

Establishment, behaviour and ecology of the
SA mainland tammar wallaby (*Macropus eugenii*
eugenii) following an experimental reintroduction.



Leah F. Kemp (BSc. Hons)

School of Earth and Environmental Sciences
The University of Adelaide, South Australia.

December 2010

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Declaration

For a Thesis that does not contain work already in the public domain

NAME:..... Leah Kemp.....PROGRAM:.....Ph.D.....

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give my consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library catalogue, the Australasian Digital Theses Program (ADTP) and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by then university to restrict access for a period of time.

SIGNATURE:..... DATE:.....23/12/2011.....

Abstract

The South Australian mainland tammar wallaby (*Macropus eugenii eugenii*) was presumed extinct in the wild from the early 1930's, until a feral population was re-discovered in New Zealand. Eighty-five animals were returned to Australia as part of a repatriation program into their former range. The establishment phase after a reintroduction is a critical time as animals may fail to survive if they cannot find resources and avoid predators in an unfamiliar habitat. To maximise reintroduction and establishment success, reintroductions need to be planned with a good understanding of the animals' ecology and anti-predator strategies. To improve this understanding requires experimental reintroductions and detailed monitoring. This thesis investigates the experimental reintroduction of 46 wallabies into Innes National Park in South Australia and examines the influence of release group familiarity on establishment. Part of this was an investigation of home range, habitat requirements and social behaviours during establishment and seasonally post-establishment. The thesis includes three data chapters which focus on (1) home range and core area, home range stability and degree of overlap with conspecifics; (2) habitat selection at the landscape scale and for day and night use within home range; and (3) factors influencing fine scale habitat use and social grouping behaviours in light of predation risk. In this study, the animals' perceived risk of predation is assumed to be reflected by surrogate measures of risk, such as distance to cover, likelihood of using cover, group size, and distance to nearest neighbour.

Release group familiarity was established by housing animals together in captivity for at least one month prior to release ("familiar" groups), whereas "unfamiliar" release groups comprised animals housed separately but released together. After each reintroduction the first month was considered to be a time of "establishment" in the environment. During the establishment month, home ranges were not randomly located within the landscape, as indicated by the biased occupancy of particular habitat types. Habitat types selected at the landscape scale were similar for familiar and unfamiliar release groups. However, animals released in unfamiliar groups showed a stronger preference for denser high cover habitat during their nocturnal activities within their home range. As tammars use cover to conceal themselves from predators, this result suggests that animals released in unfamiliar groups were more cautious than those released in familiar groups. Indeed at the fine scale, it was also found that animals released in unfamiliar groups were more likely to be found in high cover habitat, and forage closer to cover at night than did those released in pre-established familiar

groups. Using habitat with more caution and capitalising on communal vigilance in an unfamiliar habitat may ultimately improve the likelihood of survivorship and overall reintroduction success.

Comparing habitat decisions and social behaviours during the establishment period to similar times of year post-establishment suggested that animals' naivety about their new environment influenced some decisions they made. While habitat selection at the landscape scale was similar during establishment and at an equivalent time of year post establishment, analyses showed that they preferred to use melaleuca (a high cover habitat) during their nocturnal activities during establishment much more strongly than they did once they had established. Home range and core areas were also significantly smaller during the establishment month than at an equivalent time of year post establishment. This result supports the idea that animals will restrict their movements when they are unfamiliar with the habitat and predation risks. It also suggests that some habitat choices improved once they were familiar with their new environment and presumably predation risks. Their habitat choices reflected better anti-predator behaviour than those made during the establishment period: they were more likely to use high cover habitat, they remained significantly closer to cover while foraging, and group sizes were larger than during establishment.

Seasonal habitat selection at the landscape and home range scales suggested that the five habitat types within the study area provided different fundamental resources for the animals, as they were preferred at different times of year. Some differences in habitat selection were observed between the sexes, and the females were more selective in their diurnal and nocturnal activities. These differences most likely reflected, in part, differences in predator avoidance and reproductive strategies of the sexes, where females' preference at the landscape scale shifted towards high cover habitat during spring, the time of year when pouch young vacate the pouch and start to become independent. While no such selection at the landscape scale was observed for the males, it was also observed that within their daily activities both sexes were more likely to be found in high cover habitat during spring than any other time of the year, perhaps suggesting that as males were following the females. Overall, females generally selected *Eucalyptus diversifolia*, *Acacia anceps* and grassland at the landscape scale, and used *E.diversifolia* for refuge during the day and the other two habitats for foraging at night, whereas males generally preferred *Melaleuca halmaturorum* instead of *E.diversifolia* for diurnal refuge. *Eucalyptus rugosa* was mostly avoided by both sexes.

From month to month, both sexes expanded rather than shifted their home ranges to incorporate new areas, and these new areas were explored with conspecifics (when the amount of new area increased the amount of sharing also increased), highlighting their reliance on communal vigilance when in unfamiliar habitat. More new areas were incorporated into home ranges from July to December than from January to May. Time since release was not influential, which also supported the conclusion that perhaps home ranges moved to follow resources or overlap conspecifics more. Indeed, in one circumstance when neighbouring animals had died, a male wallaby was observed to move four kilometres through unfamiliar habitat and completely shift his home range in search of other residence.

