

**Quantifying Biodiversity Patterns and Extinction Risk in
Seasonal Wetland Plant Communities**

by

David Charles Deane B.Sc.

A thesis submitted to the University of Adelaide for the degree of

Master of Philosophy

**School of Biological Sciences
The University of Adelaide
May 2016**

Acknowledgements

It was originally Dr Paul Dalby who recognised the potential for applying extinction risk modelling to wetland ecosystems after seeing a presentation of similar work from terrestrial systems given by Prof. Bradshaw. I later met and discussed some other post grad research ideas with Corey, but he was keen on the wetland species-area tack. Along the way I was fortunate that he was able to recruit both Dr Damien Fordham and Prof. Fangliang He to my cause and so, here we are. I thank all of my supervisors for their patience and guidance, particularly in the esoteric world of manuscript preparation.

Many contributed indirectly to this research. It was Bec Duffield who inspired my interest in Fleurieu swamp ecology. She, along with Alys Stevens, Claire Harding and Catherine Miles between them collected much of the survey data I used. I thank them and admire their respective contributions to wetland conservation in South Australia. I also thank the data custodians: The Conservation Council of South Australia and the Government of South Australia (DEWNR) for making biological and spatial data available for this research. Plant functional group assignments were compiled as part of regional water allocation planning for the Mount Lofty Ranges by Michelle Casanova, Jason Nicol and Brian Deegan. I thank Jason Nicol for making this available.

Finally, on a personal note, I gratefully acknowledge the support of my awesome sister Tracy and her equally awesome partner Wayne, who opened both their home and their hearts to keep me off the streets while all this took place.

Abstract

Quantifying Biodiversity Patterns and Extinction Risk in Seasonal Wetland Plant Communities

David Deane

The University of Adelaide, 2016

Supervisors: Corey J A Bradshaw

Damien A. Fordham

Fangliang He

Wetlands are among the most threatened habitats on Earth. They are essential components of functional landscapes, providing habitat for native flora and fauna as well as supporting critical ecosystem services. Loss of wetland biodiversity threatens these values. There is an urgent need to understand patterns of wetland biodiversity, the processes creating these and the risk of species loss to plan effective intervention. Species-area relationships have a successful, although controversial, history of quantifying the risk of extinction in terrestrial biomes, and can provide rapid estimates of extinction risk at a range of scales without the need for extensive datasets. Prior to my research, applications of species-area relationships in extinction risk were limited to island archipelagos and formerly continuous terrestrial habitats that had become fragmented. Naturally occurring, discrete habitat types—such as wetlands—have been ignored. I address this gap, demonstrating that area-based methods can, with some modification, be successfully applied to predict extinction risk in wetland communities. Before considering extinction risk I analysed patterns of wetland plant diversity and occupancy and how competing community-assembly processes produce more or less unique combinations of species among wetlands. I showed that much of the plant community diversity in seasonal wetlands in South Australia is driven by rare terrestrial

species of wetland fringes, which assemble from a much larger available species pool. The distribution of these rare species was not correlated with total species richness or wetland size, suggesting that changes in the number or total area of wetlands could result in different extinction dynamics, depending on how they affected endemic species. I therefore compared risks associated with loss of complete wetlands (patch loss), with loss of the equivalent wetland area while maintaining the total number of wetlands. To implement the latter scenario, I developed a novel approach consisting of three steps: (i) a generalized empirical endemics-area relationship to predict the number of species lost within each wetland as a function of a reduction in wetland area; (ii) I selected the identities of the predicted number of species lost at each wetland probabilistically; (iii) I compared the number of wetlands from which each species was lost with its regional occupancy, and I considered any species predicted to be lost from all known sites as extinct. I then repeated steps (ii) and (iii) many times to obtain a distribution of regional-scale species loss for a given loss of area in each wetland. Step (ii) allowed for different scenarios to be tested by adjusting the sampling probability for each species. I found that a higher extinction risk was associated with the loss of complete wetlands than the equivalent area loss shared among all wetlands. Moreover, for a given area loss, small wetlands had a much higher risk of species loss due to the distribution of endemic species. The approach I developed could be readily applied to any discrete habitat type, providing predictions of risk for a range of ecosystems that have received little attention.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
ABSTRACT.....	IV
QUANTIFYING BIODIVERSITY PATTERNS AND EXTINCTION RISK IN SEASONAL WETLAND PLANT COMMUNITIES	IV
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF TABLES.....	VIII
LIST OF FIGURES	X
CONTEXT OF RESEARCH.....	12
CHAPTER 1 WETLAND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION AND AREA-BASED METHODS FOR EXTINCTION PREDICTION.....	14
Introduction.....	14
References.....	26
STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP CHAPTER 2	37
CHAPTER 2 DIVERSITY PATTERNS OF SEASONAL WETLAND PLANT COMMUNITIES MAINLY DRIVEN BY RARE TERRESTRIAL SPECIES	38
Abstract.....	38
Introduction.....	39
Methods	41
Results.....	55
Discussion.....	62
References.....	67

STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP CHAPTER 3	76
CHAPTER 3 NICHE CONSTRAINTS AND COMPETITION MODERATED BY SHORT- DISTANCE DISPERSAL STRUCTURE WETLAND PLANT COMMUNITIES	77
Abstract.....	77
Introduction.....	78
Methods	82
Results.....	102
Discussion.....	108
References.....	112
STATEMENT OF AUTHORSHIP CHAPTER 4	121
CHAPTER 4 FUTURE EXTINCTION RISK FOR WETLAND PLANTS IS HIGHER FROM INDIVIDUAL PATCH LOSS THAN TOTAL AREA REDUCTION	122
Abstract.....	122
Introduction.....	123
Methods	125
Results.....	130
Discussion.....	136
References.....	141
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS.....	149

NOTE: Statements of authorship appear in the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

\

Copyright

by

David Charles Deane

2016

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, 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. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree. I give 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 Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

.....

David Deane

May 2016

List of Tables

Table 1.1 summary statistics for published wetland, lake and pond studies using power-law species-area relationships. Studies above the double line were used to calculate mean wetland z-parameter values. Other studies were done in systems considered too dissimilar for meaningful comparison. Values from studies marked with an asterisk were fitted by us based on data presented.	21
Table 1.2 Summary values from Table 1.1. Mean z-parameter and coefficient of determination values and 95 % confidence intervals for studies done in wetlands and all aquatic systems.	22
Table 2.1 Regional database and analysis dataset summary statistics.....	43
Table 2.2 published wetland and aquatic ecosystem species richness data and calculated beta-1 (β_1) index of (Harrison et al., 1992). Studies above the line are on deeper water systems, while those below the line were of shallow water, similar to study wetlands.	52
Table 2.3 Mean and confidence intervals for shallow and deep water inland aquatic ecosystems.	53
Table 2.4 Model coefficients and goodness of fit for three ecological patterns for <i>all plants</i> and <i>wetland-only</i> datasets. Ranked species occupancy curves: Akaike’s information criterion weights ($wAIC$) for the top-ranked models. Species-area relationships: power-law model coefficients and 95% confidence intervals are shown along with model goodness of fit (R^2) (see also Fig. 2.7). Distance decay in similarity: Species turnover in wetland plant community composition as a function of inter-wetland distance. Shown are model coefficients with 95% confidence intervals, $wAIC$ and R^2 for the top-ranked power-law model (see also Fig. 2.8).	59
Table 2.5 model selection table for the ranked species occupancy curves fitted. Model structures are described in Jenkins (2011) and Hui (2012).	59
Table 2.6 model selection table for the distance-decay models	61
Table 2.7 Nestedness analysis for the two datasets based on overlap and decreasing fill metrics (NODF). Evidence of nestedness is indicated by estimates > expected under null community simulations, while estimates < expected indicate anti-nesting – the tendency for rare species not to occur with common species. Z-transform indicates how likely the result would be under the null hypothesis of no nestedness. The matrix fill value for <i>all plants</i> was 0.23, and for wetland –only plants was 0.29.....	61
Table 3.1 Full list of all environmental variables calculated for analysis. Those shown in bold were included in the final modelling dataset, with others removed due to collinearity (with a threshold being any value for Pearson’s $ r > 0.6$).	86
Table 3.2 Soil group broad characteristics (Hall et al 2009)	91
Table 3.3 Candidate model set explained in terms of predictors and biological rationale ...	94

