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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Glenelg River is a high profile, priority river in Victoria containing significant fauna and characterized by many reaches in excellent condition. Carp are a relatively recent arrival to the Glenelg system (circa 2001) and the Glenelg Hopkins Catchment Management Authority (Glenelg Hopkins CMA) are keen to slow their spread and manage sites where carp are present to reduce their impact on native fish and overall river health. Key to the development of a cost-effective carp management strategy is to identify carp behavioral patterns and habitat preferences which may be exploited for control purposes. As such, the Glenelg Hopkins CMA is interested in utilizing a VEMCO acoustic tracking array to capture the movements of tagged “Judas” carp throughout the system. An important first step in establishing such an array is to conduct a range finding experiment in order to identify the most suitable acoustic transmitters and to define appropriate acoustic receiver locations. The range finding experiment comprised a VEMCO V13-1X acoustic range finding transmitter and a string of five VEMCO VR2W acoustic receivers which were deployed in a representative location within the Glenelg River on 14th February 2012. Average signal detection during the low power output cycle of the range finding transmitter (147 dB) was maintained at ≈72 % for 125 m and average signal detection during the high power output cycle (153 dB) was maintained at ≈82 % to 175 m. A significant drop in detection for both the high and low power cycle was observed at 225 m as a result of the receiver being positioned out of direct “line-of-sight” of the transmitter. The effective detection range will be significantly further in larger straight pools. The less than 100 % signal detection is likely a function of interference associated with vegetation, turbidity, ambient background noise and the presence of a slight thermocline. The observed detection loss will have negligible impact on the utility of acoustic tracking within the Glenelg River. To track the movement patterns and habitat preference of mature and immature carp three VEMCO transmitters are recommended: V16-4L (152 dB; mature carp ≥500 mm Total Length (TL), ≥1200 g), V13-1L (147 dB; mature carp ≈350-500 mm TL, 550-1200 g) and V9-2L (146 dB; immature carp ≈210-350 mm TL, 235-550 g). To minimize the potential for ping train collisions and to ensure tagged carp are detected as they move past receivers a nominal ping train delay of 120 ± 60 s is recommended. Given this delay, the V16-4L, V13-1L and V9-2L transmitters will last for 10 years, 3 years and 1.4 years, respectively. The Glenelg River has pools at regular intervals which are similar to, or larger than, the experimental pool and therefore suitable for the systematic deployment VEMCO VR2W receivers. As such, the application of acoustic tracking promises to yield exceptional movement and habitat preference data.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Common carp (*Cyprinus carpio* L.) are a successful invader and a declared pest fish in several countries including Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States (Koehn 2004). The success of carp stems from their high fecundity (100,000 eggs.kg⁻¹; up to 1 million eggs.y⁻¹), their high level of recruitment (up to 40 % survival), their longevity (28+ years), their ability to occupy a broad range of habitats and their tolerance to extreme environmental conditions (Smith 2005). When in high abundance, carp cause detrimental changes to benthic habitats, water quality and the distribution and abundance of native flora and fauna (Gehrke and Harris 1994; Miller and Crowl 2006; Matsuzaki et al. 2009). These impacts stem largely from carp’s bottom-feeding behaviour (Sibbing et al. 1986) and are most commonly reported in shallow off-stream habitats (Parkos et al. 2003) where carp annually aggregate to feed and breed (Smith and Walker 2004; Stuart and Jones 2006).

The Glenelg River is a high profile, priority river in Victoria containing significant fauna and characterized by many reaches in excellent condition. Carp are a relatively recent arrival to the Glenelg River system (*circa* 2001) and the Glenelg Hopkins Catchment Management Authority (Glenelg Hopkins CMA) are keen to slow their spread down the system and manage sites where carp are present to reduce their impact on native fish and overall river health. While the Glenelg Hopkins CMA has already collected considerable background data on the species and are currently applying opportunistic control measures they are now seeking to develop a more strategic approach toward managing carp. In this regard, the Glenelg Hopkins CMA engaged the South Australian Research and Development Institutes (SARDI) Invasive Species Sub-Program in November 2010 to assist in the development of a cost-effective carp management strategy. Key to the development of this strategy is the identification of movement patterns and habitat preferences of carp which may then be exploited for control purposes (i.e. aggregation points, timing of migrations between spawning and overwintering habitats, etc). With this knowledge, the utility of control methods such as carp exclusion screens, carp separation cages or the strategic delivery of environmental water releases to aggregate or disadvantage carp can be critically evaluated. As such, the Glenelg Hopkins CMA is interested in utilizing a VEMCO acoustic tracking array to capture the behavioral patterns of tagged “Judas” carp throughout the
system. This strategy is particularly effective as the behaviour of tagged “Judas” carp mirrors that of untagged carp so that behavioural patterns of schools can be identified and exploited (IFS 2011). An important first step in establishing a tracking array is to conduct an acoustic range finding experiment in order to identify the most suitable acoustic transmitters and to define appropriate acoustic receiver locations.

