cover, I rely a lot on external sources, e.g. landholders, rail workers, road workers, and mine site personnel to report new weeds also – They usually do.
Driving random transects of properties.
Engage to community to report unusual vegetation.

Experience knowing the life cycles and preferences of weeds. Being thorough and vigilant, looking over as much property as possible.

Field days and public awareness programs. Routine, systematic property inspections, frequent roadside inspections.

Follow up inspections of known infestations.

Foot and drive patrols.

For weeds such as Athel pine, we often target areas following river flows, which can be localised. On pastoral properties, discuss issues with managers get them to highlight where weeds are, and verify with aerial or on ground surveys.

GIS mapping software for data collection. Planned strategic approach to area of interest. Incursions reported by land managers. Provide extension material to land owners.

Ground inspection by vehicle and foot. Periodic aerial surveillance at certain times of the year.

I recruit weed spotters in the community to survey their patch. A very effective method for getting reports of new and emerging weeds. I check out anything unusual that I see.

Identify weeds when mature and prior to seed set.

Information provided by members of the public then followed up.

Information supplied by council contractor.

Inspect at flowering for annual weed – highly visible.

Inspecting areas frequently. Building a good relationship with the landowner or manager.

Inspections.

Inspections of properties.

Keep a good eye out for new roadside weeds.

Knowledge of the district. Info from previous year. Complaints from other landowners.

Knowledge of weeds particular niche and history of infestation.

Landholder reports. Regular monitoring of control works. Seasonal inspectors.

Liaison with other land managers and landholders, and community and others who may travel extensively in area.

Listening to complaints from neighbouring properties. Extra eyes. Approx 4.5million pairs of eyes.

Local contacts often letting local landowners know what target weeds you have, often leads to them mentioning areas that otherwise would be overlooked.

Local knowledge. Notification from neighbours. General public.

Look, observe, and listen to complaints or suggestions.

Monitor sites on a regular basis. Having bush care workers who I communicate with, and them with me, if any outbreak of a new weed occurs.

Monitoring known sites and soil types. Farm practices.

NA.

Neighbour notification.

Neighbour requests/complaints.

Neighbours reporting infestations, known core infestations from inspection records.

New landholders asking for info, advertisement in local paper and radio, while performing roadside spraying.

No really defined strategy, the number of species in the region means almost any travel in the region will eventually result in the detection of weeds.

Observation and information.

Observation and word of mouth.

Observation.

Observation and inspection.

Observations when driving, or other site visits.

On-ground searches.

On-ground visual inspections, as we are only small.

Personally inspecting properties.

Programmed inspection with electronic mapping devices.

Property inspections, public and private. Raise community awareness. Media releases and articles.

Property inspections. Weeds booklets to inform landholders.

Property owner details to us. Field day. Talking to owners.

Public awareness and involvement. Having time to drive district.

Public awareness. Regular inspections in priority areas.

Raising people's awareness of weeds through extension and education material, as it is a lot of area for one weed officer to monitor and manage.

Random inspections of selected paddock using parallel sweeps during growing seasons for particular weeds.

Regular contact with landholders who have known infestations. Educating the public in plants and weeds.

Regular frequent patrol of all areas that we have time to get to.

Regular inspections and keeping a database of properties with declared weeds. Encourage residents to report any unusual weeds for identification.

Regular inspections, picture records, systematic inspections, i.e. targeting particular areas and catchments.

Regular inspections. Reports from landholders.

Regular patrols of areas. Walk through sweeps.

Regular physical inspections of property boundaries. Response to customise residents' complaints. Notification from other government authorities.

Reported by residents, etc, visual inspection of sites.

Requesting. Seeking reports from public. The follow up with drive by site visits.

Responding to weed spotters, and conducting targeted seasonal surveys.

Re-visit old infestations, rely on landholder information, vigilance.

Roadside inspection properties, inspections driving around.

Seasonal response. Talking to landholders.

Seasonal time of year target method.

Slow vehicle speeds within each paddock. Generally select three paddocks from each farm.

Surveillance of property boundaries adjacent to roadside infestation, paying particular attention to properties adjacent to infested properties, and raising weed awareness.

Surveillance on an organised group of properties.

Take samples, and identify any new plants that appear weedy.

Talk to neighbours, use of helicopters at the time, and helicopter spraying programs.

Talking to landowners and driving around the areas in question.

Targeted surveillance near known infestations. Familiarity with problem weeds and growth patterns determines when to look for them, etc. Raising public awareness of problem weeds, e.g. articles in local papers, etc, increases reports of suspect weeds.

Targeting an urban area around bushland or along creek line.

The neighbour.

Thorough inspection of area. Enquiries from landowners about a weed they have seen.

To target high-risk areas of the property.

Use of community. Prioritisation based on science, e.g. extent, impact, invasiveness, potential.

Use of DGPS technology.

Using binoculars. Knowledge of weed habits. Checking complaints.

Using local knowledge. Farmers know areas of plants, but may not know what the plants are. They know areas where sectors of spread have been or are.

Visiting every property within our project is to ensure everyone is treated equally.

Visual appraisal, networking with farmers, awareness programs.

Visual from vehicle.

Visual ground inspections, alert weed register at field events, etc, public phone-ins, awareness programs.

Visual. Asking landholder.

Visual. Word of mouth.

Walk creeks and gullies. Drive perimeter map as you go. Photographs of sample of unknown species.

Walk property. Mark infestations on aerial photograph and or GPS.

Walking tracks. Creeks & edges.

We have weed alert contact officers and wee spotter networks.

Weed lifecycle. Behaviour to seasonal conditions. Thorough search of roads and hotspots.

Weed spotter networkcommunity orientated reporting network.

Weed spotter network. People report sightings and I follow up on them with compliance and surveillance.

Weed spotter. General public concern. Press releases.

Weeds officer driving, walking areas, and farmer education.

When inspecting, talk to as many landowners and managers as possible about weed management.

Word of mouth, neighbour dobbing in neighbour, timing of visits to suit plant, or just noting something from road and checking it.

Word of mouth, heaps of driving.

Word of mouth. Local knowledge. Vigilance when travelling around the LCA.

Word of mouth. Visual.

---

## 4 Weed Identification

### 4.1 Identification Practice

Table 4.1 Q26. What is your procedure for identification of a new plant?

What is your procedure for identification of a new plant? (Response provided in alphabetical order, not respondent order)		
<i>'Consult with other experts' (specify type of expert)</i>	<i>'Send away for identification' (specify type of expert)</i>	<i>'Other' (specify)</i>
Agronomist.	Adelaide – botanist.	My botanical training at university.
Agronomist – DPI.	AQIS. Botanist. Qld herbarium.	Our professional knowledge.
Agronomist and botanist.	Botanic gardens.	Using keys.
Agronomist and herbarium.	Botanic gardens.	Weed alert network. Circulate images and seek feedback. Environment forum can be useful.
Botanic Gardens.	Botanic gardens.	Work closely with Tasmanian herbarium. Hand-deliver specimens.
Botanist.	Botanic gardens.	
Botanist.	Botanic gardens and weed committees.	
Botanist.	Botanic gardens in Sydney.	
Botanist.	Botanic gardens, Sydney.	
Botanist in weed alert team.	Botanic gardens. Botanist.	
Botanist.	Botanical gardens.	
Botanist. Parks & Wildlife.	Botanical gardens.	
Botanists.	Brisbane herbarium.	
Botanists from Coffs Harbour Botanic Gardens.	DAFWA. AQIS.	
CMA, HRCC.	David Cooke at DWLBC.	
Co-workers.	DPI.	
Council officers and friends.	DPI.	
CSU campus.	DPI or herbarium.	
DEH or other officers.	DWLBC.	
Dept. of Primary Industries.	DWLBC	

District agronomist, botanical ID, local qualified knowledge.	DWLBC botanist.	
DPI.	DWLBC, state govt. botanist.	
DPI.	Govt. dept.	
DPI agronomist officer.	Herbaria.	
DPI and local agronomists.	Herbarium.	
DPI colleagues.	Herbarium.	
DPIW regional weeds officer.	Herbarium.	
Ecologist, agronomist, botanist.	Herbarium.	
Field nats., native veg. officers.	Herbarium.	
Herbarium and staff.	Herbarium.	
Hort. colleagues.	Herbarium.	
Landcare.	Herbarium.	
Local agronomist.	Herbarium.	
Local botanist.	Herbarium.	
Local CMA officer.	Herbarium.	
Local DPI staff.	Herbarium.	
Local nursery.	Herbarium in Victoria.	
More experienced staff.	Herbarium in Hobart.	
Other authorised officers.	Herbarium in Melbourne.	
Other councils.	Herbarium Royal Botanic Gardens.	
Other inspectors. Agronomists.	Herbarium, RBG.	
Other officers.	If all else fails, to state herbarium.	
Other officers.	In-house bio-diversity specialist.	
Other people in my position.	Last resort: Victorian herbarium.	
Other pest management officers.	Melb. herbarium, bot. gardens.	
Other PMO offices.	Melbourne herbarium.	
Other staff and managers.	Melbourne herbarium.	
Other team members.	Melbourne Herbarium.	
Other weed inspectors.	National herbarium.	
Other weed officer, native veg. officers.	National herbarium.	

