

The Underwater Acoustic Repertoire of  
the Long-necked, Freshwater Turtle  
*Chelodina oblonga*



*Chelodina oblonga* Photo courtesy of Gerald Kuchling, 2005

**By: Jacqueline Giles**

This thesis is presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the School of Environmental Science,  
Murdoch University  
Perth, Western Australia.

Submitted  
**-September 2005-**

# DECLARATION

Except where specifically acknowledged, this project is my own account of the research that I have undertaken and has not been submitted for any other awards from other institutions.

---

**Jacqueline. C. Giles**

September 2005

With all the modern technology  
hearing-aids of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century  
listening into the quiet.

And lo – this is no longer a world of amber and silence.  
This is a world full of voices and songs.  
Ancient melodies modulating to a 200 million year old beat.

And now that we have heard the songs and the voices in the amber  
what would they tell us ?  
and are we going to listen....

J.C.G 2004

## ABSTRACT

The major question addressed by this project was to determine if the long-necked, freshwater turtle *Chelodina oblonga*, vocalise underwater and whether their vocal activity could be related to behavioural or ecological aspects of their lives. These turtles often live in wetlands where visibility is restricted due to habitat complexity or light limitation caused by factors such as tannin-staining, or turbidity. For many aquatic animals, sound is a useful means of communication over distances beyond their visual acuity. This thesis gives the first detailed account of the underwater vocal repertoire of *C. oblonga*.

In total, over 230 days were spent in the field and more than 500 hours of tape recordings were made for this research. Initially, a number of recordings took place in three wetlands known to support turtle populations: Blue Gum Lake; Glen Brook Dam; and Lake Leschenaultia in Perth, Western Australia; in order to determine the nature of the freshwater sound field and place turtle vocalisations into the context in which they were vocalising. The wetlands differed in terms of degree of enrichment, substrate material, water depth and habitat complexity. Recordings were made over a four-week period in the last month of summer and the first week of autumn (Feb-Mar 2003). Invertebrate sweeps were also taken over a two-week period at each recording site to determine if invertebrate distributions were related to patterns of sonic activity. To determine the influence of wind on ambient noise; recordings were undertaken on winter mornings (June-August, 2003) at Blue Gum Lake and Glen Brook Dam at locations north, south, west and east for four different wind speeds – Beaufort Wind Scale (BWS) 0,1,2 & 3.

There were seven distinctive calls recognised in the recordings. The frequency bandwidth most utilised by organisms was between 3 kHz up to around 14 kHz, with the exception of

the 'bird-like song'; which extended from 500 Hz up to around 10 kHz. Blue Gum Lake contained a more diverse and abundant assemblage of invertebrates than Lake Leschenaultia and Glen Brook Dam. Correspondingly, a greater diversity of calls was recorded at Blue Gum Lake, as well as the presence of chorus activity, which was not heard at the two less-enriched sites. The periods of greatest diversity and abundance of macroinvertebrates was synonymous with the increased sonic activity at dusk and midnight with noise levels greatest at dusk in particular, and to a lesser extent at midnight. There was no difference in ambient noise at Blue Gum Lake or Glen Brook Dam at wind speeds of Beaufort Wind Scale 0, 1 and 2.

Turtles from three populations were recorded in artificial environments: consisting of round, plastic, above-ground ponds (1.8m dia. x 0.65m depth), which were set up to re-create small wetlands. Recordings occurred from September to October, 2003 and from February to December, 2004 as well as January, 2005. Seven hatchling and five juvenile turtles (CL <10cm) were also recorded in order to ascertain whether very young turtles vocalised. Hatchlings were recorded in a glass aquarium (35.5cm length x 20cm width x 22.0cm depth) and juveniles were placed into a below-ground outdoor pond (1m length x 0.5m width x 0.4m depth). Recordings occurred from as early as 4.30am (dawn recordings) to as late as 1.30am (evening recordings).

