

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.

The ecosystem effects of the biocontrol of  
heather (*Calluna vulgaris*) with the heather  
beetle (*Lochmaea suturalis*).

**Andrew Blayney**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science in Zoology  
At Massey University,  
Palmerston North, New Zealand.

2012



# Abstract

---

The biological control of invasive plants has the ability to affect sustainable and targeted control over large areas. Such biological control programs are an important tool in the control of invasive plants in conservation areas. The ultimate aim for these programs is to provide a net ecosystem benefit via the reduction of invasive plant densities. However, whether this aim is fulfilled is rarely evaluated. Invasive plant control results in large scale disturbance to ecosystems by removing the novel but often utilised habitat and resources provided by the invasive plant. Biological control is also complicated by having a novel organism introduced into the ecosystem with potential flow on effects for species and trophic level interactions.

This research evaluated the ecosystem impact of the heather (*Calluna vulgaris*) biological control program using the heather beetle (*Lochmaea suturalis*) on the native tussock grassland in the central North Island of New Zealand. This was achieved by comparing invertebrate communities in a small scale experiment and over three large heather beetle outbreak sites. This work provides an extension to Keesing's (1995) research on the effects of heather invasion on communities.

Heather provides a novel and unsuitable food source to many native phytophagous insects, may disrupt host finding behaviours of these insects, and alter habitat structure and complexity affecting Araneae abundance. Changes in invertebrate community composition following control were related to the removal of these effects. This outcome was consistent with predictions from Keesing (1995) and in both small and large scale studies. Heather beetle presence was found to have a positive effect on Araneae and Collembola abundance.

Heather control also had a positive for the common skink (*Oligosoma nigriplantare polychroma*) Overall the biological control of heather caused invertebrate communities to revert back to a composition resembling more closely those found in non-invaded habitats. This suggests that the biological control of heather provides a net positive conservation benefit to native tussock grasslands.

# Acknowledgements

---

This thesis could not have happened without the continued support, advice, feedback, and time freely given from Paul Peterson (Landcare Research) and Dr. Russell Death (my supervisor).

I would also like to thank Jessica Costal for greatly improving my work by her assistance in invertebrate identification, Jessica Scrimgeour (Department of Conservation) for her advice and consultation regarding skink captures, Ian Stringer (Department of Conservation) for the loan of the invertebrate traps, Simon Fowler & Quentin Paynter (Landcare Research) for useful comments and ideas, and Paul Barret, Cleland Wallace, and Shaun Nielson for technical support. Aerial photos were supplied by Lawrie Cairns - Aerial Photography & Land Information.

I would also like to thank everyone in the Ecology department of Massey University, Palmerston North as they have provided friendship and support throughout my time there.

As well as a not inconsiderable amount of staff time, Landcare Research provided funding which made this research possible and I am grateful for their support. The New Zealand Defence Force and the Department of Conservation gave permission for access and research to be undertaken on the land they administer.

I would like to thank my family for their continued support, love, and providing a refuge from my thesis when needed.

Thank you to the heather beetle, our little minion, for munching your way through 100s of hectares of heather despite the cold and fairly average grub.

Finally but certainly not the least I extend my greatest thanks and appreciation to my partner Moniqua Nelson-Tunley who read my thesis more than is healthy for any one being. She supported me through everything, provided advice, put up with me complaining, listened to the incoherent rambling of a not quite fully formed idea, and most of all basically put up with me for the last couple of years.

# Thesis outline

---

This thesis is broken up into five chapters; general introduction, three research chapters written as individual stand-alone publications, and a general summary & recommendations.

As methods and study sites are often similar between chapters there is overlap and repetition of some aspects of introduction and results in chapters two and three and repetition of methodology throughout all chapters to maintain the stand-alone nature of the research chapters.

