

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.

**Anchoring techniques for translocated Duvaucel's geckos  
(*Hoplodactylus duvaucelii*), and the use of cell-foam retreats by  
lizards and invertebrates**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science in Conservation Biology  
Massey University, Albany,  
New Zealand.

Alaine Holdom

2015





*"You cannot get through a single day without having an impact on the world around you. What you do makes a difference, and you have to decide what kind of difference you want to make."*

*Jane Goodall*

## Abstract

Conservation management often requires translocations to isolated habitats, and determining the success of such events is reliant on the use of effective post-translocation monitoring (PTM) techniques. Many reptile populations are already difficult to monitor, and post-release dispersal often increases this difficulty. Effective monitoring techniques for nocturnal, semi-arboreal, cryptic lizards are consequently still lacking. Furthermore, very little research has been conducted on the use of anchoring techniques for improving the PTM of lizards by reducing post-release dispersal behaviour. In early 2013, two populations of Duvaucel's geckos (*Hoplodactylus duvaucelii*) were translocated to two offshore islands. This provided an excellent opportunity to investigate several aspects relating to the improvement of PTM techniques for this species. I investigated whether two anchoring techniques, i.e. temporary food provision and release into cell-foam retreats (CFRs), can reduce post-release dispersal and encourage CFR usage. Further, I assessed the usefulness of CFRs for the PTM of *H. duvaucelii*. Additionally, I investigated the usage of CFRs for a range of other lizard species and invertebrates. My research provided evidence that both anchoring techniques can improve the use of CFRs by *H. duvaucelii* in the short term. However, anchoring effects were not maintained beyond two months after release. While anchoring treatments may have delayed post-release dispersal behaviour, they did not affect post-release dispersal distances. The study results suggest that CFRs can be a useful PTM tool for *H. duvaucelii*, particularly shortly after translocation, and also aid in the detection of young. In addition, I demonstrated that CFRs can detect a variety of other lizard and invertebrate species. In conclusion, this research provides valuable information for the improvement of monitoring techniques for cryptic, semi-arboreal lizards, also providing evidence that CFRs can be useful tool for monitoring a range of lizards and invertebrates.

## Acknowledgements

There are many people I want and need to thank for getting me through this life changing experience. First and foremost, I want to say a massive thank-you to my main supervisor, Manuela Barry. Firstly, thank-you for providing me with the opportunity to conduct this amazing research on such a beautiful species. Thank-you also for all of your assistance and advice, and most of all for being so passionate, positive, and generally inspirational throughout both the research and write-up phase. Without your constant enthusiasm I don't know whether I would have had the motivation to make it through the analysis and write up of my thesis. I would also like to thank my second supervisor Dianne Brunton, who has also contributed valuable advice throughout the process.

I am also very thankful for my fellow Duvie's crazy masters student, Vivienne Glenday. I am very grateful for all of your help with my side of the Duvie's research, and for always being there to discuss the various things I needed advice on. The time spent in the field was certainly made a lot more enjoyable with your company, and it was always nice to know that someone else was suffering as much as I was!

A huge thank-you to the two Motuora Island rangers (at the time), Sian and Toby. You guys were always so enthusiastic about the geckos, and always willing to go out of your way to help with the research. I would especially like to thank you for making numerous volunteer trips to the mainland to pick me up/drop me off on your teeny boat, especially in the 'not-so-ideal' weather that was usually accompanying me. I would also like to thank the Tiritiri Matangi Island rangers, Dave and Jason, for being equally as interested and encouraging, and for helping out whenever possible.

There are also many individual volunteers I would like to thank for giving up their time to spend with the geckos (as I know it wasn't to spend time with me!). A special thank-you to Sam Bourke, Regan Dear, and Ash Jones, who all came out for entire weeks to help me with the monitoring. There are so many others who gave up their days to come out to the Islands, so I won't attempt to name you all (you know who you are!).

To the members of the community groups the Supporters of Tiritiri Matangi Island, and the Motuora Restoration Society, I would like to thank-you for the interest and support you had for the research. Without your support I would not have had the opportunity to do this amazing research. Thank-you also for providing me with many of the volunteers I had throughout my field work.

