RESULTS OF A SURVEY TO GATHER INFORMATION ON THE USE OF TREE HOLLOWS BY BIRDS IN TASMANIA

Amelia J. Koch[1] & Eric J. Woehler[2]

[1] University of Tasmania, School of Geography and Environmental Studies, Hobart. Email: ajkoch@utas.edu.au; [2] School of Zoology, University of Tasmania, Hobart and Birds Tasmania, GPO Box 68, Hobart Tasmania 7001.

INTRODUCTION

Australia has a high number of species that use tree hollows for nesting or roosting (Gibbons & Lindenmayer 2002), but there are no primary excavators such as woodpeckers present, as is the case in the northern hemisphere. This means that all hollows are produced by slow processes generally involving fire, fungi and termites, although some species are known to modify the size of cavities to an extent e.g. cockatoos, brushtail possums (Ambrose 1982; Saunders *et al.* 1982). Consequently, many years are required to form hollows, especially large hollows. There is a general decrease in hollow-bearing trees across Australia due to land clearing for urbanization and agriculture, forestry activities and the death of hollow-bearing trees retained in paddocks and urban areas (Gibbons & Lindenmayer 2002). This has resulted in concern for the conservation of hollow-using fauna across Australia (Lindenmayer *et al.* 1993; Gibbons & Lindenmayer 1997; Whitford & Williams 2002; Wormington *et al.* 2002).In Tasmania, hollow-dependent fauna are a management priority under the Tasmanian *Regional Forest Agreement* (CofA & SofT 1997). Forest management agencies in most states of Australia, including Tasmania, have developed management prescriptions for the conservation of habitat for hollow-using fauna (Wayne *et al.* 2006). Yet the tree hollow requirements and the degree to which fauna are dependent on hollows vary greatly among species. Consequently, an essential element of any retention strategy is knowledge of the fauna that use hollows in the region and their known or likely hollow requirements (Recher 1991). There are large differences in the amount of literature available for Tasmanian fauna species, birds in particular, with more information generally available for threatened species. This paper presents the results of a survey distributed to members of Birds Tasmania, intended to gather anecdotal information to assist in assessing the degree to which Tasmania's bird fauna are dependent on tree hollows. The information collected can also be used to help assess the conservation status and threatening process for these species.

METHODS

A survey was distributed to all recipients (approximately 320) of the Birds Tasmania newsletter. The survey asked four questions regarding 38 bird species found in Tasmania. The questions posed and the potential responses are outlined in Table 1. These questions included one which referred to the degree of knowledge the respondent had of the species in question. It should therefore be noted that people referred to as 'experts' in this text are

self-assessed as being such. The remaining questions in the survey aimed to gather the opinions of the participants on (a) the degree to which the species uses tree hollows, (b) the population status of the species and (c) the processes threatening populations of the species. The species considered in the questionnaire were those where mention was found in the literature that they use tree hollows (e.g. Sharland 1958; Munks *et al.,* in press). Additional comments on the status, population size and distribution, use of tree hollows and preferred habitat of the species included in the survey were also invited.

Table 1. Questions asked for each bird species included in the survey.

Question	Potential Responses
How do you rate your knowledge of this species and its current status?	Expert
	High
	Average
	Low
	None
How do you rate the hollow dependency of this species?	Reliant on hollows for roosting and breeding
	Reliant on hollows for breeding but not roosting
	Use hollows for roosting and/or breeding but can use other sites
	Do not use hollows
How do you rate the status of populations of this species?	Increasing
	Stable at high numbers
	Stable at low numbers
	Declining
Of the following issues, circle any you believe to be of concern to this species	Forestry activities
	Land clearing for agriculture
	Competition for nest sites with bees or introduced birds
	Over predation by endemic or introduced species
	Road-kill
	Hunting
	There are no concerns

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hollow use

Although some variability in the survey responses was found for certain species, generally the respondents agreed on the hollow-using status of the bird species considered. The results of the survey largely confirmed the results of scientific studies where literature was available for the species in Tasmania.