The recordings revealed that turtles utilise an underwater acoustic communication system (calling at the water's surface was also noted but these were not recorded or a part of this research) involving a repertoire of both complex and percussive sounds with short, medium and potentially long-range propagation characteristics. Complex structures included

harmonically related elements (richly or sparsely) and different rates of frequency modulation. Frequency use extended beyond the in-air auditory sensitivity known for a single species of turtle studied from the family Chelidae; with calls ranging from around 100 Hz in some of the percussive displays, to as high as 3.5 kHz in some complex calls, with 'clicks' extending beyond the 20 kHz upper limit of the recording system. However, most of *C. oblonga's* vocalisations had dominant frequencies below 1 kHz. Turtles were intermittent callers with an extensive vocal repertoire of seventeen (17) vocal categories - highly suggestive of complex social organisation. Vocalisations included: a) clacks; b) clicks; c) squawks; d) hoots; e) short chirps; f) high short chirps; g) medium chirps; h) long chirps; i) high calls; j) cries or wails; k) cat whines; l) grunts; m) growls; n) blow bursts; o) staccatos; p) a wild howl; and q) drum rolling. Also, two sustained 'pulse-bouts' were recorded during the breeding months, hypothesised to function as acoustic advertisement displays – possibly 'calling songs'. Hatchling turtles were not heard to vocalise within the audible range. Only a single complex vocalisation was heard produced by the juvenile turtles, with a number of percussive calls.

Preliminary playback trials were conducted under free-field conditions and within an artificial environment, which consisted of a below ground rectangular tank (2.4m length x 0.8m width x 0.6m deep). A number of turtle calls recorded in the artificial ponds were selected for playback. A UW 30 speaker was used for broadcast of calls. The free-field playbacks occurred at Mabel Talbot Lake and Blue Gum Lake during the months of April and May, 2005. Playback using 14 seconds of an artificially constructed sequence from the sustained 'pulse-bout' occurred in the artificial channels. This sequence consisted of some of the first phase pulses followed by a section of the 'vibrato'.

The preliminary free-field playback trials indicated that turtles had some interest in the calls being played by responding with an 'alert posture'. Turtles were shown to remain in the alert posture for a significantly longer time than when no sound was played or when white noise was played. The extensive repertoire and initial responses to the free-field playbacks indicated that sound has some biological importance for *C. oblonga*, although results of playbacks under artificial conditions were inconclusive.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was undertaken under WA Conservation and Land Management license numbers SF003994, SF004286, SF004311, SF004702; Murdoch University Animal Ethics Committee approval 931W/02 and also approval under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act (WA), 1920.

A special thankyou to William Boissevain for funding given to purchase some of the equipment needed for this project and further; I am very grateful to the Murdoch Research Committee for the scholarship funding. Without such financial support, this project would never have happened.

I would like to thank my three supervisors; Associate Professor Jenny Davis from Murdoch University, Dr Robert McCauley from Curtin University and Dr Gerald Kuchling from the University of Western Australia; for all their support, advice and direction throughout this project. Jenny, whom I hold tremendous respect for, always had such enthusiasm and support for my research and has been my rock throughout. Thank you Jenny, Rob and Gerald for your patience, for persevering with me and for sharing your knowledge.

Doing this thesis has been my 'Everest' and amongst my greatest personal achievements. However, such a research project would not have happened without the many people who have made invaluable contributions along the way. I would like to sincerely thank:

Dan Hewitt, the technician at Murdoch University, for all the fixing and fiddling of the equipment that was needed for this project; Joseph Olson from Cetacean Research Technology, for all your patience and endurance answering my silly questions and for all the technical support I received in the early stages of this thesis; Dr Alec Duncan from CMST; Curtin University, who very kindly helped me to calibrate my hydrophone and for filtering my recordings for playback; Dr David Matthews from DSTO; West Australian Navy for helping me calibrate my second hydrophone; Andy Grice for setting up the filtration system for the ponds and installing the 'viewing' windows; Steven Goynich for my wonderful maps; Dr Ian King, who gave me some very helpful suggestions and listened to my invertebrate recordings to see if he could ID any of my signals; 'Computer Peter', for removing viruses on my computer and helping me with other miscellaneous computer difficulties; and thank you also to my volunteers, who without their help the midnight ambient sound-recordings would not have happened. I would also like to thank those quiet heroic people in the background- the library staff from LIDDAS who sought and found many of the obscure journal articles I needed to complete this thesis.

Thanks also goes to Peter (X) for turning my humble dolly-trolley into the 'all-terrain assault vehicle' which enabled me to transport ALL MY EQUIPMENT over sand, through long grass, mud, over ant cities and kilometers of walk trails around wetlands!

