

Investigating and integrating animal behaviour in the conservation and management of an endangered amphibian

Melanie Sandra James, BEnvSc (Hons) (University of Newcastle)

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Environmental and Life Sciences

March 2018

This research was supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program
(RTP) Scholarship

The University of Newcastle

Australia



Melanie Sandra James

Statement of Originality

I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis is my own work, conducted under normal supervision. This thesis contains no material that has been accepted, or is being examined, 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 consent to the final version of my thesis being made available worldwide when deposited in the University's Digital Repository, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968 and any approved embargo.

Signed:

Melanie Sandra James

Date 26/3/2018

Statement of Ethics

The work presented in this thesis was conducted in accordance with The University of Newcastle Animal Care and Ethics Committee (A-2011-144) and conducted under the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service Scientific License Number SL101097 and SL100421. This research was funded through the University of Newcastle and with industry grants from BHP Billiton and Newcastle Coal Infrastructure Group.

Acknowledgements

I would like to convey my deepest thanks to all the people I've been lucky enough to know and all the people that have helped me through my undergraduate, Honours and PhD. Undertaking a PhD has been one of the best experiences of my life. It has been an amazing opportunity to spend my days pondering biology and ecology, asking fascinating questions and exploring the world. For my acknowledgements, I follow a modern version of the '*Keep It Simple, Stupid*' (KISS) principle – K. Johnson (1910–1990), known as the '*Would have liked to keep it simple, but the world got big and complicated*' (WHLTKIS-BTWGBAC) – M. James (1987 – hopefully not too soon).

I would like to dedicate my thesis to my wonderful family. To my parents Denise and Dennis James, my brother Daniel James and my grandparents Desmond Kelly and Joyce Kelly. You have encouraged me and facilitated all my passions and learning, and never once raised an eyebrow too seriously at my strange and fantastical pursuits. You have been so much support, and I love you.

Alex, my husband, fellow adventurer and best friend. We have been at Uni for 10 years. It's time to roll out the other side. I cannot thank you enough for toughing it out through harsh frogging conditions, for always having hope, time to listen to my ideas and for understanding and appreciating my passions. I am excited and a healthy amount of scared, but whatever adventures are in the future, we will forge through them together and find small fluffy birds on the way.

To my dear and wonderful friends group, Michael Spinks, Ashlea Middleton, Jessica Brooks, Jon Coyle, Lisette Walsh, Daniel James, Keira McKay, Ben Stapelton, Tristan Varman, Ylva Noren and Henrik Evensen. I have had such a wonderful time with you all, and I can't wait to continue exploring the universe with you. Now Michael, let's go to the snow and burn my thesis.

To my extended family, Boma, Bopa, Kathy, Steven and Kenneth. Thank you so much for all your support over the years, I look forward to more morning teas and picnics with scones and dinner/movie nights in the future.

To all my supervisors, thank you for all your help, for understanding the challenges of doing a PhD with a long-distance commute and for your continued enthusiasm. It kept me fuelled when working on my thesis in the evenings after full time work.

Michelle Stockwell, I will always fondly remember emailing Evan Pickett and being assigned to you to as a volunteer. It's insane that it's nearly 10 years since we crawled out of Newington Armoury in the early hours, waded through ponds in 35°C heat, cooled off in the Northern Water Feature filling our waders with water and dreaded going back to set tadpole traps after dinner and cards. You inspired me and helped me discover my love of discovery, and you have helped build my skill set not just in the scientific method, but in science communication and project management. I am the luckiest person to have you as my mentor.

Ligia Pizzato, thank you so much for being my animal behaviour guru. Your depth of knowledge and sharp wit has helped me so much, and it has been an absolute pleasure having you as a supervisor. John Clulow, magic man. Always able to sort a solution even when the going gets tough. Thank you for all your support and swoop ins. Michael Mahony, my unofficial supervisor, thank you for all the time spent nutting out the behavioural ecology of the bell frog, I am always humbled by your wealth of knowledge and it has been a honour working in the Conservation Biology Research Group.

