

ResearchOnline@JCU

This file is part of the following reference:

Knip, Danielle Melissa (2011) *Spatial ecology of mobile predators in a nearshore tropical environment and its implication for marine protected areas*. PhD thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/22939/>

The author has certified to JCU that they have made a reasonable effort to gain permission and acknowledge the owner of any third party copyright material included in this document. If you believe that this is not the case, please contact ResearchOnline@jcu.edu.au and quote <http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/22939/>

Spatial ecology of mobile predators in a nearshore tropical environment and its implication for marine protected areas

Thesis submitted by
Danielle Melissa Knip
BSc Honours (*Dalhousie University*)

For the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Fishing and Fisheries Research Centre
School of Earth and Environmental Sciences
James Cook University
Townsville, Queensland
November 2011



Nearshore tropical environments provide important habitat for a range of shark species of different life stages including juvenile pigeye *Carcharhinus amboinensis* (top) and adult spottail *Carcharhinus sorrah* (bottom) sharks. Photo credits: Fishing and Fisheries Research Centre and M. R. Heupel.

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make the thesis available for use within the University Library and allow access to users in other approved libraries.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and;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

Signature

November 1, 2011

Date

Danielle Knip

Name

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 Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

Signature

November 1, 2011

Date

Danielle Knip

Name

STATEMENT ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF OTHERS

Research Funding:

- Australian Research Council
- Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority
- School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University
- James Cook University International Postgraduate Research Scholarship co-funded with the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences

In-Kind Support:

- Fishing and Fisheries Research Centre, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University

Supervision:

- Dr. Michelle Heupel, Australian Institute of Marine Science and James Cook University
- Dr. Colin Simpfendorfer, Fishing and Fisheries Research Centre, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University
- Dr. Andrew Tobin, Fishing and Fisheries Research Centre, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University
- Dr. James Moloney, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University

Statistical and Analytical Support:

- Dr. Colin Simpfendorfer
- Dr. Michelle Heupel
- Dr. James Moloney
- Elodie Lédée, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, James Cook University

Editorial Support:

- Dr. Michelle Heupel
- Dr. Colin Simpfendorfer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend the utmost gratitude to my supervisory committee, Michelle Heupel, Colin Simpfendorfer, Andrew Tobin and James Moloney. I could not have asked for a better team of people to guide me through this project. Michelle, I have come a long way in three years and I owe that to you. Thank you for your endless patience, guidance and for all the time you invested in me. You taught me a lot and I will forever be grateful. To Colin, your statistical expertise and understanding of elasmobranchs were an invaluable resource. Thank you for imparting knowledge, helping me with R and always having an open door. To Andy, I am grateful for your vast fishing knowledge and for the fresh perspective you gave to this project. Thank you for always taking time for me and for answering my questions. James, thank you for teaching me GIS skills and helping me improve my analytical abilities.

To the Fishing and Fisheries Research Centre, thank you for including me in your group and providing a solid foundation for this project. To Amos Mapleston, Al Harry, Andrew Chin, Owen Li, Natasha Szczecinski, Cynthia Awruch, Jimmy White, Fernanda de Faria, Daniela Waltrick, Audrey Schlaff and Ron Schroeder, your help in the field was invaluable. Without you I would have accomplished a lot less. Ann Penny and Leanne Curry, thank you for having all the answers and helping me with even the little things. To all the volunteers, thank you for the long hours you put in for me and your enthusiasm for this project.

I am very grateful to the agencies that provided funding for this project including the Australian Research Council, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and School of Earth and Environmental Science at James Cook University. In addition, a James Cook University International Postgraduate Research Scholarship co-funded with the School of Earth and Environmental Sciences gave me the opportunity to pursue this PhD.

Thank you to the James Cook University staff that assisted with all things administrative, boat, vehicle, equipment, computer and electronic related. Clive Grant, Rob Scott, Ralph Botting, Glen Connolly, Paul Giveny, Phil Osmond, Jane Webb, Julie Fedorniak, Blake Hudson and Beth Moore, thank you for your patience and help. You made my life easier.

To my Townsville friends, thank you for your companionship. Nikki and Katie, I could not have asked for better friends or office mates. Thank you for being my sounding board, my shoulder to lean on and for always being there. You made my time here special. To Cameron and Tom, thank you for your friendship and support. Natasha, I am grateful that you added something North American to my life. Thank you for all the coffee breaks.

