

THE SPATIAL OCCURRENCE OF FORMAL POLITICAL REPRESENTATION AND THREATENED SPECIES

Gareth S. Kindler^{1,2}, Michelle Ward^{1,2}, and James E.M. Watson^{1,2,*}

¹Centre for Biodiversity and Conservation Science, The University of Queensland, St Lucia 4072, Australia

²School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, The University of Queensland, St Lucia 4072, Australia

***Corresponding Author**

email: g.kindler@uq.edu.au

Keywords: conservation, democracy, resource allocation, species management, political representation, formal representation

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 The authors would like to recognise . . . The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

INTRODUCTION

The present day has been defined as within the Anthropocene Epoch, representing a sixth "mass extinction" induced by humans (Lewis and Maslin 2015). Even under extremely conservative assumptions, this century's average rate of vertebrate species loss is up to 100 times higher than the background rate (Ceballos et al. 2015). This loss of the world's biodiversity is due to human-led modifications to the environment. Over-exploitation and agriculture have the greatest impact on biodiversity on a global scale (Maxwell et al. 2016), with the proportion of threats remaining roughly consistent among IPBES regions (W. W. F. 2020).

Heightened impact from invasive species and system modifications make Australia's threat profile significantly different when compared to the global aggregate (Kearney et al. 2019). Australia's concoction of threats has led to the rate of species going extinct being the highest in the world with the decline of many endangered species continuing to occur across the continent (Simmonds et al. 2020). In the past decade, three Australian species have gone extinct that were predictable and likely preventable (Woinarski et al. 2017).

In the Australian context, Legge et al. 2018 concluded the five major constraints on improved monitoring, which can roughly be translated into improved management of biodiversity are methodological challenges, cross institutional blockages, within-institutional impediments, policy/legislative deficiencies, and funding shortfalls. These significant challenges facing conservation of biodiversity could either be completely or partially improved by institutional changes. These challenges have been explored and explained by scientists over decades, with myriad analyses alerting policy makers, and recommending the necessary reforms. However, the implementation of institutional or system reform at the scale needed has not occurred. As such, a critical step in addressing the species extinction crisis is approaching it as a political and social problem.

What is the function of EPBC and why is it important?

The continent of Australia, the island of Tasmania, and numerous smaller islands represent the sovereign country of Australia. The country is divided up into 151 federal electorates, based on population data that are redrawn every 4 years. The electorates are used to elect the members of the house of representatives. Connecting members of parliament with the threatened

species that occur within the boundaries of Australia they are tasked with maintaining and advocating for is powerful. Powerful because members of parliament are responsible for ultimately deploying both resources and legislative change. Addressing this democracy deficit and pushing advocacy for threatened species onto local constituents and members has the potential to have drastic implications for changing our trajectory. Due to Australia's low population density, existing megadiversity, political stability, affluence, and large areas remaining some of the last pressure-free zones in the world (Venter et al. 2016), Australia should be performing better. Despite these motivations, obligations, advantages, and Australia's policy attempts to provide better protection (Ward et al. 2019), our biodiversity continues to decline.

METHODS

4.1 Australian threatened species data

Threatened species listing occurs by the Australian Department of the Environment and Energy's Threatened Species Scientific Committee and Minister under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (of Australia 2021). At the time of analysis, there were 1995 threatened species listed on the EPBC Act. This species data was filtered to include only "species or species habitat is likely to occur within area ". As electorates in North East Australia comprise marine regions, we have included non-terrestrial threatened species.

4.2 Australian federal electorate and boundary data

Federal electoral boundaries and their demographic classification are maintained and released by the Australian Electoral Commission. Australian boundary files were acquired from the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS) Edition 3.

RESULTS

Our analysis examines the spatial relationship between federal electoral boundaries and the distribution of federally listed threatened species under the EPBC Act 1999. Our analysis includes all 1995 threatened species currently listed on the EPBC Act, comprising flora, frogs, birds, mammals, fishes, reptiles, and other animals.