Other weed officers.	National herbarium.	
Other weed officers who are familiar with this plant.	Other weeds officers.	
Other weeds officers.	Qld herbarium.	
Other weeds officers, native vegetation officers, pasture officers.	Qld herbarium.	
Parks Vic staff.	RBG herbarium.	
Pest management officers.	RBG herbarium.	
RBG Sydney, or local BG.	RBG Sydney.	
Skilled government staff.	Royal Botanic Gardens.	
Supervisor.	Royal Botanic Gardens, Sydney.	
SW committee.	Royal Botanic Gardens, Sydney.	
Weed alert contact officers.	Scan and send to TAS herbarium, if necessary, send photo sample.	
Weed alert officer.	State herbarium.	
Weed alert officer.	Sydney botanical gardens.	
Weeds officers.	Sydney herbarium.	
Woods committees and councils.	Sydney Royal Botanic Gardens.	
	Sydney Royal Botanic Gardens	
	Tasmanian herbarium, state weed officer.	
	Weed ID specialist.	
	Weed scientists within department usually.	

## 4.2 Identification Impediments

Table 4.2 Q27. What factors may prevent you from identifying a plant?

What factors may prevent you from identifying a plant? 'Other'
Grasses hard to ID without seed.
Grasses harder to identify.
I find a way to get them identified.
Lack of adequate sample, weeds dropped in for ID.
Lack of experience personally, but find out..
Lack of fertile material for herbarium specimen sometimes.
Lack of ID resources, i.e. ID books.
Lack of plant pacts.
Lack of reference text, as there are many plants in the world.
Lack of resources.
Life cycle not conducive to identification.
May not be aware of the infestation.
Not exhibiting typical weed characteristics.
Seasonal, no flowering parts, etc.
Send plants to botanical gardens.

## 5 Weed Recording and Reporting

### 5.1 Recording and Reporting Practice

Table 5.1 Q29. What do you do when you find a new weed?

What do you do when you find a new weed? (Response provided in alphabetical order, not respondent order)	
<i>Mark its location in a field' (specify how location is marked)</i>	<i>'Other' (specify)</i>
A bright coloured ribbon or marker.	Alert the landowner.
Coloured tape or bunting.	Alert those that it impacts on, mainly landholder.
Flag tape on post.	Computer recording system unreliable, has been lack of administrative power to follow up on establishment.
Flag tape or paint.	Contact weed alert officer.
Flagging tape.	Current noxious weed infestations are known and mapped where they are controlled.
Flagging tape fluoro paint.	Get it officially identified by herbarium.
GIS mapping, location and coordinate mapping.	I have an informal list that I record them on.
GPS.	If significant, call or email other land managers, e.g. council, DSE, Parks Vic.
GPS.	Not recorded by contractor.
GPS.	Notify landholder.
GPS.	Notify landowner.
GPS.	Notify nearby landowners.
GPS.	Notify pest management team member.
GPS.	Pull it out.
GPS & flag on the position.	Report it in my diary.
GPS and/or map via pocket PC.	Report to appropriate land manager, and possibly to weeds officer.
GPS and PDA.	Report to DPI, or Sydney weeds committee.
GPS and property maps.	Serve notice.
GPS and stake with flagging.	Take a sample to weed alert contact officers.
GPS in house program, pest mapper.	Weed recording standards in NSW, NSW Ag. publication.

GPS star picket marker.	Write it on the inspection report.
Kilometre marker.	
Map manually, GPS soon.	
On map.	
PDA weed mapping program.	
Peg.	
Peg.	
Pegs.	
Pink survey tape. Star picket.	
Post.	
Posts and drum.	
Roadside, spray road.	
Sign post it.	
Sometimes stake.	
Surveyor's pegs, tape.	
Using mapping.	
Wooden peg, or star picket with tag.	

**Table 5.2 Q30. Please describe the computerised reporting/recording/mapping system/s that you use.**

Please describe the computerised reporting/recording/mapping system/s that you use.
Ag. dept. in-house database, GPS point location.
Arc E-map.
Arc GIS.
Arc GIS, Tremble GPS, Etrex GPS.
Arc Pad.
Arc Pad & Arc GIS.
Arc Pad on hand-help palmtop computer of GPS, with data record sheet, later downloaded onto PC, verified, stored in corporate database.
Arc Pad on PDAP.
Arc GIS.
Arc GIS.
Arc GIS.
Arc Map.
Arc Map, Map Info, GBM mobile, Microsoft Access.
Arc Map, Arc Pod.
Arc View.
Arc View.
Arc View, Access, email using Lotus.
Arc View, Arc Pad.
Beginning to use Biosirt for new weeds, or serious incursions.
Civica software, previously had Map Tracking, but suppliers left the country.
Computerised data base system.
Council is currently updating their system; we mainly use SEA.
CRIS Client and Resource Information System.
Data Works.
Desktop Map Info connected to MS access database, pocket PC Map Info mobile, and GBM mobile.
DGPS technology, state database, Excel database.
Do not know.

Excel and developing maps on Map Info.

Excel spreadsheet first, then placed on map and submitted quarterly to SW committee, and electronic GIS mapping.

Excel spreadsheet for recording fieldwork, GPS for mapping. Only commenced recently.

Excel, Map Info professional.

Excel, Integrated Facility Management, Word, MS Access.

Flora information system, herbarium is AUH, state system is IPMS.

Garmin GPS, Arc View, GPS.

GBM mobile, Map Info.

GIS and excel spreadsheet.

GIS Info Master.

GIS, ESRI, Arc Pad.

GIS, IPMS, general database.

GPS.

GPS.

In house database, used to have Precision Data.

In house mapping system designed by IT staff.

In house prototype program, in conjunction with Map Info called Pest Mapper.

In house spreadsheets and inspection reports.

Integrated pest management system.

Integrated pest management system.

Internal database, Integrated Pest Management System, IPMS.

Internal department system, IPMS.

IPMS, DPI Vic.

IPMS, integral database.

IPMS developed and maintained by DPI Victoria.

IPMS integrated pest management system, Arc View.

IPMS, Map Share.

IPMS, Vic govt. database, Integrated Pest Management System.

IPMS, Arc View.

IPMS, weed alert databases, Arc View, Map Share.

Locally produced with council.

Map Info.

Map Info.

Map Info and Microsoft Access.

Map Info.

Map Info, GBM, Mobile GPS, PDA system.

Map Info.

Map Info and Excel Spreadsheet.

Map Info, GIS software.

Map Info streets ahead.

Map Info.

Map Info, Microsoft Access.

Map Master, Roads, Weed Map, Map Info, Property, Landholder Weeds, Exponare.

Mapping Proclaim.

Microsoft.

Microsoft Excel spreadsheet.

NA.

OPS, IPMS.

Ozi Explorer, Arc Pad.

Pathways production software, world viewer.

PDA, Arc Pad, Ozi Explorer.

PDA, no name, as it is written for our area, still sorting out bugs. Also use Ozi Explorer.

Pest Info.

Pest Info.

Rapid Map, Weed Map.

Recording on Pest Info.

Reflect, based on Map Info and Exponare.

Regional data base being developed. All officers will use a PDA to record inspections and infestations.

Skymapper for DGSP data recording.

Trim system that council has to store information needed.

We are in the process of installing computerised software.

We do not have a computer mapping system.

We have E-View, Arc Sys as well as GPS.

We use Map Info.

Weed Map.

Weed Map and Map Master computer, GPS programs.

Weed Map, Map Info.

Weed Track.

Weed Map.

Weed Map.

Weed Map.

Weed Map.

Weed Map program.

Weed Map, Map Info.

Collaborative workspace.

## 5.2 Recording and Reporting Impediments

Table 5.3 Q31. Are there any impediments to standardised reporting of weeds in your area of responsibility?