And lastly, but by no means least; to my son William: how I treasured those precious hugs and moments together, for all the Spiderman, Van Helsing and Vin Diesel movies we saw together, reminding me of all the joy and blessings that come in our children and that there are some mysteries in communication that science will never explain.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	I
Abstract	III
Acknowledgements	VII
Table of Contents	VIII
List of Figures	XIII
List of Tables	XVI
List of Maps	XVII
<b>Ch 1.0 Introduction</b>	
1.1 General Introduction	1
1.2 Bioacoustics	4
1.2.1 Chelonian Vocalisations	6
1.3 Ambient Noise in Wetlands	9
1.3.1 The Biological Component	9
1.3.2 The Natural Component: Wind and Rain	11
1.4 Background to Shallow Water Acoustics	12
1.5 Objectives	15
<b>Ch 2.0 General Methods</b>	16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 Field Sites	16
2.2.1 Blue Gum Lake	16
2.2.2 Lake Leschenaultia	17
2.2.3 Glen Brook Dam	17
2.2.4 Quenda Wetland	18
2.3 Equipment and Procedures	22
2.3.1 The Animals	22
2.3.2 Recording Sounds within Wetlands	22
2.3.3 Calibration of Equipment	24

2.3.4	Analysis of Acoustic Sounds	29
2.3.5	Classification of Acoustic Units	30
2.3.6	Chorusing	31
2.3.7	Cut-off Frequencies	31
2.3.8	Video Equipment	34
2.3.9	Wind Speed	35
2.3.10	Invertebrate Statistical Analysis	35
2.4	Pilot Studies	36
2.4.1	Isolating Turtle Sounds	36
2.4.2	Ambient Noise	38
<b>Ch 3.0 Ambient Noise in Wetlands</b>		<b>39</b>
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	Methods and Materials	39
3.2.1	The Wetlands	39
3.2.2	The Recording Regime	40
3.2.3	Invertebrates	42
3.2.4	Acoustic Signals	43
3.2.5	Ambient Noise and Wind	45
3.3	Results	45
3.3.1	The Biologics	45
	• ‘Tick, tick’ Call	47
	• ‘Cork on Glass’ Calls	48
	• The ‘Ratchet’ Call	50
	• ‘Birdlike’ Song	51
3.3.2	Chorusing	53
	• The ‘Cork on Glass’ Chorus	53
	• The ‘12 / 6 kHz Rattle’	55
	• The ‘5.5 kHz Rattle’	56
	• The ‘TinselCaller’	57
3.3.3	Spectrum Levels	57
	• The Biologics	57
	• Background Ambient Noise	58
3.3.4	Anthropogenic Noise Contributions in wetlands	64
	• Helicopter	64
	• Speedboats	64
	• Water Fountains (aerators)	65
	• Heavy Vehicles	65
3.3.5	Invertebrates	66

3.4	Discussion	75
3.4.1	Natural Contribution to Noise	75
	• Wind	75
	• Bubbles	78
	• Biological	78
3.4.2	Anthropogenic Contribution to Noise	82
3.4.3	Influence of Temperature	84
<b>Ch 4.0 The Acoustic Repertoire of <i>Chelodina oblonga</i></b>		<b>87</b>
4.1	Introduction	87
4.1.1	Objectives	88
4.2	Methods and Materials	88
4.2.1	Experimental Procedures	88
	• Natural Wetlands	88
	• Artificial Environment	89
	• Hatchlings and Juveniles	91
4.2.2	Recording Regime	91
4.2.3	Acoustic Signals	91
4.3	Results	92
4.3.1	Terminology	97
4.3.2	Descriptions	98
	• ‘Clacks’	98
	• ‘Broadband clicks’	100
	• ‘Short chirps’	103
	• ‘High short chirps’	103
	• ‘Squawks’	105
	• ‘Medium chirps’ and ‘Long chirps’	106
	• ‘High calls’	112
	• ‘Wails’	114
	• ‘Hoots’	116
	• ‘Cat whines’	117
	• ‘Grunts, growls and blow pulses’	118
	• ‘Wild howl’	121
	• ‘Staccatos’	123
	• ‘Drum rolls’	124
	• Juvenile Calls	126
	• In air vocalisations	128
4.3.3	Cut-off Frequencies	128

