

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Monitoring the impacts of invasive mammals on arboreal geckos' habitat use, cell foam retreat use, and the effectiveness of different monitoring techniques.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science in Conservation Biology

Massey University, Auckland,

New Zealand

Joshua Jeffrey Thoresen

2011

DOC: AK 20666-FAU; General handling Permit (includes Iwi consultation) (under Dianne Brunton)

Ethics approval: Standard research handling of geckos, i.e. measuring demographics only, which does not require animal ethics approval.

“Four things on earth are small, yet they are exceedingly wise... A lizard grasps skillfully with its hands, and it is found in kings’ palaces”

Proverbs 30 vs. 24...28

For Adonai

ABSTRACT

Gecko ecology was studied in areas of pest control and no control in four areas around Auckland. The density index of geckos was highest at Waiheke (treatment, i.e. pest control) with an average of 137.5 geckos ha⁻¹ compared with Waiheke (control, i.e. no pest control): 56 g/ha⁻¹, Tawharanui: 20.3 g/ha⁻¹ and Shakespear: 9.5 g/ha⁻¹. The Waiheke sites were then studied further; gecko condition was measured and males were found to have lower body conditions at the non pest controlled sites, rats were also found to be more abundant at these sites and large invertebrates less abundant. Habitat was also analysed and geckos were found to be captured under cell foam retreats (CFRs) in areas with lower canopies, higher forest density, a higher proportion of undergrowth cover and smaller canopy areas and tree diameters. These parameters were then used to compare the detectability of geckos with their densities and areas with the lowest densities were also found to have the lowest detectability. The efficiency of CFRs was then compared with VES nightspotting, Onduline artificial cover objects (ACOs) and tracking tunnels. CFRs and VES were found to be similarly efficient with 1.66 geckos hour⁻¹ for CFRs compared with 1.10 geckos hour⁻¹ for VES. ACOs and tracking tunnels did not detect any geckos during this study. The humidity at the time of capture correlated with the number of geckos captured per check, with less geckos captured as the humidity increased.

Acknowledgements:

Unlike most herpetologists in New Zealand I was a relative latecomer to the incredible world of New Zealand reptiles.

So to begin with I must go back to 2009 to my first experience with NZ reptiles on Little Barrier, Thank you to Sue Cameron, the volunteer co-ordinator from DOC in the Auckland Region for giving me the opportunity to get on Little Barrier and do the reptile monitoring there..... Before that moment I never knew what New Zealand had to offer in terms of reptiles.... After those few weeks I was irrevocably in love.... Thank you for setting me off on this journey!

My Supervisor Dianne Brunton! You somehow, always managed to find time to help me out with any issues that arose, to proof read my drafts and to provide constructive criticism. You have got to be one of the kindest and least stressed people I have ever met! Thank you so much for all your help and encouragement throughout the year!

Su Sinclair from the Auckland Council thanks for giving me too many ideas for my research, and for giving me the opportunity to actually do this! Thanks for trusting me with managing the volunteer team on Waiheke when you were away, the first time I have ever been in a management position and I did alright I think haha! Thanks so much for getting me my first contract work, those were the first ecology/herpetology jobs I had ever done.

The Auckland Council (Thanks for the grant money! Without which, none of this would have been achievable) and all the people there who were so helpful; Melinda Habgood (Rickon?), Matt Maitland, Alison, The rangers at Whakanewha; Beatty Wigenhauser and Dan Beauchamp for being so helpful! Thanks for letting me stay in your sleep-out all the time. Thanks Dan for fixing the sleep-out when it got leaky, wet and mouldy. The rangers at Tawharanui and Shakespear; Maurice, Hamish, Colon, and many others. You guys were really helpful!

All the Herpetologists who I have worked with over the year: Trent Bell, Sarah Herbert, Jo Hoare, Dylan van Winkel, Chris Wedding, Manu Barry, Marieke Lettink it was so great to get to know all of you! Thanks Trent and Dylan for showing me how to find geckos while nightspotting. Thanks Chris and Manu for coming out to Tawharanui and finding 14 geckos in one nights nightspotting, when I had found three over the last two weeks under the covers and was very disillusioned!

