

Weed (Scientific name)	Toxicodendron succedaneum		
Region	Greater Sydney		
Management Area	Periurban, Urban and Bushland edges		
Landuse	5.4 Residential		
Assumptions	Density in land use - low (planted and spread by birds)		
Invasiveness	Score	Total	
Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?		2.0	Seedlings establish within open vegetation or weeds
Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?		3.0	95% + weeds survive common management
Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?		2.0	
(a) Time to seeding	1.0		>1-3 yrs
(b) Annual seed production	2.0		High
(c) Vegetative reproduction	1.0		Infrequent
Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100m) by natural means?		2.0	
(a) Flying animals	2.0		Common
(b) Other wild animals	2.0		Common
(c) Water	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		1.0	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	1.0		Occasional
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Contaminated produce	1.0		Occasional
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
Total		6.7	

Source and comments

Q1	Per observations over 23 years, Paul Marynissen
Q2	Not regarded as a weed unless people are alerted to it in urban areas, is regarded as a weed in bushland areas on high nutrient soils, particularly in areas with shale derived soils
Q3	a. Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001), p. 166 - seed formed in the third year after planting. b. Not mentioned by references but note Figure 1 of Oosterhout et al. (2010) c. Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001), p. 166 - suckering assumed to be root suckering.
Q4	Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001), p. 166. Water and wind not mentioned and assumed not to occur.
Q5	Deliberate spread via nursery sales in Australia is now very unlikely. Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001), p. 166 - occasional spread in soil. Deliberate spread has been recorded on a number of occasions via people sharing plants for the autumn foliage colour.

Impacts	Score	Total
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?	?	Do not know
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?	?	Do not know
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?	0.0	No reduction
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?	0.0	None
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?	3.0	High
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?	0.0	
(a) food/shelter	0.0	Minor or no effect
(b) fire regime	0.0	Minor or no effect
(c) altered nutrient levels	0.0	Minor or no effect
(d) soil salinity	0.0	Minor or no effect
(e) soil stability	0.0	Minor or no effect
(f) soil water table	0.0	Minor or no effect
Total		3.4
Potential Distribution		
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?	2.0	10-20% of land use
Comparative weed risk score		46
Weed risk category		Medium

Do not know'

Q1

Do not know'

Q2

No reduction mentioned by references.

Q3

Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001), pp. 165-166.

Q4

Only a small percentage of people will not react to exposure to the weed. Health impacts range from erythema and blistering to full thickness chemical burns.

Q5

Symptoms worsen with each exposure to the weed. As most people are not

References do not mention any major environmental health effect.

Q6

Estimate - adaptable to a wide range of soil types although very little recorded as naturalised (BGT 2010).

Q1

<p>Control Costs</p> <p>Q1. How detectable is the weed? (a) Distinguishing features (b) Period of year shoot growth visible (c) Height at maturity (d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation</p> <p>Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?</p> <p>Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control? (a) Chemical costs/ha (b) Labour costs/ha (c) Equipment costs</p> <p>Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total</p>	<p>Score</p> <p>1 0 0 0</p> <p>Total</p> <p>1 0 2 0.0 2.5</p>	<p>1 sometimes distinct > 8 months > 2 m above canopy</p> <p>high</p> <p>low (< \$100/ha) low (< \$100/ha) low</p> <p>high</p>	<p>Q1 Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001).</p> <p>Q2 Personal observations.</p> <p>Q3 If stem injection used (costs for mechanical removal would be higher but generally very few would need to be removed so total cost would be low). Oosterhout et al. (2010) and Ensbeij (2009).</p> <p>Q4 Assumption due to toxicity.</p>
<p>Persistence</p> <p>Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?</p> <p>Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?</p> <p>Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?</p> <p>Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations? (a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means (b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total</p>	<p>Score</p> <p>Total</p> <p>1 0 2 2.0 4.5</p>	<p>high</p> <p>>2 years</p> <p>> 5 years</p> <p>frequent rare</p>	<p>Q1 Management techniques including cut and paint and drill and inject have shown to be effective. Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001), p. 166.</p> <p>Q2 Oosterhout et al. (2010) mentions many years - surmised to be more than 5.</p> <p>Q3 Parsons and Cuthbertson (2001).</p> <p>Q4</p>
<p>Current distribution</p> <p>Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?</p> <p>Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Total</p>	<p>Score</p> <p>Total</p> <p>0.1 0.0 0.1</p>	<p><1% of land use</p> <p>restricted</p>	<p>Q1 Relatively few plants left in gardens [or that have escaped into bushland near urban areas].</p> <p>Q2 Continued enforcement of declaration makes this now an uncommon plant.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Feasibility of coordinated control category</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Very High</p>		

<p style="text-align: center;">Management priority category</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Calculation of overall uncertainty score</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Response</p>	<p>Contain spread</p> <p>5%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	<p>Originally introduced as an ornamental tree; it has stunning red foliage in Autumn. No longer sold due to toxicity issues but is occasionally shared between gardeners.</p>
<p>References/Other comments</p>	
<p>References</p> <p>Botanic Gardens Trust (2010). PlantNET - The Plant Information Network System of Botanic Gardens Trust, Sydney, Australia http://plantnet.rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au (Accessed 3 May 2010).</p> <p>Ensbey, R. (2009). Noxious and environmental weed control handbook, 4th edition. Industry and Investment NSW, Orange. pg. 67.</p> <p>Oosterhout, E., Monaghan, N. and McMaugh, J. (2010). Rhus. Primefact 994. Industry and Investment NSW, Orange. 4 pp.</p> <p>Parsons, W. T. and Cuthbertson, E. G. (2001). Noxious Weeds of Australia, 2nd edition. CSIRO publishing, Collingwood. pp. 165-166.</p> <p>Assessment by Dr Stephen Johnson, Weed ecologist, I&I NSW 3 May 2010. Checked 06/05/14.</p> <p>Sometimes spreads into urban bushland where it is an environmental weed (this risk assessment does not cover this) (Parsons and Cuthbertson, 2001, p. 165).</p> <p>There are a number of knowledge gaps for this species - reflected by relatively high uncertainty score.</p>	