5.1 Federal representation of threatened species

The intersection between threatened species and federal electoral boundaries reveal a disparity, with larger electorates representing more threatened species than their smaller counterparts (Figure 1). The largest electorate is Durack, which is over 50,000 times the size of the smallest, the inner metropolitan electorate of Grayndler. The larger electorates of Durack (WA), O'Connor (WA), and Kennedy (QLD) contain the most threatened species. The electorate of Adelaide contains the least with 29 threatened species and on an electorate size basis is the 31st smallest.

The disparity can primarily be explained by federal electoral boundaries being drawn on the population distribution of humans and the varied occurrence of threatened species. Despite this, the area difference of inner metropolitan electorates compared to the larger rural electorates is not equivalent to threatened species proportion. For example, the electorate of Sydney (NSW) has the highest concentration of threatened species, whilst Lingiari (NT) has the lowest. Lingiari is 30,000 times the size of Sydney yet contains less than double the number of threatened species. Australian urban areas are known to support substantially more threatened species than non-urban areas (Ives et al. 2016; Soanes et al. 2020). Another possible explanation is urban electorates are closer together and therefore share the same species. Another contribution is rural areas may house more species that are undiscovered when compared to built-up urban areas. These explanations need further investigation.




Figure 1: Dorling cartogram of threatened species occurrence within the 151 Australian federal electoral divisions. Size of circles and colour correspond to the number of threatened species within electorates. Positioning of circles roughly represent the geographic location of electorates.

The majority of threatened species reside in a single electorate, comprising forty-three percent of the total on the EPBC list (Figure 2). The median of how many electorates are covered in each species's range is two, mean is nine. One quarter of species have a range that crosses more than four electorates. Two strongly migratory species cover all 151 electorates, the Pacific Swift and the White-bellied Sea Eagle. The threatened status of species seems to have a uniform distribution across the number of electorates in their range but needs further investigation.




Figure 2: Histogram displaying the number of electorates in a species range and their threatened status. The red dashed line represents the median.

83 Endemic species were found in 44 electorates (Figure 3). The electorate of Bean contains
84 one endemic species and is the only of inner metropolitan classification. Rural electorates make
85 up seventy-two percent of electorates with endemic species. Species which have greater than
86 eighty percent of their range within an electorate were found in 60. Bean contains the 12th highest
87 number of species with eighty percent of their range within, more than 22 others which are rural.
88 Bean and Pearce contain 26 and 17 threatened species with greater than eighty percent of their
89 range within. Bean contains the 12th highest, more than 22 others which are rural.




Figure 3: Choropleth maps displaying A) number of endemic threatened species and B) number of threatened species with at least 80% of their range within continental Australian federal electoral boundaries. External territories (Lord Howe Island, Christmas Island etc) are not included in this map.

5.2 Threatened species without a representative

Our analysis found two percent of species on the list do not intersect with the boundaries of federal electorates, including external territories. This constitutes 28 species of birds, five mammals, four sub-antarctic plants, three fishes, two reptiles, and the Lorde Howe Island Phasmid. To have no representation from a federally elected member, a species must not be likely to occur on the Australian continent or external territories. In the case of plants, these are residing on the federally unrepresented site of Macquarie Island. The two reptiles live near East Timor and a rock islet

near Tasmania. For the Lorde Howe Island Phasmid, it resides on the remnants of a volcano, Balls pyramid.

5.3 Demography and threatened species

Our analysis examines the overlap of species and the demographic classification of electorates. Of the 1995 species included in this analysis, eighty-seven percent have at least part of their range within rural electorates 4.




Figure 4: Occurrence of threatened species's range within demographic classifications of Australian federal electoral boundaries. An individual species range can intersect with more than one demographic classification. Break this down into taxongroups ?