### Are there any impediments to standardised reporting of weeds in your area of responsibility?

Access to technology. Expertise in using technologies. Poor database system. Hard to retrieve data from.

Access to training in Biosirt.

Antiquated system.

Being able to maintain mapping & recording databases when problems occur. Lack of IT staff.

Computer and general literacy and weed ID skills of staff.

Computer complexity of hardware/software configuration, and difficulty of use plus integration with other programs used by council.

Cost of SRBG identification.

Covering three LGA's reporting systems. Formats vary. Cannot impose standardisation on each local council.

DPI, property report.

Every inf. is different.

Funding and time.

Hard to extract information from computer database.

Have a good procedure set up. Some are slow to enter data.

Inconsistency in interpretation on densities.

Inefficient computer databases.

IPMS.

IPMS system is a dinosaur!

It's a manual field-reporting format. An electronic format would be more efficient and less time consuming.

It's not consistent with other local control agencies.

Lack of computer skills.

Lack of effective functional software.

Lack of procedure.

Lack of standard form or procedure.

Lack of standardised reporting and mapping from DPI.

Lack of wider support in selecting reporting mapping procedure, i.e. each area in region, or state, maps and records densities differently.

Management.

Management won't allocate fund to purchase software.

Most computer programs are unworkable. Need something simpler. Lack of resources.

NA.

Need to up-skill others. Dedicated weed officer.

No agency standard database and data dictionary.

No designated. Proactive weeds inspector. No land or paddocks, just houses.

No one clearly responsible for weeds.

No procedure as yet.

No real infestation size scale that is standardised.

No recommended system to use across the region.

No set reporting form specifically for a weed.

No standardised system.

No state-wide guidelines.

No state-wide accessible user-friendly database or recording mapping system.

No system can do everything, reporting, mapping, identification photos, rates of spread.

No time, no format.

Not seen as high importance due to urban environment.

Officers not consistent in reporting.

Old database.

Other work commitments.

Our official database. Spatial reporting system doesn't allow polygons. Only points.

People using it.

Probably make it easier for me with Map Info.

Resource availability. Cost of software.

Software compatibility.

Software compatibility between councils.

Standardised reporting must be at a state level.

The benefit of mapping our weeds are miniscule in such a small urban environment, therefore the need does not justify the expense.

The fact it isn't standardised across NSW, and difficulty in updating data to reflect current distributions.

The integrated pest management system.

The present weeds act is cumbersome unhelpful and inefficient.

There isn't one.

This will improve as we have just amalgamated with two other shires.

Time.

Time taken to get this weed declared, either under state or local laws.

Time, resources.

Unknown.

Update and improve IPMS.

We do not generally report, it is not a priority where I work.

Who do we report to?

**Table 5.4 Q32. Have you experienced any hesitance on the part of landholders to report weeds? If yes, what do you believe causes this hesitance?**

<b>Have you experienced any hesitance on the part of landholders to report weeds? If yes, what do you believe causes this hesitance?</b>	
<i>Response</i>	<i>Cause</i>
Yes.	A lot of residents just don't know that they have weeds present. Therefore, maybe not hesitance, but naivety.
Yes.	Adjoining landowners may be more vigilant.
Yes.	Afraid they will be in some kind of trouble. Also, the money & and time involved for control, which most farmers lack.
Yes.	Apathy lifestyle, sense of responsibility and obligation to community as a whole, minimal awareness.
Yes.	Associated costs for control. Money and time.
Yes.	Because they don't want to be served noticed under act. They don't have time or money to fix.
Yes.	Concern they may be required to control the weed.
Yes.	Cost of control, lower property values, guilt.
Yes.	Cost of having to control the weeds.
Yes.	Cost to the landholder in removal overwhelming. Feeling of where to start, and how to manage and progress the issues.
Yes.	Dobbing culture, lack of awareness.
Yes.	Does not want to clear up, e.g. prellitory infestations.
Yes.	Don't want officers to come and see other problems.
Yes.	Don't want to be responsible or get involved with council.
Yes.	Don't want to dob in neighbours.
Yes.	Extremely small number of landholders may be reluctant due to perceived cost to carry out work.
Yes.	Fear of being responsible for control costs. These with NRM and ERW stewardship are great though.
Yes.	Fear of enforcement and/or quarantine.
Yes.	Fear of implications of the act.
Yes.	Fear of interference or being checked by officers.
Yes.	Fear of land devaluation and/or government bureaucracy.
Yes.	Fear of prosecution.
Yes.	Fear of prosecution or general apathy.
Yes.	Fear of regulation, and the probability of control measures being enforced.
Yes.	Fear of restrictions, doubt it will make any difference.
Yes.	Fear of sanctions, or responsibility to control the weed, or imagined cost of controlling the weed.

Yes.	Financial implications.
Yes.	Financial pressure.
Yes.	For fear of repercussions. Being made to control the weeds.
Yes.	Get made to control them, cost of controlling.
Yes.	Going to be put under quarantine.
Yes.	I may enforce control, may stop movement or sale of produce.
Yes.	If it comes from their land, yes, but if it is on someone else's no.
Yes.	If the weed is declared noxious, they may be concerned that they will open a can of worms if admit to infestation.
Yes.	If they feel they will have to control weed, and incur a cost that will not be reimbursed.
Yes.	If they have it, they might not want to do themselves in. Problem of responsibility.
Yes.	If they thought they would get in trouble.
Yes.	Implications or requirements to do something about it.
Yes.	Lack of concern.
Yes.	Lack of follow up response.
Yes.	Lack of funding, poor land manager, don't care.
Yes.	Lack of interest, embarrassment, may cost money to control.
Yes.	Lack of interest or frightened of prosecution.
Yes.	Lack of money, not interested.
Yes.	Lack of understanding of weed ecology, cost of outputs to community, self and abroad.
Yes.	Landholders hesitate to report weeds at times, because they think they could get in trouble by doing so.
Yes.	Loss of production from area treated.
Yes.	Making them control the weeds.
Yes.	Many are afraid their operation will be disrupted by reporting.
Yes.	Many of them feel that they will draw attention to themselves, and that they will be in some sort of legal trouble.
Yes.	May find out they have legal responsibility to control and eradicate.
Yes.	Neighbours being prosecuted.
Yes.	No knowledge of weeds.
Yes.	No not really. Sometimes a few landholders are not easy to talk to.
Yes.	Only if they detect on other landholders property.
Yes.	Only occasionally. Fear of big brother. Guilt. Poor past and present management.

Yes.	Other cash crops may be involved.
Yes.	People in uniform. May have had a bad dealing with government in past.
Yes.	Perceived self-incrimination to require control of weed.
Yes.	Previous weed management team that were know as the weed nazis. So landholders had a negative perception of weeds team.
Yes.	Producers don't like to let other people like agents, know if they have trouble weeds, as it can affect produce.
Yes.	Quarantine restrictions, do not want people on their land, and believe they can control themselves.
Yes.	Quarantine stigma, govt. workers visiting their properties.
Yes.	Repercussion on them \$\$.
Yes.	Scared that it may cause them embarrassment if it is serious.
Yes.	Some are concerned in relation to declared weeds.
Yes.	Some feel it may reflect bad management or devalue property.
Yes.	Some people believe ignorance is the best policy; if they report it, they will have to do something.
Yes.	Some people do not think it's important enough, or do not know the difference between weeds and natives, or other weeds.
Yes.	Stigma attached to potential quarantine status, and impacts and/or cost this may have on their business. Time costs resources in managing.
Yes.	The cost to control these weeds, lack of resources, lack of weed management skills.
Yes.	The fear of getting fined or prosecuted.
Yes.	The landholder is reluctant of being the only person with this weed.
Yes.	They are apprehensive of the costs of removal.
Yes.	They are concerned they may inflict a fine.
Yes.	They are worried about legal consequences, e.g. being forced to control.
Yes.	They believe we will punish them just for having it, or believe that as they are controlling/managing it effectively, there is no need to alert us.
Yes.	They do not want to get into trouble.
Yes.	They don't want the headaches associated with control.
Yes.	They don't want to get their neighbours offside.
Yes.	They fear it might invoke additional costs for them.
Yes.	They like the plant and spread them. Mainly aquatics.
Yes.	They may think it is expensive, i.e. control.
Yes.	They perceive we are not there to help as said earlier. Council has a good working relationship with most landholders now.
Yes.	They seem to think it is all bad news, and they will be in deep trouble.
Yes.	They think they are going to be issued with a weed notice.