Thank you to all the people who helped me out at Massey, reading through draft copies of my thesis and helping me out with stats; Christophe Amiot thanks for helping me out with all those stats!!, Mark Delany thanks for reading through my drafts and editing them, thanks for helping out with my results and providing constructive criticism! Manu Barry, thanks for all those times I could help out with the Duvies, Manu Martinez, Luis Ortiz Cathedral, Frederique Jordan (sorry if I spelt your name wrong), Idan, Weihong, Michelle, et al....

The volunteers who helped me out, especially; Annette Evans, Jordi Seigers, Titia Ryder and Jason. Thanks Annette for teaching me all the plant names you knew, I would have been lost without your help! Thanks Jason for all your enthusiasm on Waiheke! Thanks for all those times we went out searching for the mysterious and mythical Pacific gecko on Waiheke, I found one!! We will have to go back there some time to look again! Thanks Titia for those times you helped me out at Waiheke, thanks for cooking me dinner!

John Perrot for getting me started off on the ecology path at Unitec, thanks for all your enthusiasm and help when you were my supervisor for my undergrad negotiated study. It was really cool catching up with you down at the Eco Soc Conference out on Mokoya Island! All the other ecology lecturers at Unitec who steered me on this path as well; the great Mel Galbraith! (It was great catching up with you at the Eco Soc Conference as well), Nigel Adams (aka; Nigel Thornberry), Graham, Mark, Dan, et al.

The Ecological Society of NZ for putting on the greatest first Conference I could have experienced!! Second prize for my poster!

Mum and Dad..... Of course, thanks for helping out at Tawharanui, Thanks mum for reading through my early chapters and showing me how shockingly bad my grammar is! Thanks for living in such a great place so I can relax when I come visit. Thanks for all those kayaking trips and beach days out at Whananaki. (I still need to try and find some geckos on your property up there). Dad, I know I got my love of nature from you, I remember listening to those stories of how you saved and raised those abandoned heron chicks when you were a kid, and I remember thinking I wish I could be like you! Mum, I got my tenacity and love of music from you, without that streak of stubbornness there is no way I would have gotten this far in my studies! Without that passion for music there is no way I would have gotten this far in life, let alone my studies! I love you guys!

Grammy and Granddad.... You have been such great grandparents! I love you guys! Thanks for giving me a place to stay when Mum and Dad moved away. Without you guys I would absolutely not have managed these past few years, there is no way I could have finished this without all your help! Thank you for giving me money to tide me over when I was poor, thank you for lending me your car when mine had no

WOF or Rego, thank you for giving me the money to get my car out of the impound when the damn conmen tow-truck drivers stole my car! Thanks for all the encouragement and help you've given me!

Nana, thanks for all those engaging conversations about my studies and life in general, I really enjoyed them! Thanks for showing an interest, also thank you for the funds you gave me when you first heard I was starting a MSc, they were really helpful!

All my friends, Thanks Francis Wheeler and Bodie 'Hulk' Johnson you guys are the best! Thanks for always remembering to invite me out to all those concerts and parties even though most of the time I couldn't go due to my thesis! Thanks for shouting me drinks and food when I was too poor to pay for them myself! Thanks Bodie for paying for me to get into that epic concert the other day! All the old Rosehill guys; Kieran, Clayton, Peter, Jeremy, Jason, Britt, Carrie-anne et al. Blair and our thesis competition (in my head anyway haha) you won, you finished first! Those friends I have made over the last few years at Uni and doing field work, good friends are what makes field work extra fun! All the Massey guys... Tania, Fidi, Mark, Fiona, Emma, Moniqua, Christy, Merlyn... All the other people I have worked with over the last year; Kat, Marleen, Dave Craddock, Zoe, Jamie, Catherine, Eve, Genevieve, Steph, Tui, Carie, et al.....