Thank you to all the colleagues and friends I have met in our research group; Alex Callen, Kaya Klop-Toker, Matt Edgar, Deb Bower, Carla Pollard, James Garnham, Evan Pickett and Michelle Stockwell. Damn you guys are cool. I love the research, the fieldwork and the frogs, but loved being a part of our Lab because of you.

This thesis could not have proceeded without the numerous volunteers, scholarship students and interns. Huw Beckett, it was wonderful having you over from Cardiff U.K. to assist in the field, thank you for all your hard work and shenanigans. My scholarship students, Rye Goolan, Jacqueline O'Neill and Lachlan Howe and the numerous undergraduate volunteers and scholarship students that assisted me in the field.

Thank you to the University of Newcastle and the Faculty of Science and IT for ongoing statistical support. With statistical support, I have learnt how to undertake complex analysis which has immensely improved my research output. Such investment is a testament to our Universities integrity.

Thank you to the Central Coast Council for their employment over the last two years. It has been a phenomenal opportunity to work on grants and contribute to the ecological research and conservation in my home town.

And last but by no means least, thank you to the frogs. You were great.

Sometimes a little cranky, but great.

Contents

Contents	vi
List of figures	xiv
List of tables	xix
Chapter 1. Overview	1
1.1 Summary	1
1.2 Preamble	6
Chapter 2. Introduction	8
2.1 Factors influencing distribution and abundance and ecological theories	8
2.1.1 Habitat and species distribution	8
2.1.2 Heterospecific and conspecific interactions	11
2.1.2.1 Competition and predation	11
2.1.2.2 Negative density dependence	13
2.1.2.3 Conspecific aggregations	14
2.1.2.4 Positive density dependence	15
2.1.2.5 Using conspecifics to find suitable habitat	16
2.2 Threats to small populations and colonisation capacity	17
2.3 The endangered green and golden bell frog (<i>Litoria aurea</i>)	21
2.3.1 Information on <i>Litoria aurea</i>	21
2.3.2 Gaps in knowledge	23
2.3.2.1 Conspecific attraction	23
2.3.2.1 Microhabitat	24
2.3.2.3 Habitat construction	24
2.3.2.4 Breeding behaviour	25
2.3.2.5 Summary of gaps in knowledge	25
Chapter 3. Can conspecific call playback change amphibian distribution? Building from localised distribution manipulation to a larger scale: a continuing case	27
3.1 Abstract	27
3.2 Introduction	28

3.3 Method.....	31
3.3.1 Breeding and habitat selection behaviour of <i>L. aurea</i>	31
3.3.2 Study site and species distribution.....	32
3.3.3 Experimental waterbodies: treatments, manipulative controls and controls ..	33
3.3.4 Pre-broadcast surveys	34
3.3.5 <i>Litoria aurea</i> call recordings and speaker design.....	35
After frog calls were recorded, we used Raven Pro Interactive Sound Analysis Software (CLO 2014) to edit the calls. The aim of call editing was to make a mp3 file with 10 minutes of calling which represented different call types. Using Ford (1989) definitions of call types; A) grunts and B) drone call types, we used the cut function ensured different call types were represented in a single recording. The final file had 10 minutes of consistent calling. This calling was repeated 5 times to form a 50-minute sound file. A 10 minute stretch of silence was then introduced after the 50 minutes of looped calling to prevent habituation to calling. A small mp3 player with an USB charging port and audio jack (female) input was loaded with the 50 minute call file and was programmed to repeat.	36
3.3.6 During-broadcast surveys	37
3.3.7 Tadpole surveys	37
3.3.8 Statistical analysis.....	38
3.3.8.1 Effect of call broadcast	38
3.3.8.2 Subset of the data – high abundance waterbodies	39
3.3.8.3 Effect of speakers on length of breeding season	40
3.3.8.4 Rainfall and climate	40
3.4 Results	40
3.4.1 Observations of waterbody use.....	40
3.4.2 Pre-broadcast and during-broadcast abundance and calling.....	40
3.4.3 Effect of speakers on length of breeding season	43
3.4.4 Analysis of calling broadcast effect.....	44
3.4.5 Abundance and calling in relation to rain and climatic variables.....	45