Yes.	They want to know how much it is going to cost them.
Yes.	They worry that their operation will be impaired.
Yes.	Think they may be fined or inconvenienced by compliance staff. May be forced to use a control not comfortable with, i.e. chemical application.
Yes.	Think they may be identified, therefore possible negative repercussions.
Yes.	Think they may get in trouble.
Yes.	Think we are policemen.
Yes.	Unaware of weed infestation and identifying weed species.
Yes.	Unsure of positive identification. Worry of financial burden to owners.
Yes.	Unsure of where or whom to report to. Do not want the workload or cost of removing.
Yes.	Wary that there might be repercussions.
Yes.	Will be penalised, or could not be bothered to report.
Yes.	Worried about repercussions, fines, etc.
Yes.	Worried about the potential cost of having to control the weed.
Yes.	Worried that future compliance will target their land.
Yes.	Worried they may be forced into controlling weeds. Don't like giving info to govt. agencies, as there is fear it will be used against them.
No.	Do not deal with many landholders; they are usually ignorant if a weed is pointed out.
No.	Not applicable.
No.	Not that I am aware.
No.	Only work on state prohibited weeds in Victoria, of which Department of Primary Industries pays for treatment.
No.	They love complaining to us.

**Table 5.5 Q33. Do you think information on the distribution of weeds on private property should be publicly available?**

<b>Do you think information on the distribution of weeds on private property should be publicly available?</b>	
<i>Response</i>	<i>Reasons</i>
Yes.	Property evaluation, cost of control to a new vendor, determines crop.
Yes.	As we map our weeds, both on properties and on roads, information is available, but no addresses are given on where the possible NOAOS weeds are located in your area.
Yes.	Assists in the reduction of spread when everyone knows where the plants are.
Yes.	Assists all people when locations of weeds are publicly known.
Yes.	But at scale that makes it difficult to determine exact location, as it may impact on property prices inadvertently. Whereas if they have weeds, it should impact property price, but don't make info public, big mistake.
Yes.	But not to a lot dp level, just regionally.
Yes.	But only for a new weed threat to a certain area.
Yes.	But only in general sense, without identifying individual property owners.
Yes.	Certainly for high priority species, e.g. SPW and regionally prohibited weeds. For the public good.
Yes.	Declared weeds should be a notifiable condition prior to any land sale. Therefore, weed control would maintain land asset values.
Yes.	Devalues a property value, e.g. you or new owner could have to spend \$10,000 plus per year for a number of years to contain. Witnesses in prickly acacia are similar to what is happening elsewhere.
Yes.	Education is valuable to everybody, it could save people time and money and labour.
Yes.	Everyone should know what's going on around them.
Yes.	For the purpose of distribution, not for scrutinisation of landholders. Used as a resource for combating weeds, not attacking the landholder.
Yes.	Generally it is available. Most landholders know what weeds are growing next door and down the road.
Yes.	Gives community full knowledge of scale of problems and problem areas for specific weeds.
Yes.	Gives all landholders and managers information regarding weed locations and extent of spread.
Yes.	Higher profile.
Yes.	How are neighbours supposed to manage the risk if they are not informed?
Yes.	If landholder is selling feed or stock, buyers should know if they come from weed problem area. Also if someone is buying property, they should know.
Yes.	If there is any potential that private weeds can spread, then knowing about potential locations may provide a better response that involves neighbours helping neighbours. We help our direct neighbours with weeds, as in our best interest.
Yes.	If weed removal is part of a council program, not if it is dealt with through legislation.
Yes.	In areas where the plants can be easily spread by water or animals, people can be aware of it.
Yes.	Incentive to be active in control. Praise good landholders. Encourage poor ones to improve. Make buyers aware of weed issues in the area. Potential purchase.

Yes.	Inform other landholders of the types of weeds present in the area and their severity.
Yes.	It will help land managers plan. Survey for the right things and be more vigilant. May also build community pressure for slack land managers to pick up their act without enforcement measures as much.
Yes.	It would assist strategic planning.
Yes.	Landholders sign a form for this to be allowed.
Yes.	Make property owners aware.
Yes.	Matter of public good, welfare especially with notifiable weeds.
Yes.	Might be effective way of raising individual awareness of community issues not wanting to have the finger pointed in their direction. Could shake some apathetic attitudes.
Yes.	Name and shame.
Yes.	Need to know weed sources, as this will influence control measures and strategies on public lands.
Yes.	New landowners would be aware of the problems that may be getting into.
Yes.	Not to a property by property level.
Yes.	Only if landholder not attempting to carry out a control plan.
Yes.	Only if there is a risk that their infestation will impact on others, or be accidentally transported off that land and onto others.
Yes.	Only on a general area basis not specific.
Yes.	Particularly when land is for sale, as unless they are under a Land Management Notice, the new purchaser may have no idea what weed problem they are buying into.
Yes.	People feel kept in the dark. The public should be made aware of as much as possible.
Yes.	People would be more aware of key weed problems in their area, which raises awareness on what to be checking for.
Yes.	Perhaps via real estate on purchase of property.
Yes.	Potential buyers and neighbours have an idea of what is in their area.
Yes.	Property owners could be aware and prepared.
Yes.	Public awareness is often very good.
Yes.	So as to warn other land owners of the presence of weeds that can become a danger of the spread to them.
Yes.	So people can see where infestations are located.
Yes.	So that neighbouring properties, and local control authorities, can get prior warning of a potential weed that may not be currently established in their area.
Yes.	So the responsibility relating to weed treatment will be known.
Yes.	So weeds sources can be treated and controlled, eradicated on a regional basis.
Yes.	The more awareness the better.
Yes.	Then neighbours could work together to control weeds and share experiences, and for the reluctant landowners, a bit of peer pressure might be useful if well facilitated.
Yes.	This would pressure landholders into undertaking control works.

Yes.	To raise awareness of the threat.
Yes.	To shame people into action.
No.	Can alienate people in their community, will discourage reporting of new weeds or new weed incursions.
No.	Can cause disputes.
No.	Change of situation over time. Not all private land would be mapped. Privacy issues.
No.	Confidentiality, privacy.
No.	Confidentiality, protect the interests of the landholder.
No.	Contradicts privacy laws, creates ill health in community.
No.	Could cause ill feelings between people not directly affected, problem should be resolved by affected properties and those likely to be affected.
No.	Could open up a whole heap of trouble.
No.	Disrupts community, creates outcasts.
No.	Except where a coordinated effort is being undertaken for a specific weed.
No.	If people want to know, go ask the owner.
No.	Invasion of privacy, and may create conflict between stakeholder.
No.	It is a privacy matter.
No.	It may need to be added to section 32 if land is to be sold.
No.	It would make matters worse if publicly known. Confidentiality is important.
No.	Landowners would not want others knowing if they have any particularly nasty weeds. It could financially affect their enterprise.
No.	May be used against landowner.
No.	May effect land values and make landholders more hesitant to report.
No.	May further restrict landholders from coming forward.
No.	Most landholders are already aware of their neighbours' problems.
No.	Not a socialist state, so people do not need to know. Respect privacy for people's property.
No.	Not everyone needs to know. Could be a stigma attached to some weeds.
No.	Out situation is probably a bit different to rural areas. Nearly all residents are compliant and are keen to know how to control weeds on their property.
No.	Privacy.
No.	Privacy. For DPI good name.
No.	Privacy. Selected organisations only.
No.	Privacy. Stigma of poor land manager.
No.	Reluctance on owners to report weeds.