# Contents

---

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b><u>Abstract</u></b>  | <b>i</b>    |
| <b><u>Acknowledgements</u></b>  | <b>ii</b>   |
| <b><u>Thesis outline</u></b>  | <b>iii</b>  |
| <b><u>Contents</u></b>  | <b>iv</b>   |
| <b><u>List of figures</u></b>   | <b>viii</b> |
| <b><u>List of tables</u></b>  | <b>xii</b>  |
| <b><u>General Introduction</u></b>  | <b>2</b>    |
| <b><u>Invasive plant control restores invertebrate community composition.</u></b> | <b>5</b>    |
| <b><u>Abstract</u></b>  | <b>5</b>    |
| <b><u>Introduction</u></b>  | <b>6</b>    |
| <i>Study area</i>   | <b>8</b>    |
| <b><u>Method</u></b>  | <b>9</b>    |
| <i>Herbicide and insecticide trial plots</i>                                      | <b>9</b>    |
| <i>Trap area vegetation</i>   | <b>11</b>   |
| <i>Sample processing</i>  | <b>11</b>   |
| <i>Data Analysis</i>  | <b>12</b>   |
| <b><u>Results</u></b>   | <b>12</b>   |
| <i>Pitfall assemblages</i>  | <b>12</b>   |
| <i>Top flight assemblages</i>   | <b>18</b>   |
| <i>Plot vegetation composition</i>  | <b>21</b>   |
| <b><u>Discussion</u></b>  | <b>23</b>   |
| <i>The effect of insecticide application on invertebrate communities.</i>         | <b>24</b>   |

---

Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <i>The effect of heather control on invertebrate communities.</i>  | 26        |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  | <b>28</b> |
| <b><u>Invasive plants reduce endemic lizard abundance: effects and implications of weed control.</u></b> | <b>31</b> |
| <b>Abstract</b>  | <b>31</b> |
| <b>Introduction</b>  | <b>32</b> |
| <i>Species overview</i>  | 33        |
| <i>Study area</i>  | 34        |
| <b>Method</b>  | <b>35</b> |
| <i>Herbicide and insecticide trial</i>   | 35        |
| <i>Trap area vegetation</i>  | 37        |
| <i>Sample processing</i>   | 38        |
| <i>Data Analysis</i>   | 38        |
| <b>Results</b>   | <b>39</b> |
| <i>Skink captures</i>  | 39        |
| <i>Plot vegetation composition</i>   | 40        |
| <i>Invertebrate prey community</i>   | 42        |
| <b>Discussion</b>  | <b>44</b> |
| <i>Thermoregulation</i>  | 45        |
| <i>Foraging efficiency</i>   | 46        |
| <i>Predator avoidance</i>  | 47        |
| <i>Implications</i>  | 48        |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  | <b>49</b> |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b><u>The direct and indirect effects of the biocontrol of heather (<i>Calluna vulgaris</i>) with the heather beetle (<i>Lochmaea suturalis</i>) on invertebrate communities</u></b> | <b>51</b> |
| <b>Abstract</b>  | <b>51</b> |
| <b>Introduction</b>  | <b>52</b> |
| <i>Study areas</i>   | 53        |
| <b>Methods</b>   | <b>55</b> |
| <i>Invertebrate sample processing</i>  | 58        |
| <i>Trap area descriptions</i>  | 58        |
| <i>Data analysis</i>   | 59        |
| <b>Results</b>   | <b>60</b> |
| <i>Site one</i>  | 60        |
| <i>Site two</i>  | 63        |
| <i>Site three</i>  | 69        |
| <i>All sites combined</i>  | 75        |
| <b>Discussion</b>  | <b>81</b> |
| <i>The effect of heather control on invertebrate communities</i>   | 81        |
| <i>The effect of heather control on vegetation composition</i>   | 83        |
| <i>The indirect effect of the heather beetle on invertebrate communities</i>   | 83        |
| <b>Conclusion</b>  | <b>84</b> |
| <b><u>General Summary &amp; Recommendations</u></b>  | <b>87</b> |
| <b>General summary</b>   | <b>87</b> |
| <i>The effect of heather control</i>   | 87        |
| <i>The effect of the heather beetle on non-plant communities</i>   | 88        |
| <b>Recommendations</b>   | <b>89</b> |