Most respondents agreed on the species that use hollows only very occasionally or perhaps not at all in Tasmania. These species are house sparrows (Figure 1-al), Australian kestrels (Figure 1-j) and peregrine falcons (Figure 1-k). Although there was a range of responses for azure kingfishers (Figure 1-a), most respondents, including an expert on the species, stated that they do not use hollows in Tasmania and are only found in very low numbers here. Similarly, although a range of responses was received for grey shrike thrush (Figure 1-p), the majority of recipients suggested they very rarely use hollows. A number of additional species were mentioned by the respondents as being known to use tree hollows very occasionally. These were black currawongs (*Strepera fuliginosa*), brown falcons (*Falco berigora*), scarlet robins (*Petroica multicolour*), spotted pardalotes (*Pardalotus punctatus*), bassian thrushes (*Zoothera lunulate*) and scrubtits (*Acanthornis magnus*). It was also clear that several of the species were vagrants and rarely recorded in Tasmania, including gang gang cockatoos (Figure 1-y) and sacred kingfishers (Figure 1b). Although the rainbow lorikeet (Figure 1-ae) was considered a vagrant by many respondents, recent reports indicate that it is now established in Tasmania (M. Holdsworth pers. comm.; Birds Tasmania, unpubl. data). The conclusion reached from this survey is that 29 of the species selected for this survey use tree hollows more than very occasionally.

Great discrepancy was exhibited on the hollow-using status of the dusky woodswallow (Figure 1-aj), with an expert on the species being the only respondent to state that this species is continuously dependent on hollows, while the majority of respondents stated they were non-dependent or did not use hollows. The literature states that dusky woodswallows can use hollows for breeding but that they also use stumps and roost behind bark (Sharland 1958; Coulson & Coulsen 1981). Reports were also received in this study of nests in the forks of trees (Table 2). Similarly, for the Australian wood duck (Figure 1-h-i) the more 'experienced' respondents stated they were dependent on hollows, largely for breeding, although other responses of non-use were also received. The only Tasmanian report found in the literature for this duck indicated that they can nest in hollows or on the ground (Sharland 1958).

For southern boobooks (Figure 1-l), responses ranged from continuous dependent to non-dependent on hollows. A study by Bell *et al.* (1997) indicated that they use hollows for nesting but are occasionally recorded using nesting boxes and other man-made structures. For roosting, southern boobooks do use tree hollows but will often use dense foliage, rocky clefts, caves or man-made structures (Bell *et al.* 1997). For Australian shelducks (Figure 1i), the majority of respondents indicated the species was either breeding dependent or non-dependent. The literature states that they use tree hollows for breeding but can also use holes in the ground (Sharland 1958). Reports were also received of their using rock crevices and disused rabbit burrows on islands and in treeless areas (C. Spencer pers. comm.). The degree of dependency was also unclear for masked owls (Figure 1-m), with the majority of respondents indicating they were non-dependent, but others stating they were dependent to some degree. From the literature it appears that this

species nests only in tree hollows but can roost in other locations such as cliffs, caves, vegetation and, occasionally, man-made structures (Bell *et al.* 1997). However, one respondent stated that they can also use caves for breeding.

The majority of survey respondents suggested that chestnut teals (Figure 1-f-i) are non-dependent on hollows. The only Tasmanian report found in the literature for this species indicated that they usually nest in tree hollows, although they can also nest elsewhere (Sharland 1958). This report by Sharland (1958) could be interpreted as non-dependency or as being dependent on tree hollows for nesting. For welcome swallows (Figure 1-q), the responses were either that they do not use hollows or they are non-dependent. In the literature it is stated that they do use hollows but no indication of frequency is given (Sharland 1958). For tree martins (Figure 1-r), the majority of responses were that they were non-dependent, but some stated they use them for breeding and roosting or were breeding dependent. In the literature it was stated that they mostly use tree hollows for nesting but can use other sites (Sharland 1958). The majority of respondents for galahs (Figure 1-b) indicated they are dependent on hollows for breeding. In Western Australia, galahs use hollows mainly for breeding (Rowley 1990). For long-billed corellas (Figure 1-x), respondents indicated either a continuous dependency on hollows or that the birds were dependent for breeding. In the literature it was stated that breeding has not been confirmed in Tasmania although it is believed to occur (Brown & Holdsworth 1992). For forty-spotted pardalotes (Figure 1-ag), respondents largely indicated either dependency or non-dependency on hollows for breeding. In the literature it appears that the degree of dependency can vary, as Brown (1986) found most individuals used hollows while Woinarski & Bulman (1985) found alternative sites were more frequently used.

