APPENDICES

Operational Planning, Silvicultural Aspects and Harvest Volume of	
Experimental Logging Trials in the Study Area	215
Vegetation Structure and Floristic Composition at Representative	
Net Stations in each Research Plot	222
Maps of Home Ranges of Individuals of the Study Species Before	
and After Logging in each Research Plot	254
	Operational Planning, Silvicultural Aspects and Harvest Volume of Experimental Logging Trials in the Study Area Vegetation Structure and Floristic Composition at Representative Net Stations in each Research Plot Maps of Home Ranges of Individuals of the Study Species Before and After Logging in each Research Plot

APPENDIX 1

OPERATIONAL PLANNING, SILVICULTURAL ASPECTS AND HARVEST VOLUME OF EXPERIMENTAL LOGGING TRIALS IN THE STUDY AREA

Operational planning and silvicultural aspects

There were three key components of the planning of the experimental logging trials. These included the field delineation of treatment zones, compliance with forest harvesting and wildlife protection regulations and associated community consultation, and forest landscape context. The pertinent aspects of these components are detailed below.

Field delineation of treatment zones

I established five zones of treatment in each of the two experimental logging plots: gap (wood production zone 1), thinning (wood production zone 2), interstitial, cluster (biodiversity conservation zone), and riparian buffers (see Chapter 2: Figs. 2.5 and 2.7).

<u>Gaps</u>

A gap is defined as a break or space in the canopy created by the removal of trees that have reached their maximum economic value or end-point (SFNSW 1995d). Three (3) canopy gaps were identified and marked in each of the two experimental plots. Gap boundaries were delineated by a square-and-bar-below symbol sprayed in pink fluorescent paint on tree stems or stumps and orange polka-dot flagging tape tied on saplings or shrubs at 5-15 metre intervals around proposed gap perimeters. Each gap was measured by hip-chain to a diameter of approximately 80 metres crown-to-crown, occupying an area of about 0.64 ha. A total of 1.92 ha or 21.33% of forest in each of the two 9 ha experimental plots was therefore set aside for gap establishment. This complied with the model Gaps and Clusters Technique (GCT) requirements that no more than 25% of the available forest area should be gapped in one cutting cycle and, for each cutting cycle, no more than 2-3 canopy gaps should be established per 5 ha of forest available for gap creation (SFNSW 1995d).

The size, shape and spatial distribution of all gaps delineated in the field were dictated by four main factors. These were the seed dispersal distances of the main commercial tree species present, regrowth suppression by competition from trees flanking the edges of identified gaps, adequate levels of site disturbance to promote regeneration (see Floyd 1962; Baur 1982), and site constraints such as the presence of trees of merchantable quality and requirements for environmental protection.

Experimental evidence suggests that, to allow rapid regrowth at the centre of gaps, canopy gaps in moist hardwood forest should be at least 80 metres in diameter crown-to-crown for tall stands with wide crowns such as Blackbutt, Sydney Blue Gum, Tallowwood and Brush Box (Baur 1984; SFNSW 1993b). This size approximates the maximum seed-throw distance recorded in Blackbutt (SFNSW 1993b). Gap shape was approximately circular to oval to allow maximum light penetration.

Canopy gap creation is recommended under specific conditions of growth stage and commercial suitability. These include stands that have reached their endpoint after a sequence of thinning, stands past their optimal commercial value, and stands where the regeneration is in poor condition (SFNSW 1995d). The forest identified for gapping in the study area generally satisfied these criteria.

A set of eight (8) additional gaps of similar size, shape and spatial distribution were identified and marked in forest surrounding each of the two experimental plots. These were included to achieve two goals: enhancement of within-plot detectability of bird responses to the disturbance events by reducing the amount of forest outside of the plots that was. available to birds displaced by each GCT trial, and more realistic simulation of a GCT application. A resultant total of 22 gaps (16 located outside of the trial plots and 6 within the plots) or 6.48% (14.08 ha) of the study area (217.39 ha) was set aside for gap creation over the two year trial period.

Thinning areas

Areas of forest to be thinned from below were identified and marked in and around each of the two experimental plots. Thinning from below is a silvicultural technique that involves removing smaller trees to redistribute the growth to larger trees (SFNSW 1995d). The trunks of individual trees to be harvested were sprayed with one or more pink dots. A total of 2.06 ha or 22.88% of forest was identified for thinning in E1 Plot and 0.83 ha or 9.22% of forest in E2 Plot. A further 2.2 ha of forest was identified for thinning around E1 Plot and 2.5 ha around E2 Plot. Therefore, a total of 7.59 ha of forest were set aside for thinning in the study area during the logging trials.

The spatial distribution of thinning zones in each experimental plot was determined by stand condition, requirements for environmental protection, tree species present and presence of habitat and recruitment habitat trees. Thinning from below is generally suited to young stands where the stocking rate is high and regeneration is not required to stimulate growth (SFNSW 1995d). Light thinning was generally planned for proposed thinning areas. The exception was a well-stocked area designated for heavier thinning in the south-west corner of E2 Plot.

The few habitat or hollow-bearing trees present in and around each trial plot were marked for retention by one pink horizontal line with the letter 'H' sprayed above the line. A recruitment habitat tree was identified by a pink horizontal line with the letters 'RH' or 'R' sprayed above the line. There were very few recruitment habitat trees identified in each plot. Dead stags were marked for retention providing that current and future operational safety could be assured.