And to all those who I have regrettably forgotten to mention, thank you for your time and energy, I really appreciate all the help...

Abstract	IV
Acknowledgements	IV
Table of Contents	VIII
Table of Tables.....	XII
Table of Figures	XII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: General introduction	1
1.1 History of New Zealand’s biota and conservation	2
1.2 New Zealand’s gecko fauna: taxonomy, ecology and conservation	5
1.2.1 Taxonomy	5
1.2.2 Ecology	6
1.2.3 Conservation	8
1.3 Issues in monitoring arboreal reptiles	10
1.3.1 Pitfall traps	11
1.3.2 G-Minnow traps	12
1.3.3 Artificial cover objects (ACOs)	12
1.3.4 Visual encounter surveys (VES)	13
1.3.5 Tracking tunnels	13
1.3.6 Cell foam retreats (CFRs)	14
1.4 Issues in understanding gecko habitat use	14
1.5 Issues in understanding gecko monitoring object use	15
1.6 Research objectives	17
1.7 Thesis structure	18
Chapter Two: General methods	19
2.1 Study species	20
2.1.1 Forest gecko: <i>Mokopirirakau granulatus</i>	20
2.1.2 Auckland green, or ‘elegant’ gecko: <i>Naultinus elegans</i>	22
2.1.3 Pacific gecko: <i>Dactylocnemis pacificus</i>	24
2.2 Study areas	26
2.2.1 Whakanewha Regional Park, Waiheke Island	27
2.2.2 Tawharanui (open sanctuary) Regional Park	29
2.2.3 Shakespear (open sanctuary) Regional Park	31
2.3 Pre-thesis study	33
2.4 Waiheke Island	34
2.4.1 Cell foam retreats	34
2.4.2 Visual encounter surveys	36

2.4.3	Onduline artificial cover objects	37
2.4.4	Reptile tracking tunnels	38
2.4.5	Pest monitoring	39
2.4.6	Habitat analysis	40
2.5	Tawharanui Regional Park	42
2.5.1	Cell foam retreats	42
2.5.2	Visual encounter surveys	42
2.5.3	Pest monitoring	43
2.5.4	Habitat analysis	43
2.6	Shakespear Regional Park	43
2.6.1	Cell foam retreats	43
2.6.2	Visual encounter surveys	44
2.6.3	Habitat analysis	44
2.7	General statistics	44
Chapter Three: The impacts of rats on geckos: behaviour, population structure and condition.		45
3.1	Introduction	46
3.1.1	Introductions and impacts of rats on New Zealand reptiles	46
3.1.2	The impacts of rats on invertebrates	46
3.1.3	Body condition and sub-lethal injury estimates of reptiles	48
3.1.4	Caudal autotomy in geckos	49
3.1.5	Research objectives	50
3.2	Methodology	52
3.2.1	Study areas	52
3.2.2	Study species	52
3.2.3	Study design	52
3.2.4	Rat presence/absence	53
3.2.5	Gecko monitoring	53
3.2.6	Invertebrate sampling.....	55
3.3	Results	56
3.3.1	Predator tracking tunnels.....	56
3.3.2	Forest gecko density indices	57

3.3.3	Population demographics	59
3.3.4	Evidence of attempted rat predation: body condition index (BCI)	61
3.3.5	Evidence of attempted rat predation: body-tail condition index (BTC)	62
3.3.6	Evidence of attempted rat predation – sublethal injuries	64
3.3.7	Invertebrate abundance analysis	69
3.4	Discussion	72
3.4.1	Gecko densities and population structure	72
3.4.2	Gecko condition (BCI and BTC)	76
3.4.3	Evidence of attempted rat predation - sub lethal injuries.....	78
3.4.4	Invertebrate abundances.....	81
3.5	Conclusions	85
Chapter Four: An analysis of <i>Mokopirirakau granulatus</i> habitat use.		88
4.1	Introduction.....	89
4.1.1	Issues in understanding gecko habitat use	89
4.1.2	Gecko habitat choice variables.....	90
4.1.3	Research objectives.....	92
4.2	Methodology	94
4.2.1	Study areas	94
4.2.2	Study species.....	94
4.2.3	Study design.....	94
4.3	Results.....	96
4.3.1	Gecko presence/absence analyses	96
4.3.2	Habitat comparisons between regional parks.....	96
4.3.3	Habitat comparisons between transects on Waiheke	99
4.4	Discussion	104
4.4.1	Gecko presence/absence analysis.....	104
4.4.2	Waiheke treatment compared with control	107
4.4.3	Waiheke compared with Tawharanui and Shakespear.....	108
4.5	Conclusions.....	110

