Weed (Scientific name)	**Pennisetum villosum and Pennisetum setaceum - Poaceae**			
Region	**Sydney**			
Management Area	**Sydney**			
Landuse	**1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS**			
Assumptions				
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	Q1
Q2. What is the weed's tolerance to average weed management practices in the land use?		**1.0**	Between 5 and 50% of weeds survive	Q2
Q3. What is the reproductive ability of the weed in the land use?		**3.0**		Q3
(a) Time to seeding	1.0		>1-3 yrs	
(b) Annual seed production	2.0		High	
(c) Vegetative reproduction	2.0		Frequent	
Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100m) by natural means?		**2.0**		Q4
(a) Flying animals	0.0		Unlikely	
(b) Other wild animals	1.0		Occasional	
(c) Water	2.0		Common	
(d) Wind	2.0		Common	
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		**3.0**		Q5
(a) Deliberate spread by people	2.0		Common	
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	2.0		Common	
(c) Contaminated produce	2.0		Common	
(d) Domestic/farm animals	1.0		Occasional	
Total		**7.3**		

Impacts	Score	Total		
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		**?**	Do not know	Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		**?**	Do not know	Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		**?**	Do not know	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?		**0.0**	None	Q5
Q6. Does the weed have major positive or negative effects on environmental health?		**1.0**		Q6
(a) food/shelter	0.0		Minor or no effect	
(b) fire regime	1.0		Major negative 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		**3.7**		
Potential Distribution				
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		**6.0**	40-60% of land use	Q1
Comparative weed risk score		**162**		
Weed risk category		**High**		

Control Costs	Score	Total		
Q1. How detectable is the weed?		**2**		Q1
(a) Distinguishing features	0		always distinct	
(b) Period of year shoot growth visible	0		> 8 months	
(c) Height at maturity	1		0.5 - 2 m	
(d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	2		below canopy	
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?		**0**	high	Q2
Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?		**4**		Q3
(a) Chemical costs/ha	3		high ($250-$500/ha)	
(b) Labour costs/ha	3		high ($250-$500/ha)	
(c) Equipment costs	1		low	
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?		**2.0**	low	Q4
Total		**6.7**		

Persistence	Score	Total		
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?		**2**	medium	Q1
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?		**1**	1-2 years	Q2
Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?		**2**	> 5 years	Q3
Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?		**3.0**		Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	2		frequent	
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	2		frequent	
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	Q1
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?		**1.0**	scattered	Q2
Total		**1.3**		

Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score	**61**	
Feasibility of coordinated control category	**Low**	

Management priority category	**Manage weed**
Calculation of overall uncertainty score	**8%**
Response	**Submit Assessment**
Positive Impacts	

References/Other comments

Considered to be an emerging weed in Sydney. Observed to have similar dispersal and survival characteristics to African Lovegrass in Sydney's climate and soils. Difficulty in distinguishin
challenging. Re: Sources: Many questions were answered as a grou
Sydney West/Blue Mountains WC, and M Springall NPWS, with the assistance of Sue Stevens.

Source and comments
Requires open space and light to establish. http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_feathertop
see below
http://www.weeds.org.au/cgi-bin/weedident.cgi?tpl=plant.tpl&state=&s=&ibra=all&card=G20 http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_feathertop
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_feathertop
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_feathertop

http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_feathertop

http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_feathertop

Likley to replace native grasses. Also likely to occur along creeks and rivers. May decrease soil erosion. http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_feathertop

http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/impact_feathertop	Can be confused with other Pennisetum spp.
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_feathertop	
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_feathertop	
http://www.land.vic.gov.au/dpi/vro/vrosite.nsf/pages/invasive_feathertop	

g from the native sp. P. alopecuroides and reportedly sterile hybrids will make control more
p by: A MacKenzie & L McGee - Sydney Central WC, N Booth, D Simmons & M Costigan