Interstitial areas

Interstitial areas are portions of forest situated between gaps and clusters that can be selectively logged or thinned. In my study however, areas identified as interstitial comprised mostly non-merchantable species such as Bangalow Palm, Forest Oak, Turpentine and various rainforest trees and shrubs, or were in poor stand condition. Therefore, these areas were not scheduled for logging and were mostly not disturbed. They were marked by three pink horizontal bars sprayed on tree trunks at regular intervals along boundaries. They comprised a total of 1.37 ha or 15.28% of forest in E1 Plot and 1.12 ha or 12.5% of forest in E2 Plot.

Clusters

Clusters are groups of selected habitat and recruitment habitat trees identified for permanent conservation within the gapped and thinned forest mosaic.

The purpose of clusters is to provide fauna habitat in close proximity to canopy gaps, thus reducing the potential impacts of creating gaps on fauna (SFNSW 1993b, SFNSW 1995b). To this end, the shrub and litter layers remain generally undisturbed. Horne's GCT model described clusters as "localised, permanently undisturbed islands of animal habitat" (p. 6, SFNSW 1995e). Clusters should occupy about 15-25% of the area available for gap creation.

Three clusters were identified and marked in each experimental plot. The tree marking code used to define cluster boundaries was the same as for gap boundaries, only yellow paint and yellow polka-dot flagging tape were used.

Clusters adjoined or were in close proximity to gaps, depending on the presence of habitat and recruitment habitat trees. Clusters were connected to riparian and buffer zones, as requested by NSW NPWS (see *Regulatory compliance and community consultation* section).

Clusters were generally similar in size to (0.64 ha) or slightly larger than (0.7-0.85 ha) gaps. The larger size was designed in response to the outcomes of consultation with NSW NPWS. Clusters occupied 2.06 ha or 22.92% of forest in E1 Plot and 1.56 ha (17.36%) in E2 Plot. The smaller area of clusters in E2 Plot relative to E1 Plot reflected a larger amount of forest reserved as riparian buffers in E2 Plot (see *Riparian buffer zones*).

A further 8 clusters were identified and marked so as to match the corresponding gaps in the area around each trial plot. Therefore, a total of 22 clusters (16 located outside of the trial plots and 6 within the plots) or 6.37% (13.86 ha) of the study area was set aside for clusters over the two year trial period.

Riparian buffer zones

Logging is not permitted in riparian zones. This helps to protect water quality and plants and animals that utilise moist environments. Trees cannot be felled into riparian zones. The model GCT excludes logging in flora and fauna reserves and around sites where threatened plants and animals occur and in sites of special significance. However, these did not occur in areas identified for logging in the study area.

Riparian buffer zones were marked by spraying three pink horizontal bars on tree trunks at regular intervals along measured boundaries. Riparian zone width is determined by stream order and catchment size (SFNSW 1997, 1998b). In E1 Plot, two 40 metre-wide zones were established across the two main drainage lines (second order streams, <40 ha catchments) and one 20 metre-wide zone was marked across a side-tributary (first order stream, <40 ha catchment). In E2 Plot, one 80 metre-wide zone was delineated across the main drainage line (third order stream, 100+ ha catchment) and one 40 metre-wide zone was marked across both branches of a side-tributary (second order stream, 40+ ha catchment). No fauna movement corridors connecting major catchments were identified in the study area. Riparian buffer zones comprised a total of 1.59 ha or 17.66% of forest in E1 Plot and 3.57 ha or 39.66% of forest in E2 Plot.

Regulatory compliance and community consultation

To comply with the provisions of the SFNSW harvest planning process, pre-logging plant and animal surveys were undertaken, harvesting plans for each trial and other forest management activities at the compartment-level were prepared, and the relevant licences obtained (see SFNSW 1997, 1998b,c). An exemption from the moratorium imposed on this form of logging was granted by the Minister for Land and Water Conservation on 24 February 1997. This was contingent upon agreement being reached with the Northern Region Harvesting Advisory Board. This body had not been formed at this time so I consulted with NSW NPWS, SFNSW, a regional conservation group (North-East Forest Alliance), and the University of New England.

NSW NPWS approved the Year 1 phase of the project on 1 July 1997 by issuing a Section 120 (National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974) licence to harvest timber and construct roads,

subject to compliance with some specific conditions. These restricted the number of gaps to three in the experimental plot and eight in the surrounding identified forest, with gaps placed according to the presence of threatened species (see SFNSW 1997), and required a Year 1 progress report. NSW NPWS approved the Year 2 operation under the same conditions on 15 June 1998.

Forest landscape context

The GCT trials represented relatively local disruptions in the continuity of forest cover and maintained riparian and ridgeline connections. This satisfied the original model's spatial design requirements at the first cutting cycle. In the trials, the retained forest matrix originated from regrowth generated by past selective logging. Also, no flora reserves occur within or near the trial plots.