DISCUSSION

So A clear mismatch exists. Massive opportunity for some electorate leaders to stand up and for citizens for demanding accountability. Leaders should work with state and local council counterparts. Species can only persist if the rule are in place that work for them, the funding is place that enable the threats to be abated. That's means champions. Some ideas for enabling this conversation further – each electorate should have their own threatened species emblem? A flagship for cross party support

References

- Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P. R., Barnosky, A. D., García, A., Pringle, R. M., & Palmer, T. M. (2015). Accelerated modern human-induced species losses: Entering the sixth mass extinction. *Science Advances*, 1(5), e1400253. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1400253>
- Ives, C. D., Lentini, P. E., Threlfall, C. G., Ikin, K., Shanahan, D. F., Garrard, G. E., Bekessy, S. A., Fuller, R. A., Mumaw, L., Rayner, L., Rowe, R., Valentine, L. E., & Kendal, D. (2016). Cities are hotspots for threatened species. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*, 25(1), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geb.12404>
_eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/geb.12404>
- Kearney, S. G., Carwardine, J., Reside, A. E., Fisher, D. O., Maron, M., Doherty, T. S., Legge, S., Silcock, J., Woinarski, J. C. Z., Garnett, S. T., Wintle, B. A., & Watson, J. E. M. (2019). The threats to Australia's imperilled species and implications for a national conservation response. *Pacific Conservation Biology*, 25(3), 231. <https://doi.org/10.1071/PC18024>
- Legge, S., Lindenmayer, D., Robinson, N., Scheele, B. C., Southwell, D., & Wintle, B. A. (2018). *Monitoring Threatened Species and Ecological Communities*. CSIRO Publishing. Retrieved August 26, 2021, from <https://www.publish.csiro.au/book/7720/>
- Lewis, S. L., & Maslin, M. A. (2015). Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature*, 519(7542), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14258>
- Maxwell, S. L., Fuller, R. A., Brooks, T. M., & Watson, J. E. M. (2016). Biodiversity: The ravages of guns, nets and bulldozers. *Nature*, 536(7615), 143–145. <https://doi.org/10.1038/536143a>
- of Australia, C. (2021). Threatened species under the EPBC Act. Retrieved July 1, 2021, from <https://www.environment.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/species>
- Simmonds, J. S., Reside, A. E., Stone, Z., Walsh, J. C., Ward, M. S., & Maron, M. (2020). Vulnerable species and ecosystems are falling through the cracks of environmental impact assessments. *Conservation Letters*, 13(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12694>
- Soanes, K., Threlfall, C., Ramalho, C. E., Bekessy, S. A., Fuller, R. A., Garrard, G. E., Ikin, K., Kendal, D., Lee, K., Valentine, L., Williams, N., Parris, K., & Lentini, P. (2020). Conservation opportunities for threatened species in urban environments: Report prepared by the NESP Clean Air and Urban Landscapes Hub and Threatened Species Recovery Hub.

- Retrieved August 17, 2021, from <https://research-repository.uwa.edu.au/en/publications/conservation-opportunities-for-threatened-species-in-urban-enviro>
- Venter, O., Sanderson, E. W., Magrach, A., Allan, J. R., Beher, J., Jones, K. R., Possingham, H. P., Laurance, W. F., Wood, P., Fekete, B. M., Levy, M. A., & Watson, J. E. (2016). Sixteen years of change in the global terrestrial human footprint and implications for biodiversity conservation. *Nature Communications*, 7(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12558>
- W. W. F., I. (2020). *Living Planet Report 2020*. Retrieved August 26, 2021, from <https://livingplanet.panda.org/about-the-living-planet-report>
- Ward, M. S., Simmonds, J. S., Reside, A. E., Watson, J. E. M., Rhodes, J. R., Possingham, H. P., Trezise, J., Fletcher, R., File, L., & Taylor, M. (2019). Lots of loss with little scrutiny: The attrition of habitat critical for threatened species in Australia. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 1(11). <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.117>
- Woinarski, J. C. Z., Garnett, S. T., Legge, S. M., & Lindenmayer, D. B. (2017). The contribution of policy, law, management, research, and advocacy failings to the recent extinctions of three Australian vertebrate species. *Conservation Biology*, 31(1), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12852>