

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.

Population fragmentation in the small-scaled
skink (*Oligosoma microlepis*): the
consequences of human landscape
transformation on a habitat specialist's
distribution, morphology, and genetics.

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

Master of Science

In

Conservation Biology

At Massey University, Manawatu, New Zealand.

Moniqua Nelson-Tunley

2012

Abstract

The endemic small-scaled skink (*Oligosoma microlepis*) is restricted to the central North Island of New Zealand. Strong preference for exposed rock piles, a relatively rare habitat, has created a fragmented distribution and restricted subpopulation sizes. The Department of Conservation lists the species as in serious decline, with IUCN listing it as vulnerable. At the stronghold of this species in the southern part of its range, subpopulations exist on small rock piles separated by up to 11 km of pastureland. Scattered northern subpopulations are separated by more than 19 km. These distances may act as dispersal barriers, as might the lack of refugia between subpopulations on pastureland. Lack of migration between subpopulations could reduce genetic diversity and increase inbreeding. Reduced genetic diversity could decrease resistance to disease, parasitism and environmental change, whereas inbreeding may reduce fertility, lifespan and juvenile survival.

This thesis used a combination of survey data, morphological measurements and population genetics to investigate potential causes and consequences of population fragmentation on the small-scaled skink, with the aim of providing information to guide the long-term conservation of this species.

A survey of known small-scaled skink subpopulations was conducted to determine if the species is in decline. In addition, potential small-scaled skink habitat was searched, including previously surveyed sites. Evidence of decline was inconclusive, with three subpopulations appearing to be in decline and discovery of five new subpopulations.

Genetic (16S mitochondria and microsatellites) and morphological analysis was used to examine subpopulation differences in relation to species distribution, including investigating inbreeding within subpopulations. Relatedness between subpopulations was consistent with isolation by distance, indicating that small-scaled skink dispersal is limited by distance, but not significantly limited by pasture between subpopulations. Inbreeding was not detected within any subpopulation.

The main findings of this thesis were that evidence of species decline was inconclusive, with possible species expansion and undetected subpopulations. Dispersal was limited by dispersal distance but not by pasture and no subpopulation was subject to significant inbreeding. Current research indicates that pasture does not negatively affect the species, and may be beneficial in the formation and maintenance of habitat.

Acknowledgements

If it takes a village to raise a child, then it takes a scientific community to raise a thesis. I owe thanks to all my friends and lecturers in the Ecology Department at Massey University for their advice, camaraderie and the occasional welcome distraction. Thanks to my supervisors Doug Armstrong, Mary Morgan-Richards and Steve Trewick for their involvement in every step of the process. Thanks to Eddy Dowle and Marianna Bulgarella for helping me through the genetics work, and the other Phoenix members for their insights and advice.

I would like to acknowledge the organisations that have provided the funding that made this project possible: the Department of Conservation, Julie Alley bursary, Project Tongariro (Tongariro Natural History Society), SRARNZ, and Ecogecko consultants. Thank you to Jessica Scrimgeour from the Department of Conservation, who provided advice and liaison during the early stages of research. Thank you to the landowners that granted me access and generously provided accommodation during my fieldwork, as well as Dennis Keall for allowing sampling of the captive subpopulation.

Thank you to my family for encouraging my love of animals and the New Zealand wilderness, and for providing refuge during semester breaks.

Thank you to the small-scaled skinks that entertained us with their behaviours and interactions during sampling; sorry for the harassment.

Most of all, thank you to my partner Andrew Blayney. I cannot find the words to express my gratitude for his constant support, and hope that a lifetime supply of love and biscuits will suffice.