Compositional analysis of habitat use versus availability indicated that monthly home ranges were selectively positioned in the landscape and were always larger than 4ha. Males' home ranges were larger than females', and males shared more of their home ranges than females did, supporting the usual sex bias observed for polygamous species. Core areas were proportional to the size of the home range, with similar sizes held by males and females and throughout the year. Core size was not influenced by the degree of overlap with conspecifics, with similar amount of core area shared by both sexes year round. The time of year influenced home range size, the smallest were held in winter when food resources were likely to be most abundant, but also when inclement weather was likely to restrict movements, as the animals' ability to detect predators may be hindered due to wet and windy conditions. Living with conspecifics is known to assist predator detection by group vigilance. Indeed, this study found the amount of home range overlap and the time two individuals spend together was positively correlated, and the size of home ranges decreased when more of it was shared with conspecifics, which suggested that sharing of home range was important. The degree which home ranges were shared was observed to be a fairly stable requirement for both sexes and did not change with season or time since release.

Despite previous isolation from predators, the wallabies displayed anti-predator behaviours which incorporated interrelated benefits obtained from group vigilance and using protective cover. Additionally, these behaviours were adjusted according to their familiarity with the habitat. Post-establishment, animals were observed to go further from cover when they were a greater distance from their nearest neighbour but surrounded by larger numbers of conspecifics. Whereas during the establishment period, animals ventured further from cover when they were closer to a nearest neighbour, but group size was not influential. It is known that larger groups of animals have more false alarms to predators, and false alarms result in

the animals' wasting energy in fleeing. If false alarms are more prevalent while occupying unfamiliar habitat with unfamiliar risks, then relying on large numbers of conspecifics while establishing may have been more of a liability than a benefit during the establishment period. However, some anti-predator strategies were commonly used, regardless of familiarity with their habitat. During the establishment month and post-establishment, animals were always more likely to be found in high cover habitat when they were further from their nearest neighbour, or were surrounded by fewer conspecifics. Some strategies and habitat decisions may have reflected differences in reproductive needs. While females, with and without pouch young did not differ in how far they would forage from protective cover, females with pouch young remained closer to their nearest neighbour than those without. This finding perhaps reflected the importance of relying on communal vigilance when their flight time from a predator may be hindered due to increased weight and bulk of a pouch young. These findings supported the theory that group vigilance anti-predator strategies are somewhat innate in the tammars, as having previously been completely isolated from predators their responses could have been lost, and once released there was no opportunity to socially learn the appropriate responses off an established population.

Some habitat and social grouping behaviours were occasionally unexpected but may have been balanced out by other behaviours. This study observed that animals foraged further into the open during winter than at any other time of year, which contradicts findings by other authors where tammars foraged further into the open when the weather was fine. However, I also found that animals remained closer to their nearest neighbour during autumn and winter than at any other time of year. Perhaps foraging further into the open in inclement weather is actually safer if it provides a greater chance to detect and react to an approaching predator. For example, a fox approaching from the scrub edge would not give the wallaby enough time to respond. An additional benefit of foraging further away from cover in larger group sizes, is that animals can flee in different directions confusing the fox, as it would have to make a quick decision and chose one animal to pursue. Animals were furthest from their nearest neighbours in spring which was also somewhat surprising as this is when pouch young vacate the pouch and it was observed that females with pouch young remain closer to their nearest neighbour suggesting they gain some anti-predator benefit from doing so. However, during spring the animals were also more likely to be found in high cover habitat than at any other time of year, so this may have somewhat balanced out the need for a close neighbour.

Overall, this study confirmed that tammar wallabies retain anti-predator behaviours despite previous isolation from predators. However, their habitat and social decisions improved with time since release. In this experimental study, animals released in groups with unfamiliar conspecifics appeared to be at an advantage as they displayed habitat use and social groupings which suggested they were using their new habitat with more caution. Therefore, this study recommends releasing groups of unfamiliar conspecifics. Releasing animals at different times of year also had an influence on how they used their habitat. Animals released in spring displayed behaviours suggesting that they were more cautious in avoiding predators: they were more likely to be found in cover, foraged closer to cover, and were in larger group sizes than those animals released in winter. Therefore, it is recommended that animals are released at a time of year where conditions are fine and resources are abundant. Releasing females with pouch young did not appear to hinder the animals after their release (compared to females without pouch young) and could be recommended as young permanently evacuating the pouch in the wild are at a greater advantage than juveniles released from captivity. Results from this experimental study were used to assist ongoing management decisions and were imperative in the planning of subsequent reintroduction events for this species, and can be applied more generally to other species with similar anti-predator strategies.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr Sue Carthew as my primary supervisor. Mentoring, advice and support from Sue throughout my study were invaluable. Thank you to Dr Greg Johnston as my secondary supervisor, his suggestions, feedback and encouragement were always gratefully received and appreciated. It has been an honour to be asked to do a PhD on this nationally significant conservation program under their supervision. It has been my privilege to be a part of the Tammar Recovery Team, collaborating with The SA Department for Environment and Heritage, The Royal Adelaide and Monarto Zoological Parks, and staff from Innes National Park. In particular, I would like to acknowledge Peter Copley, Andy Sharp, Julia Bignall, Jason van Weenan, David Taggart, Peter Clark, Tony Austin, Ian Smith, Caroline Paterson, and Anthony Pieck who I have had had pleasure of liaising with for the majority of my involvement.