No.	Sensitive topic.
No.	This could affect the future sale of a property, and this information is already available as a rate search.
No.	To achieve high levels of control and public confidence in the officer concerned, privacy is essential.
No.	Too many privacy issues, and potential to target landholders by Landcare groups, or rogue community members, etc.
No.	Under the privacy act, may divide communities, i.e. branched broomrape in South Australia.
No.	Wholistic numbers should be, but not identifying specific locations.
No.	Would not be well received by landowners, would bring complaints to council, lower property values.
Unsure.	Could cause neighbourly disputes and finger pointing.
Unsure.	Council would have to be 100% sure could open up to litigation if it affects property values.
Unsure.	Depends on type of data, e.g. resolution ID linked with ownership verification of data processes, legal status of weed, etc.
Unsure.	Depends on what weed it is, and if it is a weed of national significance.
Unsure.	General location, e.g. hundred, but not property details. Dependant on seriousness of weed and impact potential.
Unsure.	General perception that weed distribution information on private property is confidential. If publicly available, could result in greater incentive for weed control, as some people possibly would not buy stock or feed from properties with weeds such as rat's tail grass.
Unsure.	Hard for struggling farmers to sell hay and grain, even if weed is not affecting crop. Neighbours should have the right to know.
Unsure.	I think other departments, e.g. water and electricity, should be made aware of certain weed locations.
Unsure.	Many weed problems beyond scope of landholders' capacity to deal with. Public may have unrealistic expectations for land holder to control existing weeds, etc.
Unsure.	May be useful with.
Unsure.	Might cause neighbours' disputes, or blur the lines of who is responsible, plus privacy issues.
Unsure.	New noxious weeds.
Unsure.	No impact or relevance to this area.
Unsure.	Not sure of the legal ramifications.
Unsure.	Privacy?
Unsure.	Reasons for and against. Privacy issues. Neighbours should have a right to know what is nearby.
Unsure.	Should be available to controlling authority.
Unsure.	Value or land may reduce, while productivity may not be drastically affected.
Unsure.	Would help prevent spread, but could cause neighbour tension, etc. Would help to provide united front against weeds.

## 6 Detection Response

### 6.1 Response Practice

Table 6.1 Q34. What is the response when a new weed is found in your organisation's area of responsibility?

What is the response when a new weed is found in your organisation's area of responsibility? (Response provided in alphabetical order, not respondent order)	
<i>Information on the weed is recorded' (specify where)</i>	<i>'Other' (specify)</i>
A file is created on specific weeds.	Depend on status.
Access database.	Eradication.
Arc.	Further inspections on adjacent land.
Computer database, IPMS.	Gets treated ASAP.
Corporate databases.	Have sent off info, re: suspected new weeds for verification.
Council.	If possible to remove financially, contractors employed.
Database.	Landcare, DPI, farmers' association.
Database.	Not informed by contractor.
Database. Computer hard drive and network.	Notices.
Database. Map Info.	Our aim is to control new weeds before they spread.
DPI.	Report to regional coordinator.
DPI and local.	Report to regional weeds committee.
DPIW database. TAS herbarium.	Report to state for declared plants only.
DWLBC.	Reported to state government if class 1.
Formal database.	Reports to DPI.
GIS.	Send to herbarium.
GPS, a computer database.	Weed is removed.
GPS on database.	
Head office and state herbarium.	
Herbarium and IPMS.	
If applicable.	

In house GIS program.

In weed alert team.

IPMS.

IPMS.

IPMS.

IPMS.

IPMS.

IPMS and weed alert databases.

IPMS database.

Log books. Database.

Map software.

Mapped and recorded.

Mapped in council mapping system.

On computer. Weed Map.

On file.

On Weed Map and GPS.

Online database.

PDA and maps.

Pest Info specimen to Qld herbarium with info.

Property file.

Qld herbarium.

Record council database Weedmap.

Regionally, databases.

See q2a.

Spatial database.

Standardised reporting system.

State recording database.

State-wide database. Personal mapping programs.

Weed alert database.

Written reports.

## 6.2 Response Impediments

Table 6.2 Q36. Are you aware of particular instances of stress and burnout being linked to the inspectorial role? If yes, please describe which factors you believe are contributing to this and what could be done to avoid it.

Are you aware of particular instances of stress and burnout being linked to the inspectorial role? If yes, please describe which factors you believe are contributing to this and what could be done to avoid it.	
Response	Contributing factors and avoiding stress/burnout
Yes.	Administrative staff think we only conduct inspections, and try to establish quotas. Landholders thinking we work weekends, Public wanting to discuss issues after hours, Councillors refusing to comprehend the full role we fill.
Yes.	Amount of red tape and paperwork involved.
Yes.	Angry landholders. Too much paper work.
Yes.	As a council, they do not care unless you can provide a legal obligation to do something.
Yes.	Available time for inspections. More resources. Unpredictable landholders due to drought or other financial factors.
Yes.	Balanced workload to address issue.
Yes.	Compliance activity should be undertaken by dedicated enforcement staff. Enforcement should not be undertaken alone if there is any sign of hostility.
Yes.	Compliance and education are two separate roles. Weeds are an area where it is very difficult to obtain a regional control, as cost is a burden to many landholders.
Yes.	Compliance and no idea.
Yes.	Conflict between staff and recalcitrant landholders. Local politics and local politicians are too close to the ratepayers, e.g. small communities.
Yes.	Confronting land managers. Have the DPI take control of the legal side of weed infection.
Yes.	Demand for inspections and quick response.
Yes.	Enforcement is the only option for uncooperative landholders. Repetitive enforcement creates stress.
Yes.	Enforcement officers never last long due to political pressure, poor legislation and overwork.
Yes.	Enforcing legislation on already financially struggling people. Dealing a lot with dissatisfied clients. Visits to reluctant landholders are longer and follow-ups have to occur. Keen landholders often short visits and no follow up.
Yes.	Ever increasing workload. Raising the bar every year.
Yes.	Generally dealing with people in a negative situation. People on land are stressed due to drought. Falling rates of return, etc. Need help to remain positive. We spend 90% of time with 10% of people who do not control weeds.
Yes.	Getting landholders to follow up with controls, and title funds available through grants to deal with publicly owned land.

Yes.	Having a large area to look after. Casual staff and help during the busy periods.
Yes.	High workload, under-resourcing, low recognition of weeds as a whole of community issue, lack of training for weeds officers, increasing complexity of role, greater reporting and admin. requirements from DPI and council.
Yes.	Increasing bureaucracy.
Yes.	Inspectors are meat in sandwich between neighbours. Councillors and DPI sometimes seen as police with out adequate powers.
Yes.	Irate landholders. Time constraints. Meeting targets.
Yes.	It is up to the LCA weed officer to develop and implement all aspects of weed control with little assistance or guidance.
Yes.	Lack of cooperation from management, perceived sub standard pay rates.
Yes.	Lack of funding. Single weed focused programs. Drought.
Yes.	Lack of government and council funding, inadequate staff numbers, too many people that just do not care.
Yes.	Lack of numbers on the ground. Increasing expectations re workload.
Yes.	Lack of political support, councillors, and management.
Yes.	Lack of resources to control.
Yes.	Lack of resources. Inspection and control programs overlap; cannot do both.
Yes.	Lack of resources. Lack of staff.
Yes.	Lack of staff and pressure from project managers
Yes.	Lack of sufficient funding and/or staffing. However, this may not be overall. Officers that are located in say three weather districts, suffer more stress than say those in one weather district, e.g. Cowra's elevation ranges from one thousand metres to two seven five metres resulting in the officer being needed in two different areas at the same time, and a large range of different species.
Yes.	Lack of support. Resources from senior management. Senior management and minister need to provide 100% support, and not be driven by political motives.
Yes.	Landholders getting verbally abusive when enforcement action is instigated to ensure control is done. Political interference when landholders try to avoid responsibilities by contacting local politicians.
Yes.	Landowner confrontation and conflict causing work stress levels.
Yes.	Large areas to be covered.
Yes.	Legal requirements of record keeping, documenting, etc, are excessive. Lack of proper weed control management. No follow up. Unwilling and uncooperative landholders.
Yes.	Low priority within councils and community.
Yes.	Minimal assistance from NSW Agriculture when difficult situations arise in particular legal matters.
Yes.	More assistance from state government.
Yes.	Need to manage by myself. Major problem is lack of assistance.
Yes.	Not enough staff to assist with large scale inspections. One officer doing job of 4 staff.
Yes.	Not so much the public, but other sectors as water controlling bodies, in limbo, as where they are on the legal side to serve compliance notices.

