



National Environmental Science Programme

Moving mammals – looking backwards, looking forward

Sarah Legge, Uni Qld and ANU; on behalf of large author team

Mike Bode, Andrew Burbidge, Nicki Mitchell, Jim Radford, Jeremy Ringma, Brendan Wintle, John Woinarski

Adrian Manning, Australian National University, Woodlands Trust Andrew Burbidge Annika Everaardt, Tasmania DPIPWE Brendan Wintle, University of Melbourne Brydie Hill, NT Dept Environment and Natural Resources Chris Dickman, University of Sydney Chris Johnson, University of Tasmania David Pannell, University of Western Australia Erin McCreless, UQ Graeme Gillespie , NT Dept Environment and Natural Resources Jeremy Ringma, University of Queensland Jim Radford, Bush Heritage Australia John Kanowski , Australian Wildlife Conservancy John Woinarski, Charles Darwin University Joss Bentley, NSW Office of Environment and Heritage Katherine Moseby, Ecological Horizons / Arid Recovery Katherine Tuft, Arid Recovery Keith Morris, WA DBCA Manda Page, WA DBCA Marcus Baseler, Dept of the Environment, ERIN Michael Bode, University of Melbourne Mike Letnic, University of Melbourne Mike Letnic, University of NSW Nick Dexter, Parks Australia (Booderee National Park) Nicki Mitchell, University of Western Australia Peter Copley, SA Dept of Environment, Water and Natural Resources Peter Latch, Dept of the Environment Peter Menkhorst, Artur Rylah Institute for Environmental Research Russell Palmer, WA DBCA

Moving mammals – looking backwards, looking forward

Looking backwards:

- Brief history of translocations
- Why do we need to move mammals?
- Development of the 'ark' or 'haven' concept for threatened mammals

Looking forwards: Strategic planning for future translocations to havens

- Which species need havens?
- How well are they currently protected?
- Where should the next havens go?

Comparisons between plant and animal translocations

Animal translocations

- Translocations is an ancient practice (eg cuscus, dingo); for food, ceremony, medicine, mind-altering...hunting aid and companionship
- Colonising Europeans also moved animals around (eg rabbits, foxes, cats)
- Early settlers formalised this tradition with acclimatisation societies (eg kookaburras:

... "merit, as vermin-destroying animals" ...

... "robust, jovial humour of their merry pleasant notes and quaint manners" ...)



The Snake Destroyer, the Laughing Jackass Illustrated Australian News, 27 December 1876.



Animal translocations for conservation

Conservation translocations to islands began late 1800s:

- Koalas to French Is; late 1800s
- Tammars to Greenly Is, SA; 1905
- Red-bellied Pademelon to Wilsons Prom; 1911
- Lyrebirds to Tasmania; 1934-49

Conservation translocations increased from c. 1960s



Animal translocations for conservation







Short 2009 'The characteristics and success of vertebrate translocations within Australia' Legge et al 2018 Wildlife Research

Why do we need to move mammals?

Australian mammal extinction rate worst in world

- >35 taxa extinct, representing
- 35% of all global mammalian extinctions since 1500



Cats and foxes are main drivers, exacerbated by habitat change from fire, grazing, other ferals (eg. rabbits)



Evidence

- The timing of fox/cat arrival vs population decline
- Correspondence between cat/fox prey with severity of population decline
- Correspondence of ecological and life history attributes with severity of decline
- Contrast in translocation success to sites with/without cats/foxes
- Some pops of some species only survived where cats/foxes remained absent

Some species only survived because they occurred on islands that remained free of cats/foxes



Greater stick-nest rats became extinct on the mainland, surviving only on the Franklin Islands



Natural Island Arks Boodies were extirpated on the mainland, surviving only on three islands off the WA coast





Natural island arks were augmented by deliberate translocations to islands...

...first using islands that were naturally cat and fox free, and later using islands from which cats/foxes were eradicated



Cumulative increase in island number and area used for mammal translocations

Extending the island concept - mainland islands

First mainland islands created by Earth Sanctuaries Limited (Wamsley) from 1980s





Extending the island concept - mainland islands



Cumulative increase in number and area of fenced exclosures used for mammal translocations

Total areas of fences projected to increase substantially over coming years Wandiyali-Environa, Tiverton, Mallee Refuge, Pilliga, Goorooyarroo, Newhaven, Mallee Cliffs, Wild Desert add 914 km²





Strategic planning for mammal translocations

- 1. Which species need complete protection from cats and foxes?
- 2. Where are the existing island and fenced havens?
- 3. Which species do they protect?
- 4. Where should the next island and fenced havens go?