Population status

The information collected in this survey indicated that two of the species considered were rare vagrants. These were the gang gang cockatoo and the sacred kingfisher.

The results of the current survey were generally supported by the literature for those few species where literature was available on the population status of the species in Tasmania. This is the case for the ducks (GMSU 2005), sulphur-crested cockatoos and little corellas (Brown & Holdsworth 1992; Coupland 2000). A mixture of responses was received for galahs (Figure 1-t), ranging from increasing to stable at low numbers. In the literature it was indicated they are likely to be at low numbers but gradually increasing (Brown & Holdsworth 1992; Barrett *et al.* 2003; Birds Tasmania unpubl. data). For blue-winged parrots, respondents indicated they were either stable at low numbers or decreasing (Figure 1-aa). Reports in the literature were conflicting, with some studies indicating they were increasing (Brown 1979; Brown & Wilson 1982) while others suggested they have decreased since European settlement (Green 1983). For eastern rosellas (Figure 1-ac), respondents indicated they were either stable at low numbers or decreasing; Green (1983) suggested they were decreasing. For forty-spotted pardalotes, the majority of respondents indicated they are either stable at low numbers or decreasing in abundance (Figure 1-ag).

It was previously thought that this species was decreasing, but recent work suggests they may always have been found at low numbers (Bryant 1997).

There was, however, one species for which the literature did not support the survey responses. Survey respondents suggested that the masked owl (Figure 1-m) was either stable at low numbers or decreasing in Tasmania. Although this species is listed as endangered at the State level (Schedule 3 of the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act 1995*), there is no evidence of a decrease in their numbers (Bell *et al.* 1997) although anecdotal reports have been received saying masked owls were more commonly seen in the 1940s and 1950s than at present (Mooney 1997).

Most of the respondents provided similar responses for particular species. For example, there was some variation in responses for long-billed corellas, but the majority of respondents indicated their numbers were increasing. For grey shrike thrushes, the majority of respondents indicated they were stable, with only a couple suggesting they were decreasing. Similarly, the majority of the more experienced respondents indicated that populations of the southern boobook were stable, while a few respondents suggested they were decreasing. Given this response and the fact that southern boobooks are found in a number of reserves across the State (Bell *et al.* 1997), it is suggested that populations of this species are presently stable.

However, there were some species for which the respondents gave very mixed results for population status. The differences in responses obtained in this survey may be due to several reasons. Firstly, it is expected that most respondents will have greater knowledge of their immediate vicinity and less on a broader geographical scale. It is possible that the degree of hollow use, population trends and threatening processes will vary among geographical areas in Tasmania. Secondly, although attempts were made to make the questions and categories of responses clear to the survey participants, there is still likely to be an effect of interpretation of the questions. For example, what constitutes a population at 'high' numbers and one at 'low' numbers may differ among respondents. One sighting of a bird breeding or roosting in an alternate location may be interpreted by some respondents as 'non-dependency' while others will still rate the species as being 'dependent' because the majority of sightings are from tree hollows. The species for which mixed responses were given are briefly discussed below.

For dusky woodswallows (Figure 1-aj) and tree martins (Figure 1-r), some respondents indicated that the population status was stable at high numbers while others indicated that they were decreasing. For sulphur-crested cockatoos (Figure 1-u), responses ranged from increasing to decreasing, although the more experienced respondents tended to indicate either increasing or stable at high numbers. A great discrepancy in responses was received for green rosellas (Figure 1-ab), from increasing to decreasing but with the majority of respondents indicating they are stable at high numbers. For Australian shelducks (Figure 1-i), a great range of responses was received, but again the majority indicating populations of this species are stable. A survey conducted by the Department of Primary Industries,

Water & Environment (now DPIW) confirmed that populations of Australian shelducks are stable (Game Management Services Unit 2005), but no information on population status was found in the literature for the other species.