# List of figures

---

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| 1.0 | Mount Ruapehu at sunset on the Central Plateau.  | 1  |
| 2.0 | Heather flowers on the Central Plateau.  | 4  |
| 2.1 | Aerial photo of study site in the central North Island.  | 9  |
| 2.2 | Modified flight-intercept-pitfall trap design used for invertebrate trapping at the WMTA site.   | 11 |
| 2.3 | Number of individual invertebrates collected in the pitfall component of FIP traps ( $\pm 1$ SE) in the four experimental treatment regimes at Waiouru 2010/2011.                                  | 13 |
| 2.4 | Morphospecies richness & rarefied species richness of invertebrates collected in the pitfall component of FIP traps ( $\pm 1$ SE) in the four experimental treatment regimes at Waiouru 2010/2011. | 14 |
| 2.5 | NMDS ordination plot of invertebrate data sorted to morphospecies collected in the pitfall component of FIP traps in the four experimental treatment regimes at Waiouru 2010/2011.                 | 15 |
| 2.6 | NMDS ordination plot of invertebrate data sorted to order collected in the pitfall component of FIP traps ( $\pm 1$ SE) in the four experimental treatment regimes at Waiouru 2010/2011.           | 16 |
| 2.7 | Number of individual invertebrates collected in the flight intercept component of FIP traps ( $\pm 1$ SE) in the four experimental treatment regimes at Waiouru 2010/2011.                         | 19 |
| 2.8 | Morphospecies richness & rarefied species richness of invertebrates collected  | 19 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| in the flight intercept component of FIP traps in the four experimental treatment regimes at Waipoua 2010/2011.  |    |
| 2.9 NMDS ordination plot of invertebrate data sorted to morphospecies for the top flight intercept component of the FIP traps in the four experimental treatment regimes at Waipoua 2010/2011. | 20 |
| 2.10 NMDS plot of vegetation composition of all plots from the herbicide/insecticide trial in Tongariro 2010/2011.   | 21 |
| 2.11 Top down view of herbicide/insecticide trial plots in Tongariro 2010/2011 with the four different treatment regimes.  | 22 |
| 3.0 Common skink intrigued by the reflections off a camera lens.   | 30 |
| 3.1 Common skink found near the study area showing the distinctively striped body pattern.   | 34 |
| 3.2 Aerial photo of the WMTA study site.   | 35 |
| 3.3 Modified flight-intercept-pitfall trap design used for invertebrate trapping at the WMTA site.   | 37 |
| 3.4 Total skink captures ( $\pm 1$ SE) in each treatment type during sampling of herbicide-insecticide trial plots from 3 <sup>rd</sup> February to 3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2011.                | 39 |
| 3.5 NMDS plot of vegetation composition of all plots from the herbicide/insecticide trial in Tongariro 2010/2011.  | 40 |
| 3.6 Top down view of herbicide/insecticide trial plots in Tongariro 2010/2011 with the four different treatment regimes.   | 41 |
| 3.7 Bar graph showing both mean invertebrate prey abundance & richness for plots   | 43 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| over the four treatment types ( $\pm 1$ SE) for trap captures in the herbicide/insecticide trial from 3 <sup>rd</sup> February to 3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2011.            |    |
| 3.8 NMDS plot of invertebrate prey community data from FIP traps in herbicide/insecticide trial plots from 3 <sup>rd</sup> February to 3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2011.       | 44 |
| 4.0 Two heather beetles in the Tongariro National Park.  | 50 |
| 4.1 Aerial photo of the WMTA study sites in the central North Island of New Zealand, heather beetle release points indicated by stars.                                   | 54 |
| 4.2 Aerial photo of Erua Conservation Area site in the central North Island of New Zealand (site 3).   | 54 |
| 4.3 Modified flight-intercept-pitfall trap design used for invertebrate trapping at Tongariro.   | 56 |
| 4.4 Pitfall element of trap design used for invertebrate trapping at Tongariro with mesh used in the second trapping period to attempt to prevent common skink captures. | 58 |
| 4.5 NMDS ordination plots of invertebrate data collected during the austral & summer 2010-2011 at site one in the WMTA, central North Island.                            | 61 |
| 4.6  |    |
| 4.7 NMDS ordination plot of vegetation data collected during the austral summer 2010-2011 at site one in the WMTA, central North Island.                                 | 62 |
| 4.8 NMDS ordination plots of invertebrate data from site two collected during the & austral summer 2010-2011 at site two in the WMTA, central North Island.              | 64 |
| 4.9  |    |
| 4.10 NMDS ordination plot of vegetation data from site two collected during the  | 68 |