This work was only made possible with the help of 236 volunteers, all of whom I can not begin to thank enough. Many of my personal friends came to help and it was lovely to have them experience something that has been a major part of my life. Other volunteers were people that I met and convinced to come, those that had heard about it through word of mouth, and those that had contacted me after seeing my advertisements. Thank you all for giving up your time to come and volunteer. Additionally, Conservation Volunteers Australian (CVA) wanted to be involved, which was a blessing. They assisted on 12 of my field trips (equalling 121 days), bringing 130 of the 236 volunteers from countries including: England, Spain, America, Hong Kong, Ireland, Japan, France, Switzerland, Germany, and of course Australia. In total, 2191 volunteer/days were worked during the field trips, which was an extraordinary effort.

Of my amazing list of volunteers and friends that came out to assist, numerous went above and beyond, making significant contributions. In particular, Trudie Jaques and Tony Lewis volunteered on very nearly every field trip, they were amazingly enthusiastic and supportive of me, assisting and helping in any way possible. Trudie also took on the role of organising and preparing our amazing meals, I thank you both so very much. David Sweeney, Chris Newell, Toni Milne, and Rob Stewart not only volunteered on multiple trips but also were incredibly enthusiastic to help with technical aspects. They put in many hours of work outside

of the field trips to help me, and taught me things I would not have otherwise learnt. Thank you all so much. George Smith, and Matthew Brewer were excellent volunteers, coming on multiple field trips and were an absolute asset to the field trips success. It was an absolute pleasure working with Mark Sutcliffe and Hamish Longbottom who were the main CVA leaders attending my field trips. Together we kept things fun, scientific, and productive. Additionally, a big thank you to my mum for cooking countless cakes and biscuits, which kept everyone happy throughout each and every field trip.

I have extraordinary gratitude to all of my volunteers. As a sign of my respect and thankfulness to the contributions they made, their names and the number of days each volunteered are listed at the beginning of this thesis (on the following two pages). These volunteers not only made the research possible, but working with a diverse range of people has also enriched my experience and enjoyment.

This work was made possible thanks to a number of organisations which contributed funding and support towards the conservation project and research. Thank you to the Department for Wildlife and Heritage, Wildlife Conservation Fund, Natural Heritage Trust, and Zoos South Australia.

Thank you to Tom Sullivan for his expert services in statistical modelling. Thank you to Steve Williams and Andy Sharp for proof-reading this thesis prior to examination.

I am extremely thankful to have been surrounded by wonderful family and friends who have supported me, helped me, encouraged me, and seen me through the biggest undertaking and challenge of my life thus far. Thank you all so very much. While I have sacrificed a lot to do this PhD, it has been the most amazing experience, opportunity and privilege to make a significant contribution to a nationally important conservation effort to reintroduce the previously extinct SA Mainland tammar wallaby back into its former range within Australia.

Names of my volunteers, and the number of days each of them worked. (DEH) = Department for Environment and Heritage employee, (GreenCorp) = Green Corps trainee, (CVA) = Conservation Volunteers Australia volunteer. * = volunteered on more than one field trip.

Aaron Scott (CVA): 6	Celine Pain (CVA): 9	Emily Allen (CVA): 6	James Cuthill (CVA): 5
Aaron Smith (DEH): 4	Chiemi Nohara (CVA): 8	Emma Edwards (CVA): 5	James Spetch (CVA): 5
Adam Cook (CVA): 4	Choi Mi Ran (CVA): 5	Emma Kemp: 2	Jan Brunner (CVA): 6
Adam Osborn: 4	Chris Cattrall (CVA): 6	Eun Seon Cho (Bubbles) (CVA): 11	Janet Newell: 5
Aiden Champion: 5	Chris Newell: 20 *	Eung Im Kim (Eunice) (CVA): 11	Jasmin Winter (DEH): 1
Al Hyde (CVA): 6	Chris Pellen: 5	Frank Edwards (CVA): 6	Jean-Michel Bellas (CVA): 15
Alan Brydon (CVA): 6	Christine Henry (CVA): 6	Gavin Small (CVA): 6	Jen Buchan: 5 *
Alan Saurun (CVA): 6	Chun Kwan Lee (Leo) (CVA): 11	Gemma Stilwell (CVA): 6	Jenn Sabean: 9
Alan Woolger (CVA): 6	Clare: 1	George Smith: 40 *	Jenna Ross (CVA): 7
Alex Warburton (CVA): 6	Clinton Tiller: 5	Gillien Ferguson (CVA): 6	Jennifer Hayes: 4 *
Alexander Althaus (CVA): 6	Connor Sampson (CVA): 7	Glenys Tiller: 5	Jess Mitchell: 5
Amanda McLean: 6	Craig Gillespie: 2	Gloria Brash (CVA): 6	Jessica Veal (CVA): 9
Amy Todd (CVA): 6	Dale Kristensen (CVA leader): 15	Grace Chan: 6	Jo Loader: 5
Andrew MacLachlan (CVA): 6	Daniel (GreenCorp): 3	Guowei Tan: 6	Joanne Van Der Vasson (CVA): 6
Anna Cocker: 11	Daniel Louie: 5	Gwon-Ae Ko (Sophia) (CVA): 11	John Apesos (CVA): 6
Anne Fuss: 6	Dannielle Short (CVA): 5	Hamish Longbottom (CVA leader): 15 *	John Lee (CVA): 6
Anthony Pieck (DEH): 3	Darryl Brown (Brownie) (CVA): 7	Hamish Longbottom: 18 *	John Newgard: 9
Ben Hyatts (CVA): 6	Dave Sweeney: 15 *	Hans vanAmstel: 6	John Nicholls (CVA): 6
Ben Turner (CVA): 6	Dave Turner (CVA): 16 *	Heather Springbett: 4	John: 3
Bianca Dunker: 7	David Brautigan: 6 *	Heather Wincer: 5	Jonathan Miles (CVA): 15
Boaz (GreenCorp): 3	David Ferguson (CVA): 6	Helen Ozeychuk : 1	Jong Ho Choi (John) (CVA): 7
Bradley Frain (CVA): 4	David Kemp: 8	Helen Waudby: 5	Jonny Rex (CVA): 5
Brian Alexander (CVA): 6	David Kenny: 4	Helene Wipf: 29 *	Josh Griffiths: 4
Bunti Pellen: 5	David Murdock (CVA): 1	Hjalte Larsen (CVA): 5	Joshua Willox: 10
Cain (GreenCorp): 3	David Olguin (CVA): 5	Huh Ji Whei (CVA): 6	Joyce Yeomans: 2
Cameron Colebatch: 12	Deb Allen (DEH): 2	Ian Sargent: 11	Julia Bignall (DEH): 4
Cande Iriarte (CVA): 11	Duncan Rands (CVA): 15	Irene Vale: 9 *	Karen Lang (CVA): 6
Carly Roworth: 4	Elli Grien (CVA): 9	Jacquelin Devereaux: 11	Karleah Trengove: 8 *
Caroline Patterson (DEH): 1	Emanuelle Gerlach: 4	Jake Parry: 4	Katherine Evans: 5