Last but not least I would like to thank my friends, family, and colleagues. To my fellow masters students, thank-you for suffering along with me and providing someone else who understood my pain. Thank you to my friends and family who every time upon seeing me asked how my writing was going, providing me with constant nagging to get the thing done! I'm sure that without this 'support' I would not have had the motivation to continue. Thank-you to the gang at 'Beach' (including all the random customers) who fully supported me in my endeavours, constantly nagged me about progress, and allowed me to spend hours in the place writing away at my computer with coffee in hand. A special thank-you to all those friends and colleagues who read my various drafts, especially Luis Ortiz Catedral, Aaron Harmer, Tom Dixon, and Rebecca Streith. You guys gave me advice in the area I struggled with the most, and I really appreciate the time you took to help me out.

Financial support for this study was provided by Massey University (Massey University Masterate Scholarship and translocation project funding). The opportunity for this study was presented through a translocation project implemented by researchers from the Ecology Behaviour and Conservation Group at Massey University, Auckland (see Barry (2014) for additional information).

This research was approved by the New Zealand Department of Conservation (permit number 35179-FAU) and the Massey University Animal Ethics Committee (protocol number 12/94). I would also like to acknowledge the representatives of the Ngati Manuhiri, Te Kawerau a Maki, Ngatai Whanaunga INC, Ngatai Maru Ruunanga, Ngatai Wai, and Ngatai Paoa iwi (indigenous Maori people) for giving their consent and support for the overall translocation, and to carry out the research.



# Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	IX
LIST OF TABLES.....	X
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	XI
<b>CHAPTER 1 LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 CONSERVATION HISTORY IN NEW ZEALAND.....	1
1.2 TRANSLOCATIONS.....	2
1.2.1 <i>Translocation theory</i> .....	2
1.2.2 <i>Translocation success</i> .....	3
1.2.3 <i>Importance of post-translocation monitoring</i> .....	3
1.2.4 <i>Reasons for translocation uncertainty or failure</i> .....	4
1.2.5 <i>Anchoring strategies and reducing post-release dispersal</i> .....	5
1.3 REPTILE CONSERVATION IN NEW ZEALAND .....	7
1.3.1 <i>Translocation history of <i>Hoplodactylus duvaucelii</i></i> .....	8
1.4 REPTILE MONITORING TECHNIQUES .....	10
1.4.1 <i>Identification techniques</i> .....	10
1.4.2 <i>Tracking techniques</i> .....	12
1.4.3 <i>Live-capture techniques</i> .....	14
1.5 RETREAT-SITE SELECTION IN REPTILES.....	16
1.6 KNOWLEDGE GAPS.....	17
1.7 RESEARCH GOALS.....	18
1.8 THESIS OUTLINE.....	18
<b>CHAPTER 2 GENERAL METHODS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 STUDY SPECIES .....	21
2.1.1 <i>Natural history</i> .....	21
2.1.2 <i>Behaviour</i> .....	21
2.1.3 <i>Diet</i> .....	22
2.1.4 <i>Distribution and conservation status</i> .....	23
2.2 STUDY SITES.....	23
2.2.1 <i>Motuora Island</i> .....	23
2.2.2 <i>Tiritiri Matangi Island</i> .....	25
2.3 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK.....	27
2.3.1 <i>Source of geckos</i> .....	27
2.3.2 <i>Release sites</i> .....	27
2.3.3 <i>Monitoring grids</i> .....	28
2.3.4 <i>Gecko release 2013</i> .....	31
2.4 <i>HOPLODACTYLUS DUVAUCELII</i> MONITORING .....	32