1.2. Objectives

- Design and conduct an acoustic range finding experiment within a representative reach of the Glenelg River, Victoria.
- Provide a brief technical report detailing the methods utilized, the results of the acoustic range finding experiment and recommendation of the most appropriate acoustic transmitters and acoustic receiver locations for tracking “Judas” carp within the Glenelg River.
2. METHODS

2.1. Site Description

The acoustic range finding experiment was conducted within a reach of the Glenelg River situated on private property approximately 68 km north of the township of Hamilton in southwest Victoria (37.12788°E; 141.92369°N; Figures 1 & 2). This location was chosen as its characteristics are representative of pools encountered at relatively regular intervals along the river. Pools are more suitable for the deployment of acoustic receivers as their depth and length permit greater propagation of signals sent by fish implanted with acoustic transmitters (i.e. the probability of detecting a tagged fish is maximized).

2.2. Water Quality

An important phenomenon that changes the spherical spreading of transmitted sound in water is refraction that results from spatial variations in sound speed that can be induced by thermoclines and haloclines (Kinsler et al. 2000). These variable conditions create a barrier layer that makes it difficult to detect acoustic transmissions across the cline. As such, a depth profile (0.2 m, 2 m, 3 m and 4 m) of electrical conductivity (µs.cm\(^{-1}\)) and temperature (°C) was collected from within the deepest section of the experimental pool (adjacent to R5; Figures 2 & 3) using a TPS 90-FLT portable water quality logger (TPS Pty Ltd, Springwood, Brisbane, Australia). Sampling occurred on the first day of the range finding experiment (14\(^{th}\) February 2012).
2.3. **Acoustic Range Finding Experiment**

A VEMCO V13-1X acoustic range finding transmitter with variable programming (see below) and an array of five VEMCO VR2W acoustic receivers (spaced at regular intervals; Table 1, Figures 2 & 3) were deployed in a representative pool within the Glenelg River on 14th February 2012. The transmitter and receivers were moored to Besser blocks and suspended within the water column 2 m below a surface float. A VEMCO VR100 manual tracking receiver was used to confirm the operation of the range finding transmitter prior to the onset of the experiment. The range test was conducted over an eight day period to capture a total of four days for both the high and low output cycles of the range finding transmitter. Receivers were retrieved on 23rd February 2012 and returned to SARDI for download, interpretation and recommendation of the most appropriate acoustic transmitters and receiver locations for the Glenelg River.

**V13-1X variable programming:**

- Days 1 and 2 - Power Low (147 dB); Fixed Delay: 10 seconds
- Days 3 and 4 - Power High (153 dB); Fixed Delay: 20 seconds
- Days 5 and 6 - Power Low (147 dB); Fixed Delay: 10 seconds
- Days 7 and 8 - Power High (153 dB); Fixed Delay: 20 seconds

![Figure 2. Google Earth image of the acoustic range finding experimental set-up.](image)
Table 1. VEMCO acoustic range finding transmitter and VR2W receiver identification and location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acoustic range finding transmitter</td>
<td>V13-1X</td>
<td>-37.12692°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR2W Receivers</td>
<td>R1 105968</td>
<td>-37.12713°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2 105969</td>
<td>-37.12748°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3 105973</td>
<td>-37.12788°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4 105974</td>
<td>-37.12818°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5 105975</td>
<td>-37.12813°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Acoustic range finding experimental set-up including receiver spacing’s and depth to receivers and the experimental pools substrate.
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Water Quality

The water quality of the experimental site was characterized by a homogenous electrical conductivity profile typical of freshwater rivers (0-800 µs.cm\(^{-1}\)) and a temperature profile indicating the presence of a slight thermocline (surface: 23.7°C; 2 m depth: 19.6°C) (Figure 4). While the thermocline may have influenced the acoustic range finding transmitters signal propagation (Kinsler et al 2000), the results of the experiment indicate that the effects were minimal (see section 3.2). In addition, as thermoclines tend to breakdown during flow events and during winter months the results of the range finding experiment are likely to represent the worst case scenario for acoustic tracking within the Glenelg River.

