Weed (Scientific name)	**Gleditsia triacanthos - Caeslapinioideae - Fabaceae**
Region	**South West Sydney**
Management Area	**Wollondilly Shire LGA**
Landuse	**1. CONSERVATION AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENTS**
Assumptions	**landuse is drainage/riparian/low lying areas and alluvial flats**

Invasiveness	**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?		**2.0**		Q3
(a) Time to seeding	0.0		>3 yrs/never	
(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	1.0		Occasional	
(b) Other wild animals	2.0		Common	
(c) Water	2.0		Common	
(d) Wind	0.0		Unlikely	
Q5. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100 m) by human means?		**2.0**		Q5
(a) Deliberate spread by people	1.0		Occasional	
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	1.0		Occasional	
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely	
(d) Domestic/farm animals	1.0		Occasional	
Total		**6.0**		

Impacts	Score	Total		
Q1. Does the weed reduce the establishment of desired plants?		**3.0**	> 50% reduction	Q1
Q2. Does the weed reduce the yield or amount of desired vegetation?		**4.0**	> 50% reduction	Q2
Q3. Does the weed reduce the quality of products, diversity or services available from the land use?		**3.0**	High	Q3
Q4. What is the weed's potential to restrict the physical movement of people, animals, vehicles, machinery and/or water?		**3.0**	High	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?		**3.0**		Q6
(a) food/shelter	1.0		Major negative effect	
(b) fire regime	?		Do not know	
(c) altered nutrient levels	1.0		Major negative effect	
(d) soil salinity	?		Do not know	
(e) soil stability	?		Do not know	
(f) soil water table	?		Do not know	
Total		**9.5**		
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		**341**		
Weed risk category		**Very high**		

Control Costs	Score	Total		
Q1. How detectable is the weed?		**2**		Q1
(a) Distinguishing features	1		sometimes distinct	
(b) Period of year shoot growth visible	1		4-8 months	
(c) Height at maturity	0		> 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?		**2**	low	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	4		very high (>$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		**8.3**		

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?		**0**	>2 years	Q2
Q3. What is the maximum longevity of sexual or vegetative propagules?		**?**	do not know	Q3
Q4. How likely are new propagules to continue to arrive at control sites, or to start new infestations?		**2.0**		Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	2		frequent	
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	1		occasional	
Total		**4.5**		

Current distribution				
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?		**1.0**	5-10% 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		**1.7**		

Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score	**63**	
Feasibility of coordinated control category	**Low**	

Management priority category	**Manage weed Protect priority sites**
Calculation of overall uncertainty score	**6%**
Response	**Submit Assessment**
Positive Impacts	
References/Other comments	

Source and comments

? http://www.northcoastweeds.org.au/site-files/docs/forum06/tecoma-honeylocust-luxton.pdf

http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf Suckers prolifically.
http://www.weedsbluemountains.org.au/more_weeds_woody.asp
Thorns broken off trunk can resprout. http://www.northcoastweeds.org.au/site-files/docs/forum06/tecoma-honeylocust-luxton.pdf

http://www.northwestweeds.nsw.gov.au/Weeds%20book%20draft%20pages%2041-50.pdf

http://www.wildflower.org/plants/result.php?id_plant=gltr

http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf
http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf
http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf
Can form dense thickets. http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf
Can inflict painful injuries to humans and livestock with its long spines. http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf
http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf Nitrogen fixer.

Deciduous. http://www.dpi.qld.gov.au/documents/Biosecurity_EnvironmentalPests/IPA-Honey-Locust-PP47.pdf
http://www.northwestweeds.nsw.gov.au/Weeds%20book%20draft%20pages%2041-50.pdf

http://www.northcoastweeds.org.au/site-files/docs/forum06/tecoma-honeylocust-luxton.pdf

http://www.northwestweeds.nsw.gov.au/Weeds%20book%20draft%20pages%2041-50.pdf