2.4.1	CFR checks .....	32
2.4.2	Tracking tunnel checks .....	33
2.4.3	Processing geckos .....	34
<b>CHAPTER 3 TESTING TWO ANCHORING TECHNIQUES TO IMPROVE POST-TRANSLOCATION MONITORING OF DUVAUCEL'S GECKOS (<i>HOPLODACTYLUS DUVAUCELII</i>) .....</b>		<b>35</b>
3.1	INTRODUCTION .....	35
3.2	METHODS .....	39
3.2.1	Anchoring treatments .....	39
3.2.2	Monitoring techniques .....	40
3.2.3	Data analysis .....	42
3.3	RESULTS .....	48
3.3.1	Effects of anchoring treatments on CFR use .....	48
3.3.2	Effects of anchoring treatments on dispersal distances .....	54
3.4	DISCUSSION .....	58
3.4.1	Effectiveness of anchoring techniques for increasing CFR use .....	58
3.4.2	Effectiveness of anchoring techniques for reducing post-release dispersal .....	63
3.5	CONCLUSIONS .....	65
<b>CHAPTER 4 EFFECTIVENESS OF DOUBLE-LAYERED CELL FOAM RETREATS AS POST-TRANSLOCATION MONITORING TOOLS FOR DUVAUCEL'S GECKOS (<i>HOPLODACTYLUS DUVAUCELII</i>)</b>		<b>66</b>
4.1	INTRODUCTION .....	66
4.2	METHODS .....	70
4.2.1	Differences in CFR use by cohorts .....	70
4.2.2	Predicting CFR and tracking tunnel visitation using environmental factors .....	71
4.3	RESULTS .....	76
4.3.1	Longevity .....	76
4.3.2	Capture success .....	76
4.3.3	Use of various CFR areas .....	76
4.3.4	Differences in temperature and humidity within CFRs .....	77
4.3.5	Visitation differences across islands and grids .....	78
4.3.6	Duration of CFR Use .....	80
4.3.7	Seasonality of CFR use .....	80
4.3.8	CFR use by different cohorts .....	83
4.3.9	Observations of juvenile CFR use patterns .....	85
4.3.10	Effects of environmental factors on CFR and tracking tunnel visitation .....	87
4.4	DISCUSSION .....	91
4.5	CONCLUSIONS .....	105
<b>CHAPTER 5 CELL FOAM RETREAT USAGE PATTERNS OF INVERTEBRATES AND OTHER LIZARD SPECIES</b>		<b>106</b>
5.1	INTRODUCTION .....	106
5.2	METHODS .....	109
5.2.1	Lizard sampling .....	109
5.2.2	Invertebrate sampling .....	110
5.2.3	Data analysis .....	110
5.4	RESULTS .....	112

5.4.1	<i>CFR use by lizards</i> .....	112
5.4.2	<i>CFR use by invertebrates</i> .....	116
5.5	DISCUSSION .....	129
5.5.1	<i>Use of CFRs by other lizard species</i> .....	129
5.5.2	<i>Use of CFRs by invertebrates</i> .....	132
5.6	CONCLUSIONS .....	142
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS</b> .....	<b>144</b>
6.1	ANCHORING TECHNIQUES.....	144
6.2	CFRS AS MONITORING TOOLS FOR <i>HOPLODACTYLUS DUVAUCELII</i> .....	149
6.3	CFRS AS MONITORING TOOLS FOR LIZARDS AND INVERTEBRATES.....	151
	<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>152</b>
	<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	<b>166</b>