To my family and friends back home, thank you for your understanding, encouragement and for believing in me. Kim, thank you for being such an unconditional friend. To my parents, sisters and brothers, thank you for always cheering me on and encouraging me to follow my dream. To my Nova bear, your furry face always made me smile and for that I am grateful. For Darryl there is no thank you big enough. Darryl, I thank you for everything. Thank you for all the early mornings and late nights, keeping me sane, and for your patience, understanding, support and unwavering confidence in me. Thank you for sharing this experience with me, I could not have done it without you.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RESULTING FROM THIS RESEARCH

Original Articles:

- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., and Simpfendorfer, C. A. (2010). Sharks in nearshore environments: models, importance, and consequences. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **402**, 1-11. **Journal Feature Article.**
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., and Moloney, J. (2011). Ontogenetic shifts in movement and habitat use of juvenile pigeye sharks *Carcharhinus amboinensis* in a tropical nearshore region. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **425**, 233-246.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., and Moloney, J. (2011). Wet-season effects on the distribution of juvenile pigeye sharks, *Carcharhinus amboinensis*, in tropical nearshore waters. *Marine and Freshwater Research* **62**, 658-667.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., and Simpfendorfer, C. A. (in review). Habitat use and spatial segregation of adult spottail sharks *Carcharhinus sorrah* in tropical nearshore waters. *Journal of Fish Biology*.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., and Simpfendorfer, C. A. (in review). Evaluating marine protected areas for the conservation of tropical coastal sharks. *Biological Conservation*.

Conference, Workshop and Meeting Presentations:

- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., and Moloney, J. (2008). Spatial ecology of mobile predators in a nearshore tropical environment. Poster presentation. *James Cook University School of Earth and Environmental Sciences Conference*. Townsville, Queensland. November 12, 2008.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., and Moloney, J. (2009). Spatial ecology of mobile predators in a nearshore tropical environment: preliminary results. Poster presentation. *8th Indo-Pacific Fish Conference*. Fremantle, Western Australia. June 4, 2009.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., and Moloney, J. (2009). Movements of mobile predators in a nearshore tropical environment. Oral presentation. *Balgal Beach Fishing Club Meeting*. Balgal Beach, Queensland. August 30, 2009.
- Simpfendorfer, C. A., Heupel, M. R., and Knip, D. M. (2009). The joys of interpreting data from VR2s. Oral presentation. *Australian Animal Tagging and Monitoring System Workshop*. Sydney, New South Wales. November 3, 2009.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., and Moloney, J. (2009). Home range and movement patterns of juvenile pigeye sharks (*Carcharhinus amboinensis*) in Cleveland Bay, north Queensland. Oral presentation. *Australian Animal Tagging and Monitoring System Workshop*. Sydney, New South Wales. November 4, 2009.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Tobin, A. J., and Moloney, J. (2010). Seasonal patterns in movement and distribution of juvenile pigeye sharks (*Carcharhinus amboinensis*) in Cleveland Bay, north Queensland. Oral presentation. *Sharks International*. Cairns, Queensland. June 7, 2010.
- Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Moloney, J., and Tobin, A. J. (2010). Site fidelity and habitat use of the spottail shark (*Carcharhinus sorrah*) in a tropical nearshore environment. Oral presentation. *Joint Meeting of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists*. Providence, Rhode Island. July 9, 2010. **American Elasmobranch Society Best Student Presentation Award.**
- Heupel, M. R., Simpfendorfer, C. A., Knip, D. M., Chin, A., and White, J. (2010). Spatial ecology of nearshore elasmobranchs. Oral presentation. *Joint Meeting of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists*. Providence, Rhode Island. July 10, 2010.

LIST OF OTHER PUBLICATIONS COMPLETED DURING THIS RESEARCH

Original Articles:

Heupel, M. R., Knip, D. M., de Lestang, P., Allsop, Q. A., and Grace, B. S. (2011). Short-term movement of barramundi in a seasonally closed freshwater habitat. *Aquatic Biology* **12**, 147-155.

Knip, D. M., Heupel, M. R., and Simpfendorfer, C. A. (in review). To roam or to home: site fidelity in a tropical coastal shark. *Marine Biology*.