Chapter Five: Quantifying the effectiveness and gecko use of Cell Foam Retreats	112
5.1 Introduction	113
5.1.1 Alternative monitoring methods	114
5.1.2 Gecko use of monitoring objects.....	116
5.1.3 Research objectives.....	117
5.2 Methodology	118
5.2.1 Study area.....	118
5.2.2 Study species.....	118
5.2.3 Study design.....	119
5.3 Results.....	121
5.3.1 Forest gecko capture/recaptures using CFRs	121
5.3.2 Fortnightly vs. alternate day checks of CFRs	121
5.3.3 CFR vs. VES (vs. ACOs and Tracking tunnels).....	122
5.3.4 Monthly temperature and relative humidity.....	124
5.3.5 Temperature and relative humidity at the exact time of capture.....	124
5.3.6 Potential gecko sex biases.....	125
5.3.7 Invertebrates.....	126
5.4 Discussion	128
5.4.1 Forest gecko capture/recaptures using CFRs	128
5.4.2 Fortnightly vs. alternate day checks of CFRs	130
5.4.3 CFR vs. VES (vs. ACOs and Tracking tunnels).....	130
5.4.4 Temperature and relative humidity	133
5.4.5 Gecko sex biases	135
5.4.6 Invertebrates.....	135
5.5 Conclusions.....	136
 Chapter Six: Conclusions and further research.....	 138
6.1 Conclusions	139
6.2 Further research	143
 References	 144
Appendix (Species Lists)	158

TABLE OF TABLES

Table 3.1 The total combined tracking rates of rats and mice per year for the Waiheke treatment transects ‘Rabbit’ and ‘Peanut’	57
Table 3.2 Average and median densities (ha^{-1}) of geckos compared between the four study areas, where n = the number of transects per study area.	59
Table 3.3 The total number of species, invertebrates and proportion of most common species found in each study area.	69
Table 3.4 Average and medians of large invertebrates per transect: sheet-web spiders, giant centipedes, and tree weta compared between the four study areas. (Where 95% CI = Lower and Upper confidence intervals) n = 5 for all areas excluding Shakespear where n = 4.	71
Table 4.1 Results of habitat analyses with median, 95% Confidence Intervals (Lower-Upper), Mann-Whitney ‘U’ statistic, and significance values. (*Where SDI indicates Simpsons Diversity Index)	96
Table 4.2 The proportion of the 10 most common species along each transect in the treatment and control areas on Waiheke Island. (Where S1 = Kanuka (<i>Kunzea ericoides</i>), S2 = Hangehange (<i>Geniostoma linguistrifolium</i>), S3 = Red Mapau (<i>Myrsine australis</i>), S4 = Mamangi (<i>Coprosma arborea</i>), S5 = <i>C. rhamnoides</i> , S6 = Mahoe (<i>Melicactus ramiflorus</i>), S7 = Silver fern (<i>Cyathea dealbata</i>), S8 = Tree fern (<i>Dicksonia squarrosa</i>), S9 = Mingimingi (<i>C. propinqua</i>), S10 = Gorse (<i>Ulex europaeus</i>).	103
Table 5.1 Total time spent searching for each monitoring method on Waiheke Island, including; total geckos found, total species found, geckos per hour, other reptiles found, geckos per trap, and other reptiles per trap. *The four other reptile species found were thought to be moko skinks (<i>Oligosoma moco</i>) or copper skinks (<i>Cyclodena aenea</i>) but an accurate identification could not be made.	123
Table 5.2 The overall differences in the number of males and females found on Waiheke Island using both CFR and VES methods (total) and only the CFR method (CFR). Showing the average and medians with standard error and upper and lower 95% confidence intervals.	126