For yellow-tailed black cockatoos (Figure 1-s), the majority of respondents indicated they were decreasing, while a number of others, including the one expert on the species, indicated they were stable. Only one respondent indicated they were increasing, stating that "*It is against all my expectations to have ticked 'increasing'. In this area (Swan Point) until recent years, a flock of 10-15 would be as many as we would see. For the last three years we have seen up to 80 in a flock. They have learnt to feed on* Pinus radiata *cones as have their white tailed cousins in southwest Western Australia*". Concern for this species has been expressed because their habitat is degraded by forest harvesting as they are dependent on large hollows for breeding (Wilson 1981; Bekessy *et al.* 2004).

Similarly, for musk lorikeets (Figure 1-ad), six of 14 responses to the survey indicated the species is decreasing, while only a single response (from the 'expert') said that the species is increasing. Reports in the literature as to their status are conflicting (Bryant 2002; Barrett *et al.* 2003). The majority of respondents also indicated that flame robins (Figure 1-a-i) are decreasing, while two respondents, including the 'expert', indicated they are stable at high numbers. Comparisons between two major national bird surveys (Barrett *et al.* 2002) suggested a nation-wide decrease in flame robins and anecdotal reports also suggest a decrease in numbers around Hobart (see Newman 2002). It was suggested that changes in rainfall patterns as a result of climate change may be cause for concern for this species (Newman 2002). The suggestion of a decrease in populations of yellow-tailed black cockatoos, musk lorikeets and flame robins, although not from the experts, is of concern and warrants further investigation.

Threatening processes

In terms of threatening processes, the one process considered to be of major concern for most species by the majority of respondents was forestry activities (although for six respondents this included the orange-bellied parrot which nests in southwest Tasmania where forestry practices do not occur, Figure 1-z). Agriculture was also considered to be a major concern. The degree of threat perceived to be due to competition for nesting sites varied among species, being quite high for some such as the orange-bellied parrot and very low for others (although these were largely those species considered to be non-dependent on hollows).

The effect of predation was perceived as being relatively unimportant for most species, although was still considered to be important for species such as rainbow lorikeets (Figure 1-ae). The effect of cars was also variable in their perceived threat, being considered of relative importance to some species such as Australian owlet nightjars (Figure 1-n), but of little concern for the majority of species considered here. The effect of hunting was greatest for the duck species, of which several species can be legally hunted (Game

Management Services Unit 2005). However, hunting was also considered to be of some importance for the owl species and non-hollow-using peregrine falcons. One threatening process which was not provided as an option but was mentioned by several of the respondents was death to birds caused by windfarms.

The species that were universally ranked as having no perceived threat were the introduced the house sparrow (Figure 1-al) and the European starling (Figure 1-ak). However, a number of other species were also considered to have no threats. Occasionally a respondent indicated there were no threats for a species while simultaneously specifying threatening processes. This was interpreted to mean that although the indicated threatening process does kill some individuals, it is not of major concern. Those species with the greatest responses of 'no threat' were sulphur-crested cockatoos (Figure 1-u), pacific black ducks (Figure 1-g), galahs (Figure 1-t), Australian wood ducks (Figure 1-h), grey shrike thrushes (Figure 1-p), laughing kookaburras (Figure 1-c), welcome swallows (Figure 1-q) and rainbow lorikeets (Figure 1-ae).

CONCLUSION

The responses to questions posed in this survey provided support to the fact that 29 bird species commonly found in Tasmania are likely to regularly use tree hollows for either roosting or nesting. The results from this survey indicate, however, that only one species, the Australian owlet nightjar, is considered to be dependent on tree hollows for both nesting and roosting. Nineteen other species are believed to be largely reliant on tree hollows for nesting, while the remaining 10 species use tree hollows to varying degrees. Four hollow-using bird species are currently listed as threatened in Tasmania (swift parrot, orange-bellied parrot, forty-spotted pardalote and masked owl, all on Schedule 3 of the *Tasmanian Threatened Species Protection Act* 1995). Respondents to the survey expressed further concern over the status of yellow-tailed black cockatoos and musk lorikeets. The threatening processes considered to be of greatest concern were associated with land clearing (forestry activities and agriculture).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all members of Birds Tasmania who responded to this survey. Thanks also to Sarah Munks, Don Driscoll and Jamie Kirkpatrick who read and provided helpful comments on this manuscript. Ethics approval for this project was obtained (ethics approval reference number H8257).