The GCT trials also took into account the location and intensity of past and concurrent logging in the compartment and throughout Lower Bucca State Forest. I reviewed SFNSW compartment history records, Forest Management Information System (FAMIS) data, Coffs Harbour Management Area Plan, and aerial photography. This revealed that while all of Lower Bucca State Forest has been selectively logged since the start of forest management records (mid-1920s), the intensity of logging has varied. To avoid bias, the GCT trials were planned for sites that had been selectively logged at similar intervals and intensities. These were areas of moist regrowth forest comprising a mix of older (41-60 year-old), intermediate (20-40 year-old) and younger (5-19 year-old) stands featuring a generally dense shrubby understorey and many fallen logs.

Existing aerial photographs of the study area were of poor quality, so new photographs were taken before and after the trials (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.5). This photography was used in an ARCINFO (Version 7.0.4) Geographic Information System (GIS) (Environmental Systems Research Institute 1996) to produce maps showing the location of the study area, research plots and the experimental gaps and clusters trial area. An ARCVIEW GIS (Version 3.1.1) (Environmental Systems Research Institute 1999) was used to produce maps of extant forest cover and moist hardwood forest cover. Data were obtained from the North-East NSW Comprehensive Regional Assessment project (NSW Department of Urban Affairs and Planning 1999). Both sets of GIS-based maps allowed areas of forested land, moist

hardwood forest and treatment zones to be calculated, and the placement of my study in a local, regional, and State forest landscape context.

Harvest volume

The amount of wood harvested from both experimental trial plots was determined using the SFNSW timber delivery docket system. Codes were entered on each docket in the field to indicate whether logs were harvested from gaps located within each trial plot, gaps outside each plot, thinning areas within each plot, or thinning areas outside each plot. Volumes of product were then collated according to these zones of harvest origin and totals were derived. Table 1 shows the total volume of wood produced by each zone in the trial plots.

PLOT	PRODUCT	VOLU	VOLUME OF WOOD EXTRACTED BY ZONE ¹							
		А	В	C	D	Е	F	TOTAL		
E1	quota sawlog	92.5	11.4	103.9	138.8	382.6	521.4	625.3		
	thinnings	52.7	3.9	56.6	62.3	132.7	195	251.6		
	salvage	135.7	24.4	160.1	198.7	419.7	618.4	778.5		
	veneer	57.1	22.9	80	182.9	248.7	431.6	511.6		
	poles,piles,girders	14.4	0	14.4	138	168.8	306.8	321.2		
	PLOT TOTAL ³	352.4	62.6	415	720.7	1352.5	2073.2	2488.2		
E2	quota sawlog	94.4	10.2	104.6	124.7	90.9	215.6	320.2		
	thinnings	50.5	25.6	76.1	55.3	59	114.3	190.4		
	salvage	67.3	6.8	74.1	133.4	118.1	251.5	325.6		
	veneer	79	12.3	91.3	9.6	66.2	75.8	167.1		
	poles, piles, girders	0	0	0	27.8	0	27.8	27.8		
	PLOT TOTAL ³	291.2	54.9	346.1	350.8	334.2	685	1031.1		
STUDY	TOTAL ⁴							3519.3		

Table 1Volume of wood extracted from E1 and E2 Plots in the study area, 1997-1998

¹zone of harvest origin - all volumes in m³:

A all gaps within plot

B all thinning areas within plot

C all gaps and thinning areas within plot

D all gaps outside plot

E all thinning areas outside plot

F all gaps and thinning areas outside plot

²total volume (m³) of wood extracted, by product type, from all gaps and thinning areas within and outside plot

³total volume of wood extracted across all product types by zone of harvest origin in each plot ⁴total volume of wood extracted from both trial areas during the study

APPENDIX 2

VEGETATION STRUCTURE AND FLORISTIC COMPOSITION AT REPRESENTATIVE NET STATIONS IN EACH RESEARCH PLOT

A botanical assessment was made of the structure and composition of vegetation in each plot before the logging trials. I sampled several attributes at net stations that were representative of the structure and floristic composition of plant communities in each plot. Attributes included slope, aspect, landscape unit, projective foliage cover, height of strata, and dominant plant species in each stratum. The following data relates to 5 net stations in each plot and samples riparian/lower slope, mid slope and upper slope vegetation communities. The full complement of net stations that were sampled in Year 1 (20 stations in each plot) is contained in Horton (1998). In Year 2, I prepared profiles of vegetation strata and identified the dominant plant species present at 28 net stations in E2 Plot and 35 net stations in C2 Plot.

VEGETATION STRATA, LANDSCAPE FEATURES AND DOMINANT PLANT SPECIES AT SAMPLED NET STATIONS IN YEAR 1 PLOTS

(from Horton [1998]: Layer 1=ground cover 0-1 m; Layer 2=shrub cover 1-5 m; Layer 3=small-medium trees 5-25 m; Layer 4=tall trees 25 m+) SEE NEXT PAGE

	N Veqe	et Station tation Lavers	
	(Domina	ants by Species)	
Plot Experimental	Net Static	on No 5	Date 25/6/97
Station Axis 72°	Station Slope 9°		
Aspect 25°	Slope 11°	Landscape Unit	Upper Slope
Layer 1	% Foliage Cover 15%		
Gristle Fern	Blechnum cartilageneum	Lantana	Lantana camara
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover 40%		
Rusty Plum Narrow-leafed Palm-lily Bangalow Palm	Amorphospermum whitei Cordyline stricta Archontophoenix cunninghamia	Rose Maple Lantana Ina	Cryptocarya rigida Lantana camara
Layer 3	% Foliage Cover 50%		
Murrogun Tree Heath Forest Oak	Cryptocarya microneura Trochocarpa laurina Allocasuarina torulosa	Bangalow Palm Scrub Turpentine	Archontophoenix cunninghamiana Rhodamnia rubescens
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover 30%		
Forest Oak Grey Gum	Allocasuarina torulosa Eucalyptus propinqua	Pink Bloodwood	Corymbia intermedia

Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species)									
Plot Experimental	Net Station No	8 Date	25/6/97						
Aspect 30°	Slope 5°	Landscape Unit	MidSlope						
Layer 1 Gristle Fern Ginger	% Foliage Cover 25% Blechnum cartilageneum Aloinea arundinella	Narrow-leafed Palm-lily	Cordyline stricta						
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover 40%								
Scentless Rosewood Murrogun	Synoum glandulosum Cryptocarya microneura % Foliage Cover 55%	Tree Heath Corkwood	Trochocarpa laurina Schizomeria ovata						
Turpentine Celerywood Forest Oak	Syncarpia glomulifera Polyscias elegans Allocasuarina torulosa	Scentless Rosewood Murrogun	Synoum glandulosum Cryptocarya microneura						
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover 25%	Turnentine	Suncernia alomulifera						
Tanowwoou	Eucaryptus microcorys								

		Net S	Station	
	(D	Vegetati	on Layers by Species)	
	(2	ommunie		
Plot Experiment	al Ne	t Station N	lo 25 Date	25/6/97
Station Axis 260°	• Station Slope 0•			
Aspect 345	° Slope 15°		Landscape Unit	Lower Slope
Layer 1	% Foliage Cover	20%		
Turpentine Rose Maple Five-leafed Water Vir Veiny Wilkea	Syncarpia glomulifera Cryptocarya rigida cissus hypoglauca Wilkea huegeliana		Narrow-leafed Palm-lity Gristle Fern Yam Supplejack	Cordyline stricta Blechnum cartilageneum Dioscorea transversa Ripogonum brevifolium
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover	30%		
Bolwarra Forest Oak Scrub Turpentine Turpentine	Eupomatia laurina Allocasuarina torulosa Rhodamnia erubescens Syncarpia glomulifera		Narrow-leafed Palm-lily Scentiess Rosewood Rose Maple	Cordyline stricta Synoum glandulosum Cryptocarya rigida
Layer 3	% Foliage Cover	55%		
Forest Oak Bolwarra E Turpentine S	Allocasuarina torulosa Eupomatia laurina Syncarpia glomulifera		Scentless Rosewood Blueberry Ash Rose Maple	Synoum glandulosum Elaeocarpus reticulatus Cryptocarya rigida
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover	15%		
Blackbutt E Forest Oak	Eucalyptus pilularis Allocasuarina torulosa		Bloodwood	Corymbia intermedia
				,
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species)								
Plot Experimental	Ne	t Station N	lo 32 Date	27/6/97				
Station Axis 34	5° Station Slope	6 °						
Aspect 175°	Slope 9°		Landscape Unit	Lower Slope				
Layer 1	% Foliage Cover	15%						
Gristle Fern Morinda	Blechnum cartilageneur Morinda jamsinoides	m	Narrow-leafed Palm-lily	Cordyline stricta				
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover	50%						
Bangalow Palm Five-leafed Water Vine	Archontophoenix cunnir Cissus hypoglauca	nghamiana	Lantana	Lantana camara				
Layer 3	% Foliage Cover	70%						
Bangalow Palm	Archontophoenix cunnir	nghamiana	Forest Oak	Allocasuarina torulosa				
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover	25%						
Blue Gum Turpentine	Eucalyptus saligna Syncarpia glomulifera		Brushbox	Lophostemon confertus				

	Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species)										
Plot Experir	mental Ne	t Station No 42 [Date 27/6/97								
Station Axis	195° Station Slope	• 1°									
Aspect	290° Slope	4° Landscape Un	it Mid Slope								
Layer 1	% Foliage Cover	30%									
Gristle Fern	Blechnum cartilageneur,	n Murrogun	Cryptocarya microneura								
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover	20%									
Guoia Tree Heath	Guoia semiglauca Trochocarpa laurina	Rose Maple Jackwood	Cryptocarya rigida Cryptocarya glaucescens								
Layer 3	% Foliage Cover	50%									
Brushbox Turpentine	Lophostemon confertus Syncarpia glomulifera	Murrogun Brushbox	Cryptocarya microneura Lophostemon confertus								
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover	20%	,								
Ironbark	Eucalyptus siderophloia	Black Apple	Planchonella australis								

Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species)								
Plot Control	Net Station N	o 1	Date 4/7	7/97				
Station Axis 120°	Station Slope 1°							
Aspect 33°	Slope 8°		Landscape Unit	Lower Slope				
Layer 1	% Foliage Cover	40%						
Gristle Fern Bolwarra Supplejack	Blechnum cartilageneun Eupomatia laurina Ripogonum brevifolium	ז	Scentless Rosewood Water Vine	Synoum glandulosum Cissus antarctica				
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover	80%						
Narrow-leafed Palm-lily Scentless Rosewood Tree Heath	Cordyline stricta Synoum glandulosum Trochocarpa laurina		Rose Walnut Bołwarra Veiny Wilkea	Endiandra discolour Eupomatia laurina Wilkea huegeliana				
Layer 3	% Foliage Cover	60%						
Rose Wainut Crabapple Smooth-barked Apple	Endiandra discolour Schizomeria ovata Angophora costata	e	Bangalow Palm Turpentine Blackbutt	Archontophoenix cunninghamiana Syncarpia glomulifera Eucalyptus pilularis				
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover	30%						
Blue Gum Broad-leafed Ironbark	Eucalyptus saligna Eucalyptus siderophloia		Blackbutt	Eucalyptus pilularis				

Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species) Plot Control Net Station No 10 Date 3/7/97 Station Axis 350° Station Slope 6° Landscape Unit Upper Slope Aspect 80° Slope 8° Landscape Unit Upper Slope Layer 1 % Foliage Cover 20% Bangalow Palm Bolwarra Archontophoenix cunningharniana Eupomatia laurina Lopidosporma laterale Rose Maple Rose Maple Porest Oak % Foliage Cover 25% Rose Maple Forest Oak Cryptocary rigida Allcoasuarina forulosa Scrub Turpentine Rose Walnut Rhodamnia rubescens Endiandra discolour Layer 3 % Foliage Cover 35% Scrub Turpentine Rose Walnut Endiandra discolour Layer 4 % Foliage Cover 35% Scrub Turpentine Rose Walnut Endiandra discolour Layer 4 % Foliage Cover 35% Scrub Turpentine Rose Walnut Endiandra discolour Layer 4 % Foliage Cover 35% Scrub Turpentine Rose Walnut Endiandra discolour Layer 4 % Foliage Cover 35% Scrub Turpentine Rose Walnut Endiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioides
Plot Control Net Station No 10 Date 3/7/97 Station Axis 350° Station Slope 6° Landscape Unit Upper Slope Aspect 80° Slope 8° Landscape Unit Upper Slope Layer 1 % Foliage Cover 20% Bangalow Palm Archontophoenix cunninghamiana Gristle Fern Blechnum cartilageneum Bangalow Palm Archontophoenix cunninghamiana Rose Maple Oryptocarya rigida Sorub Turpentine Rhodamnia rubescens New Station No 10 Date 3/7/97 Rose Maple Cryptocarya rigida Sorub Turpentine Rhodamnia rubescens Forest Oak Cryptocarya rigida Sorub Turpentine Rhodamnia rubescens Forest Oak Eucalyptus microcorys Rose Walnut Endiandra discolour Layer 3 % Foliage Cover 35% Eucalyptus microcorys Rose Walnut Endiandra discolour Layer 4 % Foliage Cover 35% Eucalyptus microcorys Rose Walnut Eucalyptus acmenioides Layer 4 % Foliage Cover 35% Eucalyptus propinqua Eucalyptus acmenioides </th
Station Axis 350° Station Slope 6° Aspect 60° Slope 8° Landscape Unit Upper Slope Layer 1 V Foliage Cover 20% Griste Fern Ginger Rose Maple Narrow-leafed Palm-liv Blechnum cartilageneum Appinea arundinella Cryptocarya rigida Cordyline stricta Bangalow Palm Bolwarra Archontophoenix cunninghamiana Eupomatia laurina Lepidosperma laterale Layer 2 % Foliage Cover 25% Rose Maple Forest Oak Cryptocarya rigida Allocasuarina torulosa Sorub Turpentine Rose Walnut Rhodamnia rubescens Endiandra discolour Layer 3 % Foliage Cover 35% Tallowwood Grey Gum Eucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propinqua Rose Walnut White Mahogany Eucalyptus acmenioides Tallowwood Grey Gum Eucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propinqua Study propinqua Study propinqua
Aspect80°Slope8°Landscape UnitUpperSlopeLayer 1% Foliage Cover20%Gristle Fern Ginger Narrow-leafed Palm-lilyBlechnum cartilageneum Alpinea arundinella Cryptocarya rigida Cordyline strictaBangalow Palm BolwarraArchontophoenix cunninghamiana Eupomatia laurina Lepidosperma lateraleLayer 2% Foliage Cover25%Rose Maple Forest OakCryptocarya rigida Allocasuarina torulosaScrub Turpentine Rose WalnutRhodamnia rubescens Endiandra discolourLayer 3% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood CassineEucalyptus microcorys Cassine australeRose Walnut White MahoganyEndiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioidesLayer 4% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood Grey GumEucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propinguaWhite MahoganyEucalyptus acmenioides
Layer 1% Foliage Cover20%Griste Fern Ginger Rose Maple Narrow-leafed Palm-liivBiechnum cartilageneum Alpinea arundinella Cordyline strictaBangalow Palm BolwarraArchontophoenix cunninghamiana Eupomatia laurina Lepidosperma lateraleLayer 2% Foliage Cover25%Rose Maple Forest OakCryptocarya rigida Allocasuarina torulosaScrub Turpentine Rose WalnutRhodamnia rubescens Endiandra discolourLayer 3% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood Grey GumEucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus microcorys CassineRose Walnut White MahoganyEndiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioidesLayer 4% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood Grey GumEucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propinquaWhite MahoganyEucalyptus acmenioides
Gristle Fern Ginger Narrow-leafed Palm-lilyBlechnum cartilageneum Alpinea arundinella Cryptocarya rigidaBangalow Palm BolwarraArchontophoenix cunninghamiana Eupomatia laurina Lepidosperma lateraleLayer 2% Foliage Cover V25%25%Rose Maple Forest OakCryptocarya rigida Allocasuarina torulosaScrub Turpentine Rose WalnutRhodamnia rubescens Endiandra discolourLayer 3% Foliage Cover Allocasuarina torulosa35%Scrub Turpentine Rose WalnutRhodamnia discolourLayer 4% Foliage Cover Cassine35%Scrub Turpentine Eucalyptus microcorys CassineRose Walnut White MahoganyEndiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioidesLayer 4% Foliage Cover Cassine35%Scrub Turpentine Rose WalnutEndiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioidesLayer 4% Foliage Cover Cassine35%Scrub Turpentine Eucalyptus propinquaEucalyptus acmenioides
Layer 2% Foliage Cover25%Rose Maple Forest OakCryptocarya rigida Allocasuarina torulosaScrub Turpentine Rose WalnutRhodamnia rubescens Endiandra discolourLayer 3% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood CassineEucalyptus microcorys Cassine australeRose Walnut White MahoganyEndiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioidesLayer 4% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood Grey GumEucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propinguaWhite MahoganyEucalyptus acmenioides
Rose Maple Forest OakCryptocarya rigida Allocasuarina torulosaScrub Turpentine Rose WalnutRhodamnia rubescens Endiandra discolourLayer 3% Foliage Cover Cassine35%
Layer 3% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood CassineEucalyptus microcorys Cassine australeRose Walnut White MahoganyEndiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioidesLayer 4% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood Grey GumEucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propinquaWhite MahoganyEucalyptus acmenioides
Tallowwood CassineEucalyptus microcorys Cassine australeRose Walnut White MahoganyEndiandra discolour Eucalyptus acmenioidesLayer 4% Foliage Cover35%Tallowwood Grey GumEucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propinguaWhite MahoganyEucalyptus acmenioides
Layer 4 % Foliage Cover 35% Tallowwood Grey Gum Eucalyptus microcorys Eucalyptus propingua White Mahogany Eucalyptus acmenioides
Tallowwood Eucalyptus microcorys White Mahogany Eucalyptus acmenioides Grey Gum Eucalyptus propinqua

