

Using the New Zealand aquatic weed risk assessment model to manage potential weeds in the aquarium/pond plant trade

Paul D. Champion^A, John S. Clayton^A, Andrew Petroschevsky^B and Melanie Newfield^C

^ANational Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA), PO Box 11-115, Hamilton, New Zealand.

^BNSW Department of Primary Industries, Grafton, New South Wales 2460, Australia.

^CMinistry of Agriculture and Forestry Biosecurity New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand.

Summary

The aquatic weed risk assessment model (AWRAM) has been used as a decision support tool to prevent the importation of potentially invasive aquatic weeds distributed in the international ornamental plant trade. The model has also been used to rank potential weeds already in Australia and New Zealand, supporting management tools such as banning from sale and distribution, and eradication programs. Competition experiments to evaluate the weed potential of aquatic plants where little information on weediness is available are discussed as an additional tool to assist with weed risk assessment.

Keywords: Potential aquatic weeds, ornamental pond and aquarium plant trade, importation, banning sale and distribution.

Introduction

The aquatic weed risk assessment model (AWRAM) developed by Champion and Clayton (2001a) assesses the potential invasiveness of an aquatic plant. This model was developed because previous general weed risk assessment models failed to adequately separate aquatic plants which have different levels of impact. AWRAM assesses characters such as habitat versatility, competitive ability, reproductive output, dispersal mechanisms, range of potential impacts, potential distribution and resistance to management activities. The AWRAM score is thus a synthesis of information relevant to the assessment of weed potential and management effectiveness providing a tool for managers and policy makers to prioritize weeds for control actions. It can also be used to compare species which are yet to naturalize with established aquatic weeds. To do this, the model requires reliable information on a range of species characters which can also be augmented by field observations (e.g. effective control methods, displacement of other species and dispersal methods).

Most current aquatic weeds (~75%) in New Zealand were imported originally as

ornamental pond and aquarium plants. Many of these species and many other potential weeds are still traded internationally, with large numbers of growers and suppliers based in many countries especially South East Asia. Unlike other ornamental plant industries, a significant amount of plant material is collected from the wild.

Two studies of imported plants showed that material was often mislabelled or contained contaminant material. Maki and Galatowitsch (2004) ordered aquatic plants from around the USA and found 93% of 40 orders contained contaminant additional plants, animals, fungi, or algae. Ten percent of the orders included other plants classified as alien invasive species. A month-long survey of plants imported into Europe via Charles de Gaulle airport (EPPO 2007) found 98 966 plants of 162 taxa in 38 consignments with many misspelled or erroneous botanical names on phytosanitary certificates. Thus importation and sale of ornamental pond and aquarium plants is an important pathway for the introduction of potential aquatic weeds into a country and their subsequent spread.

Ban from importation into New Zealand

The geographical isolation of New Zealand means the natural or accidental introduction of freshwater plants from other countries is unlikely. This would require a plant to be taken from a freshwater habitat in the donor country, survive a journey of over 1000 km out of water and establish in a new freshwater habitat within New Zealand (Closs *et al.* 2004). Unsurprisingly the indigenous freshwater flora of New Zealand is depauperate with only slightly more than 50 obligate aquatic plant species known. Deliberate importation of aquatic plants via the ornamental plant trade, or other pathways such as culinary or fodder plants is therefore the main method of introduction into New Zealand and most other countries.

The *New Zealand Biosecurity Act (1993)* provides legislation to enable the management of problem species. Any organism capable of forming self-sustaining populations and with the potential to cause adverse impacts may be declared an Unwanted Organism. The majority of introduced species could be interpreted to qualify for this status, so a system of prioritization was required to ensure that Unwanted Organism status was reserved for potentially serious pests. Champion and Clayton (2000, 2001b) identified a number of aquatic plants not known to be present in New Zealand which ranked highly as potential weeds using AWRAM (Table 1) and these were recommended for declaration as Unwanted Organisms by the Department of Conservation (DOC). This designation would make importation of those species into New Zealand an illegal activity.

These species were duly declared Unwanted Organisms by the Chief Technical officer of DOC in July 2001. Their status was upgraded to Notifiable Organisms in 2006 (Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Biosecurity New Zealand (MAFBNZ) 2006), a status requiring any person knowing of the presence of one of these plants to report it to MAFBNZ.