REFERENCES

Ambrose, G.J. (1982). *An Ecological and Behavioural Study of Vertebrates Using Hollows in Eucalypt Branches*. PhD Thesis, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Vic, Australia.

Barrett, G., Silcocks, A. & Cunningham, R. (2002). *Australian Bird Atlas (1998-2001) Supplementary Report No.1 - Comparison of Atlas 1 (1977-1981) and Atlas 2 (1998-2001).* Birds Australia, Melbourne.

Barrett, G., Silcocks, A., Barry, S.C., Cunningham, R., & Poulter, R. 2003. *The New Atlas of Australian Birds.* Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union, Melbourne.

Bekessy, S., Fox, J., Munks, S. & Wintle, B. (2004). PVA for Ringtail Possum (*Pseudocheirus peregrinus convolutor*). In: *Linking landscape ecology and management to population viability analysis. Report 2: Population viability analysis for eleven forest dependant species*. (J.C. Fox, T.J. Regan, S.A. Bekessy, B.A. Wintle, M.J. Brown, J.M. Meggs, K. Bonham, R. Mesibov, M.A. McCarthy, S.A. Munks, P. Wells, R. Brereton, K. Graham, J. Hickey, P. Turner, M. Jones, W.E. Brown., N. Mooney, S. Grove, K, Yamada & M.A. Burgman, editors). A project by the University of Melbourne prepared for Forestry Tasmania.

Bell, P., Mooney, N. & Wiersma, J. (1997). *Predicting Essential Habitat for Forest Owls in Tasmania*. Report to the Tasmanian RFA Environment and Heritage Technical Committee, Hobart.

Brown, P.B. (1979). The status of parrot species in Western Tasmania. *Tasmanian Bird Report* 9: 4-12.

Brown, P.B. (1986). *The Forty-spotted Pardalote in Tasmania*. Wildlife Division Technical Report 1986/4, Hobart.

Brown, P.B. & Wilson, R.I. (1982). The Orange-bellied Parrot. In: *Species at risk: research in Australia. Proceedings of a Symposium on the Biology of Rare and Endangered Species in Australia.* (R. H. Groves & W. D. L. Ride, editors.). Sponsored by the Australian Academy of Science and held in Canberra, 25 and 26 November 1981, pp. 106-115.

Brown, P.B. & Holdsworth, M.C. (1992). The status of cockatoos in Tasmania. *Tasmanian Bird Report* 21: 4-12.

Bryant, S. (2002). *Impact of clearing old growth elements on Tasmania's woodland vertebrates.* Firewood conferences, Tasmanian Conservation Trust, Hobart.

Bryant, S.L. (1997). Status of forty-spotted pardalote colonies. *Tasmanian Bird Report* 26: 45-50.

Commonwealth of Australia and State of Tasmania (CofA & SofT) (1997). *Tasmanian Regional Forest agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of Tasmania*.

Coulson, R.I. & Coulson, G.M. (1981). *The Effect of Forestry Practices on Bird Breeding in Open Forest.* Project Rep. 1980/4 Centre for Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania.

Coupland, C. (2000). *The Distribution, Roosting Requirements and Daily Routine of White Cockatoos in Northern Tasmania*. B.Sc. (Hons.) Thesis, University of Tasmania, Hobart.

Game Management Services Unit (GMSU) (2005). *Game Tracks Issue 10.* Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment, Hobart.

Gibbons, P. & Lindenmayer, D.B. (1997). Developing tree retention strategies for hollow-dependent arboreal marsupials in the wood production eucalypt forests of eastern Australia. *Australian Forestry* 60: 29-45.

Gibbons, P. & Lindenmayer, D. (2002). *Tree Hollows and Wildlife Conservation in Australia*. CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, Vic., Australia.

Green, R.H. (1983). The decline of the eastern rosella and other Psittaciformes in Tasmania concomitant with the establishment of the introduced European starling. *Records of the Queen Victoria Museum* 82: 1-5.

Lindenmayer, D.B., Cunningham, R.B., Donnelly, C.F., Tanton, M.T. & Nix, H.A. (1993). The abundance and development of cavities in *Eucalyptus* trees - a case study in the montane forests of Victoria, southeastern Australia. *Forest Ecology and Management* 60: 77-104.