Kathryn Haythorpe: 12 *
 Kathy Nicholls (CVA): 6
 Katie Paris: 11
 Katie Saville: 5
 Kel Mocilnik: 6
 Kerryn Daly: 5
 KiKang Leap (CVA): 6
 Kim Hee Jung (CVA): 6
 Kim Treglown: 9
 King Hang Shiu (Pheonix) (CVA): 11
 Kiran Liversage (CVA): 6
 Kirsty Maclean (CVA): 6
 Kit Hang Lee (CVA): 7
 Kris Ludwig (CVA): 6
 Kristian Rasmussen (CVA): 5
 Krystal Cliffe (CVA): 7
 Kuila Gallash (CVA): 7
 Kyle Valois (CVA): 5
 Kyle Valois (CVA): 6
 Kym Abrams: 5
 Laura Fuss: 5
 Laura Howie (CVA): 6
 Laura Mitchell (CVA leader): 11
 Laura Rance (CVA): 6
 Laura Wienke (CVA): 6
 Leah Kemp: 249 *
 Linda Siebert (CVA): 6
 Lisa Lamb (CVA): 11
 Louise Johns (CVA): 8
 Lucy Chadwick (CVA): 7
 Lucy Storey (CVA): 8
 Luke Capes (CVA): 4
 Magda Kluka: 5
 Maisie (CVA): 5
 Margo (CVA leader): 6
 Marianne Sandstrom: 4
 Marie-lea Lemaire (CVA): 6
 Mark Henderson: 11
 Mark Sutcliffe (CVA leader): 74 *
 Martin Stone (CVA): 11
 Mathieu Le lay: 3
 Matt Layfield (CVA): 6
 Matt Rossack (GreenCorp): 4
 Matt Sullivan (GreenCorp): 5
 Matthew Brewer: 38 *
 Mauritania Griffiths (CVA): 15
 Megan (GreenCorp): 3
 Megan Bennett: 5
 Melanie Prodoehl: 7
 Melissa (GreenCorp): 3
 Melissa Fenessy (CVA): 6
 Meredith Brown: 9
 Mi Jung Kim (CVA): 7
 Michael Konz (Johannos) (CVA): 5
 Michael Quast: 5
 Mirjam Menzi (CVA): 9
 Moon-Sun Kang (CVA): 6
 Nancy Meza (CVA): 5
 Naomi Croft (CVA): 5
 Nick Nicholls (CVA): 6
 Nicola Beaton (CVA): 8
 Nigel Kerby: 5
 Patrick (CVA): 5
 Paul (Jong Beom Ha) (CVA): 6
 Paul Gillen: 9 *
 Peter Epstein (CVA): 6
 Peter Thammarangsy (CVA): 5
 Peter Yeomans: 1
 Phil Donaldson: 2
 Philip Wilson (CVA): 8
 Renate Faast: 5
 Rhiannon Forbes: 6
 Richard King (CVA): 4
 Richard Wilkins (CVA): 9
 Rob Kelman: 12
 Rob Stewart: 12 *
 Robert Moir: 6
 Rose Westley (CVA): 6
 Ross Chamberlain (CVA): 6
 Sam Benesh (CVA): 6
 Sam Blight (CVA): 8
 Sam Taylor (CVA): 6
 Samantha Agius: 10
 Sara Dobson (CVA): 5
 Sarah Tottenham: 9
 Sarah White (CVA): 15
 Shingo Miyamoto (CVA): 4
 Shinichi (CVA): 5
 Shona Morton (CVA): 6
 Sofia Wells: 4
 Spencer Burgstad: 3
 Stephanie Perruchod (CVA): 6
 Storm (GreenCorp): 3
 Stuart Steele: 5
 Sue Barber: 10 *
 Suzanne Aubrun (CVA): 6
 Taeyoung Kim (CVA): 6
 Tali Moyle: 13 *
 Tammie Russell (CVA): 4
 Tani : 4
 Terry Little (CVA): 5
 Terry Little (CVA): 6
 Tim Hands (CVA): 6
 Tim Kerby (CVA): 6
 Tina Bentz: 4 *
 Tom Lissenden (CVA): 6
 Tom Stewart: 5
 Toni Milne: 40 *
 Tony Dingwall (CVA): 11
 Tony Lewis: 113 *
 Trudie Jaques: 107 *
 Vishal Narayan (CVA): 5
 Vivian Wong: 5
 Warwick Kemp: 1
 Warwick Twelftree: 3
 William Wang: 6
 Wook Chang (CVA): 11
 Yoshiaki Inada (CVA): 6
 Young Sun Seo (Eddy) (CVA): 6
 Yuk Min Suk (Katie) (CVA): 6
 Yuta Kawamata (CVA): 6
 Zbigy Rudnicki (CVA): 10