- Yes. Our compliance work is seen as 2nd class, not as important as other state compliance groups.
- Yes. Over committing officers to multiple projects, e.g. high inspections, compliance, roadsides, work, field days, funding applications, etc.
- Yes. Pressure from above. More personnel on the ground.
- Yes. Prosecuting landowners in court. Giving evidence. Preparing briefs dealing with already stressed landowners.
- Yes. Reactive, legislative approaches do not reduce the weed densities unless the available resources are thrown at the problem. In these cases, officers feel they are achieving nothing, and the time spent in ensuring compliance is wasted time taken away from those that will voluntarily comply.
- A streamlined system needs to be adopted for this situation. Land and property managers should receive a fine on the second inspection. Word may get around that they have to be aware of the Noxious Weed Act.
- Education campaigns may work more effectively and get neighbours discussing the weed problems and how they are to be addressed. Taking the onus off the Weed Officer.
- Yes. Reduction in staff with reduced budgets resulting in higher workloads. Difficulties in filling vacancies because of extra workloads, and not a well-paid job. Incidence response and maintaining normal workloads as well. Noncompliant landholders creating additional workloads.
- Yes. Regulatory function. Easier access to funding. Coordination across state poor.
- Yes. Resourcing issue, turnover rate.
- Yes. Same old story: need more staff, and more streamlined reporting and grant processes to enable more time be spent on actually physically inspecting and controlling weeds.
- Yes. Seasonal demands, and lack of landowners understanding what you can actually achieve and what are priorities. Landowners call when plants are in flower and demand something is done, when it's to late.
- Yes. Simpler legislation for landholders, and smoother approvals processes.
- Yes. So much workload. Complicated reporting systems. Less and less freedom to act and think as individual. Need for multi disciplinary skills is pushing older staff out of jobs, which equates to loss of knowledge.
- Yes. Some long days, or very hot days, can make people very tired. DPI has policy that has to take TIL after these long days.
- Yes. Some of the legislation.
- Yes. Some weeds that are declared cause high stress from continuous complaints when control is extremely difficult. Senior staff, e.g. DIP, say, "don't lose sleep," but they are not getting abused.
- Yes. Stress from angry guilty landholders arguing.
- Yes. The role is sometimes considered an autonomous role in an organisation.
- Yes. There is a high expectation from management with regard to number of properties inspected annually per inspector. At times unrealistic.
- Yes. To avoid, most have sound understanding of weed ecology and seed production cycle.
- Yes. Too few officers in regional office to tend to large territory.
- Yes. Too much area to cover in the short periods when weeds are easily identifiable. Casuals should be employed to search and control.
- Yes. Too much paperwork. Compliance issues.
- Yes. Trying to achieve optimal noxious weed control on council land, without adequate funding and staffing. Trying to juggle many various duties.

Yes.	Was an issue once. Older staff gone or burnt out. Restructures. New staff create new stresses. Times are changing. Competitive natives.
Yes.	Workload. Responsibility to ensuring no new or existing weeds are spread, e.g. weed seed spread. What supervisors expect of pest management officer and their roles. Some PMO are more knowledgeable on ground experience than their supervisors.
Yes.	Work load, verbal abuse.
Yes.	Working in the same area for long periods. Doing inspections only. Officers target specific areas for a period of time, then move to new area. Work as team in targeting specific weed or area for short periods. Undertake other works.
Yes.	You do have to put up with a lot, e.g. with the weeds having to be controlled by them, and anything else to do with shire, such as potholes, road condition, graders, etc. We seem to wear the backlash because everyone knows the weeds officer.
No.	Burnout with my colleagues comes from lack of support, not from inspecting.
No.	But I believe that more resources could be provided to reduce the workload for inspectors.
No.	Have not been in the job long enough to see it happen. But I'm sure I will.
No.	Inspector less important in Sydney metro councils.
No.	Not if they enjoy their job.
No.	So long as programs are planned and managed with appropriate resources.
No.	We don't have an inspector.
Not Indicated.	You are joking! That is the funniest thing I have read in local government.

## 7 Landholder Commitment

Table 7.1 Q38. How important are the following incentives in committing farmers/landholders to detecting and eradicating new weed infestations? 'Other'

How important are the following incentives in committing farmers/landholders to detecting and eradicating new weed infestations? 'Other'
Availability of relevant and updated information, understanding of plant biology and reproduction.
Compliance.
Compliance and enforcement activities increase awareness no end.
Coordination and facilitation.
Cost of control very important.
Funding.
How much it affects their livelihood.
Identification/awareness through media.
Land use hobby absentee less incentive than those running the farm as a business.
Legislation.
Level of other weeds on property.
Not applicable.
Offering small things to motivate the landholder, e.g. 15L pump pack and some chemical.
Peer group pressure from surrounding landholders.
Preventing potential problems by early intervention.
Prior compliance action on neighbouring property. Lead by example, do govt. reserves first.
Professional approach to farming.
Put it in dollar values. Spend \$5k now, saves \$5million in 10 years type stuff.
Rebates.
They need to know the opportunity is available to get free ID of suspected new weeds. They simply do not know.
Threat of legal action.

*Table 7.2 Q39. How important are the following impediments in reducing farmer/landholder commitment to detecting and eradicating new weed infestations? 'Other'*

How important are the following impediments in reducing farmer/landholder commitment to detecting and eradicating new weed infestations? 'Other'
Climatic conditions.
Inclusive expense, as opposed to perceived benefits.
Lack of research by state department.
Lost benefits if not a threat to individuals' enterprise, but threat to environment, neighbouring land, less incentive to control.
Minimal economic impact.
Not applicable.

*Table 7.3 Q22. What group or groups of landholders are less likely to look for new weeds? 'Other'*

What group or groups of landholders are less likely to look for new weeds? 'Other'
2 <sup>nd</sup> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> generation landholders.
Companies, e.g. Pty Ltd.
Council's parks and gardens.
Depends on individuals' motivation and general style.
Ethnic peoples.
Farmers in financial trouble.
General community.
Indifferent farms.
Lease holders.
Low priority for aboriginal land trusts, some pastoralists.
More urban residence.
Most residents around here.
Not applicable.
Recalcitrants.
Rural residential.
Seems to be ruled by landowners' general knowledge, or personality and attitude.
State government.
There is good & bad in all groups. You cannot point the finger at any.

## 8 Improvements to On-Ground Detection

Table 8.1 Q25. Are there aspects of weed surveillance on the land for which you are responsible that could be improved?

Are there aspects of weed surveillance on the land for which you are responsible that could be improved?
A better mobile mapping system to monitor distribution and size of infestations.
A better program and more funds to manage problems.
Always room for improvement, but current legislation is pretty good.
Better GPS mapping capabilities.
Better mapping for individual properties.
Better resources with staff and funds.
Build a better knowledge. Look up anything I don't know. Raising more community awareness.
By more funding being made available to allow this to become a full time position.
Cover more area, more staff, aerial surveillance.
Crown land.
Dedicated weed officer.
Do it more often.
Employment of 2-3 more fulltime inspectorial and spraying staff.
Equipment is old.
Follow up with incentives, consistent approach across state.
Frequency. Ability to enforce the Act.
Further resources. Increased capacity.
Further resourcing of time and equipment.
Given more resources to enable a proper program to be planned.
Given more time, I would increase the number of inspections on these lands.
Good question.
Govt. departments sharing info more regularly.
Greater government spending on local govt. land.
Greater resources.

Guidelines, more staff.

Hand held palm pilot, or other equipment, would improve on-farm recording infestations.

Having better equipment to take data and report with.

Having more time and resources to be able to get to more properties and cover more area.

Having more time to get around, so basically more officers on the ground.

I need more exposure to weeds that are uncommon in our area.

Improved legislation, particularly inspection powers.

Improved mapping resources.

Improved processes and community involvement.

Improved weed identification.

Improving all the time, with better mapping equipment.

Increased resources, i.e. more inspectors.

Make landowners aware of plants that may not be familiar.

Make people more aware of target plants.

Making weed spotters more familiar with our alert species.

Many are still unwilling to report weeds, as they may worry about implications to their workload.

Mapping, timing.

Media coverage.

More education and assistance to landholders.

More employees dedicated to managing weeds.

More experienced inspectors, governments that care about weeds.

More extension rather than compliance.

More frequent surveillance of whole area.

More frequently.

More manpower and government money.

More officers in more locations, and better media coverage.

More on-ground operators.

More on-ground time and less paperwork, policy, and procedure.

More people to look, having a strategy for looking, with appropriate funding for looking and action.

More regularly, get stuck doing other things.

More resources.

More resources.

More resources.

More resources.

More resources.

More resources, less paperwork, more on-paddock presence.

More resources, time commitment of authorised officers, also better record keeping and availability of data.

More resources and staff to cover area.

More resources available for surveillance would help.

More resources, people, time & funding.

More staff.

More staff to actually look.

More staff; weed inspectors just cannot cover districts properly.

More systematic, and cover more area.

More time.

More time and funding.

More time and money. The usual.

More time dedicated to weed matters.

More time doing extension work and education of the farmer.

More time spent inspecting, and more time spent communicating.

More trained eyes reporting.

More time allocation.

Need computerised recording and mapping systems, more inspectors.

No state or local politician can see any object for the money spent. The better we are, the less seen, weed surveillance is poorly funded at a state and local level, with staffing at a bare minimum for the job.

None in place at all.

Not sure.