Mooney, N. (1997). Habitat and seasonality of nesting masked owls in Tasmania. Australian Raptor Studies 2. *Birds Australia Monograph* 3: 34-39.

Munks, S., Wapstra, M., Corkrey, R., Otley, H. & Miller, G. (in press). The occurrence of potential tree hollows in the dry eucalpyt forests of south-eastern Tasmania, Australia. *Australian Zoologist*

Newman, M. (2002). A breeding season comparison of the Tasmanian robins. *Tasmanian Bird Report* 30: 19-25.

Recher, H.F. (1991). The conservation and management of eucalypt forest birds: resource requirements for nesting and foraging. In: *Conservation of Australia's Forest Fauna* (D. Lunney, editor). Royal Zoological Society of NSW, Sydney, pp. 25-34.

Rowley, I. (1990). *Behavioural Ecology of the Galah* Eolophus roseicapillus *in the Wheatbelt of Western Australia*. Surrey Beatty and Sons Pty. Ltd, Chipping Norton, NSW.

Saunders, D.A., Smith, G.T. & Rowley, I. (1982). The availability and dimensions of tree hollows that provide nest sites for cockatoos (Psittaciformes) in Western Australia. *Australian Wildlife Research* 9: 541-556.

Sharland, M. (1958). *Tasmanian Birds*. Angus and Robertson, Sydney.

Wayne, A., Kavanagh, R.P., Loyn, R.H., Munks, S.A. & Smith, G., 2006. *Brief Summary of Prescriptions for the Retention of Hollow Bearing Trees in Multiple-use Forests throughout Australia*. Report for the Research Priorities and Coordination Committee.

Whitford, K.R. & Williams, M.R. (2002). Hollows in jarrah (*Eucalyptus marginata*) and marri (*Corymbia calophylla*) trees II. Selecting trees to retain for hollow dependent fauna. *Forest Ecology and Management* 160: 215-232.

Wilson, R.I. (1981). The woodchip industry and Tasmanian birds. *Tasmanian Bird Report* 11: 11-15.

Woinarski, J.C.Z. & Bulman, C. (1985). Ecology and breeding biology of the forty-spotted pardalote and other pardalotes on north Bruny Island. *Emu* 85: 106-120.

Wormington, K.R., Lamb, D., McCallum, H.I. & Moloney, D.J. (2002). Habitat requirements for the conservation of arboreal marsupials in dry sclerophyll forests of southeast Queensland, Australia. *Forest Science* 48: 217-227.



Figure 1 (a – c). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (d – f). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (g – i). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (j - l). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (m – o). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (p – r). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (s – u). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (v – x). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (y – aa). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (ab – ad). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (ae – ag). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (ah – aj). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.



Figure 1 (ak-al). The number of responses received for each option of the survey questions. Black indicates the respondent was an expert, dark grey indicates they had high knowledge, light grey indicates they had average knowledge and white indicates they had low knowledge.

Table 2. Additional comments provided by the respondents.

Species name	Comment
Azure kingfisher	Nests in holes in river banks.
	Low records in Tasmania.
	This species does not use hollows in Tasmania.
Sacred kingfisher	Not a Tas. species, a rare vagrant.
Laughing kookaburra	Aggressive feral.
	A pair nested on our property. We have never seen kookaburras attack the small birds and the latter are not afraid of the kookaburras.
	Knew of 2 nests in hollows. Saw a competition with a brushtail possum where the kookaburra won. They are killed by vehicles but some people say a good thing.
Hardhead	Wind farm risk during migration, loss of wetlands and hunting.
	Numbers vary, if drought on mainland see more in Tasmania.
	A rare vagrant.
	Does it breed here in Tasmania?
Grey teal	Risk from windfarms, loss of wetlands and hunting.
	An occasional visitor in low numbers.
Chestnut teal	Risk from windfarms, loss of wetlands and hunting.
	A lot breed in Tasmania, especially when rains maintain over spring into summer.
Pacific black duck	Seems to be a survivor. Risk posed by hybridization with domestic ducks.
Australian wood duck	With Australian mainland drought cycles increasing this and other duck species may visit permanently thus displacing local pops.
	V. rare in Tas in 1910, has increased rapidly during last 20 years.
	Risk from windfarms, loss of wetlands and hunting.
	Becoming a problem for farmers, eating grass etc and fouling up pastures. Nest in trees.
Australian shelduck	Potentially at more risk from windfarms during migration also loss of wetlands and hunting.
	A recent migrant to King Island. Good numbers breed here but do not stay after New Year.
	Persecuted by ill informed persons - hunters and farmers.
Australian kestrel	This species is rare on mainland Tas (>10 pairs) and is not known to use tree hollows (i.e. uses cliff sites). Larger populations on Bass Strait Islands but all nests known from cliffs and corvid nests.
	Likely to be persecuted by ill informed persons.
Peregrine falcon	Land clearing for development.