ABSTRACT

Nearshore environments are of high value and provide important habitat for a diverse assemblage of shark species. However, these regions are also highly dynamic, creating challenging conditions for inhabitants due to their shallow nature and close proximity to shore. This dissertation research defines the spatial ecology of sharks within a nearshore tropical environment to (1) provide a better understanding of the factors influencing species distribution, habitat use and movement patterns and (2) evaluate the effectiveness of marine protected areas (MPAs) for sheltering these mobile species from exploitation (e.g. fishing pressure).

Although shark species are highly diverse and occur in a wide range of habitats, limited effort has gone into understanding population level use of habitat. Theoretical models describing coastal shark populations have remained largely unchanged since the 1960s despite limitations in applicability to many species, with smaller-bodied species being poorly represented by the current models. Coastal shark populations have typically been described as using nearshore nursery areas as juveniles and then moving further offshore as adults. A new theoretical model is proposed in this dissertation to represent those species that spend most or all of their life within nearshore regions, but do not show use of discrete nursery areas. Description of this new model outlines the importance of nearshore regions to smaller-bodied species in particular.

Field work was conducted using passive acoustic monitoring to examine the presence and movements of two coastal shark species within a nearshore tropical environment. An array of fifty-seven acoustic receivers deployed throughout two MPA regions in Cleveland

Bay, north Queensland, Australia, passively tracked pigeye *Carcharhinus amboinensis* and spottail *Carcharhinus sorrah* sharks from 2008 to 2010. These species were selected to define differences in the use of nearshore habitat between sharks that have different life history and ecological characteristics, putting the results of the theoretical population models into context. *Carcharhinus amboinensis* individuals consisted of juveniles from three age classes (young-of-the-year, one-year-olds and two-year-olds), and *C. sorrah* individuals were adults.

Juvenile *C. amboinensis* were present in Cleveland Bay for long periods, ranging from 3 to 429 days (mean = 88). Individuals associated strongly with shallow turbid habitats, with core home ranges consistently remaining in areas adjacent to creek and river mouths. Significant differences in minimum convex polygon measures of home range revealed that older juveniles used larger areas and undertook movements from core ranges more frequently than younger juveniles. Movements of *C. amboinensis* were related to the tidal cycle, but changes in water depth associated with the tide had the strongest influence on the youngest juveniles. An ontogenetic shift in depth used was also evident, with young-of-the-year individuals restricting their movements to shallower depths (mean = 236 cm) than one- and two-year-old individuals (means = 261 and 269 cm, respectively).

Freshwater influences associated with the wet season played a role in habitat use of juvenile *C. amboinensis* in this nearshore region. Home ranges and distribution of *C. amboinensis* showed distinct changes across two consecutive wet seasons, with individuals moving away from creek mouths during times of high freshwater inflow. Although juvenile *C. amboinensis* moved in response to freshwater inflow, home range sizes remained stable, and the amount of space individuals used did not change in

relation to freshwater inflow. This result suggests that individuals use consistent amounts of space despite changes in location.

Adult *C. sorrah* were also present in Cleveland Bay for long periods, ranging from 8 to 408 days (mean = 190). Unlike *C. amboinensis*, however, this species used areas away from creek and river mouths and generally remained in deeper water habitats (mean = 421 cm). Analyses of home range revealed that individuals consistently used the same areas and similar amounts of space over time. A high level of spatial segregation occurred among *C. sorrah* within this nearshore region, with individuals using different types of habitat and showing high attachment to specific areas. In addition, the range of depths individuals used varied between sexes. Males tended to remain within a narrow depth range, whereas females displayed a seasonal shift in the range of depths used. Mean monthly depths varied by as much as 200 cm for females, with individuals using shallower habitats where water temperature was higher (up to 4^o C) during the winter months.

Both species spent a large proportion of time inside the MPAs. The mean proportion of time *C. amboinensis* and *C. sorrah* spent inside MPAs was 0.22 and 0.32, respectively, and MPA use varied seasonally. Both species used large areas inside the MPAs, but individuals generally used only half of the available protected space. All individuals made excursions from the MPAs, however, both species exited and re-entered MPAs within consistent locations along the boundaries.