Table 3.4 Model selection table for full candidate set ranked by Akaike’s information criterion corrected for small sample size (AIC_c), with the weight and difference between each model and the top-ranked model. The evidence ratio is the ratio of the Akaike weight for the top-ranked model and the model being compared. Model name codes indicate which hypothesis the predictors used to build the model are testing: niche mechanisms are represented by prefix *hyd* for hydrological or *phy* for physiographic predictors; *dsp* = dispersal; *bio* = biological interactions. *k* is the number of parameters in each model. 104

Table 3.5 Final model set and model selection values. Model structure and rationale is given in Table 3.3; predictors are described in Table 3.1 and their standardised regression coefficients are given in Table 3.6. *k* is the number of predictors including the two intercepts from beta regression (subtract from 26 – the number of samples - to obtain model degrees of freedom); AIC_c is Akaike’s second-order information criterion; $wAIC_c$ is the small sample corrected Akaike weight; ΔAIC_c is the difference in Akaike’s second order information criterion compared with the minimum AIC_c ; $evdRat$ = evidence ratio, the ratio of the $wAIC_c$ of each model and the top ranked model. Pseudo- R^2 is the approximate amount of variation in the response variable explained by the model. 106

Table 3.6 Regression coefficients for predictor variables in averaged model. Averaged regression coefficients (Estimate) were calculated using the zero method (Burnham and Anderson, 2002) and indicate relative effect size for the predictor. I.V. = average importance value (the sum of Akaike weights for each model in which the predictor was observed divided by the number of models) also provides a measure of relative influence. Standard errors and confidence intervals were calculated from unconditional variance and include model selection uncertainty. 107

Table 3.7 Pearson correlations between final model set predictors and wetland species richness (see Table 3.1 for description of predictors and Table 3.4 and 3.5 for model selection results). Degrees of freedom in all cases is 24. 107

List of Figures

- Figure 2.1 Fleurieu Peninsula, South Australia showing wetlands in white. Also shown are 750 and 800 mm isohyets and major watercourses. Shading represents elevation, with dark areas indicating higher areas that reach a maximum of ~ 320 m above sea level. Fleurieu wetlands occur mostly above elevations of around 250 m coinciding with mean annual rainfall > 750 mm. Wetland outlines are as defined based on a state agency spatial mapping program (Harding 2005).44
- Figure 2.2 Example plot-based rarefaction curves for two wetlands that do not reach asymptote. These were among a number of wetlands exhaustively surveyed by me during 2008 and are known to be near-complete censuses. Triangles show the rarefied richness as each additional sample is added and the dotted lines show the 95 % confidence limits for this.48
- Figure 2.3 Species-area relationship for wetlands with near-complete census data selected according to the number of missing species using the Chao 2 non-parametric species richness estimate.48
- Figure 2.4 Examples of survey designs. Surveys from panels a) and b) were both selected by Chao 2 as having greater than 80 % of richness sampled, but they are poorly interspersed and unlikely to reflect diversity. Panel c) shows the characteristics of the spatial design that I considered would provide the best estimate of species richness with both longitudinal and transverse interspersed.49
- Figure 2.5 Comparison of binned species occupancy data for native plants (All species $n = 168$ species and wetland-only $n = 80$ species). Shown are the proportion of 18 wetlands where each species was observed (x -axis) and the number of species within each bin (y -axis). The difference in height between the black and grey bars indicates the contribution of terrestrial plants - note the extreme dominance of the infrequently occurring (< 10 % of sites) rare ('satellite') species.57
- Figure 2.6 Ranked species-occupancy curves for (a) *all plants* and (b) *wetland-only* datasets. The x -axis shows the rank order of each species (highest occupancy is ranked 1st). The top-ranked model is also shown, along with the coefficient of determination for each fit. CE = concave exponential function; SS = symmetric sigmoidal (see Jenkins 2011).57
- Figure 2.7 Species-area relationships for *all plants* (a) and *wetland-only* (b) datasets. The log-log implementation of the power-law species-area model is fitted to each data subset and the value for the intercept (C) slope parameter (z) and coefficient of determination (R^2) are shown in the bottom right of each panel.58
- Figure 2.8 Species turnover as a function of geographical distance (distance-decay) for wetlands in the same catchment (open circles) or different catchments (open triangles), modelled with a power function. The y -axis indicates the similarity in species composition between wetlands (measured as 1-Jaccard dissimilarity index), with higher values indicating more similar wetland communities.60
- Figure 3.1 Fleurieu Peninsula, South Australia, with wetlands coded according to their local contribution to β -diversity, where larger symbols represent wetlands with more