Table of Contents

DECLARATION	2
ABSTRACT	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	8
TABLE OF CONTENTS	12
List of tables	15
List of figures	18
1 CHAPTER 1: OVERALL INTRODUCTION: REINTRODUCTION BIOLOGY	20
1.1 History of extinctions	20
1.1.1 Decline of Australian native mammals	21
1.2 Reintroductions	22
1.3 Reintroduction guidelines and recommendations	24
1.3.1 Measuring success of reintroduction	25
1.4 Factors affecting establishment success	27
1.4.1 Predation	27
1.4.2 Training to increase awareness about predators	29
1.4.3 Population dynamics	31
1.4.4 Habitat use	32
1.5 Importance of monitoring and experimentation	34
1.6 Thesis aims	35
2 CHAPTER 2: SA MAINLAND TAMMAR WALLABY REINTRODUCTION OVERVIEW AND GENERAL METHODS	37
2.1 Study animal	37
2.1.1 Overview of biology	37
2.1.2 Re-discovery	41
2.2 Reintroduction site: Innes National Park	42
2.2.1 Study site	42
2.2.1.1 Habitat assessment of the five vegetation communities within the study area	47
2.3 Reintroduction	52
2.3.1 Release group preparation and composition	52
2.3.2 Release events & location	55
2.3.3 Monitoring	56
2.3.3.1 Collar fitting:	56
2.3.3.2 Collar specifications:	57
2.3.3.3 Tower specifications and triangulation:	58
2.3.3.4 Tower locations in the study area:	60
2.3.3.5 Radio-tracking	61

3	CHAPTER 3: HOME RANGE & SOCIAL DYNAMICS	62
3.1	Introduction	62
3.2	Methods	65
3.2.1	Size of home range and core area	65
3.2.2	Range shifts and stability (home range location)	69
3.2.3	Sharing home ranges with conspecifics	72
3.3	Results	74
3.3.1	Establishment month	74
3.3.1.1	Size of home range and core area, and amount shared	74
3.3.1.2	Establishment vs. an equivalent season post-establishment	76
3.3.2	Post Establishment	77
3.3.2.1	Group cohesion	77
3.3.2.2	Range shift and stability	81
3.3.2.3	Size of home range and core area, and amount shared	84
3.3.2.3.1	Home range size	84
3.3.2.3.2	Core area size	87
3.3.2.3.3	Home range shared	88
3.3.2.3.4	Core area shared	89
3.3.2.3.5	Number of animals and percent of population overlapped	89
3.3.2.3.6	Home range overlap & time spent as nearest neighbours	92
3.4	Discussion	93
3.4.1	Home range and core area: size and sharing during establishment	93
3.4.2	Influence of experimental release protocol	94
3.4.3	Merging of release groups	96
3.4.4	Seasonal influence	97
3.4.5	Site fidelity	99
3.4.6	Conclusion	100
4	CHAPTER 4: HABITAT SELECTION	102
4.1	Introduction	102
4.2	Methods	104
4.2.1	Habitat selection: use v availability	105
4.3	Results	108
4.3.1	Habitat Selection during the establishment period	108
4.3.2	Seasonal habitat selection	111
4.3.2.1	Selection at landscape compared to selection within home range	112
4.3.2.2	Seasonal habitat choices by females and males	114
4.3.3	Habitat selection during establishment month compared to an equivalent time of year	115
4.4	Discussion	117
4.4.1	Habitat selection at the landscape scale during establishment	118
4.4.2	Diurnal and nocturnal habitat selection during establishment	118
4.4.3	Seasonal habitat selection at the landscape scale	120
4.4.4	Seasonal diurnal and nocturnal habitat selection	121
5	CHAPTER 5: HABITAT USE & SOCIAL BEHAVIOURS	124
5.1	Introduction	124
5.2	Methods	128
5.2.1	Analysis of habitat use and social grouping	129
5.2.1.1	Statistical analysis	130
5.3	Results	134

5.3.1	Establishment phase:	134
5.3.1.1	Likelihood of using high cover during establishment phase	135
5.3.1.2	Distance to cover during establishment phase	136
5.3.1.3	Number of animals within 100m during establishment phase	137
5.3.1.4	Distance to nearest animal during establishment phase	139
5.3.2	Post establishment:	141
5.3.2.1	Likelihood of using high cover	142
5.3.2.2	Distance to cover	144
5.3.2.3	Distance to nearest animal	145
5.3.3	Release month vs. 12 months later:	148
5.4	Discussion	149
5.4.1	Influence of experimental group (familiar and unfamiliar)	150
5.4.2	Influence of timing of release	151
5.4.3	Habitat use and social proximity during establishment and post-establishment	152
5.4.4	Influence of sex and season on habitat use and social proximity after successful establishment	156
5.5	Conclusions	158
6	CHAPTER 6: OVERALL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	160
6.1	Key findings during the release month	160
6.2	Influence of release protocol: group familiarity and timing of release event	163
6.3	Release groups dispersing after release	165
6.4	Home range and sharing	165
6.5	Importance of habitat types	166
6.6	Fine scale habitat use and social behaviours	167
6.7	Recommendations for reintroductions	168
6.8	Further research required	171
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	177
	APPENDIX A: FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF PLANT SPECIES OBSERVED IN EACH HABITAT TYPE	194
	APPENDIX B: MEAN DISTANCE TAMMARS MOVED BETWEEN CONSECUTIVE SAMPLING PERIODS	199
	APPENDIX C: PERCENTAGE OF TIME SPENT WITHIN CERTAIN PROXIMITY OF NEAREST NEIGHBOUR	200