3.4.6 Dip-netting surveys.....	46
3.4.7 Water quality	46
3.5 Discussion	47
3.5.1 General findings.....	48
3.5.2 Correlation between rainfall and climate with calling and abundance.....	48
3.5.3 Failed breeding events	49
3.5.4 Possible confounding factors influencing conspecific attraction response	50
3.5.4.1 Distance	50
3.5.4.2 Differential habitat selection	51
3.5.4.3 Other forms of conspecific attraction	52
3.5.4.4 Timing of speaker placement	53
3.5.5 Revised implications for habitat selection and amphibian conservation.....	53
3.5.6 Improvements for future studies	54
3.6 Conclusions	55
3.7 Acknowledgements	55
Chapter 4. Microhabitat selection of calling male green and golden bell frogs (<i>Litoria aurea</i>) in N.S.W. Australia	57
4.1 Abstract	57
4.2 Introduction	57
4.3 Method.....	60
4.3.1 Available information on <i>Litoria aurea</i> calling behaviour	60
4.3.2 Study site	61
4.3.3 Study design and quadrat placement	62
4.3.4 Statistical methods	64
4.3.4.1 Substrate use description	64
4.3.4.2 Analysis of calling presence/absence to substrate, water parameters and microclimate	65
4.4 Results	66

4.4.1 Substrate use descriptions	66
4.4.2 Analysis of calling presence/absence to substrate, water parameters and microclimate	67
4.5 Discussion	70
4.5.1 Substrate use	71
4.5.2 Water parameters	73
4.5.3 Implications for future research and conservation.....	74
4.5.3.1 Habitat creation programmes	74
4.5.3.2 Male distribution and conspecific attraction	76
4.5.3.3 Monitoring <i>Litoria aurea</i> habitat	76
4.5.4 Limitations of the study	77
4.5.5 Future research on direct habitat selection and natal learning.....	78
4.6 Conclusion.....	79
4.7 Acknowledgements	79
Chapter 5. Rapid colonisation of constructed wetlands by the endangered green and golden bell frog (<i>Litoria aurea</i>) and five other frog species.....	81
5.1 Abstract	81
5.2 Introduction	82
5.3 Method.....	86
5.3.1 Study area including constructed habitat, and <i>Litoria aurea</i> distribution	86
5.3.2 Collection of baseline data.....	89
5.3.3 Habitat design and construction.....	90
5.3.4 Surveys after completion of the constructed habitats	91
5.3.4.1 <i>Gambusia holbrooki</i> , tadpole and invertebrate surveys	91
5.3.4.2 Auditory and visual encounter surveys	92
5.3.4.3 Habitat surveys	92
5.3.4.4 Water quality and depth	93
5.3.5 Descriptive and statistical methods	93

