

QUESTION	COMMENTS	REFERENCE	RANKING
Social			
1. Restrict human access?	“An erect perennial herb, to 1 m high. It is usually confined to moist areas adjacent to streams, swamps etc., from which it encroaches into moist pastures. The weed forms very dense stands and appears to be as strongly competitive as St John’s wort.” Its presence beside the banks of waterways may impede individual access.	P & C (2001)	ML
2. Reduce tourism?	It is usually confined to moist areas adjacent to streams, swamps etc. from which it encroaches into moist pastures. The weed forms very dense stands and appears to be as strongly competitive as St John’s wort.” Some water-based recreational activities may be affected due to access restrictions.	P & C (2001)	ML
3. Injurious to people?	Not documented to be toxic.		L
4. Damage to cultural sites?	Dense patches may create a moderated negative visual impact in cultural sites.		ML
Abiotic			
5. Impact flow?	Terrestrial species.	P & C (2001)	L
6. Impact water quality?	Terrestrial species.	P & C (2001)	L
7. Increase soil erosion?	“Extensive roots, no distinct taproot, numerous rhizomes.” As a perennial, it is unlikely to contribute to soil erosion.	P & C (2001)	L
8. Reduce biomass?	Plants grow to 1 metre high, and can form very dense stands. Biomass may increase.		L
9. Change fire regime?	Life cycle, “appears to be similar to that of St John’s wort.” Dead flower stems remain standing for some years; potential to increase the frequency of fire risk.	P & C (2001)	ML
Community Habitat			
10. Impact on composition (a) high value EVC	EVC=Creekline grassy woodland (E); CMA=Goulburn Broken; Bioreg=Victorian Riverina; VH CLIMATE potential. Medium to large populations in rare or localised infestations. Can form dense stands. Similar impact to St John’s wort. Mostly occurs close to water. Potential for major displacement of ground covers.	Carr <i>et al</i> (1992) P & C (2001)	MH
(b) medium value EVC	EVC=Riverine grassy woodland (E); CMA=Goulburn Broken; Bioreg=Victorian Riverina; VH CLIMATE potential. Impact as in 10(a) above.	Carr <i>et al</i> (1992) P & C (2001)	MH
(c) low value EVC	EVC=Moirra Plain wetland (E); CMA=Goulburn Broken; Bioreg=Murray Fans; VH CLIMATE potential. Impact as in 10(a) above.	Carr <i>et al</i> (1992) P & C (2001)	MH
11. Impact on structure?	“The weed forms very dense stands and appears to be as strongly competitive as St John’s wort. To date, it only occurs close to water.” It occurs in medium to large populations (though only in rare or localised infestations in riparian vegetation). Potential to have a major effect on lower infested area.	P & C (2001) Carr <i>et al</i> (1992)	ML
12. Effect on threatened flora?			

Scientific Name: *Hypericum tetrapterum*

Common name: St Peter's wort

QUESTION	COMMENTS	REFERENCE	RANKING
Fauna			
13. Effect on threatened fauna?			
14. Effect on non-threatened fauna?	It occurs in medium to large populations in rare or localised infestations, predominantly in riparian vegetation. Minor impact on fauna species.	Carr <i>et al</i> (1992)	ML
15. Benefits fauna?	No known benefits.		H
16. Injurious to fauna?	"St Peter's wort is believed to be poisonous to stock and to cause photosensitisation similar to St John's wort, but the infestations in Victoria are so limited that this has not been observed in the field." Potentially harmful.	P & C (2001)	MH
Pest Animal			
17. Food source to pests?	Not known as a food source to pests		L
18. Provides harbor?	Not known to provide harbor for pest animals.		L
Agriculture			
19. Impact yield?	It can encroach into moist pastures, but its impact is not documented.	P & C (2001)	L
20. Impact quality?	No documented impact on agricultural quality.		L
21. Affect land value?	Not a weed of agriculture. Does not affect land value.		L
22. Change land use?	Not a weed of agriculture. Land use not affected.		L
23. Increase harvest costs?	Not a weed of agriculture.		L
24. Disease host/vector?	None evident.		L