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 Rare ‘yellow morph’ Auckland green or elegant gecko (<i>Naultinus elegans</i>) Photo: Author	1
Figure 2.1 (from left) Mark, Fracess, & Author processing <i>Mokopirirakau granulatus</i> during VES nightspotting. Photo: D.v.Winkel	19
Figure 2.2 Male <i>M. granulatus</i> retreating into tree cavity. Photo: Author	20

Figure 2.3 Distribution of *M. granulatus* 21

Figure 2.4 Demonstrating male hemipenial sac of *N. elegans*. Photo: Lee Thoresen 22

Figure 2.5 Distribution of *N. elegans* 23

Figure 2.6 The first documented *Dactylocnemis pacificus* was found on Waiheke Island during March 2012, after this study had been completed. Photo: Author 24

Figure 2.7 Distribution of *D. pacificus* 25

Figure 2.8 Map of New Zealand and the Hauraki Gulf, showing the three study areas, Waiheke Island (lowest square), Shakespear (middle) and Tawharanui (top). Photos: Google Earth. 26

Figure 2.9 Maps of Waiheke showing the area of Whakanewha Regional Park and the adjacent control study areas, including all 10 CFR (labeled IA to IE and OA to OE) and six VES transects. Photo: Google Earth. 28

Figure 2.10 Map of Tawharanui, showing all five CFR transects and the predator-proof fence border. Photo: Google Earth. 30

Figure 2.11 Map of Shakespear Regional Park, showing all four CFR transects the predator-proof fence and the border with the New Zealand Defence Force. Photo: Google Earth 32

Figure 2.12 Example of CFR nailed to kanuka (left) Author checking a CFR attached to small manuka (right). Photos: Su Sinclair (left), Lee Thoresen (right). 34

Figure 2.13 An example of one of the double stacked Onduline ACOs used during this study. Photo: Author. 37

Figure 3.1 Male (right) and female (left) forest geckos found under a CFR, one of many pairs found during this study 45

Figure 3.2 An example of two dorsal identification photographs of two mature male forest geckos (gecko OA16, and gecko ID12). Note the distinct difference in the lower back markings, especially around the tail base, the gecko on the left also shows an autotomised re-grown tail. Photos: Author 54

Figure 3.3 The percentage of tracking tunnel transects tracked by predators over four transects in the control areas (no pest control), and two transects in the treatment area (pest control). ‘Gecko tunnels’ denote the tracking tunnels that were set up within the treatment area to attempt to track geckos, a mustelid and a rat were found using these tunnels. 57

Figure 3.4 Gecko density (ha^{-1}) indices over every transect in the four study sites 58

Figure 3.5 Total forest gecko captures per size category in areas of treatment (pest control) and control (no pest control) on Waiheke Island. 60

Figure 3.6 Proportion of forest geckos caught in each size category (mm) in relation to total catch in treatment and control areas on Waiheke Island. 60