5.3.5.1 Tadpole diversity and macroinvertebrate abundance, diversity and sensitivity	93
5.3.5.2 Comparison of constructed wetlands to reference wetlands: chorus size as a measure of habitat utilisation	94
5.3.5.3 Comparison of constructed wetlands to reference wetlands: sex ratios, age class structure and body condition	94
5.3.5.4 Comparison of constructed wetlands to reference wetlands: habitat availability and use	95
5.3.5.5 Site conditions and suitability: rain data and water quality for constructed wetlands	96
5.4 Results	96
5.4.1 Post-construction landscape description.....	96
5.4.2 Frog and macro-invertebrate data	97
5.4.2.1 <i>Litoria aurea</i> response	97
5.4.2.2 Tadpole species diversity and abundance	98
5.4.2.3 Macroinvertebrate diversity and abundance	99
5.4.3 Comparison of habitat quality and use by <i>L. aurea</i> between constructed and reference wetlands on Ash Island and other sites	99
5.4.3.1 Chorus sizes in Ash Island, Avoca and Sydney Olympic Park populations	100
5.4.3.2 Sex ratio	100
5.4.3.3 Estimated age class structure of <i>L. aurea</i> in constructed habitat, Ash Island	101
5.4.3.4 Body condition of <i>L. aurea</i> in constructed and reference wetlands	102
5.4.3.5 Habitat structure comparison between constructed and reference wetlands	103
5.4.3.6 Habitat use in constructed and reference wetlands	103
5.4.3.7 Comparison of habitat use between sexes in constructed and reference wetlands	104
5.4.3.8 Comparison of habitat use between constructed and reference wetlands	105
5.4.4 Water quality and <i>Gambusia holbrooki</i> surveys.....	107
5.4.4.1 Rainfall post-construction and occurrence of <i>Gambusia holbrooki</i>	107
5.4.4.2 Abiotic water quality parameters	107

5.5 Achievement of Key Performance Indicators for constructed habitat during the study period (7/1/2016 – 30/3/2016)	110
5.5 Discussion	111
5.5.1 Assessment of outcomes of constructed L. aurea compensatory habitat programme	111
5.5.3 Implications of research findings on L. aurea biology and ecology	113
5.5.3.1 Body condition of L. aurea in constructed wetlands	113
5.5.3.2 Age and breeding of L. aurea in constructed and reference habitats	114
5.5.3.3 Colonisation and dispersal of L. aurea at a landscape level – support from this study for developing paradigms	115
5.5.4 Broad implications for habitat creation programmes	119
5.6 Conclusions	119
5.7 Acknowledgements	119
Chapter 6. Larger males get the girls: mating patterns help direct captive breeding strategies for the endangered green and golden bell frog (<i>Litoria aurea</i>)	121
6.1 Abstract	121
6.2 Introduction	122
6.3 Method.....	125
6.3.1 Study species	125
6.3.2 Field method	125
6.3.3 Weight and size analysis.....	127
6.3.4 Assortative mating	127
6.3.5 Behavioural observations.....	128
6.4 Results	128
6.4.1 Climate.....	128
6.4.2 General descriptions	129
6.4.3 Variability in morphometric measurement precision	129
6.4.4 Weight and size analysis.....	130

6.4.5 Assortative mating	130
6.4.6 Behavioural observations.....	132
6.5 Discussion	134
6.5.1 Large male mating advantage?	135
6.5.2 Varied size of amplexing females.....	137
6.5.3 Captive breeding programmes	137
6.6 Conclusion.....	138
6.7 Acknowledgements	138
Chapter 7. Synthesis	139
7.1 Summary	139
7.1.1 Conspecific attraction	139
7.1.2 Microhabitat selection	140
7.1.3 Constructed wetlands.....	140
7.1.4 Mating patterns	141
7.2 Synthesis of chapters and conservation implications	141
7.2.1 Microhabitat selection alongside aggressive territorial behaviour suggests guarding of habitat or chorus space	141
7.2.2 The implications of conspecific attraction, chorus density, large male mating advantage and the Allee effect.....	142
7.3 Recommendations for future research.....	143
7.3.1 Behaviour and Allee Effects	143
7.3.2 Resource Selection.....	144
7.3.3 Behavioural traits affecting dispersal and utilisation of natal and other breeding habitats	144
7.4 Conclusion.....	146
Chapter 8. References	147