unique species compositions. Shading represents elevation, with dark areas indicating higher areas that reach a maximum of ~ 320 m above sea level. Also shown are the 750 and 800 mm rainfall isohyets.....83

Figure 4.1 Predicted proportion of regional species extinctions as entire wetlands are removed. The *x*-axis shows the proportion of total wetland area that is accounted for as individual wetlands are removed based on three different orderings: decreasing (circles) and increasing (triangles) size order, and random selection (squares). Grey lines are bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals, shown only for the decreasing and increasing response for clarity. 132

Figure 4.2 Comparison of patch loss scenarios. Each point represents the proportion of the regional species pool that is lost (*y*-axis) for the loss of the total area shown on the *x*-axis. Values were calculated by removing individual wetlands sequentially according to different ordering of the data. So viewing panel a) from left to right, the first point shows the proportion of species lost when the smallest patch is removed; the second point shows the proportion lost when the two smallest wetlands are both removed and so on. Each panel compares the estimated lost proportion for the relevant size ordering to a random loss indicated by the continuous curve. In panels a-c different orderings of the data are compared and panel d plots the ordering shown in panels a and b on a common axis for comparison (see also Fig.4.1). The distance-based scenario described in the main text is shown in panel c (headed ‘proximity’). In all cases grey vertical lines represent 95% bootstrapped confidence intervals. 133

Figure 4.3 Predicted extinctions for a given loss of area within a single wetland. The endemics-area (lower curve) and species-area (upper curve) relationships are modelled using equation 1 ($z = 0.13$) and the power function species-area relationship ($z = 0.19$), respectively. Grey lines are 95% confidence intervals based on four sampling grids of 100 cells each. Dashed lines show curves fitted using 95% uncertainty bounds of z 134

Figure 4.4 Regional proportional loss of species predicted from a given proportional loss of area at each of the wetlands in the network for the four sampling probabilities. If all wetlands lost the proportion of area shown on the *x*-axis (evaluated at 20, 40, 50, 60 and 80 %), the regional loss of species predicted is shown on the *y*-axis. 135

Figure 4.5 Comparison of species predicted to become extinct when wetlands are removed (patch loss) or decreased in size (area loss). Each set of comparisons represents the random patch-loss estimate and four area-loss estimates, each of which impose a different weighting for species loss sampling probabilities: ‘area – hydrology’ preferentially removes species requiring longer periods of inundation and simulates the effects of climatic drying; ‘area- edge’ preferentially removes species found in wetland fringes simulating agricultural encroachment into wetland fringes. Two null models provide points of reference ‘null – worst case’ preferentially samples endemic species; ‘null – random’ samples species totally at random. Percentages indicate the proportion of the total wetland estate that is lost. Mean species loss is indicated by the height of the bars, while error bars show 95% confidence intervals obtained using 1000 simulations (calculating using bootstrapping for patch-loss scenarios and resampling under the relevant species sampling probabilities for the area loss scenarios). 136