			······································						
Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species)									
Plot Control	Net Station No	14 Date	4/7/97						
Station Axis 200°	Station Slope 6°								
Aspect 155°	Slope 14°	Landscape Unit	Lower Slope						
Layer 1	% Foliage Cover 20%								
Gristle Fern Blue Flax Lily Supplejack	Blechnum cartilageneum Dianella caerulea Ripogonum brevifolium	Spinyhead Matrush Orange Thorn	Lomandara longifolia Citriobatus pauciflorus						
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover 25%								
Narrow-leafed Cordyline Grey Possumwood Rose Maple Banana Bush	Cordyline stricta Quintinia verdonii Cryptocarya rigida Tabernaemontana pandacaqui	Native Ginger Scentless Rosewood Jackwood	Alpinea arundinelliana Synoum glandulosum Cryptocarya glaucescens						
Layer 3	% Foliage Cover 50%								
Murrogun Grey Possumwood Rose Maple	Cryptocarya microneura Quintinia verdonii Cryptocarya rigida	Rusty Plum Forest Oak	Amorphospermum whitei Allocasuarina torulosa						
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover 40%								
Blue Gum	Eucalyptus saligna	Red Mahogany	Eucalyptus resinifera						
L									

Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species)						
Plot Control	Net Station No	19 Date 3,	17/97			
Station Axis 220°	Station Slope 0°					
Aspect 150°	Slope 7°	Landscape Unit	Upper Slope			
Layer 1	% Foliage Cover 30%					
Tree Heath Yam	Trochocarpa laurina Dioscorea transversa	Gristle Fern Ginger	Blechnum cartilageneum Alpinea arundinella			
Layer 2	% Foliage Cover 75%					
Tree Heath Bolwarra Scrub Turpentine Blackbutt	Trochocarpa laurina Eupomatia laurina Rhodamnia rubescens Eucalyptus pilularis	Rose Maple Callicoma Scentless Rosewood	Cryptocarya rigida Callicoma serratifolia Synoum glandulosum			
Layer 3	% Foliage Cover 55%					
Rose Maple Scentless Rosewood Forest Oak	Cryptocarya rigida Synoum glandulosum Allocasuarina torulosa	Callicoma Rose Myrtle Tree Heath	Callicoma serratifolia Archirrhodomyrtus beckler Trochocarpa laurina			
Layer 4	% Foliage Cover 20%					
Blackbutt Grey Gum	Eucalyptus pilularis Eucalyptus propinqua	Tallowwood	Eucalyptus microcorys			

Net Station Vegetation Layers (Dominants by Species) Net Station No 31 Date 2/7/97 Plot Control Station Axis 330° Station Slope 6° <u>50°</u> Slope 9° Landscape Unit Mid- Lower Slope Aspect % Foliage Cover 35% Layer 1 Bolwarra Eupomatia laurina Scentless Rosewood Synoum glandulosum % Foliage Cover 70% Layer 2 Bolwarra Scentless Rosewood Synoum glandulosum Eupomatia laurina Layer 3 % Foliage Cover 75% Eucalyptus siderophloia Brushbox ironbark Lophostemon confertus % Foliage Cover 20% Layer 4 Eucalyptus saligna Bloodwood Corymbia intermeda Blue Gum

