

Invasive mesopredator release
Supplementary material

MW Rees

2021-06-30

Contents

1 Survey methods	2
1.1 Timeline	2
1.2 Camera-trap deployment	3
2 Individual cat identification	4
3 Summary statistics	6
4 Feral cat detection plots	7
4.1 Glenelg	7
4.2 Otway Ranges	9
5 Fox spatial occupancy	12
5.1 Glenelg	12
5.2 Otway Region	14
6 Vegetation categories	16
7 Spatial mark-resight models	17
7.1 Glenelg region	17
7.2 Otway region	19
8 Session information	21
References	21

1 Survey methods

1.1 Timeline




Figure 1: Camera-trap operation times in the Glenelg region (A) and Otway Ranges (B). Each blue, horizontal line represents one camera-trap. Grey shading indicates periods of fox control in the Otway Ranges.

1.2 Camera-trap deployment

In the Glenelg region, we deployed camera sites once, whereas in the Otways, we redeployed cameras three times annually. All 2017 camera-sites were resurveyed each year, except for four logically challenging sites in the southern grid. In 2018, we added 16 additional sites in the southern grid, as well as 36 additional sites in the northern grid. These additional sites were resurveyed in 2019. Camera-trap grids ranged from 3442 - 7819 camera-trap nights across both regions (Table 1).

At each site, we deployed a singular remote trail camera with infrared flash and temperature-in-motion detector. The vast majority of cameras were Reconyx Hyperfire HC600, but a small proportion were PC900's HF2X's, infrared camera-traps (Reconyx, Holmen, Wisconsin). We programmed camera's to their highest sensitivity and to take five consecutive photographs when triggered (no quiet period). We attached each camera to a tree, approximately 30 cm above the ground, and facing toward a lure 2 - 2.5 metres away. The lure comprised an oil-absorbing cloth doused in tuna oil and placed inside a PVC pipe container with a mesh top. We secured each lure to the top of a 1 metre wooden stake and attached a handful of small white feathers to the outside of the PVC pipe container. We cleared vegetation in the camera's line-of-sight to reduce false triggers and avoid obscuring cat coat markings in images. While these cameras were aimed to target predators, they were also effective at detecting mammalian prey species.



Figure 2: Example of a camera-trap set-up

2 Individual cat identification

We first labelled every camera-trap image with a species metadata tag using DigiKam software www.digikam.org. We also tagged cats based on their coat type: black, mackerel tabby, classic tabby, ginger and other: coats with multiple colour blends (Fig. 3). This allowed us to summarise species detections and extract cat images using the “camtrapR” R package (Niedballa et al., 2016).

We considered all black cats to be of the ‘unmarked’ category in spatial mark-resight models - even the few with white splotches on their underside (these couldn’t always be seen as cats move with their head down).

In the remaining coat categories, we identified individual cats based on their unique coat markings. The ability to identify individuals substantially increased as the image library for each cat increased. Therefore we made the easiest identifications first to build up these libraries, before making decisions on the less obvious detections. We examined and matched all coats markings seen between two particular detections. Markings on the front legs were most often seen and particularly useful for ID’s as the patterns do not skew as much with different body positions. On the whole, unidentifiable detections were mainly due to only part of a cat appearing in the frame, or because photos were blurry (fast moving cats or a fogged up camera lens).

However, we were left with a small number of instances (less than ten) where only left or right flanks could be seen. In this case, the side with the most repeat detections was labelled as an individual, whereas the side with the least number of detections was considered unidentifiable.

Additionally, an extremely small portion of cats in the Otways had ginger coats. When ginger coats are photographed with an infrared flash, they become overexposed and appear consistently white (bottom-right corner in Fig. 3). We only had one detection of a ginger cat without an infrared coat. Therefore, if there were multiple ginger cat detections in a single grid, we treated them in same way as one-sided flank detections.

One observer identified the feral cats in the Glenelg region (MR). In the 2017 and 2018 Otway datasets, where there were substantially more cat detections and fewer distinct coat patterns, two independent observers identified individual cats and discrepancies between observers were reviewed together until consensus was reached (MR, MLP, BH). If no consensus could be reached, the cat was considered unidentifiable. In the 2019 Otway dataset, many of the identified cats were sighted in the previous surveys – these larger individual libraries meant that cats could be identified more easily so only one observer was necessary (MR). We also made use of additional cat images taken within the Otway grids (just before each of our surveys) by white flash camera-traps from a complementary study (Z. Banikos, unpublished data). This provided additional and higher quality images (due to the white flash) of individuals.