Long-term use of Cleveland Bay demonstrates that this region contains important habitat for both juvenile *C. amboinensis* and adult *C. sorrah*. However, differences in movement and habitat use suggest that this nearshore environment serves different functions for these species. Use of discrete, shallow areas is likely a refuging strategy for young *C.*

amboinensis, and an ontogenetic shift in depth used may be a mechanism to decrease competition between different juvenile age classes using the same area. For *C. sorrah*, the high level of spatial segregation among individuals may be a strategy to improve foraging success by increasing separation and using more areas. Although movement and habitat use patterns varied between species, both used MPA regions for a large proportion of time. Thus, coastal MPAs provide some protection and benefits for mobile species like sharks. By defining the spatial ecology of coastal sharks, this dissertation contributes to improving the conservation and management of their populations, and provides a framework for future research on the effectiveness of MPAs for mobile species within Australia and around the world.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

General Introduction	1
----------------------------	---

CHAPTER 2

Sharks in Nearshore Environments.....	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Theoretical models of shark populations in nearshore environments.....	8
2.3 How shark populations use nearshore environments	13
2.4 Living in nearshore waters: challenges, adaptations and consequences	16

CHAPTER 3

General Methods	22
3.1 Study site	22
3.2 Study species.....	22
3.3 Passive acoustic monitoring	26
3.4 Permits and ethics.....	30

CHAPTER 4

Habitat Use and Movement of Juvenile <i>Carcharhinus amboinensis</i>	32
4.1 Introduction	32
4.2. Data analyses	34
4.2.1 Presence	34
4.2.2 Home range	35
4.2.3 Movement	36
4.2.4 Habitat use by depth.....	37
4.3 Results.....	38
4.3.1 Presence	40
4.3.2 Home range	42
4.3.3 Movement	45
4.3.4 Habitat use by depth.....	52
4.4. Discussion.....	54

CHAPTER 5

Wet Season Effects on the Distribution of Juvenile <i>Carcharhinus amboinensis</i>	62
5.1 Introduction	62
5.2 Townsville wet season	63
5.3 Data analyses	65
5.3.1 Distribution and home range.....	65
5.3.2 Regression analysis	66
5.4 Results.....	67
5.4.1 Distribution and freshwater inflow	67
5.4.2 Home range	71

5.5 Discussion.....	74
CHAPTER 6	
Habitat Use and Movement of Adult <i>Carcharhinus sorrah</i>	80
6.1 Introduction	80
6.2 Data analyses	81
6.2.1 Presence	82
6.2.2 Home range	82
6.2.3 Habitat use by depth.....	83
6.3 Results.....	84
6.3.1 Presence	85
6.3.2. Home range	85
6.3.3 Habitat use by depth.....	92
6.4 Discussion.....	96
CHAPTER 7	
Evaluating the Effectiveness of Marine Protected Areas for Sharks	104
7.1 Introduction	104
7.2 MPA study site and shark species.....	106
7.3 Data analyses	108
7.3.1 Time spent inside MPAs.....	110
7.3.2 Excursions from MPAs	110
7.3.3 Space use inside MPAs.....	111
7.4 Results.....	111
7.4.1 Time spent inside MPAs.....	112
7.4.2 Excursions from MPAs	115
7.4.3 Space use inside MPAs.....	117
7.5 Discussion.....	120
CHAPTER 8	
General Discussion.....	128
8.1 Comparison of <i>C. amboinensis</i> and <i>C. sorrah</i> spatial ecology in Cleveland Bay ..	128
8.2 Implications for the broader spatial ecology of sharks in nearshore environments	132
8.3 Directions for future research	136
REFERENCES	138

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 4

Table 4.1 Tagging information for *C. amboinensis* monitored in Cleveland Bay from 2008 to 2010 including date tagged, age class, stretch total length, sex and total days monitored. *individuals still present at the end of the monitoring period (31/07/2010).39

Table 4.2 Presence of *C. amboinensis* in Cleveland Bay. Summary includes total days present, continuous days present and residency index by year and age class. Brackets are standard errors.41

Table 4.3 Results of χ^2 goodness-of-fit tests for number of detections versus time of day and tidal stage for *C. amboinensis*. Data is listed by year and age class.....47