## List of Figures

FIGURE 1.1. DORSAL PHOTOGRAPHS OF TWO ADULT FEMALE DUVAUCEL'S GECKOS, SHOWING THE DIFFERENCES IN PATTERNING ALLOWING INDIVIDUAL IDENTIFICATION. ....	12
FIGURE 2.1. SATELLITE IMAGE OF MOTUORA ISLAND .....	24
FIGURE 2.2. SATELLITE IMAGE OF THE HAURAKI GULF REGION .....	25
FIGURE 2.3. SATELLITE IMAGE OF TIRITIRI MATANGI ISLAND .....	26
FIGURE 2.4. LAYOUT OF THE DUVAUCEL'S GECKO MONITORING GRIDS .....	29
FIGURE 2.5. DESIGN AND SET-UP OF THE DOUBLE-LAYERED CFRS USED THROUGHOUT THIS STUDY. ....	30
FIGURE 2.6. SETUP OF THE TRACKING TUNNELS AT EACH SAMPLING POINT. ....	31
FIGURE 2.7. TWO TRACKING CARDS SHOWING DUVAUCEL'S GECKO FOOTPRINTS. ....	34
FIGURE 3.1. AN ADULT DUVAUCEL'S GECKO CAUGHT INSIDE A FUNNEL TRAP, AND A TYPICAL SET-UP OF A FUNNEL TRAP. ....	42
FIGURE 3.2. THE NUMBER OR PERCENTAGE OF TREATMENT AND CONTROL CFRS THAT WERE USED AT LEAST ONCE OVER THE FOURTEEN MONTH SAMPLING PERIOD, AND DURING EACH OF THE FOUR SEPARATE 'SEASONS' FOLLOWING RELEASE. ....	49
FIGURE 3.3. THE NUMBER OR PERCENTAGE OF TREATMENT AND CONTROL GECKOS THAT USED CFRS AT LEAST ONCE OVER THE FOURTEEN MONTH SAMPLING PERIOD, AND DURING EACH OF THE FOUR SEPARATE 'SEASONS' FOLLOWING RELEASE. ....	52
FIGURE 4.1. DIAGRAM OF THE GRIDS USED TO SAMPLE SURROUNDING VEGETATION COVER .....	73
FIGURE 4.2. THE MEAN DIFFERENCE IN TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY BETWEEN EACH PAIRING OF THE THREE MEASURED CFR AREAS. ....	78
FIGURE 4.3. AVERAGE NUMBER OF CFRS USED PER 2013 MONITORING GRID PER CHECK DAY FOR EACH SEPARATE SAMPLING MONTH. ....	81
FIGURE 4.4. AVERAGE NUMBER OF TOTAL GECKOS FOUND IN CFRS PER MONITORING GRID PER CHECK DAY FOR EACH SEPARATE SAMPLING MONTH. ....	81
FIGURE 4.5. AVERAGE NUMBER OF ADULT GECKOS FOUND IN CFRS PER MONITORING GRID PER CHECK DAY FOR EACH SEPARATE SAMPLING MONTH. ....	82
FIGURE 4.6. AVERAGE NUMBER OF JUVENILE GECKOS FOUND IN CFRS PER MONITORING GRID PER CHECK DAY FOR EACH SEPARATE SAMPLING MONTH. ....	82
FIGURE 5.1. A COPPER SKINK ( <i>OLIGOSOMA AENEUM</i> ) FOUND IN A CFR. ....	113
FIGURE 5.2. TWO MOKO SKINKS ( <i>OLIGOSOMA MOCO</i> ) FOUND IN CFRS. ....	113
FIGURE 5.3. PHOTOS OF VARIOUS INVERTEBRATES FOUND INSIDE CFRS. ....	115
FIGURE 5.4. PHOTOS OF COCKROACHES FOUND INSIDE CFRS. ....	118
FIGURE 5.5. PHOTOS OF WETA FOUND INSIDE CFRS. ....	118
FIGURE 5.6. PHOTOS OF SPIDERS FOUND INSIDE CFRS. ....	118
FIGURE 5.7. BOXPLOT OF AVERAGE INVERTEBRATE DENSITIES PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING GRID. ....	122
FIGURE 5.8. BOXPLOTS OF AVERAGE INVERTEBRATE RICHNESS PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING GRID. ....	123
FIGURE 5.9. MEAN INVERTEBRATE DENSITY PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING MONTH. ....	125
FIGURE 5.10. MEAN INVERTEBRATE RICHNESS PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING MONTH. ....	125
FIGURE 5.11. MEAN ISOPTERA DENSITY PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING MONTH. ....	126
FIGURE 5.12. MEAN BLATTODEA DENSITY PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING MONTH. ....	126
FIGURE 5.13. MEAN COLEOPTERA DENSITY PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING MONTH. ....	127
FIGURE 5.14. MEAN TOTAL NUMBER OF ORTHOPTERA PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING MONTH, IN TOTAL AND FOR EACH SIZE CLASS SEPARATELY. ....	127
FIGURE 5.15. MEAN TOTAL NUMBER OF ARANEAE PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING MONTH, IN TOTAL AND FOR EACH SIZE CLASS SEPARATELY. ....	128