We were therefore left with three groups of cats: unmarked (black cats), marked (cats which could be identified to the individual-level with complete certainty) and mark status unknown (cats which were not black, but couldn’t be identified to the individual level with complete certainty).

We discarded detections of cats which were obviously young enough to be dependent on a parent, as these kittens do not have independent activity centres or movements and not yet recruited into the adult population.



Figure 3: Feral cat coat categories.

3 Summary statistics

Table 1: Camera-trap surveys and feral cat spatial capture-recapture summary statistics.

Land-scape	Fox control?	Camera-traps	Trap nights	Identified cats	Identified detections	Unidentified detections	Unmarked detections
Annya	no	110	8000	9	23	3	20
Cobbob	yes	110	7752	13	35	9	37
Hotspur	no	99	6085	8	22	3	13
Mt Clay	yes	106	5451	10	33	5	0
South 2017	no	73	3565	20	62	8	46
North 2017	no	67	7099	26	60	4	48
South 2018	yes	85	7838	24	75	12	62
North 2018	no	103	4543	30	90	17	59
South 2019	yes	86	6077	25	133	22	101
North 2019	no	99	7150	27	90	23	58

Note: There is a maximum of one detection per each 24-hour occasion.

4 Feral cat detection plots

4.1 Glenelg

4.1.1 Pair 1




Figure 4: Feral cat detections in the first grid pair of the Glenelg region. Camera-traps are indicated by red crosses. Circles with coloured fills represent individual cats and lines denote thier observed movements. Black circles represent black cats, blue circles unidentifiable detections (the circle radius scales positively with the number daily detections). Fox control does not occur in Annya (A) but has since 2005 in Cobboboonee (B).

4.1.2 Pair 2




Figure 5: Feral cat detections in the second grid pair of the Glenelg region. Camera-traps are indicated by red crosses. Circles with coloured fills represent individual cats and lines denote their observed movements. Black circles represent black cats, blue circles unidentifiable detections (the circle radius scales positively with the number daily detections). Fox control does not occur in Hotspur (A) but has since 2005 in Mt Clay (B).

4.2 Otway Ranges

4.2.1 2017




Figure 6: Feral cat detections in the Otway Ranges 2017. Camera-traps are indicated by red crosses. Circles with coloured fills represent individual cats and lines denote their observed movements. Black circles represent black cats, blue circles unidentifiable detections (the circle radius scales positively with the number daily detections). Fox control did not occur in either of the grids during this time.

4.2.2 2018

A) Otways north 2018
74 occasions, 90 detections, 30 animals

B) Otways south 2018
75 occasions, 75 detections, 24 animals




Figure 7: Feral cat detections in the Otway Ranges 2018. Camera-traps are indicated by red crosses. Circles with coloured fills represent individual cats and lines denote thier observed movements. Black circles represent black cats, blue circles unidentifiable detections (the circle radius scales positively with the number daily detections).

4.2.3 2019

A) Otways north 2019
90 occasions, 90 detections, 27 animals

B) Otways south 2019
94 occasions, 133 detections, 25 animals




Figure 8: Feral cat detections in the Otway Ranges 2019. Camera-traps are indicated by red crosses. Circles with coloured fills represent individual cats and lines denote thier observed movements. Black circles represent black cats, blue circles unidentifiable detections (the circle radius scales positively with the number daily detections).

5 Fox spatial occupancy

5.1 Glenelg

```
##  
## Family: binomial  
## Link function: logit  
##  
## Formula:  
## fox ~ s(x, y, bs = "ds", m = c(1, 0.5), k = 200) + offset(log(survey_duration))  
##  
## Parametric coefficients:  
##             Estimate Std. Error z value      Pr(>|z|)  
## (Intercept) -4.5577    0.1039 -43.84 <0.000000000000002 ***  
## ---  
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1  
##  
## Approximate significance of smooth terms:  
##             edf Ref.df Chi.sq   p-value  
## s(x,y)  24.29    199  54.76 0.00000614 ***  
## ---  
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1  
##  
## R-sq.(adj) =  0.142  Deviance explained = 14.8%  
## fREML = 670.38  Scale est. = 1          n = 425
```

Glenelg region, 2018




Figure 9: Standard error of fox occupancy probability derived from generalised additive models within each impact (I) and associated non-impact (NI) landscape in the Glenelg region.