Figure 3.7 Box-plots comparing the body condition of males and females between the control and treatment areas on Waiheke Island. (Where n = the number of geckos captured per sex, per area).	61
Figure 3.8 Box-plots comparing the body condition index between the size classes of 40-60 mm, 61-75 mm, 76-85 mm, and 86-95 mm in areas of control compared with treatment on Waiheke Island. (Where n = number of geckos captured per size class, per area).	62
Figure 3.9 Box-plots comparing the body-tail condition index of males and females between the areas of control (no pest control) and treatment (pest control) on Waiheke Island. (Where n = the number of geckos captured per sex, per area).	63
Figure 3.10 Box-plots comparing the body-tail condition index between the size classes of 40-60 mm, 61-75 mm, 76-85 mm, and 86-95 mm in areas of control compared with treatment on Waiheke Island. (Where n = the number of geckos captured per size, class per area).	64
Figure 3.11 Male <i>M. granulatus</i> gecko, found under CFR OA31 showing two scars on upper back in the shoulder region. No other visible scars were observed on this gecko, also the tail has not been autotomised.	66
Figure 3.12 Male <i>M. granulatus</i> gecko, found under CFR OA32, over eight scars were observed on the lower back and head region. The tail has been autotomised and re-grown at least once.	67
Figure 3.13 Male <i>M. granulatus</i> , found under CFR OA09 showing a small scar on the upper labial and canthal scales. There were no other visible scars found on this gecko, and no evidence of tail loss.	68
Figure 3.14 Box-plots comparing the median number of invertebrates per transect over the four study areas, (where n = number of transects).	70
Figure 4.1 <i>M. granulatus</i> on <i>Coprosma</i> sp. Photo: Author	88
Figure 4.2 Box-plots showing the Simpsons diversity index from each of the four study areas. n = Shakespear = 80, Tawharanui = 200, Waiheke control = 200, Waiheke treatment = 199. (Where n = the number of CFR areas analysed per study area)	97
Figure 4.3 Box-plots showing the average number of trees per area around each CFR (19.63m ²), per study area. (Where n = the number of CFR areas per study area; Waiheke control = 200, treatment = 199, Tawharanui = 200, Shakespear = 80).	98
Figure 4.4 Box-plots showing the tree height (m) over each of the four study sites. (Where n = the number of CFR sites per study area: Shakespear n = 80, Tawharanui = 200, Waiheke control = 200, Waiheke treatment = 199).	99
Figure 4.5 Box-plots showing the Simpsons diversity index over all 10 transects in the treatment and control areas on Waiheke Island. (Where 'I' signifies treatment (Inside pest control), and 'O' signifies control (Outside pest control)). Where n = 40 CFRs for each transect excluding IB where n = 39.	100

Figure 4.6 Box-plots showing the average forest density (measured as trees per 19.63m ²) over the 10 transects in the treatment and control areas of Waiheke Island. (Where I = Inside regional park, denoting treatment and O = outside, denoting control). Where $n = 40$ CFRs for each transect excluding IB where $n = 39$	101
Figure 4.7 Box-plots showing the tree height (m) over all 10 transects in the treatment and control areas on Waiheke Island. (Where ‘I’ signifies treatment (Inside pest control), and ‘O’ signifies control (Outside pest control)). Where $n = 40$ CFRs for each transect excluding IB where $n = 39$	102
Figure 5.1 Male-female pair of forest geckos found under a single CFR. Photo: Author	112
Figure 5.2 Gecko captures and recaptures using CFRs, also showing the cumulative catch throughout the three study periods: six checks during March, four checks between May-August, and six checks between September-November.	121
Figure 5.3 Box-plot comparing the amount of geckos captured for each monitoring method. (Where $n =$ the number of checks per method).	122
Figure 5.4 Box-plot showing the geckos captured per hour for the CFR and VES monitoring methods over each study site and as an overall total. (Where $n =$ the number of checks per method, per study area).	124
Figure 5.5 The temperature at the exact time of capture correlated with the numbers of geckos captured between May – November.	125
Figure 5.6 The relative humidity at the exact time of capture compared with the numbers of geckos caught between May – November.	125
Figure 5.7 Box-plot showing The median number of invertebrates under the gecko occupied CFRs (presence) compared with the non-occupied CFRs (Absence). (Where $n =$ the number of CFRs per area, where n presence = 49, absence = 190).	127
Figure 6.1 Male <i>N elegans</i> Auckland green or elegant gecko, showing distinctive cream markings outlined in black. Photo: Lee Thoresen	138