4.4	Discussion	129
	• Transmission of Turtle Vocalisations	130
	• Turtles and Tortoises	133
	• Hearing in Long-necked, Freshwater Turtles	135
	• Sound Production and Individual Variation	136
	• ‘Clicks’	140
	• The Aerial Platform for Vocalisations and Observations	142
<b>Ch 5.0 Acoustic Repertoire: sustained vocalisations</b>		<b>146</b>
5.1	Introduction	146
	5.1.1 Objectives	146
5.2	Methods and Materials	146
5.3	Results	146
	5.3.1 Summary of the sustained turtle vocalisations	147
	5.3.2 Descriptions	147
	5.3.3 The ‘pulse-bout’	149
	• The First Phase	152
	• The Second Phase	153
5.4	Discussion	155
<b>Ch 6.0 Temporal call patterns and behavioural observations within functional groupings</b>		<b>160</b>
6.1	Introduction	160
	6.1.1 Objectives	160
6.2	Methods and Materials	161
	6.2.1 The Turtles	161
	6.2.2 Recording Regime for Vocal Periodicity	162
	6.2.3 Behavioural Observations	163
6.3	Results	164
	6.3.1 Vocal Calling Patterns	164
6.4	Discussion	168
	• Food and Parent-Young Interactions	168
	• Group Movements and Aggregations	169
	• Social Calls	170
	• Predators and Threatening Situations	171
	• Sexual Activity	175
	• Temperature and Vocal Activity	176

<b>Ch 7.0 Playback Studies</b>	179
7.1 Introduction	179
7.1.1 Objectives	180
7.2 Methods and Materials	180
7.2.1 The Turtles	180
7.2.2 Playback Calls	180
7.2.3 Pilot Study: Playback in free-field Conditions	183
• Pilot Study: Results and Discussion	184
• Pilot Study: Summary	185
7.2.4 Free-field Playbacks	186
7.2.5 Playback Trials under Artificial Conditions	187
7.2.6 Playback Responses	188
7.3 Results	188
7.3.1 Free-field Playback Trials	188
7.3.2 Playback of the ‘pulse-bouts’ in the Constructed Channels	188
7.4 Discussion	189
<b>Ch 8.0 General Discussion</b>	193
8.1 Overview	193
8.2 Further Research questions	197
8.2.1 Turtles	197
8.2.2 Propagation characteristics within the Wetland Environment	199
8.2.3 Anthropogenic Noise Contributions	199
8.2.4 Ambient Noise	200
8.3 Limitations	200
<b>Ch 9.0 References</b>	203
<b>Appendices</b>	218
Appendix 1 Analysis of Variance – comparing wind speed data at locations NSW.	218
Appendix 2 Filtering Procedure for Playback Studies.	220

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure.2.1.</b>	Spectrum of the calibrated white noise into the right channel of the TASCAM DAT-P1 recorder revealing a flat response.	25
<b>Figure.2.2.</b>	Linear plot of gain on the Tascam DA-P1 DAT recorder using the input settings 0-8.	26
<b>Figure.2.3.</b>	Spectra obtained in hydrophone calibration comparing the output of the CRT C53 hydrophone with the calibrated hydrophone the MASSA TR-1025.	28
<b>Figure.2.4.</b>	Spectra obtained in hydrophone calibration comparing the output of the HTI-96- MIN with the calibrated hydrophone, the RESON TC 4033.	28
<b>Figure.3.1.</b>	Spectrogram of a ‘Tick, tick...’ pulse-train frequently heard at Lake Leschenaultia and Glen Brook Dam but not heard at Blue Gum Lake.	47
<b>Figure.3.2.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘Cork on Glass’ caller regularly heard at Blue Gum Lake and Glen Brook Dam.	49
<b>Figure.3.3.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘Ratchet’ call only heard at Blue Gum Lake.	50
<b>Figure.3.4.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘Bird-like’ call heard at Glen Brook Dam and Lake Leschenaultia.	51
<b>Figure.3.5.</b>	Spectrogram of a single ‘squeaky kiss’ from the ‘Bird-like’ call.	52
<b>Figure.3.6.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘Birdlike fluttering’ component of the ‘Bird-like’ call.	52
<b>Figure.3.7.</b>	Spectrogram of a continuous chorus heard Blue Gum.	54
<b>Figure.3.8.</b>	Spectrogram of a dis continuous chorus heard at Blue Gum Lake.	54
<b>Figure.3.9.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘12 /6 kHz rattle’ at Blue Gum Lake with ‘Cork on Glass’ Callers heard calling between the 6 kHz and 12 kHz band-widths.	55
<b>Figure.3.10.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘5.5 kHz Rattle’ only heard at Blue Gum Lake.	56
<b>Figure.3.11.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘Tinsel’ caller at Blue Gum Lake.	57
<b>Figure.3.12.</b>	Spectra of winter ambient noise levels at wind speeds of Beaufort scale 0, 1 and 2. Blue Gum Lake winter 2003.	60
<b>Figure.3.13.</b>	Spectra of dominant biologic activity at Blue Gum Lake(midday) from $\frac{1}{3}$ -octave band measurements.	61
<b>Figure.3.14.</b>	Spectra of dominant biologic activity at Blue Gum Lake (dusk) from $\frac{1}{3}$ -octave band measurements.	62
<b>Figure.3.15.</b>	Spectra of dominant biologic activity at Blue Gum Lake (midnight) from $\frac{1}{3}$ -octave band measurements.	63
<b>Figure.3.16.</b>	Spectrogram of noise produced by a helicopter directly overhead at Lake Leschenaultia. Summer, 2003.	64