5.2 Otway Region

```
##  
## Family: binomial  
## Link function: logit  
##  
## Formula:  
## fox ~ year + s(x, y, by = year, bs = "ds", m = c(1, 0.5), k = 100) +  
##       s(station, bs = "re") + offset(log(survey_duration))  
##  
## Parametric coefficients:  
##             Estimate Std. Error z value      Pr(>|z|)  
## (Intercept) -5.283154   0.230023 -22.968 <0.0000000000000002 ***  
## year2018     0.004643   0.277696   0.017          0.987  
## year2019     0.037119   0.282270   0.132          0.895  
## ---  
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1  
##  
## Approximate significance of smooth terms:  
##             edf Ref.df Chi.sq p-value  
## s(x,y):year2017  2.68844090    99  8.096 0.010597 *  
## s(x,y):year2018  0.00002494    99  0.000 0.506341  
## s(x,y):year2019  6.14777668    99 22.262 0.000380 ***  
## s(station)       53.65519870   194 75.723 0.000116 ***  
## ---  
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1  
##  
## R-sq.(adj) =  0.24  Deviance explained = 27.8%  
## fREML = 763.36  Scale est. = 1           n = 513
```

Otway region




Figure 10: Standard error of fox occupancy probability derived from generalised additive models within each impact (I) and associated non-impact (NI) landscape in the Otway region.

6 Vegetation categories

We condensed the main Ecological Vegetation Class groupings (DELWP, 2020) present into three categories for each region: Cleared Land, Heathy Woodlands, Lowland Forests (Glenelg region only) and Wet Forests (Otways region only). We merged similar groups to reduce the number of categories for each region. In the Glenelg region, we merged Dry Forests with Lowland Forests. In the Otway Ranges, we merged Rainforests with Wet Forests, as well as merged Dry Forests and Heathy Woodlands.

A very small proportion of other Ecological Vegetation Class groupings were present in the habitat masks: Riparian Scrubs or Swampy Scrubs and Woodlands, Coastal Scrubs Grasslands and Woodlands, Wetlands, Riverine Grassy Woodlands or Forests, Plains Woodlands or Forests, Herb-rich Woodlands. We removed these groups, and interpolated cell values from the nearest of the three vegetation categories.




Figure 11: Condensed Ecological Vegetation Class groups used as habitat mask covariates in spatial mark-resight models.

7 Spatial mark-resight models

7.1 Glenelg region

7.1.1 Detector function fits




Figure 12: Detector function shapes (solid line) and 95% confidence intervals (dashed lines) tested for the Glenelg region.

Table 2: Akaike's Information Criterion values for detector functions in the Glenelg region.

Detector function	Parameters	logLik	AIC	AICc	dAICc	AICcwt
exponential	3	-1441	2887	2888	0	1
half-normal	3	-1453	2911	2912	23.92	0

7.1.2 Candidate model fits

Table 3: Akaike's Information Criterion values adjusted for small sample size for feral cat density models in the Glenelg region (ordered in decreasing AICc scores).

Density	Detectability	Parameters	logLik	dAICc	AICcw
session	1	6	-985	0	0.46
fox_occ	1	4	-988.3	1.25	0.24
session	pair	8	-983.1	2.34	0.14
1	1	3	-990.9	3.91	0.06
1	T	4	-990.2	5.02	0.04
fox_occ	fox_occ	6	-987.9	5.87	0.02
vegetation	1	5	-989.6	6.54	0.02
session	foxbaiting_012	10	-982.5	8.16	0.01
1	fox_occ	5	-990.5	8.2	0.01
session	pair + foxbaiting_012	12	-981.3	13.67	0

session - landscape ($n = 4$)

1 - constant

T - linear time trend ($g0$ only)

vegetation - vegetation type (lowland forest, heathy woodland or cleared native vegetation)

fox_occ - spatial occupancy probability of foxes derived from generalised additive models

foxbaiting_012 - fox-baited or not, but with separate effects of foxbaiting for the two baited landscapes

7.2 Otway region

7.2.1 Detector function fits




Figure 13: Detector function shapes (solid line) and 95% confidence intervals (dashed lines) tested for the Otway region.

Table 4: Akaike's Information Criterion values for detector functions in the Otway region.

Detector function	Parameters	logLik	AIC	AICc	dAICc	AICcwt
exponential	3	-5591	11188	11188	0	1
half-normal	3	-5743	11493	11493	304.5	0

7.2.2 Candidate model fits

Table 5: Akaike's Information Criterion values adjusted for small sample size for feral cat density models in the Otway region (ordered in decreasing AICc scores).

