

The Ecology and Biology of Stingrays (Dasyatidae) at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia



**This thesis is presented for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy of Murdoch University 2012**

Submitted by

Owen R. O'Shea BSc (Hons I)

**School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology
Murdoch University, Western Australia**

Sponsored and funded by the Australian Institute of Marine Science

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own account of my research and contains as its main content, work that has not previously been submitted for a degree at any tertiary education institution.

.....

Owen R. O'Shea

.....

Date

Publications Arising from this Research

- **O'Shea, O.R.** (2010) New locality record for the parasitic leech *Pterobdella amara*, and two new host stingrays at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia. *Marine Biodiversity Records* 3 e113
- **O'Shea, O.R.**, Thums, M., van Keulen, M. and Meekan, M. (2012) Bioturbation by stingray at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 63:(3), 189-197
- **O'Shea, O.R.**, Thums, M., van Keulen, M., Kempster, R. and Meekan, MG. (Accepted). Dietary niche overlap of five sympatric stingrays (Dasyatidae) at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia. *Journal of Fish Biology*
- **O'Shea, O.R.**, Meekan, M. and van Keulen, M. (Accepted). Lethal sampling of stingrays (Dasyatidae) for research. *Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching*. Annual Conference on Thinking outside the Cage: A Different Point of View. Perth, Western Australia, 24th – 26th July, 2012
- **O'Shea, O.R.**, Braccini, M., McAuley, R., Speed, C. and Meekan, M. (In review). Optimising the estimation of growth parameters of difficult-to-sample species: an example for tropical stingrays. *PLoS One*
- Speed, C.W., **O'Shea, O.R.** and Meekan, M.G. (2013). Transmitter attachment and release methods for short-term shark and stingray tracking on coral reefs. *Marine Biology* DOI 10.1007/s00227-012-2151-y
- Cerutti-Pereyra F, Meekan MG, Wei NWV, **O'Shea O.R.**, Bradshaw CJA, Austin CM (2012) Identification of Rays through DNA Barcoding: An Application for Ecologists. *PLoS one* 7:e36479
- Kempster, R.M., Garza, E., Egeberg, C.A., Hart, N.S., **O'Shea, O.R.** and Collin, S.P. (In review) Sexual dimorphism in the electrosensory system: a quantitative analysis of nerve axons in the dorsal anterior lateral line nerve of the fantail stingray *Taeniura lymma* (Forsskål 1775). *Frontiers in Neuroanatomy*

Conference Presentations Arising from this Research

- **Australian Marine Science Association (AMSA), July 2011, Fremantle, Western Australia**
Bioturbation by stingrays at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia
- **International Coral Reef Symposium (ICRS), July 2012, Cairns, Queensland, Australia**
Physical and biological effects associated with stingray foraging behaviour at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia
- **Australia and New Zealand Council for the Care of Animals in Research and Teaching (ANZCCART) July 2012, Perth, Western Australia**
Lethal sampling of stingrays for scientific research
- **American Elasmobranch Society (AES) August 2012, Vancouver, Canada**
Physical and biological effects associated with stingray foraging behaviour at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia

Abstract

Batoids make up a significant portion of the biomass in coastal and nearshore ecosystems, yet few data are available on the functional role and life history characteristics of rays in these environments. Given their conservative life history traits and vulnerability to extrinsic pressures, urgent information is required to further understand this little known group of fishes. The objectives of this research were to assess the biological and ecological characteristics of tropical stingrays at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia. More specifically, I wanted to quantify the physical and biological impacts associated with predation by stingrays, prey specificity and trophic resource partitioning and age and growth of five sympatric species (*Himantura uarnak*, *Neotrygon kuhlii*, *Pastinachus atrus*, *Taeniura lymma* and *Urogymnus asperrimus*). A technical assessment for safe and ethical lethal sampling protocols for large dasyatid rays is discussed as a foundation to the research that was conducted for this degree. Strict codes of practice for the welfare of animals in scientific research demand up to date methodologies for ethical consideration, especially where death is an endpoint. Safe and humane techniques were developed as part of this study in order to sample the rays required using lethal methods. These techniques proved successful with both considerations met and it is hoped, will provide a framework for safe practices for any future work where lethal sampling of large, potentially hazardous demersal elasmobranchs is required. Age and growth parameter estimates were evaluated for these five species by sectioning and counting calcium band-pair deposition in vertebral samples. Due to less than ideal sample sizes on account of logistical constraints, a multi-analytical approach was adopted to optimise parameter estimates and generate

