

10.1071/BT19064_AC

© CSIRO 2019

Supplementary Material: *Australian Journal of Botany*, 2019, 67, 531–545.

The importance of fire in the success of a 15-hectare subtropical heathland translocation

Peter Dufourq^{A,B} and Alison Shapcott^A

^AGenecology Research Centre, School of Science and Engineering, University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore DC 4558, Queensland, Australia.

^BCorresponding author. Email: pjd006@student.usc.edu.au

Table S1. The total diversity for the two heath types and translocation site

Simpson's diversity (D) and Shannon's diversity (H) index values with Shannon's equitability value (E_H) are presented

	Dry heath	Wet heath	Translocation site
Number of species	105	112	150
D	0.01	0.01	
H	4.36	4.46	
E_H	0.94	0.95	

Table S2. List of species on the dry heath list showing the comparison of species present and abundance (%) at the start and end of the original monitoring period (2008/2009 and 2011) and this study (2016)

Abundance is given as a percentage out of transects sampled (twelve transects) where each species was present.
 Bolded species represent performance criteria listed forage species for *Pezoporus wallicus*

	2008/09	2011	2016
<i>Acacia attenuata</i>	60	80	60
<i>Acacia longissima</i>	30	30	10
<i>Acacia o'shanesii</i>	10	30	30
<i>Babingtonia bidwillii</i>	80	60	80
<i>Baloskion tetraphyllum</i>	50	60	50
<i>Banksia robur</i>	20	10	10
<i>Baumea juncea</i>	10	0	10
<i>Boronia falcifolia</i>	10	10	20
<i>Boronia rivularis</i>	40	40	40
<i>Burchardia umbellata</i>	0	0	10
<i>Cassutha glabella</i>	30	50	50
<i>Cassutha pubescens</i>	60	50	80
<i>Caustis recurvata</i>	20	20	10
<i>Dianella caerulea</i>	40	30	20
<i>Dillwynia floribunda</i>	10	10	20
<i>Empodisma minus</i>	30	30	80
<i>Entolasia stricta</i>	80	90	80
<i>Epacris pulchella</i>	20	10	20
<i>Eurychorda complanata</i>	20	0	0
<i>Gahnia clarkei</i>	50	50	90
<i>Gahnia sieberiana</i>	90	100	90
<i>Hibbertia salicifolia</i>	20	20	10
<i>Ischaemum australe</i>	20	30	30
<i>Leptospermum liversidgei</i>	10	10	20
<i>Leptospermum semibaccatum</i>	0	0	30
<i>Leptospermum trinervium</i>	30	30	0
<i>Leucopogon ericoides</i>	0	0	0
<i>Leucopogon leptospermoides</i>	30	30	30
<i>Lindsaea ensifolia</i>	70	60	70
<i>Lindsaea linearis</i>	30	0	20
<i>Logania albiflora</i>	0	0	0
<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	70	60	70
<i>Melastoma malabathricum</i>	80	80	80
<i>Oxylobium robustum</i>	10	30	20
<i>Parsonsia straminea</i>	10	30	30
<i>Phyllota phyllicoides</i>	0	0	10
<i>Pultenaea paleacea</i>	50	0	80
<i>Pultenaea villosa</i>	30	30	50
<i>Schoenus apogon</i>	0	20	0
<i>Schoenus brevifolius</i>	80	90	90
<i>Schoenus paludosus</i>	0	0	0
<i>Sowerbaea juncea</i>	10	0	10
<i>Sporadanthus interruptus</i>	30	20	40
<i>Sprengelia sprengelioides</i>	20	0	20
<i>Xanthorrhoea fulva</i>	40	40	40
<i>Zieria minutiflora</i>	40	70	80
<i>Zieria smithii</i>	30	40	60

Table S3. List of species on the wet heath list showing the comparison of species present and abundance (%) at the start and end of the original monitoring period (2009 and 2011) and this study (2016)

Abundance is given as a percentage out of transects sampled (six transects) where each species was present.
 Bolded species represent performance criteria listed forage species for *Pezoporus wallicus*