![Figure 4. Temperature (°C) and electrical conductivity (µs.cm\(^{-1}\)) depth profile taken adjacent to receiver R5.](image)
3.2. Acoustic Range Finding Experiment

Average signal detection during the low power output cycle of range finding transmitter (147 dB) was maintained at ≈72 % for 125 m from the range finding transmitter before declining to ≈62 % at 175 m and 0 % at 225 m (R5; Figures 2, 3 & 5). Average signal detection during the high power output cycle (153 dB) was maintained at ≈82 % for 175 m from the transmitter but declined to ≈10 % at 225 m (R5; Figures 2, 3 & 5). The significant drop off in detection at R5 for both the high and low power cycle is attributed to the receiver being positioned out of direct “line-of-sight” of the transmitter. Given that minimal loss of detection was witnessed over the four receivers in direct “line-of-sight”, the effective detection range should be significantly further in larger straight pools (pers. comm. Jonathan Mulock, VEMCO). It is also important to note that the reported ranges represent the potential range both upstream and downstream of a VR2W receiver in similar or larger pools (i.e. 175 m upstream + 175 m downstream = detection range up to 350 m). Signal detection lower than 100 % is most likely a function of interference associated with vegetation, turbidity, changes in ambient background noise resulting from fluctuations in flow, wind speed, rain events, etc, as well as the presence of a slight thermocline. Although some detection loss is expected as a result of the above factors, this loss will have negligible impact on the utility of acoustic tracking within the Glenelg River.

Figure 5. V13-1X High/Low acoustic range finding experiment summary.
3.3. **Acoustic Transmitters**

Acoustic transmitters are manufactured in a range of sizes and various programming specifications (power output and nominal ping train delay) so that transmitters can be tailored to particular species, life stages (juveniles, adults, sexually mature or immature, etc.) and the specific research objectives of a given study. In this regard, it is important to first develop the research objectives and to identify any potential limitations in order to define the appropriate acoustic transmitters. As such, the transmitter recommendations given below take into account the results of the acoustic range finding study as well as the following considerations (developed through consultation with VEMCO and the Glenelg Hopkins CMA):

- The current experiment represents the first stage of a tracking study which aims to identify movement patterns and habitat preferences of carp over 250-300 km of the Glenelg River that can be exploited for control/eradication purposes.
- The tracking study will be conducted over a three year period to account for behavioral changes resulting from natural and human induced variation between seasons and year’s (i.e. flooding, drying, environmental water releases, etc).
- The study will aim to track the behaviour of 100+ carp and will include immature (≈210-350 mm Total Length (TL); 235-550 g), small mature (≈350-500 mm TL; 550-1200 g) and large mature (≥500 mm TL; ≥1200 g) carp to account for behavioral differences between these size classes (age, length and weight relationships adapted from Smith 2005).
- Carp will be captured and tagged from across the entire study area and tagged carp will be released at their capture locations. This will ensure that tagged carp are widely dispersed at the on-set of the tracking study. However, there is potential that tagged carp will migrate through and aggregate in certain areas during spawning and overwintering times. The actual number of tagged carp that could be expected in any one migration and aggregation is difficult to speculate at this stage.
- In terms of carp behavior, observational evidence suggests that carp are able to swim at burst speeds of approx. 1 m.s\(^{-1}\), however they rarely swim at this speed and can only maintain it for a short period if they do (SARDI unpublished data).
- Acoustic transmitters cannot exceed 2 % of a tagged carp’s total weight (out of water) in order to minimise potential impacts on its behaviour (Winter 1996).
- Transmitter programming will be optimized to minimize the potential for ping train collisions and to ensure that tagged carp will be detected as they pass through the
detection range of a VR2W receiver. Collisions affect a receiver’s ability to identify an individual transmitter’s unique code and result from multiple tagged fish (20+) being within range of a receiver. The potential for collision can be minimized by increasing the nominal ping train delay but this can also decrease the probability of detection as a carp may pass a receiver between ping trains. A balance between the detection loss resulting from collision or an extended ping train delay is required. Due to extended residency times at aggregations points, the probability of detecting all tagged carp within the aggregation is increased.