realistic results. This included using a Bayesian framework to approximate the posterior distribution of the growth parameters. Growth rates of smaller-bodied species were faster than for larger-bodied species, but longevity was shorter. The oldest recorded age from these samples was 27 years and although validation was not possible, annual deposition is assumed based on previous accounts of similar species. This is the first time that growth parameter estimates in dasyatid rays have been assessed using this approach, yet the application is highly relevant for other rare, vulnerable or endangered species where optimal sample sizes may not be possible. The characterisation of ray diets was assessed through stomach content analysis from 170 individuals of five species. Five broad taxonomic prey categories were common to all species of ray; however, *H. uarnak* is shown to be a crustacean specialist while the remaining four species showed high levels of overlap within their diets. Assessment of the physical impacts related to stingray foraging within an intertidal embayment, previously identified as an area of intense feeding by rays, demonstrated high levels of sediment excavation. As a direct result of bioturbation by stingrays over 21 days, 760 kg of sediment was excavated from an experimental area of 1,500 m². Predation effects by rays were examined by experimentally manipulating densities in fixed areas to prevent feeding. Results indicated that some, but not all prey-taxa differed significantly in abundance between treatment and controls. Sampling also allowed a quantitative assessment of infaunal taxa common within the Marine Park, and the potential importance as a prey source for rays, as well as other epibenthic predators. Throughout the course of this study, a new species locality record and parasite-host relationships was described for the parasitic leech *Pterobdella amara* and *Himantura leoparda* and *Urogymnus asperrimus*. This is the first time this leech has been encountered in Western Australia and in combination with a significant gnathiid isopod

larvae infestation; the effects on an individual stingray are documented. A methods paper is also included in this thesis detailing a cost-effective method of tag attachment and retrieval for short-term tracking in reef associated elasmobranchs. Field-testing of galvanic timed releases and the practical application in tagging two individual sharks (*Carcharhinus melanopterus*) and three large stingrays (*Pastinachus atrus* n = 2 and *Urogymnus asperrimus* n = 1) are discussed. Preliminary results of these short-term tracks demonstrated that these methods are a rapid and effective means of tagging elasmobranchs with limited impact on the animal's welfare. This research is the first of its kind at Ningaloo Reef and details critical functional processes and highlights the ecological significance of rays within coral reef environments. It also details current methodologies and techniques trialled for the first time within the context of ecological studies on tropical elasmobranchs. Data presented here can be used to develop or contribute to, conservation and management strategies for this overlooked, yet vulnerable group of fishes.

Table of contents

AbstractIV
List of TablesXII
List of FiguresXIV
List of AppendicesXVIII
AcknowledgmentsXXI
Chapter 1: General introduction1
<i>Classification, diversity and role of rays in the environment</i>1
<i>Threats, impacts and conservation</i>3
<i>Demography</i>5
<i>Aims</i>7
<i>Thesis structure</i>11
Chapter 2: Lethal sampling of stingrays for research14
<i>Introduction</i>14
<i>Materials and Methods</i>15
<i>Study location and species</i>15
<i>Sampling design</i>17
<i>Considerations</i>20
<i>Lethal sampling techniques</i>20
<i>Discussion</i>24
<i>Pain perception in elasmobranchs</i>25
<i>Outcomes</i>26
<i>Conclusions</i>27

Chapter 3: Optimising growth parameter estimates in tropical stingrays

with low sample sizes	29
<i>Introduction</i>	28
<i>Materials and Methods</i>	31
<i>Study sites and sample collection</i>	31
<i>Age validation</i>	32
<i>Vertebrae preparation</i>	33
<i>Age estimation</i>	33
<i>Growth parameter estimation</i>	34
Results	38
<i>Recaptures and seasonal edge deposition</i>	39
<i>Comparison of growth models</i>	39
<i>Estimation of growth parameters</i>	42
Discussion	43
<i>Validation of age estimates</i>	44
<i>Growth models and parameter estimates</i>	44
<i>Conclusions</i>	46

