

The efficacy of biological control agents of gorse, *Ulex europaeus* L., in Tasmania

Jamie T. Davies

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Agricultural Science and Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research

CRC for Australian Weed Management

University of Tasmania

August, 2006

DECLARATION

This thesis contains no material that has been accepted for a degree or diploma by the University of Tasmania or any other institution, except by way of background information, which has been duly acknowledged within the thesis. To the best of my knowledge and belief, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where reference is made in the text.

Jamie T. Davies

This thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968.

Jamie T. Davies

Abstract

The primary aim of this study was to assess the individual impact of the gorse seed weevil (*Exapion ulicis*), gorse spider mite (*Tetranychus lintearius*) and gorse thrips (*Sericothrips staphylinus*) on the growth and development of gorse. Factors such as natural enemy attack and herbicide use may affect biological control agent populations and their resulting impact on the target weed. For this reason, the study was extended to assess the potential impact of natural enemies on the gorse spider mite and the gorse thrips and assess the toxicity of herbicides and adjuvants commonly used for gorse control on the gorse thrips.

The gorse spider mite caused a reduction in dry matter production of approximately 36% in a field experiment that compared mite-attacked plants to sprayed controls over two and a half years. A threat to the effectiveness of this agent is predation by the Chilean predatory mite, *Phytoseiulus persimilis*. An experiment showed this species will develop at a similar rate on a diet of gorse spider mite as it would on the two-spotted mite, therefore confirming the ability of this species to have a negative impact on gorse spider mite populations.

In a glasshouse experiment, gorse thrips, ryegrass competition and simulated grazing individually reduced the growth of gorse seedlings. When treatments were combined, survival of gorse seedlings was also reduced. These results suggest that this species has the potential to be a useful biological control agent of gorse. However, as population build up in the field has been slow, further studies on the biology and ecology of this species are required. A field study was conducted to identify potential natural enemies of the gorse thrips within the arthropod fauna inhabiting gorse. A

range of species, including generalist predators, were identified. Of these, the Phlaeothripid *Haplothrips victoriensis* and mites in the family Phytoseiidae were the most abundant predatory arthropods present on gorse throughout the study and are also reported to be natural enemies of other members of the family Thripidae. Further studies are required to test the predatory efficacy of these arthropods on gorse thrips.

The gorse seed weevil was found to reduce seed production of gorse at two sites in Tasmania. Due to pod production being continual at Lymington and only over spring and summer at Stonehenge, the percentage of mature seed damaged in black pods for the whole 20 months of sampling was 2.7 times higher at Stonehenge (45.5%) than at Lymington (16.7%). On an annual basis, damage to mature seed at Stonehenge was 34.4% (2001/2002) and 55.4% (2002/2003) and at Lymington was 18.1% (2001/2002) and 12.4% (2002/2003). Based on the results of this study and population models produced elsewhere, it was concluded that additional seed feeding biological control agents would be required to reduce seed production of gorse to below replacement levels.

A bioassay was conducted to determine the toxicity of herbicides and adjuvants commonly used to control gorse on adult and juvenile gorse thrips. The herbicide triclopyr/picloram was found to be consistently the most toxic chemical to both juvenile and adult gorse thrips. Some toxicity was measured for the herbicide glyphosate, the adjuvant modified polydimethylsiloxane and the adjuvant soyal phospholipids/propionic acid. Metsulfuron methyl was not significantly toxic to either adult or juvenile gorse thrips. Both adjuvants seemed to increase the toxicity of all the herbicides on both juvenile and adult gorse thrips. The integration of chemical and biological control using the gorse thrips is discussed.

Although each individual agent did have a measurable impact on certain aspects of gorse performance, each had its limitations. Predation of the gorse spider mite by the specialist predator, *Phytoseiulus persimilis*, is likely to limit its impact on gorse. The gorse thrips did have an impact on gorse in a glasshouse environment but populations have been slow to establish in the field and no evidence of an impact of this species has been recorded five years after release. The gorse seed weevil does have an impact on the production of gorse seed, however, the levels recorded in this study were not enough to have an impact on gorse populations. The combined impact of these agents on gorse populations was beyond the scope of this study, however, due to limitations of each agent, it seems apparent that additional agents will be required if biological control is to be considered an important long-term component of an integrated management strategy for gorse.

Acknowledgements

This thesis was produced with the assistance of many people, their time and advice was greatly appreciated. I would like to thank the following people and organisations:

The CRC for Australian Weed Management, Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research (TIAR) and the School of Agricultural Science/University of Tasmania supported this work financially and in the provision of infrastructure. Thanks to everyone in these organisations that made this project possible.