1. Which species need protection from cats and foxes?

- Assessed 246 mammal taxa (excluding bats)
- Categorised by ~30 experts according to susceptibility to cats/foxes

EXTREME = Don't persist with cats/foxes

HIGH = May just persist, but heavily reduced pop size or viability; or only if cat/fox density is much reduced

LOW = persists, but with some reduction in pop size or viability

NO = pop size and/or viability unaffected by cats/foxes



Predator susceptibility of all terrestrial mammal species



Radford et al. (2018) Wildlife Research



Radford et al. (2018) Wildlife Research

Digression – cats and faunal attrition



McKenzie et al 2007 Legge et al (2017) Bio Cons



Strategic planning for mammal translocations

- 1. Which species need complete protection from cats and foxes?
- 2. Where are the existing island and fenced havens?
- 3. Which species do they protect?
- 4. Where should the next island and fenced havens go?





Used ERIN Island database, DEWHA feral animals on islands database, Mammal Action Plan, additional references, pers comms from agencies, NGOs

Where are the existing island and fenced havens?



Cat and fox-free islands



Cat/fox-free with susceptible taxa



- 101 islands, covering 2152 km²
- Range 1 ha 235 km² (Barrow) and now 628 km² (DHI)
- Median = 6 km²

In situ, or natural pops vs translocated island pops



'Natural' havens

• Concentrated in the north

Havens by translocation

- More common south of tropics
- WA and SA govs most active
- 22 islands; 30 translocations



Mainland havens (fenced areas)



Excludes small fenced areas with pops maintained by supplementary feeding, or constant restocking

- 19 fenced areas
- 17 with threatened mammal taxa susceptible to cats/foxes
- Cover 346 km²
- Range 0.5-123 km²
- Median 4 km²



Woylie release at Perup fenced reserve, WA. (O'Rourkes/Dept. Biodiversity, Conservation, Attractions)

Islands and fences – some vital stats



Islands reach much larger areas:

- Median fence area = 4 km², max = 123 km²
- Median island area = 6 km², max = 628 km²

Island havens outnumber fences, and cover much larger total area

Islands protect more populations, but not more taxa...

Greater redundancy of pops (per taxa) across islands

Islands and fences – some vital stats



Compared to islands, fenced areas are more likely to have multiple taxa

number of taxa in the haven

Islands and fences – some vital stats

In situ pops vs translocated populations

- Islands have played an important role in protecting in situ pops
- Fenced areas are important havens for translocated pops





The eastern barred bandicoot exists only within three fenced areas and two islands *Photo: Wiki CC*

Islands and fences - success rates

Haven	Short 2009	Legge et al 2018
Open site	Ranges from 0% to <<50%	
Island	82% (n = 17)	86% (n = 35)
Fence	59% (n = 41)	70% (n = 60)
Time periods	1880-2009	1980-2017

- Success rates are probably increasing; island translocations more successful than to fences
- Translocation success overwhelming influenced by cat/fox predation (habitat quality, disease, animal husbandry, small founder number much less important)
- Most failures to fenced areas were from cat/fox incursion, but also small area in some cases
- Without adequate investment in construction & ongoing maintenance, security of fenced areas is inevitably compromised

Short J (2009) The characteristics and success of vertebrate translocations within Australia. Legge et al (2018) Wildlife Research

Progress so far - representation across havens



Progress so far - representation across havens



The last 10 haven areas have increased protection for some species, **but have not added any new species to the haven network**

Many players create havens (state gov, local gov, NGO, community groups, private individuals). Decentralisation:

- Creates resilience
- Improves community buy-in
- Challenges national coordination

Strategic planning for mammal translocations

- 1. Which species need complete protection from cats and foxes?
- 2. Where are the existing island and fenced havens?
- 3. Which species do they protect?
- 4. Where should the next island and fenced havens go?





Systematic planning for future havens

Aim: How should we expand the haven network to reduce extinction riak for mammal taxa threatened by cats and foxes

- 67 taxa
- Historical distribution to guide where each taxon could be protected
- Weighted taxa according to their existing protection
- Prioritised subregions by iteratively re-weighted taxa

Compared performance of this approach with

- 'Random' subregions selected at random
- 'Business as usual' extrapolate from past network growth

Systematic planning for future havens



Determined the minimum number of new havens required for different levels of population redundancy

- At least one pop of every taxa
- To at least 6 pops of every taxa

To achieve one or more pops...we need as few as 12 new havens.