<b>Figure.3.17.</b>	Spectrogram of noise produced by a passing outboard motor boat at Lake Leschenaultia. Summer, 2003.	65
<b>Figure.3.18.</b>	Spectrogram of the ambient sound field in Mabel Talbot Lake, Subiaco whilst a water aerator was operating.	65
<b>Figure.3.19.</b>	Spectrogram of the noise produced by a heavy haulage vehicle passing no more than 300m from Piney Lake along the Leach Highway.	66
<b>Figure.3.20.</b>	Dendrogram displaying the wetland clustering based on macro and micro-invertebrate abundances.	72
<b>Figure.3.21.</b>	Dendrogram displaying the wetland clustering based on macro-invertebrates only at the wetlands.	74
<b>Figure.4.1.</b>	Artificial ponds used to contain turtles in which to make recordings of their underwater vocalisations.	90
<b>Figure.4.2.</b>	Spectrogram and waveforms of the ‘Clack’ pulse.	99
<b>Figure.4.3.</b>	Spectrograms of the Broadband clicks recorded in the artificial ponds produced by both male and female turtles.	101
<b>Figure.4.4.</b>	Spectrogram of three rapid clicks produced by a turtle near the hydrophone at Blue Gum Lake – dawn, summer 2003.	101
<b>Figure.4.5.</b>	Waveform characteristics of ‘double clicks’.	102
<b>Figure.4.6.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a typical ‘short chirp’.	103
<b>Figure.4.7.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘chirp bout’ emitted by a male turtle in the artificial pond, which included ‘high short chirps’ and a ‘long chirp’.	104
<b>Figure.4.8.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a typical ‘squawk’.	105
<b>Figure.4.9.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘sparsely harmonic (SH) long chirp’.	107
<b>Figure.4.10.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘richly harmonic (RH) long chirp’.	108
<b>Figure.4.11.</b>	Spectra of a ‘chirp bout’ of ‘medium chirps’ believed to be in response to a poodle barking.	108-112
<b>Figure.4.12.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘High call’ call from the Pinweryning Dam females.	113
<b>Figure.4.13.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘High call’ call from the Blue Gum Lake females.	114
<b>Figure.4.14.</b>	Series of spectrograms depicting the bout of ‘wails’ produced by large females from PinweryningDam.	115
<b>Figure.4.15.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of two ‘hoots’ produced by male turtles.	116
<b>Figure.4.16.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘cat whine’ produced by the ‘seized turtles’	117
<b>Figure.4.17.</b>	A series of ‘grunts’ produced by the Pinweryning Dam ‘females with follicles’.	119

