

ResearchOnline@JCU

This file is part of the following reference:

Davis, Jennifer L. (2008) *Improving short-term removal methods of the introduced pest species the cane toad, Chaunus [Bufo] marinus, in north-eastern Australia.* Masters (Research) thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/17599/>

If you believe that this work constitutes a copyright infringement, please contact ResearchOnline@jcu.edu.au and quote <http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/17599/>

Improving Short-term Removal Methods of the Introduced
Pest Species the Cane Toad, *Chaunus [Bufo] marinus*, in
North-eastern Australia

Jennifer L. Davis

Submitted for the Degree of Master's of Science

School of Marine and Tropical Biology

James Cook University

September 2008

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital Theses network, for use elsewhere.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and;

I do not wish to place any further restriction on access to this work.

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education.

Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

STATEMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF OTHERS

I declare that no other persons contributed to this thesis other than myself and my supervisors, Ross Alford and Lin Schwarzkopf. I did not receive any financial help or editorial assistance. I also declare that all procedures reported in this thesis were conducted under the approval of JCU Animal Ethics Committee, approval number A1166.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors Ross Alford and Lin Schwarzkopf for their support and guidance throughout this entire process. Their patience and understanding has enabled me to complete this project. I would also like to acknowledge my friends and family who offered support to carry on and complete this research. My sincere gratitude goes to Bree Clouten, Stephen Kolomyjec, Brian MacElvaine, Noriko Iwai and Braydon Maloney for helping me with data collection. I would also like to thank Sarah Swan, Gary and Julie Bromham, Sonia Harmen, and last but certainly not least my mother and stepfather for all of their kindness and support throughout this process. Without the love and support of my extended family none of this would have been possible. Many, many thanks.

Abstract

The cane toad's (*Chaunus [Bufo] marinus*) introduction in 1935 into Australia has had tremendous consequences for the native wildlife which inhabit the area of invasion. Much effort has recently been concentrated on minimizing the impact of the toad, especially along the invasion front in the Northern Territory and Western Australia. Efforts have focused on implementing short-term management solutions while long-term solutions are being developed. Trapping has proved useful in the Northern Territory, and there is strong interest in improving the efficiency of this technique. Current traps use fluorescent lights which improve trapping success, but the mechanism of this has not been documented, and the efficacy of alternative light sources has not been investigated. I investigated the reactions of toads to four different light sources (incandescent, white fluorescent, yellow fluorescent and ultraviolet lights). My results indicate that toads are not attracted to any of these light sources, and white fluorescent and incandescent lights actively repel toads. This suggests that the attractiveness of lighted traps is due to the insects that are attracted by lights, which the cane toads feed upon. Yellow fluorescent and ultraviolet lights neither attract nor repel toads; given this result, and the fact that toads are apparently attracted to traps by the insects that lights attract, it is likely that using UV lights on traps would increase their effectiveness. Previous research indicated that both male and female cane toads are attracted to conspecific mating calls, and that playing back toad calls in the vicinity of traps can improve their efficiency. In other species, it has been established that manipulating certain aspects of calls can produce "superstimuli", calls that are more attractive than any natural call. Playbacks of a superstimulus might provide even greater efficiency increases for toad traps. I recorded and analyzed the calls of toads in nature to

determine the mean and range of dominant frequency, pulse rate, and call length. I evaluated the responses of toads to manipulated calls with characteristics just outside the natural range for dominant frequency (high and low) and pulse rate (high and low). Both male and female toads were more attracted to calls with high pulse rates than they were to natural calls. The responses of females to manipulated calls also depended on their reproductive status. Based on my findings, it appears that the efficiency of traps could be substantially improved by using ultraviolet lights instead of white fluorescent lights, and by adding playbacks of high pulse rate advertisement calls. Validating these suggestions will require field experiments, which should be undertaken as soon as possible.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	11
1.1 Background.....	11
1.2 Thesis Outline.....	19
Chapter 2: Light as Lures for Cane Toads: Implications for Improving Short-term Removal of an Invasive Species.....	20
2.1 Introduction.....	20
2.2 Methods.....	22
2.2.1 Experimental Subjects.....	22
2.2.2 Lights.....	22
2.2.3 Trials.....	24
2.2.4 Data Analysis.....	25
2.3 Results.....	25
2.4 Discussion.....	29
Chapter 3: Cane Toad (<i>Chaunus marinus</i>) Advertisement Calls: An analysis from North Queensland, Australia.....	33
3.1 Introduction.....	33
3.2 Methods.....	34
3.3 Results.....	35
3.4 Discussion.....	39
Chapter 4: Putting Sexual Selection to Good Use: Experimental Evaluation of the Attractiveness of Natural and Modified Mating Calls to Invasive Anurans.....	42
4.1 Introduction.....	42
4.2 Methods.....	43

4.2.1 Call Recordings.....	44
4.2.2 Call Manipulation.....	44
4.3 Results.....	51
4.4 Discussion.....	54
Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	58
5.1 Implications for Management.....	58
5.2 Directions for Further Research.....	59
References.....	62

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Experimental Trials.....	25
Table 3.1 Comparison of <i>Chaunus marinus</i> , <i>Bufo valliceps</i> and <i>Bufo americanus</i> call characteristics.....	38
Table 3.2 Comparison of variation of call characteristics in <i>Chaunus marinus</i> , <i>Bufo valliceps</i> , and <i>Bufo americanus</i>	39

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Projected Distribution of <i>C. marinus</i> in Australia for the year 2030....	14
Figure 2.1 The Y-Maze.....	23
Figure 2.2 Light vs No Light Choice in the Y-Maze Experiments.....	26

Figure 2.3 Pairwise Comparisons Between Different Light Sources.....	27
Figure 2.4 Each Light Paired Against All Other Lights.....	29
Figure 2.5 The Light Spectrum.....	31
Figure 3.1 Frequency Distribution of Call Length (secs) for <i>Chaunus marinus</i>	36
Figure 3.2 Frequency Distribution of Pulse Rate (p/sec) for <i>Chaunus marinus</i>	36
Figure 3.3 Frequency Distribution of Time between Calls (seconds) for <i>Chaunus marinus</i>	37
Figure 3.4 Frequency Distribution of Dominant Frequency (Hz) for <i>C. marinus</i>	37
Figure 4.1 Standardised Normal <i>Chaunus marinus</i> mating call.....	46
Figure 4.2 Experimentally Modified High-Frequency <i>Chaunus marinus</i> call.....	46
Figure 4.3 Experimentally Modified Low-Frequency <i>Chaunus marinus</i> call.....	47
Figure 4.4 Experimentally Modified High Pulse Rate <i>Chaunus marinus</i> call.....	47
Figure 4.5 Experimentally Modified Low Pulse Rate <i>Chaunus marinus</i> call.....	48
Figure 4.6 Sound Pressure Readings.....	49
Figure 4.7 Directional Bias in the Acoustic Arena.....	53
Figure 4.8 Minimum Distance to the Speaker: Difference between Experimental Treatments and Control Treatment.....	54