

Weed (Scientific name)	Tecoma stans (yellow tecoma)		
Region	Sydney		
Management Area	Sydney North Region		
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?		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?		1.0	
(a) Time to seeding	0.0		>3 yrs/never Q3
(b) Annual seed production	1.0		Low
(c) Vegetative reproduction	0.0		None
Q4. How likely is long-distance dispersal (>100m) by natural means?		1.0	
(a) Flying animals	1.0		Occasional Q4
(b) Other wild animals	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Water	1.0		Occasional
(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 Q5
(b) Accidentally by people and vehicles	0.0		Unlikely
(c) Contaminated produce	0.0		Unlikely
(d) Domestic/farm animals	0.0		Unlikely
Total		4.0	

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?		0.0	None 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?		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		2.6	
Potential Distribution			
Q1. Within the geographic area being considered, what is the percentage area of land use that is suitable for the weed?		0.5	<5% of land use Q1
Comparative weed risk score		5	
Weed risk category		Negligible	

Control Costs		Score	Total	
Q1. How detectable is the weed?			1	Q1
(a) Distinguishing features	0			
(b) Period of year shoot growth visible	0			
(c) Height at maturity	0			
(d) Pre-reproductive height in relation to other vegetation	2			
				always distinct
				> 8 months
				> 2 m
				below canopy
Q2. What is the general accessibility of known infestations at the optimum time of treatment?			0	high
Q3. How expensive is management of the weed in the first year of targeted control?			2	Q3
(a) Chemical costs/ha	1			low (< \$100/ha)
(b) Labour costs/ha	1			low (< \$100/ha)
(c) Equipment costs	1			low
Q4. What is the likely level of participation from landholders/volunteers within the land use at risk?			1.0	medium
			3.3	Q4
	Total			
Persistence		Score	Total	
Q1. How effective are targeted management treatments applied to infestations of the weed?			1	high
Q2. What is the minimum time period for reproduction of sexual or vegetative propagules?			?	do not know
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?			1.0	Q4
(a) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by natural means	1			occasional
(b) Long-distance (>100m) dispersal by human means	0			rare
			4.1	
	Total			
Current distribution				
Q1. What percentage area of the land use in the geographical area is currently infested by the weed?			0.1	<1% of land use
Q2. What is the number of infestations, and weed distribution within the geographic area being considered?			0.0	restricted
			0.1	Q2
	Total			
Comparative feasibility of coordinated control score			1	
Feasibility of coordinated control category			Very High	

<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>Monitor</p> <p>7%</p> <p>Submit Assessment</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Positive Impacts</p>	
<p>References/Other comments</p>	

Source and comments

Effects Blue Gum Hight Forest critically endangered ecological community- Sydney North
Regional Weeds Committee