- Ideally, transmitters will have a projected battery life of at least 3 years.

### 3.3.1. VEMCO V16-4L coded acoustic transmitter

V16-4L coded acoustic transmitters (152 dB; Figure 6) with a nominal ping train delay of 120 ± 60 s are recommended for tracking large mature carp ≥500 mm TL (≈1200 g). With a weight of 24 g, these transmitters are ≤2 % body weight of this size class. They offer a power output similar to the high power cycle of the range finding transmitter and should therefore be detected at similar or greater distances (depending on the length of the pool in which the receiver is deployed). The nominal ping train delay will minimize the potential for collisions (pers. comm. Jonathan Mulock, VEMCO) while maximizing the probability of detection as a carp swims past a receiver. For example, using the recommended ping train delay and a carp swimming at a burst speed of approx. 1 m.s⁻¹, an acoustic receiver should log one to two detections as a tagged carp swims through 200 m of a pool (however the actual number of detections should be higher as carp’s normal swim speed is rarely at this maximum). This transmitter’s battery size and programming specification will provide 3650 days (10 years) of continuous tracking data.

![Figure 6. VEMCO V16 coded acoustic transmitter (http://www.vemco.com/pdf/v16coded.pdf).](http://www.vemco.com/pdf/v16coded.pdf)
3.3.2. VEMCO V13-1L coded acoustic transmitter

V13-1L coded acoustic transmitters (147 dB; Figure 7) with a nominal ping train delay of 120 ± 60 s are recommended for tracking small mature carp 350-500 mm TL (≈550-1200 g). With a weight of 11 g, these transmitters are a maximum of 2 % body weight of the size class. They offer a power output equivalent to the low power cycle of the range finding transmitter and should therefore be detected at similar or greater distances. Similar to the V16-4L, the ping train delay will minimize the potential for collision while maximizing the probability of detection as receivers should log at least one to two detections as a tagged carp swims through a pool. This transmitter's battery size and programming specification will provide 1092 days (3 years) of continuous tracking data. To ensure this size class is represented for the entire 3 year study it is recommended that carp at the lower end of the size range are tagged at the onset of the study.

Figure 7. VEMCO V13 coded acoustic transmitter (http://www.vemco.com/pdf/v13_coded.pdf).

3.3.3. VEMCO V9-2L coded acoustic transmitter

V9-2L coded acoustic transmitters (146 dB; Figure 8) with a nominal ping train delay of 120 ± 60 s are recommended for tracking immature carp 210-350 mm TL (≈235-550 g). With a weight of 4.7 g, these transmitters are a maximum of 2 % body weight of the size class. They offer a power output similar to the low power cycle of the range finding transmitter and should therefore be detected at similar or greater distances. While this transmitter's performance is similar to the V13-1L, due to its battery size it will only provide 514 days (1.4 years) of continuous tracking data. To ensure this size class of carp is represented for the entire 1.4 years of the transmitter’s battery life it is recommended that carp at the lower end of the size range are tagged at the onset of the study. If tracking this size class is to continue for the entire 3 year duration of the study then a second round of surgeries will be required.
3.4. Acoustic Receiver Locations

The Glenelg River is characterized by pools at regular intervals which are similar to, or larger than, the experimental pool and therefore suitable for the systematic deployment of VEMCO VR2W receivers. As such, the application of acoustic tracking promises to yield exceptional movement and habitat preference data. Ideally, receivers should be deployed in large pools every 10-15 km to encompass the current and predicted distribution of carp within the Glenelg River as well as to target known aggregation points such as Clunies Hole (pers. comm. Stephen Ryan, Glenelg Hopkins CMA). It is recommended that the final array design and receiver mooring techniques be undertaken with further consultation between the Glenelg Hopkins Catchment Management Authority and SARDI Aquatic Sciences.
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