## List of Tables

TABLE 3.1. MAXIMUM POINT DISTANCE (M) TRAVELLED BY GECKOS DURING EACH SEASON.....	54
TABLE 4.1. VERTICAL AND DEPTH POSITION OF EACH GECKO ENCOUNTERED IN A CFR DURING EACH CHECK SESSION OVER THE ENTIRE FOURTEEN MONTH STUDY PERIOD.....	77
TABLE 4.2. NUMBER OF CFRS USED AT LEAST ONCE AT EACH OF THE 2013 AND 2006 RELEASE GRIDS DURING EACH OF THE FOUR STUDY SEASONS, AND OVER THE ENTIRE FOURTEEN MONTH STUDY PERIOD. ....	79
TABLE 4.3. NUMBER OF GECKOS IN EACH COHORT ON EACH ISLAND THAT USED CFRS AT LEAST ONCE OVER THE ENTIRE FOURTEEN MONTH SAMPLING PERIOD. ....	84
TABLE 4.4. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GECKOS RELEASED IN DIFFERENT COHORTS THAT USED CFRS AGAIN AT LEAST ONCE DURING EACH OF THE FOUR SEPARATE STUDY SEASONS, DURING SEASONS TWO TO FOUR COMBINED AND OVER THE ENTIRE FOURTEEN MONTH STUDY SEASON, AND THE RESULTS OF CHI-SQUARE TESTS RUN FOR EACH COHORT COMPARISON. ....	86
TABLE 4.5. ALL FACTORS CONSIDERED IN THE MODEL SELECTION PROCESS FOR DETERMINING WHICH HABITAT FACTORS EFFECTED CFR VISITATION AND TRACKING TUNNEL VISITATION RATES.....	90
TABLE 5.1. USE OF THREE CFRS BY TWO NATIVE SKINK SPECIES, INCLUDING THEIR POSITIONS WITHIN THE CFRS AND THE CORRESPONDING TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY READINGS OF THE CFR AT THE TIME THE CFR WAS CHECKED. ....	114
TABLE 5.2. RESULTS OF MULTIPLE PEARSON’S CORRELATIONS RUN BETWEEN THE DENSITIES OF THE FIVE MAIN INVERTEBRATE GROUPS, TOTAL DENSITY AND RICHNESS, AND AVERAGE TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY. ....	121