Chapter 4: Dietary partitioning by five sympatric stingrays

(Dasyatidae) at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia	47
<i>Introduction</i>	47
<i>Materials and Methods</i>	49
<i>Study location and species</i>	49
<i>Diet analysis</i>	51
<i>Data analysis</i>	52
Results	55
<i>Abundance of prey taxa</i>	55
<i>Dietary shifts relating to sex and ontogeny</i>	61
Discussion	64

Chapter 5: Bioturbation by stingrays	70
<i>Introduction</i>	70
<i>Materials and Methods</i>	72
<i>Study locations</i>	72
<i>Sampling</i>	76
<i>Analytical procedures</i>	76
Results	78
<i>Mangrove Bay</i>	78
<i>Longevity</i>	79
<i>Secondary use</i>	80
<i>Coral Bay</i>	83
Discussion	84
<i>Sediment removal</i>	84
<i>Comparable taxa</i>	84
<i>Mangrove Bay vs. Coral Bay</i>	85
<i>Longevity</i>	86
Chapter 6: Experimental manipulation of stingray foraging on infaunal communities in a tropical intertidal bay at Ningaloo Reef, Western Australia	89
<i>Introduction</i>	89
<i>Materials and Methods</i>	91
<i>Study location and species</i>	91
<i>Experimental design</i>	91
<i>Laboratory procedures</i>	93
<i>Analytical procedures</i>	93
Results	94
Discussion	104

Chapter 7: New locality record for the parasitic leech, *Pterobdella amara*, and two new host stingrays at Ningaloo Reef, Western

Australia	108
<i>Introduction</i>	108
<i>Discussion</i>	111

Chapter 8: Transmitter attachment and release methods for short-term shark and stingray tracking on coral reefs

<i>Introduction</i>	112
<i>Materials and Methods</i>	115
<i>Study location</i>	115
<i>Galvanic timed release static field test</i>	115
<i>Transmitter attachment design and deployment</i>	117
<i>Reef sharks</i>	117
<i>Stingrays</i>	120
<i>Shark and stingray tracking</i>	122
<i>Transmitter retrieval</i>	124
Results	124
<i>Galvanic timed release static field test</i>	124
<i>Transmitter attachment design and deployment</i>	124
<i>Stingray tracking</i>	125
<i>Shark tracking</i>	126
<i>Transmitter retrieval</i>	127
<i>Discussion</i>	129

Chapter 9: General Discussion

<i>Dasyatids of Ningaloo Reef</i>	134
Main Findings	135
<i>Lethal Sampling of stingrays for research</i>	135
<i>Optimising growth parameters estimates in poorly represented ray species</i>	136
<i>Dietary characteristic of stingrays at Ningaloo Reef</i>	138
<i>Bioturbation</i>	140
<i>Experimental manipulation of rays</i>	142

<i>New locality records</i>144
<i>Short-term tracking of sharks and stingrays on coral reefs</i>145
<i>Future directions</i>147
<i>Conclusions</i>149
Appendices151
References171

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Sampling sites and associated waypoints within the Ningaloo Reef Marine Park

Table 2.2: Morphometric and demographic data of rays sampled

Table 3.1: Growth models and associated formulas used to fit size at estimated age data for four species of dasytid ray

Table 3.2: Index of average percentage error (IAPE) and coefficient of variance (CV) values for inter-reader precision of age determination ($i = \text{reader}$); * denotes larger bodied species, ** smaller bodied species

Table 3.3: Comparison of growth model's fit and parameter estimates

Table 3.4: Summary of growth parameter estimates (median with 95% credibility intervals) from the Bayesian modelling approach

Table 4.1: Summary of prey taxa consumed by *Himantura uarnak*, *Neotrygon kuhlii*, *Pastinachus atrus*, *Taeniura lymma* and *Urogymnus asperrimus* from Ningaloo Reef, quantified by dietary measures: overall sampled size (n), Percentage of numerical importance within each species (%n), and percentage frequency of occurrence (%FO)