	2009	2011	2016
<i>Acacia melanoxylon</i>	0	0	30
<i>Aotus ericoides</i>	30	30	100
<i>Baloskion pallens</i>	70	70	30
<i>Baloskion tetraphyllum</i>	70	30	0
<i>Baumea articulata</i>	0	0	0
<i>Baumea rubiginosa</i>	100	100	30
<i>Baumea teretifolia</i>	70	70	30
<i>Blechnum indicum</i>	100	100	0
<i>Centella asiatica</i>	30	30	30
<i>Chorizandra sphaerocephala</i>	30	30	0
<i>Cyclosorus interruptus</i>	0	0	0
<i>Dianella caerulea</i>	30	0	0
<i>Gleichenia dicarpa</i>	30	0	0
<i>Hypolepis muelleri</i>	0	0	0
<i>Juncus continuus</i>	70	100	0
<i>Juncus polyanthemus</i>	30	30	0
<i>Juncus usitatus</i>	30	30	0
<i>Lepidosperma longitudinale</i>	0	30	0
<i>Lepironia articulata</i>	0	0	30
<i>Lindsaea ensifolia</i>	70	70	30
<i>Lygodium microphyllum</i>	30	30	0
<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i>	100	100	100
<i>Melastoma malabathricum</i>	100	70	0
<i>Parsonsia straminea</i>	70	30	30
<i>Rhynchospora corymbosa</i>	30	30	0
<i>Schoenus apogon</i>	70	100	70
<i>Schoenus paludosus</i>	0	0	0
<i>Sporadanthus caudatus</i>	0	70	0

Table S4. Chi-square results for total species present on the two heath type lists between the three time periods

Years	Df	χ^2	Critical value	<i>P</i>
Dry heath				
2008-09/2011	1	0.63	3.841	0.4274
2008-09/2016	1	0.03	3.841	0.8625
2011/2016	1	1.03	3.841	0.3102
Wet heath				
2009/2011	1	0	3.841	1
2009/2016	1	3.2	3.841	0.0736
2011/2016	1	3.2	3.841	0.0736

Table S5. List of foraging species for *Pezoporus wallicus* and their abundance (%)

Abundance is given as a percentage of total transects (18) sampled where each species was present. Bolded species represent species that are on the two heath type lists but were not identified at the time as foraging species. A total of 33 species were identified by McFarland (1991). This list shows 26 of them, and the remaining species are bolded in Tables 1 and 2 describing the schedule lists

	Abundance
<i>Baumea juncea</i>	10
<i>Bossiaea heterophylla</i>	10
<i>Conospermum taxifolium</i>	10
<i>Daviesia umbellulata</i>	0
<i>Dianella caerulea</i>	10
<i>Epacris microphylla</i>	10
<i>Epacris obtusifolia</i>	0
<i>Gompholobium pinnatum</i>	30
<i>Gompholobium virgatum</i>	0
<i>Grevillea leiophylla</i>	0
<i>Hibbertia vestita</i>	20
<i>Lepironia articulata</i>	10
<i>Leptocarpus tenax</i>	30
<i>Lepyrodia scariosa</i>	0
<i>Mirbelia rubiifolia</i>	60
<i>Panicum simile</i>	0
<i>Philothea myoporoides</i>	0
<i>Pimelea linifolia</i>	80
<i>Pseudanthus orientalis</i>	30
<i>Ptilothrix deusta</i>	0
<i>Rhynchospora rubra</i>	0
<i>Schoenus sp.</i>	100
<i>Sporadanthus caudatus</i>	10
<i>Sporadanthus interruptus</i>	60
<i>Themeda triandra</i>	20
<i>Zieria laxiflora</i>	10
Total foraging species present	17/26 (22/33)

Table S6. Summary of species diversity and Foliage Projective Cover (FPC) measures between heath types

Mean species richness, mean Simpson's diversity (D), mean Shannon's diversity (H), and mean Shannon's equitability (E_H) values are presented. Time since fire (TSF) and mean FPC is shown including FPC range (in parenthesis). Mean values are also given per heath type for all measures

Heath type	TSF	Number of species	D	H	E_H	FPC shrubs <2m
Dry	~17	26	0.05	2.98	0.92	75 (3-88)
Dry	2	39	0.04	3.35	0.91	86 (63-88)
Dry	1	41	0.03	3.39	0.93	82 (3-88)
Mean		33	0.04	3.16	0.92	79
Wet	3	38	0.03	3.38	0.94	85 (63-88)
Wet	1	53	0.03	3.68	0.93	81 (63-88)
Mean		43	0.03	3.49	0.93	84

Table S7. ANOVA results for comparisons between species richness and species diversity (Simpson's index, Shannon's index) and the three time since fire periods (1, 2, ~17 years)

Variable	Df	Sum of squares	Mean square	F value	<i>P</i>
Species richness	2	315.2	45	5.34	0.039
Simpson's index (<i>D</i>)	2	0.0008	0.0001	3.73	0.106
Shannon's index (<i>H</i>)	2	0.638	0.193	5.381	0.038

Table S8. Kruskal-Wallis results for comparisons between Foliage Projective Cover (FPC) and the three time since fire periods (1, 2, ~17 years)

Variable	<i>N</i>	Df	H value	<i>P</i>
Mean FPC (Shrub stratum <2m)	45	2	2.385	0.303
Mean FPC (Shrub stratum 2-4m)	45	2	15.588	0.000