Our council needs more inspectors prepared to fulfil the regulatory role, and back it up with practical information about the impact on the environment as a whole.

Powers of inspection.

Property inspections by helicopter in steep hilly areas.

Providing more user-friendly identification information.

Resources, better access.

Resources. More of. Then could do it more frequently.

Routine checks align to flowering and growth season.

Spending more time in those areas.

Strategic weed identification strategies, and target species, need to be forwarded to the Australian Association of Bush Regeneration, AABR, to disseminate down to the ground staff.

Through research and development, introduce biological control, less poisons used.

To have a part time weeds officer would be of great benefit, as I am mostly busy doing other tasks.

Training, comprehensive leaflets, recognition.

Unsure.

Unsure.

Up to date aerial photos. Improved and increased sampling methods.

Using historical records and databases more effectively.

With a jet I could cover my area a lot quicker.

With more people on the ground.

You can always improve, but we are lucky to have volunteers and bush regenerators helping to maintain the forest.

---

**Table 8.2 Q28. On the land for which you are responsible, are there aspects of weed identification that could be improved?**

<b>On the land for which you are responsible, are there aspects of weed identification that could be improved?</b>	
<i>Response</i>	<i>How?</i>
Yes.	A budget would be useful.
Yes.	A collective visual record of newly identified weed species, herbarium.
Yes.	All aspects of new and emerging weeds.
Yes.	Better ID resources.
Yes.	Better pictures of weeds in a more diverse range of seasonal conditions.
Yes.	Better references available, particularly quality photographs.
Yes.	Building knowledge of weeds comes with time. Different districts and regions often have different weeds, and need to learn what these are when relocating or moving to other areas.
Yes.	By visiting areas where unknown weeds exist. Much better than identifying from photos.
Yes.	Continual and improved training.
Yes.	Dedicated weed officer.
Yes.	Dedicated weeds officer.
Yes.	Early detection and intervention, more training for pest management officers in this field.
Yes.	Education of landowners.
Yes.	Emergency grass weeds can be difficult to detect early.
Yes.	Ensuring contractor conveys information to our officers.
Yes.	Equipment, training for staff.
Yes.	Farmer guide for basic weed ID.
Yes.	Field days to educate landowner courses for NW inspections in weed ID.
Yes.	Force identification prior to control.
Yes.	Greater knowledge.
Yes.	If I can't ID a weed, I don't send it off for identification.
Yes.	Improve my knowledge of more weeds.
Yes.	Improve staff skills, on-going and requires familiarity.
Yes.	Improved web-based info.
Yes.	In particular, aquatic plant books.
Yes.	Increased capacity, larger focus areas.

Yes.	Info to landholders not left as responsibility of local govt.
Yes.	Information kits and education in weed identification.
Yes.	Information to land owners, e.g. newspaper articles.
Yes.	Knowledge, vigilance, public awareness.
Yes.	Landowners need to know that we can be a valuable resource for ID.
Yes.	More education, weed ID for council workers.
Yes.	More education on new weed species.
Yes.	More grass ID workshops, including native grasses.
Yes.	More native grasses and plant ID and knowledge.
Yes.	More printed resources for landholders.
Yes.	More resources.
Yes.	More resources and books, etc, to improve skills in identification.
Yes.	More resources to allow more time to identify.
Yes.	More resources. Weed keys needed.
Yes.	More time dedicated to this area.
Yes.	More training.
Yes.	More training and education to our volunteers.
Yes.	More training provided.
Yes.	More up to date reference books, prohibitive cost, better communication between regions.
Yes.	More use of herbarium for correct ID, greater botanical training to understand what to look for to assist with ID.
Yes.	Need delivery of better samples and images from those finding weeds. This is promoted to registered weed spotters.
Yes.	Not real good with aquatics.
Yes.	Ongoing education and better samples.
Yes.	Ongoing training.
Yes.	Plant ID training.
Yes.	Public awareness.
Yes.	Public programs and signage for noxious weeds.
Yes.	Regular workshops. ID to attend.
Yes.	See 25.
Yes.	Signage, etc, greater interest of works crews.

Yes.	Some information has to be resourced with LOTS of digging for old information. Some resources are not up to date in literature.
Yes.	Training and improved procedures will improve identification.
Yes.	Training in 10 of alert weeds for region. Brochures, flyers, etc.
Yes.	Use of weed spotters network as per trial in Qld.
Yes.	Weed spotters network.
Yes.	Weeds in govt. reserves, especially in water catchments.
No.	Aquatic weeds we are weak on.
No.	Current processes work.
No.	I think it works well at this stage.
No.	Need to improve my own skills. Skills in work-team are excellent.
No.	Not really. Resources for weed ID are readily available.
No.	We are able to attend workshops, which are valuable to our daily work.
Not Indicated.	Pocket guide to new weeds that may appear in district.
Not Indicated.	Unsure.

**Table 8.3 Q42. Are there any other ways in which you believe on-ground property weed detection strategies can be improved?**

<b>Are there any other ways in which you believe on-ground property weed detection strategies can be improved?</b>
Awareness programs. School based programs. Better resources inspection units.
A identification manual on weed ID, potential impacts and contact details, etc.
A lot more funding from government, less waste of govt. funds on administration, more funding for on ground eradication.
Because of size of area to cover, need a bigger budget to employ more weed people, to enable other weeds inspectors to be doing the same job as myself.
Better aerial imagery, so some larger weeds could be identified from maps.
Better communication between councils and government depts.
Better funding, more staff, staff training.
Better mapping, recording, and utilisation of this data.
Better relationship with local authorities, and more educational means.
Better training provided to teach OW, to teach as opposed to prosecution.
By the formation of a specific weed detection unit (state).
By the removal of section 45.1 from the Act.
Communication between agronomists. Public authorities, Landcare groups. Integration of weed databases. Sources of knowledge.
Community education, GPS, seasonal weed surveys need to be carried out.
Community groups in hobby farm estates, demonstration of govt. work to remove declared weeds.
Continue noxious weeds ads on TV.
Continue to lessen, or streamline, grant application and reporting processes.
Developing a standardised weed inspection reporting format, both hard copy inspection sheets and mapping, and database using GIS and GPS, that would be used by all weed control authorities.
Distribute more information to landholders, hold community workshops and field days for ID of weeds.
Encourage farmers and landholders to report anything new on their properties.
Extra staff.
Good information on potential weed provided to control authorities.
Greater extension work with landowners, and also media coverage of court results.
Greater funds or resources to do education, and therefore enforcement.
Have consistent management program year in year out.
Having weeds declared made notifiable under legislation.
Improve inspectors, and farmers need knowledge, make whole farm plans mandatory.

Improve weed ID.

Improved funding and legislation.

Improved inspection powers for officers and clearer, stronger legislation.

Increase funding, so more regular visits can be made, as opposed to only going on properties every two to three years. More funds, more work; more work is less weeds.

Increase landholders' voluntary reporting.

Increase school-age weed awareness, increase awareness in landscaping. Reveg. Industry. Make more weed information readily accessible to small landowners eg hobby farmers.

Increased frequency of inspections. Up-to-date knowledge of new weed invaders, and their potential to infest large areas rapidly.

Increased funding. Remove impediments from weeds act. Increase staffing in certain areas.

Inspecting waterways by boat or canoe. Aerial inspections.

Interagency cooperation improvement.

Keep an eye on life cycle of a plant, clean boots and clothing, check vehicle tyres, which all can be time consuming, educating community days on impact of weeds.

Keep getting the message out. Broad scale media and selective targeting of the need to report new weeds that turn up. Extension and education events.

Landholders to be more confident in reporting weeds, and ask for advice by local authorities when needed.

Landowner education in weed threat and ID, more funds for NW control, more inspectors.

Less office duties and more time conducting inspections, and more staff or smaller areas to inspect. Impossible to cover areas adequately.

Media.

Mentioned previously.

More education more funding.

More education of land managers.

More education with landholders and funding to control weeds.

More funding. More staff. Better retention of staff.

More incentive weed control programs, but management practices of control introduced. Stress the benefits to the landholder.

More inspectors on the ground.

More knowledgeable people looking.

More liaison with other authorities, e.g. councils, etc.

More money for more inspectors, using standardised mapping and reporting in a cooperative and coordinated manner, with emphasis on education and awareness, instead of enforcement.

More resources.

More resources.

More resources, as a very large workload for most weed inspectors. An education office in each region would be greatly beneficial.

More resources provided to carry out strategies.

More resources to implement detection and control. Take away responsibility of landholders. Command and control.