Table 4.2: Summary of results from the ANOSIM pairwise tests for differences between species

Table 4.3: Values of α calculated using the Manly-Chesson index of prey selectivity. Values range between 0 (complete avoidance) and 1 (complete preference)

Table 5.1: Ranked general linear mixed effects models of the probability of a ray pit being present explained by day and random effects (pit nested in year), and the volume of ray pits explained by day and random effects (pit nested in year) LL, maximum log-likelihood; k , number of estimate model parameters; AIC_c , Akaike's Information Criterion for small samples; ΔAIC_c , change in AIC_c relative to the to ranked model ; $WAIC_c$, AIC_c weight

Table 6.1: Summary of infaunal taxa collected from all treatments (T) and controls (C) from each time (1 – 4) to highest taxonomic resolution (HTR)

Table 6.2: Results from PerMANOVA main test (df = degrees of freedom; P (perm) = permutational significance level)

Table 8.1: List of species tracked with acoustic telemetry. **Shark size is presented in total length (L_T) and ray size is presented in approximate disc width (W_D)*

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: The five species of stingray (Dasyatidae) focused on for this study (A) reticulate whipray *Himantura uarnak*, (B) blue-spotted mask ray *Neotrygon kuhlii*, (C) porcupine ray *Urogymnus asperrimus*, (D) cowtail ray *Pastinachus atrus* and (E) blue-spotted fantail ray *Taeniura lymma*

Figure 2.1: Map of the Ningaloo Reef Marine Park, highlighting the three broad areas targeted for sampling

Figure 2.2: Optimum approach by a diver to a ray while free diving. The arrows represent the directions in which rays will typically swim based on behaviours observed during this research. The blue shaded area highlights the ideal angle of flight, while the red poses the greatest risk. It is important to note, that both red and blue areas are not mutually exclusive, and whichever angle the diver approaches from, should always be considered ‘red’

Figure 3.1: Map of the eighteen study sites within the Ningaloo Reef Marine Park, Western Australia

Figure 3.2: (A) Photographic images of sagittal centrum sections from *Pastinachus atrus* with 27 band pairs, (B) example of difficult to read section from *Urogymnus asperrimus* and (C) example of calcein marked centra from 91 days at liberty for *P. atrus*

Figure 3.3: Observed and predicted age at size (disc width, cm) for the different growth models VBGF, 2VBGF, LOG and GGF

Figure 3.4: Posterior distributions for $W_{D\infty}$ and k , for the four species where band pairs could be counted

Figure 4.1: Map showing Ningaloo Reef and the 18 sites where rays were collected. The shaded area shows the extent of the marine park

Figure 4.2: The cumulative number of new prey taxa for each consecutive stomach sampled for all prey taxa found (Black line) and for the 10 summarised prey categories (grey line)

Figure 4.3: Non-metric multidimensional scaling ordination of rays based on stomach contents:

Figure 4.4: Percentage contributions of the most dominant prey categories to the diets of each ray species.

Figure 4.5: Feeding strategy plots for each ray species

Figure 5.1: Ningaloo Reef Marine Park and the two study locations, Mangrove Bay and Coral Bay

Figure 5.2: (A) New pit created by feeding ray, and (B) degraded pit with *Scylla serrata* occupying excavation

Figure 5.3: Mangrove Bay southern intertidal zone and position of all sampled pits

Figure 5.4: GLMM predicted probabilities of pit presence over time. The thick line in the middle represents the predicted probabilities for all pits and the lighter lines either side are 95% confidence intervals

Figure 6.1: Map of Mangrove Bay and treatment locations

Figure 6.2: (A) Rank abundance of all infauna sampled at the highest taxonomic resolution and (B) rank abundance at the family level

Figure 6.3: Mean abundance of Mollusca between experimental treatments and sampling times

Figure 6.4: Mean abundance of Platyhelminthes between experimental treatments and sampling times