List of figures

Figure 1: Hypothetical distribution of species across a landscape affected by habitat quality, and differential spatial partitioning of the landscape determined by age and sex as well as physical attributes of the habitat.	10
Figure 2: The potential influence of density on the gain (A) or loss (B) of organisms (the per capita demographic rate). Gain is due to the rate of immigration and births, whereas loss is due to death and emigration. Three scenarios are displayed: negative density dependence (NDD), density independence (DI) in grey and positive density dependence (PDD) in black.	14
Figure 3: The influence of population density on per capita growth rate for negative density dependent model (solid line) compared to weak Allee effects (dash line) and strong Allee effects (dotted line). The carrying capacity indicates maximum population density where per capita growth rate becomes 0 (loss = growth in a stable population) and the Allee threshold indicates the point where per capita growth rate becomes negative (Courchamp et al. 2008).	18
Figure 4: The distribution of the green and golden bell frog (<i>Litoria aurea</i>) across maps of A) Australia and B) New South Wales and photographs of C) an adult male with a raised black nuptial pad on the forefinger used for grasping females and D) a juvenile <i>L. aurea</i>	22
Figure 5: A) Map of Australia with Ash and Kooragang Islands (square) (-32.862863 S, 151.728355 E). On the map, 15 waterbodies are identified by symbols. Groups of waterbodies formed five replicate clusters (1-5), each replicate cluster contained a Treatment, in which speakers broadcasted <i>L. aurea</i> calls and a Manipulative Control in which speaker was set up without broadcasting sound. For the replicate clusters, additional shallow ‘scrapes/swales’ acted as Controls with no speakers or stands (excluding replicate cluster 1). Replicate clusters two and three are considered low abundance.	33
Figure 6: Mean waterbody abundance per hour (A) and total calling males (C) prior to speaker broadcast and mean waterbody abundance per hour (B) and total calling males (D) during <i>Litoria aurea</i> call broadcast, within each treatment cluster for treatment (T), manipulative control (MC) and control (C).	42

Figure 7: Mean abundance over a 40 minute survey of <i>Litoria aurea</i> from raw data displaying pre-call broadcast and during-call broadcast surveys for A) Mean abundance and B) Mean number of calling males (\pm SE).....	43
Figure 8: A) Mean abundance of <i>Litoria aurea</i> (\pm SE) and B) mean number of calling male <i>L. aurea</i> (\pm SE) from speaker placement on the 15 th September 2014 to the end of the breeding season in March 2015 for waterbodies; treatment (T) broadcasting <i>L. aurea</i> calls, manipulative control (MC) in which speaker was set up without broadcasting sound and ‘scrapes/swales’ as general controls (C) with no speaker box or sound. Calling reference waterbody shows the total number of calling males on a survey night.	44
Figure 9: Estimated mean abundance over a 40 minute survey of <i>Litoria aurea</i> \pm CI determined from Generalised Linear Model in R (RStudioTeam 2015) accounting for seasonal effects and repeated measures.	45
Figure 10: Mean water quality per waterbody (\pm SE) for pH (A), salinity (B), dissolved oxygen (C) and temperature (D). Light grey: Adult tolerance range which is broader than tadpole tolerance, Dark grey: tadpole tolerance range overlapping adult tolerance (Browne & Edwards 2003; Christy & Dickman 2002; Hamer 1998; Penman 1998; Pyke <i>et al.</i> 2002; Stockwell 2011; Werkman 1999).	47
Figure 11: A) Australia with survey sites (square) and map of the east coast of NSW (grey). Map of survey waterbodies on B) Kooragang Island (-32.860727 S, 151.723370 E), C) Avoca Lagoon (-33.462165 S, 151.434301 D) and E) Sydney Olympic Park (-33.841743 S, 151.073256 E), NSW Australia.	62
Figure 12: Percentage substrate use for calling males from August to March, on Ash Island (2013-2014, 2014-2015), Avoca Lagoon (2014-2015) and Sydney Olympic Park (2012-2013).....	67
Figure 13: Comparison between mean substrate availability at calling and non-calling quadrats. Substrate availability is displayed as a percentage coverage for each substrate: emergent vegetation, ground, floating vegetation and water, based on 1m ² quadrat with substrates measured at basal level. Linear Mixed Models (SAS 2016) were used to determine estimated marginal means \pm 95% CI adjusted for covariates with statistical significance between calling and non-calling sites indicated by asterisks (*).	68