This project was conducted under the supervision of John Ireson (Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research) and Geoff Allen (School of Agricultural Science, University of Tasmania). I would especially like to thank John and Geoff for their contributions throughout this study. Their support, advice and encouragement on many aspects of this investigation are greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank Phil Brown and Peter Lane (School of Agricultural Science, University of Tasmania) for their contributions in the co-ordination of this project.

Numerous people at the New Town Research Laboratories assisted with specific aspects of this project. Richard Holloway and Wade Chatterton (Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research) provided technical advice and support on many aspects of the project, I am particularly grateful for their contributions. Moya Sue (Tasmanian Institute of Agricultural Research) and Anthony Bosworth (Department of Primary Industry and Water, Tasmania) provided administrative support. The New Town publications syndicate (Sally Bound, Karen Stott, Warwick Gill, Kathy Evans, Robert Tegg, Aletia Eyles and Alice Palmer) reviewed chapters and associated publications from the thesis.

I was required to seek advice from professionals on many aspects of this project. I would like to thank Andy Sheppard (CSIRO Entomology, Canberra), Richard Hill (Richard Hill and Associates, New Zealand), Hugh Gourlay (Landcare Research, New Zealand), A.F.G. Dixon (University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK), Trevor Partridge (Landcare Research, New Zealand) and Marilyn Steiner (NSW Agriculture) for their theoretical insights and advice on aspects of the design of experiments. I would also like to thank Owen Seeman (Queensland Museum) for his contributions in identifying insects and mites, Laurence Mound (CSIRO Entomology) for identifying thrips and his unpublished knowledge of thrips biology, Andy Ryland (Beneficial bugs co., NSW) for providing the NSW population of *P. persimilis* and Quentin Paynter (Landcare Research, New Zealand) for an update of the taxonomy of the *Cydia* species present on gorse in New Zealand. I would also like to thank Bruce McCorkell (NSW Agriculture) for statistical advice on data in Chapter 5.

Part of this study was conducted on gorse infestations on private property. I would like to thank Richard Ramsey, Marcus and Elliot McShane and David and Lynne Dowe for allowing access on their properties.

My family and friends have provided moral support and encouragement throughout my candidature. My mother, Lynn Townsend, has been particularly supportive and has always encouraged me to achieve to the best of my ability. My father, Bob Davies encouraged a strong interest in science from an early age. I would also like to thank my siblings, Simon Davies, Oliver Davies and Sarah Townsend and friends Nigel Harris and Julian Springham for their support. Finally, I would like to thank my lovely wife, Katrina Hill for her unwavering support, encouragement and motivation.

Table of Contents

Declarations	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	viii
<u>Chapter 1</u> : General Introduction	1
<u>Chapter 2</u> : The impact of the gorse spider mite, <i>Tetranychus lintearius</i> , on the growth and development of gorse, <i>Ulex europaeus</i> .	28
<u>Chapter 3</u> : The development time of two populations of <i>Phytoseiulus persimilis</i> , on diets of the two spotted mite, <i>Tetranychus urticae</i> , and the gorse spider mite, <i>Tetranychus lintearius</i> , and its implications for the biological control of gorse, <i>Ulex europaeus</i> .	51
<u>Chapter 4</u> : The phenology and impact of the gorse seed weevil, <i>Exapion ulicis</i> , on gorse, <i>Ulex europaeus</i> .	72
<u>Chapter 5</u> : The impact of gorse thrips, <i>Sericothrips staphylinus</i> , ryegrass competition and simulated grazing on seedling performance of gorse, <i>Ulex europaeus</i> , in a controlled environment.	99
<u>Chapter 6</u> : Potential natural enemies of <i>Sericothrips staphylinus</i> within the arthropod fauna inhabiting gorse, <i>Ulex europaeus</i> .	117
<u>Chapter 7</u> : Toxicity of commonly used herbicides and adjuvants used in gorse control on the gorse thrips, <i>Sericothrips staphylinus</i> .	134
	viii

<u>Chapter 8: General Discussion.</u>	151
References	162
Appendix 1: Development data used in Figure 3.1 and Table 3.3 for (a) <i>Phytoseiulus persimilis</i> (b) <i>Tetranychus urticae</i> and (c) <i>Tetranychus lintearius</i> .	178
Appendix 2: Publications and presentations during candidature	180