A survey of ornamental pond and aquarium plants in New Zealand (Champion and Clayton 2001b) and subsequent cultivation of this material found *Typha latifolia* L. and *Sagittaria sagittifolia* L. to be already present in New Zealand with the latter species well established in a stream at one site. This survey also found that 27% of all species identified were unknown from New Zealand in the 1980s, suggesting that illegal importation of aquatic plants was occurring, with these species being distributed by the trade. A recent (July 2007) case saw the prosecution of an offender responsible for importing at

Table 1. Aquatic weed risk assessment model (AWRAM) scores for some potential weed species traded internationally, but not known to be present in New Zealand in 2009.

| Species | AWRAM score |
|---|-------------|
| <i>Myriophyllum spicatum</i> L. | 73 |
| <i>Ludwigia peruviana</i> (L.) H.Hara | 64 |
| <i>Trapa natans</i> L. | 63 |
| <i>Typha latifolia</i> L. | 58 |
| <i>Najas marina</i> L. | 57 |
| <i>Typha domingensis</i> Pers. | 56 |
| <i>Najas guadalupensis</i> (Spreng.) Magnus | 54 |
| <i>Sagittaria sagittifolia</i> L. | 53 |

least 11 new aquarium species into New Zealand, through mislabelled mail. These plants were offered for sale on the internet and subsequent sales led to the dispersal of plants from Taipa near the northernmost point of the North Island to Invercargill in the south of the South Island.

Ban from sale and distribution in New Zealand

The majority of New Zealand's aquatic weeds are or were historically sold as aquarium or pond plants. The aquatic plant trade distributes large numbers of plants, increasing propagule pressure and the potential for new naturalized populations to occur (Kolar and Lodge 2002). Few problem aquatic weeds reproduce sexually in New Zealand, so spread by bird or wind dispersed seed does not occur (Champion *et al.* 2002). Thus human transfer between catchments is the major dispersal mechanism for these species and movement of plants through the ornamental trade is potentially a major long-distance dispersal pathway (Champion *et al.* 2002).

Six species of submerged plants (*Hydrilla verticillata* (L.f.) Royle, *Ceratophyllum demersum* L., *Egeria densa* Planch., *Lagarosiphon major* (Ridley) Moss, *Vallisneria australis* S.W.L.Jacobs & Les and *V. spiralis* L.) were banned from sale in 1983 under the *Noxious Plants Act* (1978). A range of aquatic plant species already present in New Zealand were evaluated with AWRAM as part of the process to determine which species could be effectively managed by banning their sale and distribution (Champion 2005, Newfield and Champion 2010). This resulted in 30 aquatic species (Table 2) being included on the National Pest Plant Accord (NPPA) in July 2007. The NPPA is a MAFBNZ initiative involving regional and central government agencies and representatives from the plant nursery trade.

Other management of highly ranked species in New Zealand

MAFBNZ initiated eradication programs for six aquatic weeds in their national interest pest program beginning in 2007 (MAFBNZ 2009). These are the five highest ranked species (Table 2) along with *Salvinia molesta* D.S.Mitchell, a species already subjected to a national program since 1983. Programs for the eradication or containment of most other species in Table 2 are also currently being undertaken and funded by one or more Regional Council. Four of these species (*Nymphoides peltata* (S.G.Gmel.) Kuntze, *Potamogeton perfoliatus* L., *Menyanthes trifoliata* L. and *Pistia stratiotes* L.) are already considered eradicated from all known sites outside of containment.

Evaluation of aquatic plants offered for sale in Australia

Sales lists for aquatic plants in Australia were collated and compared with a list of internationally traded plants (Booth 2002, Slocum and Robinson 1996, Oriental Aquarium 2002, Kasselmann 2003). Amongst these lists, potential weeds were identified from various weed lists (e.g. Csurhes and Edwards 1998, Champion *et al.* 2002, Randall 2002, Randall and Kessal 2004, Groves *et al.* 2005, Barker *et al.* 2006, ISSG 2007) and recent reports of naturalization (e.g. Weed Spotter Newsletters, CRC Weed Management 2008).

AWRAM was changed to reflect factors relevant to mainland Eastern Australia including removal of attributes such as impedance of hydro-electric power generation and impacts of freezing while increasing the importance of competitive ability, the importance of fluctuating water levels, turbidity, increased salinity (southern and inland areas), irrigation and flood control.

Additional information specific to the aquatic plant trade was included, with assessment of length of time and volume in the trade and whether the species is traded as an outdoor (i.e. pond) or aquarium plant. Period of time and volume in the trade were scored as having a decreased likelihood of a species becoming weedy if it had been traded for over 30 years without naturalizing. Pond plants were seen as a much greater risk of naturalizing than tropical aquarium species, normally grown at a constant 28°C. Species with a weed risk assessment score greater than 50 (25 species) were recommended for a national ban from sale in Australia (Petroschevsky and Champion 2008).