Figure 14: Mean water quality and microclimate at *Litoria aurea* calling locations and non-calling locations from a 1m² quadrat. Estimated means \pm CI with statistical significance indicated by asterisks (*) determined from Generalised Linear Mixed Model in SAS (SAS 2016) accounting for spatial autocorrelation and random effects. 68

Figure 15: A) Australia with Ash and Kooragang Islands (square) located east coast of NSW (grey). B) Adult *Litoria aurea* C) Partial map of Ash and Kooragang Islands showing the industrialised areas (yellow) and mid-island (green boundary), both occupied by *L. aurea*. The upper north-west zone includes re-introduced *L. aurea* (blue). Surveyed waterbodies ‘reference wetlands’ (red) are indicated as R1-8. D) Constructed wetlands map - grey-scale represents waterbody depth in Australian Height Datum, ephemeral wetlands 1A, 2A,B,C and 4A,B,C, permanent wetlands 1B and 3A and remnant wetland. 88

Figure 16: A) Total number of *L. aurea* captured grouped by sex and wetland for permanent, and ephemeral constructed wetlands, remnant wetland and the terrestrial foraging zone on Ash Island. B) Mean Shannon Weiner Diversity Index for tadpoles (all frog species) and macroinvertebrates in constructed wetlands with ANOVA post-hoc connecting letters report or non-parametric each pair Wilcoxon comparison (SAS 2016); tadpoles (A,B,C) and macroinvertebrates (◆,■) (means \pm SE). 98

Figure 17: The maximum number of calling male *Litoria aurea* in a chorus per wetland based on triangulation and visual encounter of chorusing males in constructed wetlands (January – March 2016) and reference wetlands from August to March, on Ash Island (2013-2014, 2014-2015) and reference wetlands in NSW Australia; Avoca Lagoon (2014-2015) and Sydney Olympic Park (2012-2013) (S1:Northern Water Feature and Brickpit wetlands S2:12, S3:11s, S4:13, S5:C1, S6:S1) (James *et al.* (2015) and *unpublished data*). 100

Figure 18: Sex ratios of captured adult *L. aurea*. Mean number of frogs per night by sex for constructed wetlands, remnant wetlands, terrestrial foraging zone and Ash Island ephemeral and permanent wetlands (means \pm SE). 101

Figure 19: Age classes of female and male *Litoria aurea* in constructed wetlands in 2016 compared to reference wetlands from 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 breeding seasons on Ash Island. Utilising size-age classes based on snout vent length from (Hamer & Mahony 2007), where age is expressed as months post-metamorphosis. Constructed

wetlands 2016 data (N=17) and reference wetlands 2013 – 2015 data (N=60), and for males in the constructed wetlands 2016 (N=34) and reference wetlands 2013 – 2015 (N=102)..... 102

Figure 20: Mean body condition of *Litoria aurea* determined using regression residuals in constructed wetlands 2016 compared to reference wetlands from 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 breeding seasons on Ash Island. Body condition determined for females in constructed wetlands (N=17) and reference wetlands (N=60), and for males in constructed wetlands (N=34) and reference wetlands (N=102) (means \pm SE, *indicates significance, $p < 0.05$)..... 103

Figure 21: A) Mean percentage of available substrate type in constructed and remnant wetlands, terrestrial foraging habitat and reference wetlands on Ash Island (mean \pm SE). B) Height at which male and female *Litoria aurea* positioned themselves on chosen substrate (median \pm quartiles; mean \pm SE). C) and D) The observed count of *L. aurea* compared to expected count per substrate type (relative to availability) for females/males in constructed wetlands and in reference wetlands (95 % \pm CI)..... 105