Figure 6.5: Mean abundance of Crustaceans between experimental treatments (C = controls and T = treatment) and sampling times (1 – 4)

Figure 6.6: Mean abundance of Echinoderms between experimental treatments (C = controls and T = treatment) and sites (1 – 9) for each sampling time (1 – 4)

Figure 6.7: Mean abundance of Crustaceans between experimental treatments (C = controls and T = treatment) and sites (1 – 9) for each sampling time

Figure 7.1: (A) Buccal cavity of *P. atrus* with gnathiid isopod larvae embedded in tissue, (B) gills of the same individual ray with similar infestation and (C) magnified close up of gnathiid isopod larvae

Figure 7.2: (A) Upper dentition of the ray *Pastinachus atrus* showing the parasitic leech *Pterobdella amara* and (C) close up of two individual leeches showing the area of basal attachment with part of the stingray jaw still attached.

Figure 8.1: Map Coral Bay Township and surrounding reef where tags were tested

Figure 8.2: External attachment design for active tracking of reef sharks

Figure 8.3: External attachment design for active tracking of stingrays. *Photo shows porcupine ray *Urogymnus asperrimus* tagged at Lottie's Lagoon.*

Figure 8.4: Optimal technique for in-situ tagging of large benthic rays with (A) approach from the side and slightly from behind; (B) Tag attachments from directly above in the pectoral fin close to the body; (C) The movement of the ray swimming away provides the detachment of the tag from the spear and (D) the ray swimming away with the tag attached correctly with minimum invasion

Figure 8.5: Water temperature and GTR release times for experiment duration.

Figure 8.6: (A) Stingray tracks up to nine hours duration each, within the Maud Sanctuary Zone, Ningaloo Reef; numbers represent the starting points of each track and the points represent locations at 30 minute intervals, and (B) Track of *C. melanopterus* within Skeleton Bay, Ningaloo Reef; each point represents an average position for each hour tracked

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Supplementary Tables and Figures to Chapter 3

Supplementary Table 3.1: Species and mean growth parameter estimates of $W_{D_{\max}}$, $W_{D_{\infty}}$ and k derived from published sources and used as informative priors in the Bayesian model

Supplementary Figure 3.1: Prior probability density distributions for growth parameters $W_{D_{\infty}}$, k and variation σ

Supplementary Figure 3.2: Geweke's diagnostic test (Geweke 1991) for *Himantura uarnak*. The convergence of mean estimates is tested by comparing means from the first 10% and the second 50% of the Markov Chain

Supplementary Figure 3.3: Geweke's diagnostic test (Geweke 1991) for *Neotrygon kuhlii*. The convergence of mean estimates is tested by comparing means from the first 10% and the second 50% of the Markov Chain

Supplementary Figure 3.4: Geweke's diagnostic test (Geweke 1991) for *Pastinachus atrus*. The convergence of mean estimates is tested by comparing means from the first 10% and the second 50% of the Markov Chain

Supplementary Figure 3.5: Geweke's diagnostic test (Geweke 1991) for *Taeniura lymma*. The convergence of mean estimates is tested by comparing means from the first 10% and the second 50% of the Markov Chain

Supplementary Figure 3.6: Trace plots for growth parameters $W_{D_{\infty}}$, k and variation σ for *Himantura uarnak*

Supplementary Figure 3.7: Trace plots for growth parameters $W_{D\infty}$, k and variation σ for *Neotrygon kuhlii*

Supplementary Figure 3.8: Trace plots for growth parameters $W_{D\infty}$, k and variation σ for *Pastinachus atrus*

Supplementary Figure 3.9: Trace plots for growth parameters $W_{D\infty}$, k and variation σ for *Taeniura lymma*

Appendix 2: Supplementary Figures to Chapter 5

Supplementary Figure 5.1: Volume frequency of all pits sampled at Mangrove Bay

Supplementary Figure 5.2 The log-transformed volume of all pits sampled from 2009, 2010 and 2011 that were present for three days or more is plotted on the y-axis, against day of sampling on the x-axis. The un-transformed values are plotted on the opposite y-axis and the fitted line for the population of pits obtained by the linear mixed effects model is shown