Ringma et al. (2018) Cons Letts "Systematic planning can rapidly close the protection gap in Australian mammal havens."

The next 12 havens...to achieve protection for at least one pop of every mammal taxon susceptible to cat/fox predation



Performance with systematic planning



Objective: to reduce extinction risk across all 67 taxa susceptible to predation by cats and foxes

Strategic planning outperforms other approaches.

Random selection of future sites outperforms Business-As-Usual

Ringma et al. (2018) Cons Letts "Systematic planning can rapidly close the protection gap in Australian mammal havens."

Support partnerships:

- Funded species, even multi-species, recovery teams
- Brokered partnerships, even tied to government investment

Whilst recognising that locally-focussed groups have immense value!











Pig-footed Bandicoot



Short-tailed Hopping Mouse Crescent nailtail wallaby

White-footed rabbit-rat

Large-eared Hopping Mouse



Some of the mammals sent extinct by cats and foxes





Lesser Stick-nest rat



Long-tailed Hopping Mouse







13 taxa have avoided extinction because of natural or 'created' havens

Boodie (2 subspecies)





Spectacled Hare-wallaby (Barrow Is)

Rufous Hare-	
wallaby	Rock-wa
(2 subspecies)	(2 island









Gilbert's Potoroo



Eastern Barred Bandicoot



Western Barred Bandicoot



Shark Bay Mouse



Greater Stick-nest rat



Photos: H. McGregor; Wiki CC; R. Francis; D. Walker; Parks Australia; DBCA; J. Lochman

This is what avoided extinction looks like



Even with multiple havens, distribution and ecological roles have collapsed





....and could make return to open landscapes harder

- Loss of local adaptation
- Loss of predator recognition and response

- Northern quolls translocated in 2003 to NT island without cats or dingoes
- After 13 generations, island quolls and their captive born offspring lost recognition of cats/dingoes, compared with mainland quolls and their captive-born offspring



Jonno Webb

- The existence of mammal pops on offshore islands prevented extinctions
- Islands and fenced areas continue to play a critical role in conservation of mammals highly susceptible to cats/foxes
- But they are a stop-gap...

Mammal versus plant translocations (Courtesy Jen Silcock et al)

Animals translocations began ramping up about a decade earlier than plants, but are fewer, and involve fewer species



All animals: >400 translocations involving >230 taxa Mammals: >310 translocations involving > 50 taxa >1000 translocations involving >375 taxa

Mammal versus plant translocations (Courtesy Jen Silcock et al)



Mostly to less populated areas

Mostly **reintroductions** (within known range) 65%

DRIVER = PREDATION FROM CATS/FOXES

Main reason for failure = predation



Mostly near most populated areas

Mostly introductions (but within known range) 80%

DRIVER = HABITAT LOSS FROM DEVELOPMENT

Main reason for failure = small founder size

Green Stars = conservation translocations

Red Crosses = development mitigation translocations



Moving mammals – looking backwards, looking forward

Sarah Legge, Uni Qld and ANU; on behalf of large author team

Mike Bode, Andrew Burbidge, Nicki Mitchell, Jim Radford, Jeremy Ringma, Brendan Wintle, John Woinarski

Adrian Manning, Australian National University, Woodlands Trust Joss Bentley, NSW Office of Environment and Heritage Katherine Moseby, Ecological Horizons / Arid Recovery Andrew Burbidge Katherine Tuft, Arid Recovery Annika Everaardt, Tasmania DPIPWE Brendan Wintle, University of Melbourne Keith Morris, WA DBCA Manda Page, WA DBCA Brydie Hill, NT Dept Environment and Natural Resources Marcus Baseler, Dept of the Environment, ERIN Chris Dickman, University of Sydney Michael Bode, University of Melbourne Chris Johnson, University of Tasmania Mike Letnic, University of NSW David Pannell, University of Western Australia Nick Dexter, Parks Australia (Booderee National Park) Erin McCreless, UQ Nicki Mitchell, University of Western Australia Graeme Gillespie, NT Dept Environment and Natural Resources Jeremy Ringma, University of Queensland Peter Copley, SA Dept of Environment, Water and Natural Resources Jim Radford, Bush Heritage Australia Peter Latch, Dept of the Environment John Kanowski , Australian Wildlife Conservancy Peter Menkhorst, Artur Rylah Institute for Environmental Research John Woinarski, Charles Darwin University Russell Palmer, WA DBCA