List of tables

- Table 2.1** Calculations used for determining the available biomass of each plant species within each quadrat, after drying and weighing the hand held unit (HHU). 49
- Table 3.1** Number of surviving group members from each familiar and unfamiliar release group during the first seven months following the Jun05 reintroduction; each group started with six members. Bracketed numbers indicate that no comparisons 'within group' could be made as one or no group members remained alive. 70
- Table 3.2** Influence of predictor variables on home range and core area (determined by univariate linear mixed models) and percentage of those areas shared with other tammar wallabies (determined by Kruskal-Wallis tests for group and sex, and Spearman's Rho for no. animals overlapped) during the establishment period. Significance given as P-values, and highlighted in bold when significant. "-" = not tested. 75
- Table 3.3** The influence of establishment month on the size of home range and core area compared to an equivalent season post-establishment (determined by univariate linear mixed effects model). Percentage of area shared with one or more conspecifics is given as a median value from the descriptive statistics, with 95% confidence interval (for home range and core area size), and inter quartile range (for % area shared) in brackets. 77
- Table 3.4** Type III tests of fixed effects from linear mixed effects models: average distance between familiar and unfamiliar group members for seven months following reintroduction (distance calculated by mean centre of home ranges). 78
- Table 3.5** Type III tests of fixed effects from linear mixed effects models: average distance between familiar and unfamiliar animals to members of other release groups for seven months following reintroduction (distances calculated by mean centre of home ranges). 79
- Table 3.6** Difference in proximity between mean centre of home ranges of non-group members ($\pm se$) with each month since release, as determined by linear mixed effects model post hoc tests. Calculated independent of experimental treatment group, as no significant difference was detected between familiar and unfamiliar groups. \downarrow indicates decrease in distance between mean centre of home ranges between the two months examined. Significant P values in brackets and highlighted in bold. 80
- Table 3.7** Type III tests of fixed effects from linear mixed effects model: average proximity to group members and non-group members for seven months following reintroduction (distances calculated by mean centre of home ranges). 81
- Table 3.8** Significance of predictor variables on home range stability (area of home range the same as previous month) and new area incorporated into monthly home ranges by tammar wallabies post-establishment after a reintroduction, as found by multivariate models, and given as P-values (significant values in bold). "(univariate)" did not meet the $p>0.1$ criteria in the univariate model for subsequent consideration in the multivariate model. 82
- Table 3.9** Amount of new area incorporated into home ranges at different times of year post-establishment, and differences between the times of year as determined by post hoc tests. \downarrow indicates less new area included (compared to the corresponding period), \uparrow indicates more new area incorporated. P values of <0.05 , <0.001 , <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. "ns"= no significant difference between the two periods in the amount of new area incorporated into home ranges. 83
- Table 3.10** Significance of predictor variables on home range and core area size and amount shared during establishment month and post-establishment, including comparison between establishment month and an equivalent season post-establishment. Additionally, influence of predictor variables on home range stability and completely new area used. Significance highlighted in bold. "(univar)"=univariate model, "-"=untested. 86
- Table 3.11** Home range size of tammar wallabies at different times of year post-establishment (median value and 95% CI in brackets) as determined by multivariate linear mixed effects models, and differences

between the times of year as determined by post hoc tests. ↓ indicates reduction in home range size (compared to the corresponding period), ↑ indicates increase in home range size. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= no significant change in home range size between the two periods..... 87

Table 3.12 Significance of relationship between percentage of monthly home range overlap and time spent as nearest neighbours for reintroduced tammar wallabies. Correlation calculated by two tailed mantel’s tests where the number of randomisations in each matrix was 998. Numbers of randomisations falling above and below the true value are shown. Significance given as P values, and highlighted in bold when significant. Number of animals excluded from the analysis refers to those which could not be monitored during that month (due to radio collar failure). 92

Table 4.1 Habitat selection by tammar wallabies during the month following releases in November 2004 and June 2005, given as ranks at landscape and within home range scales obtained from Compositional Analysis, ranging from 1 (most preferred/selected) to 5 (least preferred). Habitat types were Grassland (Gra), Eucalyptus diversifolia (E.d), Acacia anceps (A.a), Eucalyptus rugosa (E.r), and Melaleuca halmaturorum (M.h). Habitats labelled with the same superscript (eg. ^a) do not differ significantly in rank. N= number of individuals analysed..... 109

Table 4.2 Habitat selection by animals in experimental familiar and unfamiliar groups during the winter (Jun05) establishment period, given as ranks from Compositional Analysis, ranging from 1 (most preferred/selected) to 5 (least preferred). Habitat types were Grassland (Gra), Eucalyptus diversifolia (E.d), Acacia anceps (A.a), Eucalyptus rugosa (E.r), and Melaleuca halmaturorum (M.h). Habitats labelled with the same superscript (eg. ^a) do not differ significantly in rank. N= number of individuals analysed..... 110