Density	Detectability	Parameters	logLik	dAICc	AICcw
session	year + foxbaiting_012	16	-3521	0	1
session	year	12	-3533	13.49	0
year + fox_occ	fox_occ	8	-3543	23.59	0
session	foxbaiting_012	12	-3538	23.93	0
year	fox_occ	7	-3544	25.01	0
year + fox_occ	1	6	-3548	30.11	0
year	1	5	-3551	33.2	0
year	T	6	-3550	33.77	0
session	1	8	-3548	35.26	0
year + vegetation	1	7	-3550	36.39	0

session - landscape deployment ($n = 6$)

year - year of deployment (2017-19)

foxbaiting_012 - fox-baited or not, but with separate effects in 2018 and 2019 for the impact landscape

1 - constant

T - linear time trend ($g0$ only)

vegetation - vegetation type (wet forest, heathy woodland or cleared native vegetation)

fox_occ - spatial occupancy probability of foxes derived from generalised additive models

8 Session information

R version 3.6.3 (2020-02-29)

Platform: x86_64-apple-darwin15.6.0 (64-bit)

locale: en_AU.UTF-8||en_AU.UTF-8||en_AU.UTF-8||C||en_AU.UTF-8||en_AU.UTF-8

attached base packages: stats, graphics, grDevices, utils, datasets, methods and base

other attached packages: sp(v.1.4-5), sf(v.0.9-6), viridis(v.0.5.1), viridisLite(v.0.4.0), patchwork(v.1.0.1), gratia(v.0.6.0), pander(v.0.6.3), RColorBrewer(v.1.1-2), camtrapR(v.2.0.3), mgcv(v.1.8-33), nlme(v.3.1-144), secr(v.4.4.1), forcats(v.0.5.0), stringr(v.1.4.0), dplyr(v.1.0.2), purrr(v.0.3.4), readr(v.1.3.1), tidyverse(v.1.3.0) and bookdown(v.0.21)

loaded via a namespace (and not attached): fs(v.1.5.0), overlap(v.0.3.2), lubridate(v.1.7.4), httr(v.1.4.2), tools(v.3.6.3), RcppNumerical(v.0.4-0), backports(v.1.2.1), rgdal(v.1.4-7), utf8(v.1.2.1), R6(v.2.5.0), KernSmooth(v.2.23-16), DBI(v.1.1.1), colorspace(v.2.0-1), raster(v.3.4-10), withr(v.2.4.2), tidyselect(v.1.1.0), gridExtra(v.2.3), compiler(v.3.6.3), cli(v.2.5.0), rvest(v.1.0.0), xml2(v.1.3.2), labeling(v.0.4.2), scales(v.1.1.1), classInt(v.0.4-3), mvnfast(v.0.2.5), digest(v.0.6.27), rmarkdown(v.2.7), pkgconfig(v.2.0.3), htmltools(v.0.5.1.1), highr(v.0.8), dbplyr(v.1.4.2), rlang(v.0.4.11), readxl(v.1.3.1), rstudioapi(v.0.13), farver(v.2.1.0), generics(v.0.1.0), jsonlite(v.1.7.2), magrittr(v.2.0.1), Matrix(v.1.2-18), Rcpp(v.1.0.6), munsell(v.0.5.0), fansi(v.0.4.2), abind(v.1.4-5), lifecycle(v.1.0.0), stringi(v.1.5.3), yaml(v.2.2.1), MASS(v.7.3-51.5), grid(v.3.6.3), parallel(v.3.6.3), crayon(v.1.4.1), lattice(v.0.20-38), haven(v.2.2.0), splines(v.3.6.3), hms(v.0.5.2), knitr(v.1.31), pillar(v.1.6.1), codetools(v.0.2-16), reprex(v.0.3.0), glue(v.1.4.2), evaluate(v.0.14), data.table(v.1.12.6), RcppParallel(v.5.1.4), modelr(v.0.1.6), vctrs(v.0.3.8), cellranger(v.1.1.0), gtable(v.0.3.0), assertthat(v.0.2.1), xfun(v.0.22), broom(v.0.5.5), e1071(v.1.7-2), class(v.7.3-15), units(v.0.6-5) and ellipsis(v.0.3.2)

References

DELWP. (2020). *Bioregions and evc benchmarks*. Victorian Government Department of Environment, Land, Water; Planning, Melbourne. Accessed June 2021). <https://www.environment.vic.gov.au/biodiversity/bioregions-and-evc-benchmarks>

Niedballa, J., Sollmann, R., Courtiol, A., & Wilting, A. (2016). CamtrapR: An r package for efficient camera trap data management. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(12), 1457–1462.