austral summer 2010-2011 at site two in the WMTA, central North Island.

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| 4.11 | NMDS ordination plots of invertebrate data from site three collected during the<br>& austral summer 2010-2011 at site three in the Erua conservation area, central<br>4.12 North Island. | 70 |
| 4.13 | NMDS ordination plot of vegetation data collected during the austral summer<br>2010-2011 at site three in the Erua conservation area, central North Island.                              | 74 |
| 4.14 | NMDS ordination plots of invertebrate data from all sites collected during the<br>& austral summer 2010-2011 from all sites in the central North Island.                                 | 76 |
| 4.15 |  |    |
| 4.16 | NMDS ordination plot of vegetation data collected during the austral summer<br>2010-2011 from all sites in the central North Island. Numbers above plots<br>indicate site number.        | 80 |
| 5.0  | Stream flowing from the slopes of Mount Ruapehu.   | 86 |

# List of tables

---

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 2.1 | Treatment timeline for herbicide and insecticide applications, and invertebrate trapping, at the WMTA site between 2007 and 2011.   | 10 |
| 2.2 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between no treatment regime and other treatment regimes.   | 17 |
| 2.3 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between plots treated with or without insecticide treatment.   | 17 |
| 2.4 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between plots treated with insecticide only and those treated with herbicide + insecticide.  | 18 |
| 3.1 | Treatment timeline for insecticide/herbicide trial plots between 2007 and 2010.   | 36 |
| 4.1 | Invertebrate trapping transects details and timeline, Tongariro 2010-2011 (austral summer).   | 37 |
| 4.2 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of plant species between characterised vegetation zones reported against the regenerating native zone at site one with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.       | 63 |
| 4.3 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between characterised vegetation zones reported against the regenerating native zone at site two with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution. | 66 |
| 4.4 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss   | 66 |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
|      | dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites with or without live heather at site two with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.  |    |
| 4.5  | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites with or without heather beetle catches at site two with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.                              | 67 |
| 4.6  | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites that caught at least 100 heather beetles and those that caught less at site two with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution. | 67 |
| 4.7  | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of plant species between characterised vegetation zones reported against the regenerating native zone at site two with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.         | 69 |
| 4.8  | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between characterised vegetation zones reported against the regenerating native zone at site three with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.  | 72 |
| 4.9  | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites with or without live heather at site three with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.                                      | 73 |
| 4.10 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites with or without heather beetle catches at site three with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.                            | 73 |
| 4.11 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of plant species between characterised   | 75 |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
|      | vegetation zones reported against the regenerating native zone at site three with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.  |    |
| 4.12 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between characterised vegetation zones reported against the regenerating native zone using combined data with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.   | 78 |
| 4.13 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites with or without live heather using combined data with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.  | 78 |
| 4.14 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites with or without heather beetle catches using combined data with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.                              | 79 |
| 4.15 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of invertebrate orders between trap sites that caught at least 500 heather beetles and those that caught less using combined data with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution. | 79 |
| 4.16 | Average abundance and percentage contribution to the Bray-Curtiss dissimilarity (SIMPER analysis) of plant species between characterised vegetation zones reported against the regenerating native zone using combined data with a cut off of 90% cumulative contribution.         | 81 |