VEGETATION PROFILES AND DOMINANT PLANT SPECIES AT SAMPLED NET STATIONS IN ALL PLOTS

(Year 1 plots from Horton [1998], Year 2 plots completed by A. Huggett with species ID by D. Binns)

Key to dominant plant species in Year 2 plots (some are shown in the profiles on the following pages)

- 1 Guioa semiglauca 2 Notelaea longifolia 32 3 Synoum glandulosum 33 Eupomatia laurina Archirhodomyrtus beckleri 4 34 5 Cryptocarya microneura 35 Alpinia arundinella 6 Endiandra discolor 36 Wilkea huegeliana Neolitsea dealbata 7 Schizomeria ovata 37 8 Smilax australis Cryptocarya rigida 38 9 Quintinia verdonii 39 10 Randia benthamiana 40 Dodonaea triquetra 41 Denhamia celastroides Billardiera scandens 11 12 Scolopia braunii 42 Parsonsia straminea Endiandra muelleri 43 Rapanea variabilis 13 14 Melodinus australis 44 Euroschinus falcatus *Canthium coprosmoides* 45 Rhodamnia rubescens 15 16 Acmena smithii 46 Elaeocarpus reticulatus Jagera pseudorhus 47 Acacia melanoxylon 17 Croton verreauxii 48 Gahnia aspera 18 Caldcluvia paniculosa 49 Ozothamnus diosmifolius 19 50 Alpinia caerulea 20 Hibbertia scandens Diospyros pentamera 51 Cyathea australis 21 Tasmannia insipida 52 Dianella caerulea 22 23 Morinda jasminoides 53 Cissus antarctica 24 Asterolasia sp. 54 Claoxylon australe 25 Pilidiostigma glabrum 55 Blechnum cartilagineum 26 Ficus coronata 56 Ricinocarpus speciosus 27 Cissus hypoglauca 57 Alphitonia excelsa 28 Backhousia myrtifolia 58 Lomandra spicata 59 Acacia longissima 29 Hibiscus splendens Seringia arborescens 30 *Ceratopetalum apetalum* 60 61 Archontophoenix cunninghamiana Eucalypts & other trees 62 Cupaniopsis anacardioides Cordyline stricta 63 BBx Brushbox Lophostemon confertus 64 Trochocarpa laurina At Forest Oak Allocasuarina torulosa 65 Callicoma serratifolia Т Turpentine Syncarpia glomulifera PB Pink Bloodwood Corymbia intermedia BG Sydney Blue Gum Eucalyptus saligna TW Tallowwood E. microcorys BBt Blackbutt E. pilularis Broad-leafed Ironbark E. siderophloia IB WM White Mahogany E. acmenioides
- RM Red Mahogany E. resinifera
- FG Flooded Gum E. grandis

- 31 Ripogonum discolor
- Citriobatus pauciflorus
- Ripogonum fawcettianum

- Amorphospermum whitei





Net S Key:	tation Experimental 5				
At TI AW Sg	Forest Oak Tree Heath Rusty Plum Scentless Rosewood	Allocasuarina torulosa Trochocarpa laurina Amorphospermum whitei Synoum glandulosum	BW GG IB P	Pink Bloodwood Grey Gum Ironbark Bangalow Palm	Corymbia intermedia Eucalyptus propinqua Eucalyptus siderophloia Archontophoenix cunninghamiana



Net Station Experimental 8 Key:

- White Mahogany WM
- Tree Heath ΤI
- Celerywood Pe TW Tallowwood
- Eucalyptus acmenioides Trochocarpa laurina Polyscia elegans
- Tallowwood
- Forest Oak Scentless Rosewood
- Crabapple
- Cm Murrogun

At

Sg

So

- Allocasuarina torulosa Synoum glandulosum Schizomeria ovata Cryptocarya microneura



Net Station Experimental 25 Key:

- Т
- Turpentine Blackbutt BB
- Forest Oak At BW
 - Bloodwood (Pink)
- Syncarpia glomulifera Eucalyptus pilularis Allocasuarina torulosa Corymbia intermedia
- Rose Maple

Cr AC

IB

- Smooth-barked Apple Ironbark (Northern Grey)
- Cryptocarya rigida Angophora costata Eucalyptus siderophloia

Avifauna Research Project Lower Bucca State Forest Net Station Site Experimental 32

Vegetation Profile

 on Profile
 0.67

 Horizontal Scale 1cm = m
 Vertical Scale 1cm = 4m



Т

At

Bangalow Palm Archontophoenix cunninghamiana BW Р

- Cr Rose Maple
- Murrogun Cm Bb
- Cryptocarya microneura Brushbox

Cryptocarya rigida

- Lophostemon confertus
- Bloodwood (Pink) Turpentine
 - Forest Oak
- Corymbia intermedia Syncarpia glomulifera Allocasuarina torulosa



Net Station Experimental 42 Key:

- Bb Brushbox Murrogun Cm
- Cr Rose Maple Т
 - Turpentine
- Black Apple BA
- Lophostemon confertus Cryptocarya microneura Cryptocarya rigida Syncarpia glomulifera Planchonella australis
- Tree Heath Gu