Table 4.3 Habitat selection by females & males during winter (Jun05) establishment period, given as ranks from Compositional Analysis, ranging from 1 (most preferred/selected) to 5 (least preferred). Habitat types were Grassland (Gra), Eucalyptus diversifolia (E.d), Acacia anceps (A.a), Eucalyptus rugosa (E.r), and Melaleuca halmaturorum (M.h). Habitats labelled with the same superscript (eg. ^a) do not differ significantly in rank. N= number of individuals analysed. 111

Table 4.4 Habitat selection at different times of year by females and males at two spatial and temporal scales: landscape scale and within home range, as analysed by compositional analysis (Leban 1999). Given as P-values where significant selection detected, temporal selection distinguished as diurnal (D) and nocturnal (N), ns = selection not detected. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. Data from the establishment month following the two reintroductions was excluded from these analyses. 112

Table 4.5 Habitat selection by females (a) and males (b) at different times of year, at landscape level and during diurnal (day) and nocturnal (night) activities, given as ranks from Compositional Analysis, ranging from 1 (most preferred/selected) to 5 (least preferred). Habitat types were Grassland (Gra), Eucalyptus diversifolia (E.d), Acacia anceps (A.a), Eucalyptus rugosa (E.r), and Melaleuca halmaturorum (M.h). Habitats labelled with the same superscript (eg. ^a) do not differ significantly in rank. N= number of individuals analysed..... 113

Table 4.6 Habitat selection at the landscape scale during the spring release month (Nov04) and post-establishment (Nov-Dec), and winter release month (Jun05) and post-establishment (Jul-Aug). Given as ranks from Compositional Analysis, ranging from 1 (most preferred/selected) to 5 (least preferred). Habitat types were Grassland (Gra), Eucalyptus diversifolia (E.d), Acacia anceps (A.a), Eucalyptus rugosa (E.r), and Melaleuca halmaturorum (M.h). Habitats labelled with the same superscript (eg. ^a) do not differ significantly in rank. N= number of individuals analysed. 116

Table 4.7 Diurnal and nocturnal habitat selection within the home range during the spring release month (Nov04) and post-establishment (Nov-Dec), and winter release month (Jun05) and post-establishment (Jul-Aug). Given as ranks from Compositional Analysis, ranging from 1 (most preferred/selected) to 5 (least preferred). Habitat types were Grassland (Gra), Eucalyptus diversifolia (E.d), Acacia anceps (A.a), Eucalyptus rugosa (E.r), and Melaleuca halmaturorum (M.h). Habitats labelled with the same superscript (eg. ^a) do not differ significantly in rank. N= number of individuals analysed..... 117

Table 5.1 Predictor variables considered in each model to assess their influence on the four aspects habitat and social grouping behaviours during establishment phase and post-establishment. 131

Table 5.2 Specifications and categories of the predictor variables used for modelling various aspects of habitat use.....	133
Table 5.3 Significance of predictor variables as given by P values derived from multivariate models for four aspects of habitat use and social behaviour by tammar wallabies during the establishment period. Predictor variables which did not meet the $p>0.1$ criteria in the univariate model “(univariate)” were excluded from subsequent consideration in the multivariate model. Significant values are highlighted in bold, “-” = untested.	135
Table 5.4 Percentage difference in the likelihood of using high cover for different stages of day or night during the establishment period, as determined by “relative risk” post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were less likely to be in high cover, ↑ indicates animals were more likely to be in high cover (read as: left column compared to top column). P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant.....	136
Table 5.5 Percentage difference in group size (number of animals within 100m) for different stages of day or night during the establishment period, as determined by rate ratio post hoc tests. ↓ indicates smaller group size (compared to the corresponding stage), ↑ indicates larger group size. ($P<0.0001$ for all significant differences). “ns”= non significant.	138
Table 5.6 Percentage differences in group size (number of animals within 100m) while using different habitat types during the establishment period, as determined by rate ratio post hoc tests. ↓ indicates smaller group size (compared to the corresponding habitat type), ↑ indicates larger group size. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference.	139
Table 5.7 Distance between an animal and its nearest neighbour (median value) at the different stages of the day or night, and differences in proximity between the different stages of the day or night as determined by post hoc tests (in median metres) during establishment month. ↓ indicates animals were closer (compared to the corresponding stage), ↑ indicates animals were further apart. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= no significant difference in distance to nearest neighbour between the two stages.....	140
Table 5.8 Distances between nearest neighbours (median metres) during establishment while occupying different habitat types, and comparisons between neighbour proximities in the five different habitat types (in median metres), as determined by post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were closer (compared to the corresponding month), ↑ indicates animals were further apart. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference.....	141
Table 5.9 Significance of predictor variables on three aspects of habitat use and social behaviour by reintroduced tammar wallabies post-establishment, given as P values derived from multivariate models. Predictor variables which did not meet the $p>0.1$ criteria in the univariate model “(univariate)” were excluded from subsequent consideration in the multivariate model. Significant values are highlighted in bold, “-” = untested.	142
Table 5.10 Differences in percentage likelihood of animals being found in high cover habitat at different times of year, as determined by relative risk post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were less likely to be in high cover (compared to the corresponding period), ↑ indicated animals were more likely to be in high cover. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference.	143
Table 5.11 Differences in percentage likelihood of animals being found in high cover habitat during different stages of the day or night, as determined by relative risk post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were less likely to be in high cover (compared to the corresponding stage), ↑ indicated animals were more likely to be in high cover. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference.....	144

