

<b>Weed (Scientific name)</b>	<b>Erythrina crista-galli - Fabaceae</b>		
<b>Region</b>	<b>Sydney</b>		
<b>Management Area</b>	<b>Sydney</b>		
<b>Landuse</b>	<b>1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS</b>		
<b>Assumptions</b>			
<b><i>Invasiveness</i></b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?</b>		<b>3.0</b>	Seedlings establish within dense vegetation or weeds Q1
<b>Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?</b>		<b>2.0</b>	Between 50 and 95% of weeds survive Q2
<b>Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?</b>		<b>3.0</b>	
(a) Time to seeding	?		Do not know Q3
(b) Annual seed production	2.0		High
(c) Vegetative reproduction	2.0		Frequent
<b>Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100m) by natural means?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	
(a) Flying animals	0.0		Unlikely Q4
(b) Other wild animals	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Water	2.0		Common
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely
<b>Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (&gt;100 m) by human means?</b>		<b>2.0</b>	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	2.0		Common Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	1.0		Occasional
(c) Contaminated produce	1.0		Occasional
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
<b>Total</b>		<b>7.3</b>	

<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		<b>2.0</b>	10 - 50% reduction Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		<b>2.0</b>	10 - 25% reduction Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		<b>2.0</b>	Medium Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		<b>2.0</b>	Medium Q4
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?		<b>0.0</b>	None Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		<b>0.0</b>	Q6
(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
<b>Total</b>		<b>4.2</b>	
<b>Potential Distribution</b>			
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		<b>2.0</b>	10-20% of land use Q1
<b>Comparative weed risk score</b>		<b>62</b>	
<b>Weed risk category</b>		<b>Medium</b>	

<b>Control Costs</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. How detectable is the weed?</b> (a) Distinguishing features (b) Period of year shoot growth visible (c) Height at maturity (d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	0 0 0 2	<b>1</b>	always distinct > 8 months > 2 m below canopy
<b>Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?</b>		<b>1</b>	medium
<b>Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?</b> (a) Chemical costs/ha (b) Labour costs/ha (c) Equipment costs	3 4 1	<b>4</b>	high (\$250-\$500/ha) very high (>\$500/ha) low
<b>Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?</b>		<b>0.0</b>	high
<b>Total</b>		<b>5.0</b>	
<b>Persistence</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Total</b>	
<b>Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?</b>		<b>2</b>	medium
<b>Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>		<b>1</b>	1-2 years
<b>Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?</b>		<b>2</b>	> 5 years
<b>Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?</b> (a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means (b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	2 1	<b>2.0</b>	frequent occasional
<b>Total</b>		<b>6.4</b>	
<b>Current distribution</b>			
<b>Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?</b>		<b>0.1</b>	<1% of land use
<b>Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?</b>		<b>1.0</b>	scattered
<b>Total</b>		<b>0.9</b>	
<b>Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score</b>		<b>29</b>	
<b>Feasibility of coordinated control category</b>		<b>High</b>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Management priority category</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Calculation of overall uncertainty score</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Response</b></p>	<p>Protect priority sites</p> <p>1%</p> <p><b>Submit Assessment</b></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Positive Impacts</b></p>	
<p><b>References/Other comments</b></p>	

Re: Sources: Many questions were answered as a group by: A MacKenzie & L McGee - Sydney Central WC, N Booth, D Simmons & M Costigan Sydney West/Blue Mountains WC, and M

**Source and comments**

Is not shade tolerant. [http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina\\_crista-galli\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina_crista-galli_htmlwra.htm) Has been observed to establish in both dense and open vegetation.

SWC  
see below

[http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina\\_crista-galli\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina_crista-galli_htmlwra.htm)  
<http://www.sydneyweeds.org.au/weeds/cocks-comb.php>

[http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina\\_crista-galli\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina_crista-galli_htmlwra.htm)

Does not form thickets.  
<http://74.125.153.132/search?q=cache:pINhldfNaN0J:www.botany.hawaii.edu/faculty/daehler/wra/full/Erythrina%2520crista->

Can shade out other species. pers. obs. SS

pers. obs. SS

Spines on trunk and branches have potential to restrict movement.  
[http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina\\_crista-galli\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina_crista-galli_htmlwra.htm) Large infestations have potential to restrict movement. SS

Nitrogen fixer. [http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina\\_crista-galli\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina_crista-galli_htmlwra.htm)  
Might destabilise stream banks due to undercutting. SS

Richardson, Richardson & Shepherd. Deciduous.  
<http://coolexotics.com/plant-401-erythrina-crista-galli.html>

Approximately 6% of the flowers set seeds in natural populations.  
<http://www.jstor.org/pss/2666157>

Evidence that persistent (>1 year) propagule bank is formed.  
[http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina\\_crista-galli\\_htmlwra.htm](http://www.hear.org/Pier/wra/pacific/erythrina_crista-galli_htmlwra.htm) Seeds can last many years, vegetative propagule not persist for long. SWC

---

Springall NPWS, with the assistance of Sue Stevens.