Contents

| | |
|--|------------|
| Abstract | i |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Contents | iv |
| List of figures | vii |
| List of tables | x |
| General introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 The effects of habitat fragmentation on dispersal and gene flow | 3 |
| All matrices are not equal | 3 |
| The consequences of reduced genetic diversity | 3 |
| Innate measures of avoiding inbreeding and inbreeding depression | 4 |
| 1.2 The history of habitat transformation in New Zealand | 4 |
| Pre human habitat transformations | 5 |
| Anthropogenic habitat transformation | 5 |
| 1.3 The small-scaled skink | 7 |
| Species description | 7 |
| Habitat preferences | 8 |
| Distribution | 9 |
| Conservation status | 14 |
| 1.4 Thesis aims and structure | 15 |
| Aims | 15 |
| Thesis structure | 16 |
| Site survey | 19 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 20 |

| | | |
|------------|------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2.2 | Methods | 22 |
| | Site descriptions | 22 |
| | Skink detection and identification | 23 |
| 2.3 | Results | 23 |
| 2.4 | Discussion | 29 |
| | Morphological variation | 33 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 34 |
| 3.2 | Methods | 36 |
| | Catching and sampling procedure | 36 |
| | Data analysis | 37 |
| 3.3 | Results | 39 |
| | Morphological variation | 39 |
| | Fluctuating asymmetry | 41 |
| | Toe and tail loss | 42 |
| | Parasitism | 43 |
| | Sex ratio | 45 |
| 3.4 | Discussion | 45 |
| | Morphological variation | 45 |
| | Fluctuating asymmetry | 47 |
| | Captive versus wild variation | 47 |
| | Tail and toe loss | 48 |
| | Parasitism | 49 |
| | Sex ratio | 49 |
| | Conclusions | 50 |
| | Population genetics | 51 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 52 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Genetics overview | 52 |
| The small-scaled skink | 52 |
| Aims | 54 |
| 4.2 Materials & Methods | 55 |
| DNA extraction, amplification, sequencing and genotyping | 55 |
| 4.3 Results | 57 |
| mtDNA | 57 |
| Microsatellites | 65 |
| 4.4 Discussion | 73 |
| Isolation by distance | 73 |
| Gene flow across pasture | 74 |
| Potential inbreeding | 75 |
| Post-eruption colonisation | 76 |
| Historical abundance | 77 |
| Origin and conservation value of the captive population | 78 |
| Genetic diversity, scale asymmetry and parasitism | 79 |
| Summary | 79 |
| Summary and recommendations | 81 |
| 5.1 Summary | 82 |
| 5.2 Recommendations | 88 |
| References | 91 |
| Appendices | 103 |
| Appendix 1 | 103 |
| Appendix 2 | 108 |
| Appendix 3 | 112 |
| Appendix 4 | 117 |

List of figures

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1.0 | Typical basking behaviour of small-scaled skinks. | 1 |
| 1.1 | A small-scaled skink showing the tear-drop pattern and relatively small scales that are distinguishing features for this species. | 8 |
| 1.2 | The distribution of small-scaled skinks. | 10 |
| 1.3 | The distribution of the speckled skink (<i>O. infrapunctatum</i>) (left) and the striped skink (<i>O. striatum</i>) (right). | 11 |
| 1.4 | Topographical map (LINZ) showing the known distribution of small-scaled skinks. Sites marked with black dots were surveyed for this research whereas sites marked with red (Ngamatea station, Motutaiko Island and one Otupae site) were not. | 12 |
| 1.5 | Photograph of the 186 AD Taupo eruption ignimbrite layer in the upper Ngaruroro Valley ca. 2 km downstream (south) of the Boyds small-scaled skink subpopulation, which resides on habitat formed from riverine erosion of this layer. | 14 |
| 2.0 | Finding the skink is tricky; catching them is an even greater challenge. | 19 |
| 2.1 | Poronui small-scaled skink site in December 2009 (top) and January 2011 (bottom). | 27 |
| 3.0 | Photographs of the heads of several small-scaled skinks, showing variation in the distinctive tear-drop pattern that has previously been used for individual identification. | 33 |
| 3.1 | Topographical map (LINZ) of the small-scaled skink distribution, showing the designated groupings used for analysis. | 38 |
| 3.2 | Average SVL of the assigned groups (Springvale versus non- | 40 |

Springvale and southern versus northern) including standard errors.