Species name	Comment
	Human impacts greatest risk. Windfarms may pose a risk.
	Predation by 'pigeon fanciers'.
	Peregrines do not use hollows or other birds nests in Tas - cliffs only.
	Often persecuted by ill informed persons.
Southern boobook	Kookaburras, clearfelling.
	Pesticide usage is of concern for population of this species and illegal trade in bird species.
	Wood collection a problem.
	Occasionally persecuted by ill informed persons.
Masked owl	Also uses caves for breeding.
	Pesticide usage is of concern for this species and illegal trade in bird species.
	Breeds in hollows but roosts often in cliffs and vegetation.
	Occasionally persecuted by ill informed persons.
Australian owlet nightjar	Sometimes nest in fence posts.
	Environmental concern re. use of pesticides etc.
	Distribution of species confirmed in SW Tas through nest box usage.
Spotted quail thrush	Feral cats and maybe foxes are accounting for this bird.
	Nest beside tree stumps.
	Three years ago I observed a nesting female on 2 eggs. The nest was in a curled up piece of bark on the ground.
	This species rarely uses true hollows. Occasionally in the base of tree cavities.
Grey shrike thrush	One pair of grey shrike thrush nested in a manfern over summer in the backyard. The nest was a construction of shredded bark, twigs and fibre between fronds and fern and trunk.
	Over the years have found more nests in the forks of scrubby trees and rarely in hollows.
	Uses stumps for nests.
	Urbanisation increasing threat.
	Feral cat predation impacting on this species.
	Mostly uses open cavities, shelves rather than hollows.
Welcome swallow	Nest yearly under house eaves.
	They seem to have enjoyed our civilisation. Used to nest on rock faces. Now like buildings and under bridges.
	Windfarms may pose a risk during migration.
	Studied swallows in Campania area. Never found any nesting in holes. Man made

Species name	Comment
	structures benefit their nesting. Use caves and cliff shelves. Land clearing helps them on their hawk over paddock trees when insect hatching. But never seen them over forests. Occasional road kill, especially juveniles.
Tree martin	Windfarms may be becoming a risk during migration.
Yellow-tailed black cockatoo	Dependent on mature and rotting rainforest trees (esp. *Nothofagus cunninghamii*) for the fungi and grubs found in there.
	Often get a small flock of 5-9 feeding in *Banksia marginata*.
	It is against all my expectations to have ticked 'increasing' in this area. Until recent years, a flock of 10-15 would be as many as we would see. For the last 3 years have seen up to 80 in a flock. They have learnt to feed on *Pinus radiata* cones.
	Wood cutting removes trees with potential nesting hollows.
	The increase in sulphur-crested cockatoos, galahs and corellas is a concern for this species.
Gang gang cockatoo	Rarely seen in Tasmania.
	Land clearing for urban expansion and illegal trade in parrots and other bird species.
Sulphur-crested cockatoo	Have observed being shot/poisoned due to the damage they cause to urban gardens.
	Illegal poaching of young birds.
Galah	Aggressive competitor for nesting sites.
Little corella	No comments.
Long-billed corella	No comments.
Swift parrot	Window strike kill.
	Possible competition with the introduced bumblebee? For eucalypt nectar? Noticed a decline in numbers on Maria Island where there are no forestry activities or land clearing.
	Serious threat from human impacts and introduced ferals.
	Does not nest here. Migrants passing through (King Island report)
	Illegal poaching of young birds.
Orange-bellied parrot	Wind turbines are of concern for the migration of this species from Tas. to Victoria and vice versa.
	Recent breeding successes.
Blue-winged parrot	Ground feeder, cats, habitat loss means a one-way spiral.
	These were a regular sight during winter. Feeding on seeds in apple orchards in the West Tamar area. Have not been on our property for at least 20 years.
	Possible increasing threat from wind farms during migration.
	Vagrants, have been past breeding records (King Island report).