## List of Appendices

APPENDIX A. NUMBER OF CFRs AND GECKOS OF EACH TREATMENT TYPE, AT EACH OF THE SIX 2013 RELEASE GRIDS. ....	166
APPENDIX B. INFORMATION ON ALL 180 ADULT GECKOS RELEASED IN 2013. ....	167
APPENDIX C. DATES OF CFR CHECKS, GRID FOOD TREATMENT, AND THE ORIGIN OF GECKOS RELEASED ONTO EACH MONITORING GRID .....	172
APPENDIX D. AVAILABILITY OF GPS LOCATION DATA FOR EACH RADIO-TRACKED GECKO .....	173
APPENDIX E. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TREATMENT AND CONTROL CFRs USED MULTIPLE TIMES FOR EACH ANCHORING TREATMENT.....	174
APPENDIX F. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE VISITATION RATES TO TREATMENT AND CONTROL CFRs WITHIN TWO MONTHS, AND BETWEEN THREE AND FOURTEEN MONTHS FOLLOWING RELEASE.....	175
APPENDIX G. MODEL EFFECTS FOR THE TWO GENERALISED LINEAR MODELS EXPLORING THE EFFECTS OF GRID FOOD TREATMENT AND RELEASE TREATMENT ON CFR VISITATION RATES AND USE OF CFRs BY GECKOS. ....	176
APPENDIX H. PARAMETER ESTIMATES FOR EACH OF THE SIGNIFICANT FACTORS CALCULATED IN THE TWO GENERALISED LINEAR MODELS ON THE EFFECTS OF GRID FOOD TREATMENT AND RELEASE TREATMENT ON CFR VISITATION RATES AND CFR USE BY GECKOS. ....	177
APPENDIX I. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF GECKOS IN TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUPS THAT USED CFRs AT LEAST ONCE AND MORE THAN ONCE DURING THE ENTIRE FOURTEEN MONTH MONITORING PERIOD.....	178
APPENDIX J. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE NUMBER OF VISITS TO CFRs BY TREATMENT AND CONTROL GECKOS WITHIN TWO MONTHS, AND BETWEEN THREE AND FOURTEEN MONTHS FOLLOWING RELEASE.....	179
APPENDIX K. CROSS-TABULATION OF THE NUMBER OF TREATMENT AND CONTROL GECKOS (OF THE GRID FOOD TREATMENT) LOCATED AT EACH CATEGORY DISTANCE DURING EACH SEASON AND TIME PERIOD. ....	180
APPENDIX L. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE EFFECTS OF GRID FOOD TREATMENT ON THE MEAN DISTANCE TRAVELLED BY GECKOS DURING EACH OF THE TIME PERIODS FOLLOWING RELEASE.....	181
APPENDIX M. RESULTS OF THE GENERALISED ESTIMATING EQUATIONS RUN ON DATA FROM WITHIN TWO MONTHS FOLLOWING RELEASE TO DETERMINE THE SHORT TERM EFFECTS OF GRID FOOD, CFR FOOD AND RELEASE ANCHORING TREATMENTS ON CATEGORY AND POINT DISTANCES TRAVELLED BY RELEASED GECKOS. ....	182
APPENDIX N. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE EFFECTS OF CFR FOOD TREATMENT ON THE MEAN DISTANCE TRAVELLED BY GECKOS DURING EACH OF THE TIME PERIODS FOLLOWING RELEASE.....	183
APPENDIX O. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE EFFECTS OF RELEASE TREATMENT ON THE MEAN DISTANCE TRAVELLED BY GECKOS DURING EACH OF THE TIME PERIODS FOLLOWING RELEASE.....	184
APPENDIX P. LOCATION OF FOUR JUVENILE GECKOS (J2, J3, J8, AND J9) AT EACH CFR CHECK SESSION DATE. ....	185
APPENDIX Q. RESULTS OF THE MANN-WHITNEY U TESTS RUN ON DATA FROM EIGHT AND TWELVE MONTHS FOLLOWING RELEASE TO DETERMINE THE LONG TERM EFFECTS OF GRID FOOD, CFR FOOD AND CFR RELEASE ANCHORING TREATMENTS ON CATEGORY AND POINT DISTANCES TRAVELLED BY RELEASED GECKOS .....	186
(T=TREATMENT GROUP, C=CONTROL GROUP).....	186
APPENDIX R. RESULTS OF THE GENERALISED LINEAR MODEL BACKWARD ELIMINATION MODEL SELECTION FOR CFR MICROHABITAT EFFECTS ON CFR VISITATION. ....	187
APPENDIX S. RESULTS OF THE GENERALISED LINEAR MODEL BACKWARD ELIMINATION MODEL SELECTION FOR CFR MICROHABITAT EFFECTS ON TRACKING TUNNEL VISITATION. ....	188
APPENDIX T. RESULTS OF THE GENERALISED LINEAR MODEL BACKWARD ELIMINATION MODEL SELECTION FOR SURROUNDING VEGETATION EFFECTS ON CFR VISITATION. ....	188
APPENDIX U. RESULTS OF THE GENERALISED LINEAR MODEL BACKWARD ELIMINATION MODEL SELECTION FOR SURROUNDING VEGETATION EFFECTS ON TRACKING TUNNEL VISITATION. ....	189

APPENDIX V. RESULTS OF THE GENERALISED LINEAR MODEL BACKWARD ELIMINATION MODEL SELECTION FOR SURROUNDING FLAX ( <i>PHORMIUM TENAX</i> ) EFFECTS ON CFR VISITATION. ....	190
APPENDIX W. RESULTS OF THE GENERALISED LINEAR MODEL BACKWARD ELIMINATION MODEL SELECTION FOR SURROUNDING FLAX ( <i>PHORMIUM TENAX</i> ) EFFECTS ON TRACKING TUNNEL VISITATION. ....	191
APPENDIX X. NUMBER OF INVERTEBRATES ENCOUNTERED THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE NINE MONTH SAMPLING PERIOD. ....	192
APPENDIX Y. NUMBER OF CFR HOUSING TREES OF EACH SPECIES, AND THEIR CORRESPONDING AVERAGE INVERTEBRATE DENSITIES. .....	193
APPENDIX Z. NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF TREES OF EACH SPECIES THAT CFRs WERE ATTACHED TO. ....	194
APPENDIX AA. MEAN INVERTEBRATE DENSITY AND RICHNESS FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL CFR, FOR EACH OF THE EIGHT MONITORING GRIDS SEPARATELY.....	195
APPENDIX BB. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS (MINIMUM, MAXIMUM, MEAN AND STANDARD ERROR) FOR THE AVERAGE INVERTEBRATE DENSITY AND RICHNESS PER CFR PER CHECK SESSION FOR EACH MONITORING GRID AND TIRITIRI MATANGI AND MOTUORA ISLANDS SEPARATELY. ....	203