Experimental evaluation of competitive performance

When there is little information on the impact posed by a plant (e.g. where a species has yet to establish as a naturalized species, or has only recently naturalized),

Table 2. Aquatic weed risk assessment model (AWRAM) scores for aquatic weed species banned from sale and distribution in New Zealand in 2009.

| Species | AWRAM score |
|--|-------------|
| <i>Phragmites australis</i> (Cav.) Trin. ex Steud. | 75 |
| <i>Hydrilla verticillata</i> (L.f.) Royle | 74 |
| <i>Zizania latifolia</i> (Griseb.) Turcz. ex Stapf | 68 |
| <i>Ceratophyllum demersum</i> L. | 67 |
| <i>Eichhornia crassipes</i> (Mart.) Solms | 67 |
| <i>Egeria densa</i> Planch. | 64 |
| <i>Alternanthera philoxeroides</i> (Mart.) Griseb. | 63 |
| <i>Lagarosiphon major</i> (Ridley) Moss | 60 |
| <i>Nymphoides peltata</i> (S.G.Gmel.) Kuntze | 58 |
| <i>Typha latifolia</i> L. | 58 |
| <i>Gymnocoronis spilanthoides</i> (D.Don ex Hook. & Arn.) DC. | 57 |
| <i>Salvinia molesta</i> D.S.Mitchell | 57 |
| <i>Myriophyllum aquaticum</i> (Vell.) Verdc. | 56 |
| <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> L. | 54 |
| <i>Potamogeton perfoliatus</i> L. | 54 |
| <i>Utricularia gibba</i> L. | 54 |
| <i>Sagittaria sagittifolia</i> L. | 53 |
| <i>Iris pseudacorus</i> L. | 52 |
| <i>Sagittaria platyphylla</i> (Engelm.) J.G.Sm. | 52 |
| <i>Ludwigia peploides</i> (Kunth) P.H.Raven | 51 |
| <i>Vallisneria australis</i> S.W.L.Jacobs & Les | 51 |
| <i>Vallisneria spiralis</i> L. | 51 |
| <i>Nymphaea mexicana</i> Zucc. | 48 |
| <i>Nymphoides geminata</i> (R.Br.) Kuntze | 47 |
| <i>Sagittaria montevidensis</i> Cham. & Schldl. | 46 |
| <i>Schoenoplectus californicus</i> (C.A.Mey.) Palla | 46 |
| <i>Hydrocleys nymphoides</i> (Humb. & Bonpl. ex Willd.) Buchenau | 45 |
| <i>Menyanthes trifoliata</i> L. | 45 |
| <i>Nuphar lutea</i> (L.) Sm. | 43 |
| <i>Pistia stratiotes</i> L. | 42 |

an experimental evaluation of competitive performance has been developed to allow ranking of the species by AWRAM. A series of competition experiments where candidate species are grown with selected competitor species (which included both known weeds and native species) have been carried out both in New Zealand (Champion *et al.* 2007) and Australia (Petroeschovsky and Champion 2008).

More recent trials have used the experimental system of Burnett *et al.* (2007) to replicate a range of water temperatures approximating other climatic zones of Australia. Currently the potential weeds *Hygrophila polysperma* (Roxb.) T. Anderson, *H. difformis* (L.f.) Blume, *Heteranthera reniformis* Ruiz & Pav. and *Limnophila sessiliflora* (Vahl) Blume are being assessed, growing in competition with *Cabomba caroliniana* A.Gray and *Alternanthera philoxeroides* (Australian Weeds of National Significance) or *Ludwigia peploides* and *Hydrilla verticillata* (indigenous to Australia). The displacement or severe reduction of cover/biomass of competitor species in these experiments would indicate significant weed potential providing a basis for banning the deliberate distribution of these species.

Conclusions

The Aquatic Weed Risk Assessment Model (AWRAM) is an important decision support tool providing a defensible and science-based approach for policy makers wishing to ban the importation or sale of potential aquatic weeds or prioritize their management actions. Banning the importation of species ranked highly by AWRAM effectively keeps biosecurity risks off-shore, whilst banning a species from sale and distribution is a highly effective way of restricting both long-distance dispersal and density of propagules thereby reducing the occurrence of new infestations.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank the following agencies that helped fund this work: New Zealand Foundation for Research, Science and Technology, Department of Conservation and MAF Biosecurity New Zealand, and the Australian 'Defeating the Weed Menace' program.