More staff and funding to detect new and emerging, e.g. in ports, ships, fodder, nurseries postal from overseas.

More staff for inspections, more weed awareness.

More time devoted to inspection, equals more inspections, equals increased weed detection.

More trained staff.

More workshops to educate landholders about emerging weeds in the area, and plant ID workshops.

Need more incentives for landholders to report weeds. Either financial or regulatory.

No.

No.

No.

No.

No.

Not at this stage.

One of best means is word of mouth.

Only increase numbers on the ground.

Proactive encouragement of awareness for stakeholders.

Public education.

Raising public awareness. More resources to cover more area. More time. Weeds are only one aspect of the job role.

Reallocation of funding from consolidated revenue, treasury, to the agencies responsible for land management.

Resources, time, funding, skills.

Resourcing of human element, people on the ground. Dedicated weed inspectors combined with awareness raising activities.

Satellite imagery surveys by NSW Ag.

Satellite imagery, if it is cheap.

Specific role as weeds officer.

State supported uniform mapping and reporting systems, training for other land management professionals. Training for landholders.

The main ways new weeds are coming into our shire are pig shooters, and dogs hunting deer and other wildlife here.

Time efficient and standardised.

Train more on ground operators.

TV campaign.

We have some pretty good systems in place here, but as mentioned, are in a different situation to many other respondents of this survey, as we are urban.

Weed identification packs for landholders showing known weeds for their area, and able to have updates of potential new weeds added to the pack. Similar to weed decks.

Weed officers cannot see everywhere at once. We need to get communities, farmers, spray contractor, etc, to understand that if the government knows of new areas of alert weeds, not common weeds, then we are in a better position to help eradicate/control it before it spreads.

Yes, you should not have to tell the owner, or land manager, you are going to inspect a property. This only wastes time in having weeds eradicated, when they are absent from properties. The time lapse is too long.

Yes, get more of us on the ground. Fund them well with latest technology, i.e. laptops. GPS, etc, to record. Employ trained professional, or make ID training very available. Encourage atmosphere of continual improvement; knowledge is empowerment.

---

## 9 Further Comments

Table 9.1 Further Comments

### Further Comments

Absentee landowners are the worst offenders, particular in peri-urban areas where the landowner has very little interest with regard to land management. Often the land is purely an asset they are waiting to subdivide.

Difficult to answer many of the questions. Many of the problems are directly related to lack of resources with funding and personnel. Weeds officers' tasks have changed dramatically over the last ten plus years. No real career prospects for a young person. Salaries do not reflect the responsibilities and requirements of a weeds officer. Weed management and general vegetation management should be key factors in training courses, such as Pro Graze. Landholders require ongoing training to ensure weed management is a key part of property and livestock management.

Extremely relevant and important.

I have been in the industry for 18 years, and this is the first weed detection survey I have seen. Well done.

I have done these surveys before. Nothing changes, until we can achieve greater commitment from government at all levels, we will be fighting a losing battle.

I would like to see research done on how to assist farmers, possibly via tax incentives for weed control. This would effectively increase the dollar value of time spent in real terms, and reflect the cost of weed control conducted by farmers. It might actually get more done on defeating the weed menace across the board, inspectors would use less energy convincing those under financial strain of the importance of maintaining control priorities.

In a local govt. perspective, pest management seems particularly low on the priority list, which means it can be hard to access man power and equipments to be able to do these sort of inspections regularly and properly. In my experience, PMO would say that these inspections were a very important part of the job, detection and prevention, but we have to prioritise what we can do with the limited resource base that is available to us.

In an inner urban environment, we do get involved with some weed management in streets and parks, and the small areas of natural bush/native plantings we have. This tends to focus on things like publicity about asthma weed. Very little is done on private land, which this survey seems to be about. In that situation, we are talking about residential lots or industrial land, and some railway corridors and ports land, which fall out of our responsibility.

Interested in outcomes. Let us know how it goes.

It is encouraging to be a part of a survey that is covering such a large area of the state. Australia's weed problems are immense and not reported enough. The cost to the economy and the environment is extraordinary, and climate change appears to be favouring our exotic invaders in cleared areas. Continuing fragmentation of vegetation only strengthens exotics' hold on properties and native bushland reserves. Please keep us up to date on your research outcomes.

It seems that everyone is worried about new weeds, but actual fact is that we can't keep on top of the declared weeds we have. In my view, there is not enough funding or people on the ground. Government land, e.g. forest, parks, etc, don't do near enough to control weeds and pests.

It would be interesting to see how weed management and resources vary across regions and states.

Legally, I am meant to inform the landholder of my visit, but because of time, or lack of, I don't. I will just lob at the door if no one home; I will leave my card and pop back another time. If home will arrange to have a look around, or pass any info I have in regard to weeds, I would like to see more across border relations between NSW and Victoria in regards to all weeds, not just priority weeds.

Many officers give up before they get there, or slip up on the following. I find the weed act cumbersome and time consuming, e.g. an officer must comply with the following: A. notice of intent to make inspection; B. inspection; C. notice of intent to serve seven days notice; D. notice section 18 after expiration; E. notice of intent to make ISP; F notice of intent to serve section 20; G. after expiration, notice

of intent to make inspection; H. entry and work carried out. Eight actions. Old weeds act: A. control notice; B. entry notice.

Most of my work is based on specific project weeds, and doesn't involve surveillance of new weeds. This is the duty of the weed alert contact officers. 100% of my time is spent dealing with weed complaints, preparing landowner files, project plans, and weed inspections for the specific project weeds and other widespread established weeds.

No. Thanks for including us in your survey.

Please ensure that a summary of the results is posted. Many thanks.

Survey is comprehensive, I look forward to the outcomes and recommendations of this research.

Survey is far too long.

Survey was not really suited to my work, I work state-wide targeting species that are established, e.g. gorse, serrated tussock.

Thank you from Mach.

The balance needs to shift. We have lots of scientists, researchers, project management people, etc, but not enough grass roots workers. In the end, you need people in fixed, safe jobs, who are well enough paid to stay in these positions, because it is good to detect these new weeds, but you then have to have the workers to destroy them.

The design of some of these questioning scales is limiting, need more room for comment. I hope you are also planning qualitative research such as focus groups and interviews to accompany these quantitative results. Hope something good comes out of it though. Good Luck. Feel free to contact me to clarify any responses if required.

The noxious weed control authority for Penrith City Council is Hawkesbury River County Council. Please contact them for further information.

Think it's valuable research. Weeds have been overlooked over the years. More resources are required to tackle the weed problem, and local govt. hasn't got the financial capacity to fully address the problem.

This survey did not seem entirely relevant to a weeds officer in an urban environment. Some questions were hard to answer, as it seems there is little relationship with my role to maybe that of a weeds officer in Harden shire council, and in terms of surveillance and working with private landholders. I would like to see a survey focused on an urban setting. A lot of my answers were therefore based on guesswork. Kind regards.

This survey was very much LCA, RLPB focused in rural areas. I work in bushland surrounded by highly urbanised areas, and I do not undertake inspections of private properties generally, as this is the responsibility of adjoining councils. I have a good working relationship with these though, and hope this survey response is of use to you.

Urban councils probably do not have dedicated weed inspectors.

Very interested to see the outcomes.

What was meant by "new weed infestation"?

a. New location of a known declared weed

or

b. Weed not previously known to be in the region.

With regards to my responsibilities and area covered, my role is principally to coordinate the strategic efforts of local and state government agencies in the region. As part of this role, I am also the Weed Spotter regional coordinator, so while I have a role in the detection of weeds in the region, and can assist with control information, the responsibility for control is still the responsibility of the agency or landholder concerned.

In relation to Q34, I have found or relocated species such as *Thunbergia laurifolia*, *Thunbergia fragrans*, *Cecropia peltata*, *Annona glabra* and *Praxelis clematidea*, many of this species were not well known in this region.

In relation to Q40, with regards to the commitment of government agencies to detection and eradication, in my possibly limited experience, I have found that the Main Roads Dept. (at least here in Mackay) relies on the local government Pest Management Officer for the identification of weeds on new construction sites, and has no other procedure for the identification of weeds.

While the local government Pest Management Officer is familiar with most of the weeds commonly present in the region, this person is not necessarily familiar with all of the listed declared species. As a result, it is possible for construction to start on a project without appropriate weed control measures in place. I feel that this practice has resulted from a direction within the department, to liaise with the local government Pest Management Officers.

You made me laugh at # 36. Maybe those inspectors need to experience other areas.