

Weed (Scientific name)	Ageratina adenophora - Asteraceae		
Region	Sydney		
Management Area	Sydney		
Landuse	1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS		
Assumptions			
<i>Invasiveness</i>	Score	Total	
Q1. What is the ability of the weed to establish amongst existing plants?		1.0	Seedlings establish after moderate disturbance Q1
Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?		2.0	Between 50 and 95% of weeds survive Q2
Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?		3.0	
(a) Time to seeding	2.0		1 year or less Q3
(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	0.0		Unlikely Q4
(b) Other wild animals	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Water	2.0		Common
(d) Wind	2.0		Common
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		1.0	
(a) Deliberate spread by people	0.0		Unlikely Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	1.0		Occasional
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
Total		6.0	

Impacts	Score	Total		
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		2.0	10 - 50% reduction	Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		2.0	10 - 25% reduction	Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		1.0	Low	Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		1.0	Low	Q4
Q5. What is the weed's potential to negatively affect the health of animals and/or people?		2.0	Medium	Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		0.0		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	
Total		4.2		
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	Q1
Comparative weed risk score		51		
Weed risk category		Medium		

Control Costs	Score	Total	
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	0 0 1 2	2	always distinct > 8 months 0.5 - 2 m below canopy
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?		1	medium
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	2 4 1	4	medium (\$100-\$249/ha) very high (>\$500/ha) low
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?		1.0	medium
Total		6.7	
Persistence	Score	Total	
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?		2	medium
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?		3	< 6 months
Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?		?	do not know
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	2 1	2.0	frequent occasional
Total		7.3	
Current distribution			
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?		0.5	1-5% of land use
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?		2.0	widespread
Total		2.1	
Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score		101	
Feasibility of coordinated control category		Low	

<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>Manage sites</p> <p>3%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>References/Other comments</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

Particularly invasive on cleared land that is not grazed.
http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/155962/crofton-weed.pdf

see below

http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Crofton-Weed-PP16.pdf http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0010/155962/crofton-weed.pdf

<http://www.weeds.org.au/cgi-bin/weedident.cgi?tpl=plant.tpl&state=&s=&ibra=all&card=H01>

<http://www.weeds.org.au/cgi-bin/weedident.cgi?tpl=plant.tpl&state=&s=&ibra=all&card=H01>

Likely, but extent may vary.

Likely, but extent may vary.

On wet slopes it has invaded kikuyu grass pasture.
http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Crofton-Weed-PP16.pdf

The plant is poisonous causing a disease in horses known in Queensland as "Tallebudgera Horse Disease" and in New South Wales as "Numinbah

Crofton weed is an aggressive weed in pastures in the valleys and on the plateaus in south-eastern Queensland.
http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Crofton-Weed-PP16.pdf

http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Crofton-Weed-PP16.pdf
<http://www.weeds.org.au/cgi-bin/weedident.cgi?tpl=plant.tpl&state=&s=&ibra=all&card=H01>

Crofton weed can germinate during wet summer periods and develop into good sized plants within twelve weeks, to flower the following spring.

http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Crofton-Weed-PP16.pdf

Springall NPWS, with the assistance of Sue Stevens.