Species name	Comment
	Illegal poaching of young birds.
	Competition with starlings for nest sites, serious for years.
	High numbers but declining?
Green rosella	Often killed by motor vehicles when feed on road sides.
	Often killed as 'vermin' by orchardists and gardeners. Often killed as a result of window collision.
Eastern rosella	Population has declined in N. Tas. more abundant in SE.
	Urban expansion and related habitat destruction is of concern.
	Knew of 3 nests. All hollows in Campania area. 1 was taken over by starlings. Concerned that many are being caught in grape nets. Illegal poaching of young birds.
	Competition with starlings for nest sites.
	Occasionally killed as 'vermin' by orchardists and gardeners. Often killed as a result of window collision.
Rainbow lorikeet	Vagrant to Tasmania.
	Urban expansion and habitat destruction is of concern for this species.
	This species is probably establishing from cage escaped birds and very localised.
Musk lorikeet	Bees and starlings may be of concern, flocks appear to be reducing in winter.
	Have seen an increase in numbers in Launceston this autumn.
	Environmental degradation by human activities and feral species.
	Picked up 3 road kill this summer. Only know of nest in a hole in gum trees. In established suburbs where many mainland flowering gum trees have been planted.
	They seem to be an increasing problem in fruit trees in outer Hobart areas.
	Illegal poaching of young birds.
	Occasionally killed as 'vermin' by orchardists and gardeners, often killed as a result of window collision.
Striated pardalote	Also nests in holes in banks and sometimes in buildings and pipes. Also gravel-soil heaps.
	Over the 70 years of my interest in birds, this species has remained fairly stable. Nesting sites have changed from mostly in hollow trees to mostly in tunnels in drain banks.
	Plenty around Buckland area, have seen nests built in behind stores and on bricks in walls.
	Reduced number of hollows available in urban corridors and bush. Bees and galahs compete for nest sites and kookaburras starlings feral cats and sparrows.
Forty-spotted pardalote	Wildfire is a concern for Flinders island population.

Species name	Comment
	The forty-spotted seems to be appearing in new habitats and doing OK.
Dusky robin	Was quite common 70 years ago. Sometimes nested in the fork of a fruit tree. Never see them here now.
	Land use changes and environmental degradation may be pushing this bird towards a decline.
Flame robin	Was the most plentiful robin 70 years ago in this area. For many years only see the rare family passing through.
	Land use changes and environmental degradation in Tasmania and on the mainland seems to me to be responsible for a major decline in a formerly common bird. Windfarms sites may be a further risk during migration.
	See quite a few spread over wide areas. The vast area netted for orchards plus high density agriculture must reduce a lot of feeding ground.
Dusky woodswallow	These birds used to nest in fruit trees at times.
	Risk from windfarms during migration. Land use changes and environmental degradation could easily push this bird to decline.
	Observed three nests. Two in the fork of trees and one against a tree trunk partly protected by a large piece of peeling bark.
European starling	Have witnessed 'gangs' of this bird expelling a nesting pair of swift parrots from an *E. viminalis* at Deloraine and blue winged parrots at Ross (*E. pauciflora*).
	Estimates in area around 300 (Ulverstone).
	I have witnessed this species competing for nesting sites locally and harassing parrot species to leave tree hollows.
	Very opportunist bird. Nests in hollows, top of fence posts, in buildings. Good year for corbi grubs, seen extra large flocks of juveniles in winter flocks. Feral so no concern.
House sparrow	Urban dweller rarely seen in native forest.
	Pest species. Causes concerns for other species. Congregates around the human that brought it. Mostly located in disturbed environment so less of an environmental impact.
	Feral. Opportunist. Hollows, rose hip bushes, haystacks, buildings, holes in a bank. Difficult to say status. When the rosehips (*Bria bushus)* were removed, v. few birds remained.
	Sparrow numbers have been increasing greatly until 2004 since then numbers in flocks seem reduced greatly.