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 3.3 | Relationship between SVL and weight for all skinks, grouped by subpopulation. | 40 |
| 3.4 | Head scale variation within small-scaled skinks. a; normal scale morphology, b; abnormal scale morphology caused by scaring, c; heavily ridged but otherwise normal morphology, d; abnormal scale morphology of unknown cause (extra 2 supra-orbital scales on right side). | 42 |
| 3.5 | Four mites found on an <i>O. microlepis</i> skink. | 44 |
| 3.6 | Parasites per (small-scaled) skink compared to lizard species present at site, with error bars indicating standard error. | 45 |
| 3.7 | Direct visual comparison between the heaviest captive skink (left) and the heaviest wild skink (right). | 48 |
| 4.0 | A small-scaled skink poised to strike a fly. | 51 |
| 4.1 | Minimum spanning network of mtDNA haplotypes based on 760 BP of 16S from small-scaled skinks. | 61 |
| 4.2 | Distribution and frequency of 16S haplotypes amongst small-scaled skink subpopulations. | 62 |
| 4.3 | Positive correlation between geographical distance (log km) and genetic distance (log ϕ_{ST}) in the small scaled skink (mantel test $P = 0.0001$). | 65 |
| 4.4 | Diagram of the optimal ($K=2$) population structure of small-scaled skinks using four polymorphic nuclear loci, which indicated there were two populations of small-scaled skink within the samples. | 66 |
| 4.5 | Distribution and frequency of alleles at the microsatellite locus Oligr20 among small-scaled skink subpopulations. | 67 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 4.6 | Distribution and frequency of alleles at the microsatellite locus Oligr19 among small-scaled skink subpopulations. | 68 |
| 4.7 | Distribution and frequency of alleles at the microsatellite locus Oligr14 among small-scaled skink subpopulations. | 69 |
| 4.8 | Distribution and frequency of alleles at the microsatellite locus Oligr6 among small-scaled skink subpopulations. | 70 |
| 4.9 | Mantel test for matrix correlation between log (genetic distance (F_{ST})) and log (distance) using combined microsatellite loci. | 73 |
| 5.0 | A small-scaled skink basking on the upper edge of a ten metre cliff. | 81 |
| 6.1 | The larger rock pile slope at Black hill. | 103 |
| 6.2 | Springvale 6, showing the prominent greywacke outcrop on the left of the image. | 104 |
| 6.3 | Springvale 7 viewed facing north. | 105 |
| 6.4 | One of the rock pile slopes at Wakemans 2, complete with funnel traps set. A photo of the entire site was not possible due to the steep and forested terrain. | 106 |
| 6.5 | Ohinewairua 2. | 107 |

List of tables

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 2.1 | All known small-scaled skink sites, showing which sites were surveyed by whom including the most recent survey. | 24 |
| 2.2 | Aspect and altitude of surveyed sites, including sites where small-scaled skinks were not detected but had previously been recorded. | 28 |
| 2.3 | Rock type, vegetation type and other lizard species recorded at all sites. | 29 |
| 3.1 | Average snout-vent length, weight and tail width (mm) of wild and captive small-scaled skinks, including standard errors. | 41 |
| 3.2 | Average SVL (including standard error) of small-scaled skinks that have or have not lost tail and toe(s). | 43 |
| 4.1 | Oligonucleotide primers used in this study of variation at five genetic loci in the small scaled skink, (<i>Oligosoma microlepis</i>). | 56 |
| 4.2 | 16S haplotypes of small-scaled skinks, showing the nucleotide substitutions which differ from the most common haplotype (A). | 58 |
| 4.3 | The number of alleles (microsatellite loci) or haplotypes (mtDNA) identified at each subpopulation of small-scaled skinks. | 59 |
| 4.4 | Pairwise geographical distance (km) between subpopulations of <i>O. microlepis</i> . | 60 |
| 4.5 | 16S nucleotide diversity of subpopulation of <i>O. microlepis</i> . | 63 |
| 4.6 | Pairwise ϕ_{ST} computed using mitochondrial haplotype frequencies. | 64 |
| 4.7 | Estimates of population pairwise F_{ST} values based on four microsatellite loci from 13 small-scaled skink subpopulations. | 71 |
| 4.8 | F_{IS} calculated per loci and per site. | 72 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| 6.1 | Small-scaled skink raw morphological data. | 108 |
| 6.2 | Small-scaled skink sequence lengths for microsatellite loci and 16S mitochondrial haplotype. | 112 |
| 6.3 | Raw sequence data for <i>O. microlepis</i> haplotypes | 117 |