Figure 22: A) The total amount of rain (mm) in four-day periods recorded from the Newcastle University Weather Station (No. 61390). B, C, D, E) Mean depth, salinity, water temperature and dissolved oxygen, during 6 days of sampling from November 2015 to March 2016 in the compensatory wetlands on Ash Island. Grey shading indicates thresholds for maximum tadpole survival and light grey in salinity indicates suitable salinity for adults (Browne & Edwards 2003; Christy & Dickman 2002; Hamer 1998; Penman 1998; Pyke *et al.* 2002; Stockwell 2011; Werkman 1999). *In the references provided, tadpole survivorship was not affected up to 4 ppt. However, in one study, tadpole survivorship was reduced at 2 ppt (Christy & Dickman 2002). 109

Figure 23: Mean snout-vent length (SVL) and right tibia length (RTL) variability for recaptured *Litoria aurea* (\pm SE with statistical significance indicated by asterisks*).. 130

Figure 24: Size and weight measurements of male *Litoria aurea*. The A) snout vent length (SVL), B) right tibia (RTL) and C) weight of males in amplexus (SVL and RTL n=10, weight n=7) compared to males not in amplexus (n=91). Diamonds indicate averages \pm SE with statistical significance indicated by asterisks (*). 131

Figure 25: Size and weight measurements of female *Litoria aurea*. The A) snout vent length (SVL), B) right tibia (RTL) and C) weight of female in amplexus (SVL and RTL

n = 11, weight n = 5) compared to females not in amplexus (SVL and RTL n = 52, weight n = 50). Diamonds indicate averages \pm SE with statistical significance indicated by asterisks (*). 131

Figure 26: Within the *Litoria aurea* breeding waterbody A) Two males during an approach after mirrored grunt calling without amplexus grasp, B) male maintaining amplexus during microchipping C) two amplexing pairs laying eggs in the same location within a chorus D) eggs layed in floating algae, around emergent grass. Photos by Melanie James. 133

List of tables

Table 1: Akaike information criterion (AIC) and degrees of freedom for abundance and calling data using various methods in generalised linear models to assess over-dispersion. Differences of 10 or more reflect strong support for the model with the lower AIC. Differences 4 to 7 are of intermediate support. Difference < 4 have little support (Burnham & Anderson 2004). Bold values indicate the most supported model.	39
Table 2: Significance output for climatic variables in a Generalised Linear Mixed Model analysing the response variable number of <i>Litoria aurea</i> per hour and number of calling males compared to fixed effects of rainfall and climate. Statistical significance indicated by asterisks (*).	46
Table 3: Linear Mixed Models for calling male <i>Litoria aurea</i> location compared to non-calling location for water quality and microclimate in SAS (SAS 2016). Analysis accounted for spatial autocorrelation using Exponential, Matérn or Gaussian curves dependent on measure of fit from the Akaike information criterion and visual assessment. Covariates included within each model are listed from A – G, statistical significance for main effects indicated by bold and asterisks (*) and significant covariates in bold.....	69
Table 4: Linear Mixed Models for calling male <i>Litoria aurea</i> location compared to non-calling location for vegetation, water and ground coverage in SAS (SAS 2016). Analysis accounted for spatial autocorrelation using Exponential, Matérn or Gaussian curves dependent on measure of fit from the Akaike information criterion and visual assessment. Covariates included within each model are listed from A – G, statistical significance for main effects indicated by bold and asterisks (*) and significant covariates in bold.	70
Table 5: Habitat selection analysis for <i>Litoria aurea</i> in constructed and reference habitats on Ash Island. Output for habitat selection analysis showing the ratio of observed/expected habitat use, based on Generalised Linear Mixed Model post hoc comparisons; calculated with lsmeans package in the statistical package R (RStudioTeam 2015). A) Habitat selection within each sex and habitat, and B) habitat use comparison between sexes and C) comparison between male and female use between constructed wetlands and Ash Island.....	105

Table 6: Summary of results relating to Project Aims and Key Performance Indicators (KPI) for constructed wetlands designed for <i>Litoria aurea</i> conservation on Ash Island, NSW Australia.	111
Table 7: Climate data for the survey nights from the NIWA Taihoro Nukurangi climate centre from interpolated data (closest weather station 25578) (NIWA 2014).	129