References

- Barker, J., Randall, R.P. and Grice, T. (2006). 'Weeds of the future? Threats to Australia's grazing industries from garden plants'. Project number NBP.357, final report prepared for Meat and Livestock Australia Ltd by the CRC for Australian Weed Management.
- Booth, G. (2002). Aquarium plant list. (<http://www.thekrib.com/Plants/Plants/big-plant-list.html>. Accessed September 2009).
- Burnett, D.A., Champion, P.D., Clayton, J.S. and Ogden, J. (2007). A system for investigation of the temperature responses of emergent aquatic plants. *Aquatic Botany* 86, 187-90.
- Champion, P.D. (2005). Evaluation criteria for assessment of candidate species for inclusion in the National Plant Pest Accord. (<http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/files/pests/plants/nppa/nppa-tag-eval-criteria.pdf>. Accessed September 2009).
- Champion, P.D. and Clayton, J.S. (2000). 'Border control for potential aquatic weeds. Stage 1. Weed risk model'. Science for Conservation 141. (Department of Conservation, New Zealand).
- Champion, P.D. and Clayton, J.S. (2001a). A weed risk assessment for aquatic weeds in New Zealand. In 'Weed risk assessment', eds R.H. Groves, F.D. Panetta and J.G. Virtue, pp. 194-202. (CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Victoria).
- Champion, P.D. and Clayton, J.S. (2001b). 'Border control for potential aquatic weeds'. Stage 2. Weed risk assessment. Science for Conservation 185. (Department of Conservation, New Zealand).
- Champion, P.D., Clayton, J.S. and Rowe, D.K. (2002). 'Lake managers' handbook: alien invaders'. (Ministry for the Environment, Wellington, New Zealand).
- Champion, P.D., Hofstra, D.E. and Clayton, J.S. (2007). 'Border control for potential aquatic weeds. Stage 3. Weed risk management. Science for Conservation 271. (Department of Conservation, New Zealand).
- Closs, G.P., Dean, T.L., Champion, P.D. and Hofstra, D.E. (2004). Aquatic invaders and pest species. In 'Freshwaters of New Zealand', eds J. Harding, P. Mosley, C. Pearson and B. Sorrell, pp. 27.1-27.14. (New Zealand Hydrological Society and The New Zealand Limnological Society, Christchurch, New Zealand).
- CRC Weed Management (2008). Weed spotters newsletters (http://www.weedscrc.org.au/documents/weed_spotters_summer08_newsletter.pdf. Accessed September 2009).
- Csurhes, S. and Edwards, R. (1998). 'Potential environmental weeds in Australia'. (Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra).
- European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) (2007). Pathway analysis: aquatic plants imported in France (<http://archives.eppo.org/EPPORreporting/2007/Rse-0701.pdf>. Accessed September 2009).
- Groves, R.H., Boden, R. and Lonsdale, W.M. (2005). 'Jumping the garden fence: invasive garden plants in Australia and their environmental and agricultural impacts'. (WWF Australia).
- (http://www.wwf.org.au/publications/jumping_the_garden_fence/. Accessed February 2008).
- Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) (2007). Global invasive species database (<http://www.invasivespecies.net/database/welcome/>. Accessed September 2009).
- Kasselmann, C. (2003). 'Aquarium plants'. (Krieger Publishing, Florida, USA).
- Kolar, C.S. and Lodge, D.M. (2002). Ecological predictions and risk assessments for alien species. *Science* 298, 1233-6.
- Maki, K. and Galatowitsch, S. (2004). Movement of invasive aquatic plants into Minnesota (USA) through horticultural trade. *Biological Conservation* 118, 389-96.
- Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Biosecurity New Zealand. (2006). Schedule of notifiable organisms 2006. (<http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/files/pests/schedule-notifiable-organisms.pdf>. Accessed September 2009).
- Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry Biosecurity New Zealand. (2009). National interest pest response (NIPR). (<http://www.biosecurity.govt.nz/pests/surv-mgmt/mgmt/prog/nipr>. Accessed October 2009).
- Newfield, M. and Champion, P.D. (2010). Risk assessment for the New Zealand National Pest Plant Accord: which species should be banned from sale? *Plant Protection Quarterly* 25, 75-8.
- Oriental Aquarium (2002). 'The aquarium plant handbook'. (Oriental Aquarium, Singapore).
- Petroeschovsky, A. and Champion, P.D. (2008). Preventing further introduction and spread of aquatic weeds through the ornamental plant trade. Proceedings of the 16th Australian Weed Conference, eds R.D. van Klinken, V.A. Osten, F.D. Panetta and J.C. Scanlan, pp. 399-402. (Queensland Weeds Society, Brisbane).
- Randall, R.P. (2002). 'A global compendium of weeds'. (R.G. and F.J. Richardson, Melbourne).
- Randall, R.P. and Kessal, O. (2004). 'National list of naturalised invasive and potentially invasive garden plants in Australia'. (WWF Australia, Sydney).
- Slocum, P.D. and Robinson, P. (1996). 'Water gardening'. (Timberland Press, Oregon, USA).