CHAPTER 5

Table 5.1 Tagging information for *C. amboinensis* monitored in Cleveland Bay during two wet seasons including date tagged, date of last detection, number of days monitored during wet season period and age class. Date last detected indicates the last detection during monitoring period analysed (December-April). *individuals monitored in both years.68

CHAPTER 6

Table 6.1 Tagging information for *C. sorrah* monitored in Cleveland Bay from 2009 to 2010 including date tagged, side of the bay individuals were captured/released on, stretch total length, sex and total days monitored. *individuals still present at the end of the monitoring period (31/10/2010).86

Table 6.2 Presence of *C. sorrah* in Cleveland Bay. Summary includes total days present, continuous days present, continuous days absent and residency index by sex. Brackets are standard errors.87

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 3

- Fig. 3.1 Study site. Google Earth™ aerial image of Cleveland Bay relative to its location along the Queensland coast.....23
- Fig. 3.2 Study species. Photos of a juvenile *C. amboinensis* (a) and an adult *C. sorrah* (b).
.....24
- Fig. 3.3 Components of passive acoustic monitoring. Vemco's VR2W acoustic receiver (a) and V16 acoustic transmitter (b).27
- Fig. 3.4 Cleveland Bay. Symbols are locations of acoustic receivers deployed in November 2008 (● = mid-water deployments, ○ = fixed bottom deployments), August 2009 (▲) and January 2010 (■). Asterisk indicates location of a hydrographic station in the bay. Dashed lines indicate bathymetry.28
- Fig. 3.5 Acoustic receivers deployed in Cleveland Bay: mid-water deployment (a), fixed bottom deployment (b).29
- Fig. 3.6 Surgery and release procedures of study species. Field work assistant holding a *C. sorrah* while surgery is conducted (a), suturing the muscle and skin layers (b) and releasing a *C. amboinensis* in good condition (c).31

CHAPTER 4

- Fig. 4.1 Presence plot of *C. amboinensis* in Cleveland Bay by day. Symbols represent days detected on the eastern array (●), western array (Δ), Ross River receiver (□) and days when individuals were removed by fishers (X).43
- Fig. 4.2 Mean monthly home ranges with standard errors for *C. amboinensis* released in 2008-2009 (● and solid line) and 2009-2010 (□ and dashed line) calculated with 95% KUDs (a) and 50% KUDs (b). Grey shading indicates months that typically receive the most rainfall during the monsoonal wet season in the Townsville region.44
- Fig. 4.3 Representative monthly home ranges of nine *C. amboinensis* for November 2009, March 2010 and June 2010. Panels include young-of-the-year (a), one-year-old (b) and two-year-old (c) individuals. Blue fill: 95% KUDs, yellow fill: 50% KUDs, dashed line: MCPs, black dots: COA locations used to calculate home ranges.....46
- Fig. 4.4 Proportion of detections during each 20 cm tidal stage (grey bars) and actual tidal stage distribution (●) for *C. amboinensis*. Panels indicate detections on deep (a-c) and shallow (d-f) receivers for young-of-the-year (a,d), one-year-old (b,e) and two-year-old (c,f) age classes.48

Fig. 4.5 Boxplots showing distribution of detections on deep receivers (grey) and shallow receivers (white) by tidal stage for each age class of *C. amboinensis*. Boxes are 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers), 25th and 75th percentiles (boxes), mean (dashed line) and median (solid line).....50

Fig. 4.6 Spectral density of hourly detections for *C. amboinensis* on deep (a-c) and shallow (d-f) receivers calculated separately for young-of-the-year (a,d), one-year-old (b,e) and two-year-old (c,f) age classes.....51

Fig. 4.7 Proportion of available depths in Cleveland Bay (solid line) and proportion of depths used by young-of-the-year (dotted line), one-year-old (dashed line) and two-year-old (dotted-dashed line) age classes of *C. amboinensis* (a). Electivity analysis of depth for young-of-the-year (dotted line), one-year-old (dashed line) and two-year-old (dotted-dashed line) age classes of *C. amboinensis*. Values above zero indicate affinity (b).....53

CHAPTER 5

Fig. 5.1 Mean daily rainfall for the Townsville region (grey fill) and mean daily Alligator Creek flow (solid line) from January through April for 2009 (a) and 2010 (b).64