TÌ

IB

BB

- Guoia Ironbark Blackbutt
- Guoia semiglauca Eucalyptus siderophloia
 - Eucalyptus pilularis

Trochocarpa laurina

238



Net Station Control 1 Key:						
BG Sg BB TW At Ca PM	Blue Gum Scentless Rosewood Blackbutt Tallowwood Forest Oak Brittlewood Plum Myrtle	Eucalyptus saligna Synoum glandulosum Eucalyptus pilularis Eucalyptus microcorys Allocasuarina torulosa Claoxylon australe Plidioistigma glabrum	T Turpentine IB Ironbark (Northern Grey) Cr Rose Maple AC Smooth-barked Apple P Bangalow Palm Jw Jackwood El Bolwarna Ed Rose Walnut	Syncarpia glomulifera Eucalyptus siderophloia Cryptocarya rigida Angophora costata Archontophoenix cunninghamiana Cryptocarya glaucescens Eupernatia launha Endiandra discolor		







Net Station Control 14 Key:							
Cr At PM Pw RM Gu Cm	Rose Maple Forest Oak Plum Myrtle Possumwood Red Mahogany Guoia Munrogurt	Cryptocarya rigida Allocasuarina torulosa Plidioistigma glabrum Quintinnia virdonii Eucalyptus resinifera Guoia semiglauca Cryptocarya microres	Aw TW Jw Fc El De	Rusty Plum Tallowwood Jackwood Sandpaper Fig Bolwarra Denhamia	Amorphospermum whitei Eucalyptus microcorys Cryptocarya glaucescens Ficus coronata Eupomatia laurina Denhamia celastroides		





Net Station	Control	19
Kev		

3B	Blackbutt	Eucalyptus pilularis
Г	Turpentine	Syncarpia glomulifer
GG	Grey Gum	Eucalyptus propingu
٦r	Scrub Turpentine	Rhodamnia rubesce
ΞI	Bolwarra	Eupomatia laurina
٨b	Rose Myrtle	Archirrhodomyrtus b
	-	

- Ps Persoonia
- Syncarpia glomulifera Eucalyptus propinqua Rhodamnia rubescens Eupomatia laurina Archirrhodomyrtus beckleri Cr Persoonia stradbrokensis
- Forest Oak Murrogun Cm Dm Duboisia

At

Ba

- Cs Callicoma Rose Maple
- Cryptocarya microneura Duboisia myoporoides Blueberry Ash Elaeocarpus reticulatus Callicoma serratifolia Cryptocarya rigida

Allocasuarina torulosa





Cm

BW

At

So

ΙB

Net Station Control 31 Key:

- EI Bolwarra
- Bb Brushbox
- BG Blue Gum
- Scentless Rosewood
- Sg Ed Rose Walnut
- Lophostemon confertus Eucalyptus saligna Synoum glandulosum Endiandra discolour

Eupomatia laurina

- Murrogun Cryptocarya microneura Ironbark (אויא לאנה (אין) Eucalyptus siderophloia Bloodwood (אין) Corymbia intermedia Forest Oak Allocasuarina torulosa
- Crabapple Schizomeria ovata

PLOT: Year 2 Experimental NET STATION: 2

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 m Horizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

PLOT: Year 2 Experimental NET STATION: 12

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 mHorizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

estimated height (m)

245

PLOT: Year 2 Experimental NET STATION: 42

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 mHorizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

(m)

height

PLOT: Year 2 Experimental NET STATION: 45

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 m Horizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

PLOT: Year 2 Experimental NET STATION: 66

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 m Horizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)



Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 m Horizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)
PLOT: Year 2 Control NET STATION: 8

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 m Horizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

PLOT: Year 2 Control NET STATION: 57

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 mHorizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

PLOT: Year 2 Control NET STATION: 64

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 m Horizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

PLOT: Year 2 Control NET STATION: 78

Vertical scale 10 mm = 5 mHorizontal scale 15 mm = 1 m



distance along net station (m)

APPENDIX 3

MAPS OF HOME RANGES OF INDIVIDUALS OF THE STUDY SPECIES BEFORE AND AFTER LOGGING IN EACH RESEARCH PLOT

Page guide to map sets (by species)

Eastern Yellow Robin: Maps 1-16	255-270
Pale-yellow Robin: Maps 17-32	271-286
Yellow-throated Scrubwren : Maps 33-48	287-302
White-browed Scrubwren: Maps 49-64	303-318
Rufous Fantail: Maps 65-68 (E2 and C2 Plots only)	319-322
Spectacled Monarch: Maps 69-72 (E2 and C2 Plots only)	323-326

Presentation

Home range maps are presented for each study species in two separate versions: the first uses the Minimum Convex Polygon (MCP, 95%) method, and the second uses the Harmonic Mean (HM, 95%) approach (see Chapter 5). Where applicable, these are presented for both the before and after logging sampling periods in each plot. Therefore, a total of 4 home range maps are provided for each study species in each plot (ie. 16 maps per sedentary species and 4 maps per migratory species over the study period). The small number of maps obtained for Rufous Fantails and Spectacled Monarchs reflects the limited amount of home range data that I obtained for these species (ie. from the Year 2 plots after logging only).





















.

























































































