Supplementary Figure 5.3: Linear relationships between day of sampling and volume of each of the pits sampled from September 2010 that were present for three days or more

Supplementary Figure 5.4: Linear relationships between day of sampling and volume of each of the pits sampled from February 2011 that were present for three days or more

Appendix 3: Supplementary Tables to Chapter 6

Supplementary Table 6.1: Prey taxa identified to the highest possible taxonomic resolution from the stomachs of each ray species, quantified by dietary measures: Percentage frequency of occurrence (%FO) and percentage of numerical importance (%n). Prey category refers to the categories used to pool data for analyses

Supplementary Table 6.2: Summary of infauna identified from sediment cores.

Appendix 4: Journal Feature Front Cover

Front cover of *Marine and Freshwater Research* Vol:63, Issue 3, 2012, highlighting the research paper which formed the basis for chapter 5

Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisors for putting up with me for almost 4 years. It has been an experience to say the least and Mark Meekan, Mike van Keulen and Michele Thums never gave up on me, although I suspect it crossed their minds. Their patience and help has been greatly valued, although more retrospectively than in certain moments; whether it was Mark virtually throwing me overboard to get at the wheel of the research boat because he's convinced that massive cowtail was about to evade us, or a phone call from Michele spitting chips because the 'latest' manuscript I sent round, was in fact an older version with all the previous errors and none of the updated analyses; or it could get even worse: a day where Mike didn't wear one of his several Hawaiian shirts. The learning curve has been steep, yet valuable and I wouldn't change a thing about this process.

Secondly, yet equally, if not more important is my wife Michelle, who has supported me through it all and has borne witness to the highs and lows the last four years have brought. I could not have done any of it without you and I'm sure your relief reflects mine now we can continue with some semblance to normality in our lives – although I am considering a new degree in master brewing. I will never forget what has been sacrificed for me to do this. My parents, Glynis and Michael have always believed in me, more than I have at times and without their support and overseas visits to keep me motivated, I'm sure this would have been far more challenging. In addition, my boys back home: Jamez, Blenks, Bouske, Toddy², Palmi, Beef, Mike and Olly – we've come a long way from the Kennel, smashing Lenny and hedge-jumping in a haze of soap, so your support too has been overwhelming.

In addition, this project required over 9 months of fieldwork at the beautiful Ningaloo Reef. During these field trips I received assistance and support from so many people whether it be full time volunteers, or bar staff still serving in the Coral Bay pub after we had clearly had a few, but Flintoff was still at the wicket about to smash Mitchell Johnson for *another* boundary. So, in no particular order I would like to thank the following people: Fray-man, Aldo, Dr. S-blend, Tessa T-bags (small but perfectly formed lungs), Gay-buh, Danica, Lu-Lu, Connie, Jonny Tan, Steverino, Magsy Moo Moos, Helen, Digs (*Esox lucius*), Michelle, Disey, Captain Al, Rory, Rogue Mikey, Nick, Simone, Courtney, Sam (my brother in ink), Franny-Pants, Jane, G-man, Kimbo, Tinks, Will, Dommy B to the C, Danny Boy, Tiff, Ryan, Eduardo, Matias, Channing, Inday, Karen, James Squire, Thomas Cooper (Red Death) and N. Adams for proof reading. Plus Andrew Strauss and the magnificent 11 for winning two Ashes series during my PhD. Plus anyone who ever recorded extreme, heavy metal music that consoled me during the dark times and the 30-hour round trip drives to Ningaloo. For anyone else who has bought me a beer after a day's slog in the field in the Pot Shot or sunk a few cold ones at the Coral Bay pub: It's been an honour, and a pleasure.

This research was conducted in accordance with WA Fisheries Exemption Permit RS457/98-05; Murdoch University Animal Ethics Permit #R2275/09; Murdoch University Animal Ethics Licence #U6/2010-2011. All sites within the Marine Park were accessed according to DEC regulation 4 permit number CE002624 and fauna were collected under DEC regulation 17 permit number SF007122

‘An understanding of the natural world and what's in it, is a source of not only a great curiosity but great fulfilment’

David Attenborough