Table 5.12 Median distance to cover of foraging animals post-establishment, and differences between times of year, as determined by post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were closer to cover (compared to the corresponding period), ↑ indicated animals were further from cover. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference..... 145

Table 5.13 Median distance between nearest neighbours post establishment, and differences between times of year, as determined by post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were closer (compared to the corresponding period), ↑ indicates animals were further apart. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference..... 146

Table 5.14 Distance between nearest neighbours, and differences in neighbour proximities for different stages of the day or night (median value) post establishment, as determined by post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were closer (compared to the corresponding stage), ↑ indicates animals were further apart. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference..... 146

Table 5.15 Distances between nearest neighbours post establishment while occupying different habitat types (median metres), and comparisons between neighbour proximities in the five different habitat types (in median metres), as determined by post hoc tests. ↓ indicates animals were closer (compared to the corresponding habitat type), ↑ indicates animals were further apart. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively. “ns”= non significant difference..... 147

Table 5.16 Differences between establishment month and in the month one year after establishment in the tammar wallabies’ likelihood of using high cover, distance to cover while foraging at night, group size (number of animals within 100m), and distance between nearest neighbours. Results obtained from univariate models. “ns”= non significant difference. 148

List of figures

Figure 2.1 Tammar wallaby (*Macropus eugenii eugenii*). (Photo: Tony Lewis). 37

Figure 2.2 Distribution of tammar wallabies in Australia prior to European settlement (dark blue colour denotes their current distribution, red colour signifies reintroduced populations in South Australia, Hinds 2008). 38

Figure 2.3 a) Location of Innes National Park in South Australia, and b) Release sites within the park (indicated by black squares). 43

Figure 2.4 Images of tammar wallaby release site habitat in the southern region of Innes National Park, South Australia. 44

Figure 2.5 Habitat types of the study area within Innes National Park (map created in ArcGIS using vegetation layers supplied by DEH). 47

Figure 2.6 Locations of random quadrats in each habitat type within the study area. At each of the 95 4m² locations, the habitat structural cover, species diversity, and plant and seasonal grass biomass were assessed. 48

Figure 2.7 Mean percentage canopy cover for each height category (±se), in each habitat type, measured in 95 random 4m² quadrats..... 49

Figure 2.8 Mean plant species diversity found within each 4m² quadrat (±se) surveyed in each habitat type in the study area. 50

Figure 2.9 Mean total plant biomass available in 4m² (±se) quadrats within each habitat type. All foliage from 0-0.5m above the ground was included, as this was considered to be "available" forage for tammar wallabies. 51

Figure 2.10 Seasonal mean grass biomass per 4m ² (\pm se) quadrat within the each habitat type.	51
Figure 2.11 Overall seasonal productivity of habitat types: combined mean plant and grass biomass (gDM) per 4m ² quadrat.	52
Figure 2.12 Animals being transported to the release site at Innes National Park. (Photo: Trudie Jaques).	54
Figure 2.13 Tammar wallaby release pen.	55
Figure 2.14 Spacing of pens at reintroduction site in Innes National Park.	56
Figure 2.15 Wallaby and collar with reflective tape (Photo: Trudie Jaques).	58
Figure 2.16 a) Radio-tracking tower dismantled and on top of trailer, b) Erected, and c) In use. (Photo a&b: Trudie Jaques, c: Leah Kemp).	59
Figure 2.17 Preliminary investigation on the expected range of radio-tracking towers within the study area. Each trial collar position was detected by at least two towers.	60
Figure 3.1 Mean number of location points (\pm se) obtained for each animal from radio-tracking (with error ellipses <10ha) for each month.	67
Figure 3.2 Percentage of 95%MCP areas derived from different numbers of location points obtained from animals (n=212).	68
Figure 3.3 Mean distance between mean centre of home ranges (\pm se) for familiar and unfamiliar group members with time after release, as calculated by the distance between the mean centre of animals' monthly home ranges.	78
Figure 3.4 Mean distance \pm se between mean centre of monthly home ranges for group members and non-group members with time after release. P values of <0.05, <0.001, <0.0001 indicated by *, **, *** respectively.	80
Figure 3.5 Percentage of monthly home range areas (n=212) of varying size estimated for tammar wallabies over twelve months following their reintroduction.	85
Figure 3.6 Mean monthly home range size (\pm se) for female and male tammar wallabies post-establishment following their reintroduction.	85
Figure 3.7 Mean percentage of monthly home range area shared (\pm se) for female and males tammar wallabies post-establishment following a reintroduction.	88
Figure 3.8 Mean percentage of monthly core area shared (\pm se) for female and males tammar wallabies post-establishment following a reintroduction.	89
Figure 3.9 Mean number of animals overlapping each tammar wallabies' monthly home range (\pm se) following their reintroduction, relative to the number of animals available. ↓ indicates reintroduction event.	91
Figure 3.10 Mean percentage of the population overlapping each tammar wallabies' monthly home range (\pm se) following their reintroduction, relative to the number available. ↓ indicates reintroduction event.	91
Figure 4.1 Study area (as defined by a 500m buffer on the perimeter of home ranges), and boundary of monthly home ranges (as calculated by 100%MCPs) of tammar wallabies radio-tracked for 12 months following their reintroduction.	107