Fig. 5.2 Boxplots showing range of latitude locations of *C. amboinensis* in Cleveland Bay by week in relation to mean weekly flow from Alligator Creek (dashed line) and the location of the mouth of Alligator Creek (solid line). Weeks include December through April for 2008-2009 (a) and 2009-2010 (b). Boxes are 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers), 25th and 75th percentiles (boxes) and median (solid line).....69

Fig. 5.3 Regression lines of mean weekly latitude location of *C. amboinensis* and mean weekly flow of Alligator Creek for 2008-2009 (● and solid line) and 2009-2010 (Δ and dashed line).70

Fig. 5.4 Representative monthly home ranges of two *C. amboinensis* over two consecutive wet seasons including the months of December (start of wet season), February (peak of wet season) and April (end of wet season) for 2008-2009 (a) and 2009-2010 (b). Green fill: 95% KUDs, beige fill: 50% KUDs.....72

Fig. 5.5 Regression of mean weekly home ranges (95% KUDs) of *C. amboinensis* and mean weekly flow of Alligator Creek for 2008-2009 (●) and 2009-2010 (Δ).....73

CHAPTER 6

Fig. 6.1 Presence plot of *C. sorrah* in Cleveland Bay by day. Symbols represent days detected on the eastern array (●), western array (Δ) and days when individuals were removed by fishers (X).88

Fig. 6.2 Representative monthly home ranges of four *C. sorrah* over three consecutive months of August, September and October. Panels include two individuals released in 2009 (a,b) and two individuals released in 2010 (c,d). Blue fill: 95% KUDs, yellow fill: 50% KUDs, black dots: COA locations used to calculate home ranges.90

Fig. 6.3 Mean monthly home ranges with standard errors for *C. sorrah* using the eastern side of the bay (● and solid line) and western side of the bay (□ and dashed line) calculated with 95% KUDs (a) and 50% KUDs (b).91

Fig. 6.4 Proportion of available depths in Cleveland Bay (solid line) and proportion of depths used by female (dotted line) and male (dashed line) *C. sorrah* (a). Electivity analysis of depth for female (dotted line) and male (dashed line) *C. sorrah*. Values above zero indicate affinity (b).93

Fig 6.5 Boxplots showing range of depths used by female (a) and male (b) *C. sorrah* in Cleveland Bay by month in relation to water temperature at two depth strata (solid line: 190 cm, dashed line: 850 cm). Boxes are 10th and 90th percentiles (whiskers), 25th and 75th percentiles (boxes), mean (dashed line) and median (solid line).94

Fig. 6.6 Interaction plot with standard errors of mean monthly depths used by female (● and dotted line) and male (○ and dashed line) *C. sorrah*. Grey shading indicates months when females used deeper depths than males.95

CHAPTER 7

Fig. 7.1 Cleveland Bay. Solid lines indicate boundaries of Conservation Park zones. Symbols are locations of acoustic receivers deployed inside MPAs and classified as edge deep (●), edge shallow (■), inner deep (○) and inner shallow (▲).107

Fig. 7.2 Frequency histograms of the proportion of time individuals spent inside MPAs for *C. amboinensis* (a) and male (black) and female (grey) *C. sorrah* (b).113

Fig. 7.3 Mean proportion of time individuals spent inside MPAs by month for *C. amboinensis* (black) and *C. sorrah* (grey).....114

Fig. 7.4 Frequency histograms of number of daily excursions individuals made from MPAs and mean excursion duration in hours for *C. amboinensis* (a,c) and *C. sorrah* using the western (black) and eastern (grey) MPAs (b,d). Note differences in scale on y-axes.116

Fig. 7.5 Mean proportion of detections on edge receivers when individuals exited and returned to MPAs: *C. amboinensis* (a,c), *C. sorrah* using the eastern and western MPAs (b,d). Dashed lines indicate bathymetry.118

Fig. 7.6 Representative maps of minimum convex polygon home ranges (filled cross hatch) for nine individuals: *C. amboinensis* (a), *C. sorrah* using the eastern MPA (b), *C. sorrah* using the western MPA (c). Dashed lines indicate bathymetry.119

Fig. 7.7 Frequency histograms of proportion of space individuals used inside MPAs for *C. amboinensis* (a) and *C. sorrah* (b).....121