<b>Figure.4.18.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘Growl’ by the Pinweryning Dam large female group.	119
<b>Figure.4.19.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a ‘Blow burst’ by the Pinweryning Dam large female group.	120
<b>Figure.4.20.</b>	Spectrogram of a ‘growl squawk’ by the Pinweryning Dam large female group.	121
<b>Figure.4.21.</b>	A sequence of spectrograms of the ‘Wild howl’ by a female from the Pinweryning Dam population.	122
<b>Figure.4.22.</b>	Spectrogram and waveform spectra of a ‘staccato’.	123
<b>Figure.4.23.</b>	‘Drum rolls’ by the Pinweryning Dam large male group.	124
<b>Figure.4.24</b>	Spectrogram and waveform spectra of a ‘Drum roll’ by Blue Gum Lake males.	125
<b>Figure.4.25.</b>	Spectrograms of the short ‘drum roll’ produced by both larger and smaller females from Pinweryning Dam.	126
<b>Figure.4.26.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of a single chirp produced by juvenile turtles (CL: <10cm).	127
<b>Figure.4.27.</b>	Spectrogram and amplitude spectra of the ‘Duck honk’ call produced by a sub-adult male turtle with a carapace length of 11.3cm.	128
<b>Figure.5.1.</b>	Spectrogram, amplitude spectra and waveform characteristics of typical pulses used in the ‘pulse-bout’ at Blue Gum Lake.	150
<b>Figure.5.2.</b>	Spectrogram, amplitude spectra and waveform characteristics of typical pulses used in ‘pulse-bout’ by the Masons Gardens male turtle.	151
<b>Figure.5.3.</b>	Spectrogram of an irregular pulse-series in the ‘pulse-bout’ produced by a male <i>C. oblonga</i> .	152
<b>Figure.5.4.</b>	Spectrogram of the ‘rocking’ pulse series from the Second Phase ‘pulse-bout’ at Blue Gum Lake.	154
<b>Figure.5.5</b>	Spectrogram of the rhythmic pulse series or ‘ <i>Vibrato</i> ’ from the Second Phase of a male turtle from Masons Gardens.	154
<b>Figure.6.1.</b>	Number of calls in each sex/size class of turtles for each period of the day.	165
<b>Figure.6.2.</b>	Number of calls made in summer by male and female turtles from Blue Gum Lake.	167
<b>Figure.6.3</b>	Feeding aggregation at Blue Gum Lake around the NE shoreline, summer 2002.	170
<b>Figure.7.1.</b>	The below-ground channels used for playback of the turtle ‘pulse-bout’.	188
<b>Figure.7.2.</b>	Responses of turtles to playback of the ‘pulse-bout’ under artificial conditions in the below-ground channel.	189



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table.3.1.</b>	Summary of recording regime that was undertaken from February – March 2003 for the ambient sound recordings.	41
<b>Table.3.2.</b>	Summary table of the acoustic properties of the biological calls heard at Lake Leschenaultia, Glen Brook Dam and Blue Gum Lake, summer 2003.	46
<b>Table.3.3.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘tick, tick...’ call at Lake Leschenaultia.	48
<b>Table.3.4.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘tick, tick...’ caller at Glen Brook Dam.	48
<b>Table.3.5.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Cork on Glass’ calls at Blue Gum Lake.	49
<b>Table.3.6.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Cork on Glass’ caller at Glen Brook Dam.	50
<b>Table.3.7.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Ratchet’ call at Blue Gum Lake.	51
<b>Table.3.8.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Bird-like song’ at Lake Leschenaultia.	52
<b>Table.3.9.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Bird-like song’ call at Glen Brook Dam.	53
<b>Table.3.10.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Cork on Glass’ chorus, which includes continuous chorusing (C) as well as the dis continuous chorusing (d) and isolated calls (I).	54
<b>Table.3.11.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Cork on Glass’ chorus at Glen Brook Dam.	54
<b>Table.3.12.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘12 /6 kHz rattle’ call at Blue Gum Lake.	55
<b>Table.3.13.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘5.5 kHz rattle’ call at Blue Gum Lake.	56
<b>Table.3.14.</b>	Spatial and temporal calling patterns of the ‘Tinsel’ call at Blue Gum Lake.	57
<b>Table.3.15.</b>	Relation between wind speed and the sea or wetland surface state.	59
<b>Table.3.16.</b>	List of invertebrates found at Lake Leschenaultia, Glen Brook Dam and Blue Gum Lake.	67
<b>Table.4.1a.</b>	Summary of adult turtle vocalisations and their acoustic properties recorded from three populations.	94-96
<b>Table.4.1b.</b>	Summary of juvenile turtle vocalisations and their acoustic properties.	96
<b>Table.4.2.</b>	Classification of acoustic units.	97
<b>Table.4.3.</b>	Estimates of the cut-off frequencies calculated in the wetlands for summer and winter using two water depths available for calling activity.	129
<b>Table.5.1.</b>	Summary of sustained vocalisations and their acoustic properties.	147

<b>Table.5.2.</b>	Classification of units in the sustained turtle vocalisations.	148
<b>Table.6.1</b>	Size sex groupings of turtles from Pinweryning Dam used in diel calling patterns.	161
<b>Table.6.2.</b>	Size of male and female Blue Gum turtles used in summer diel calling patterns.	162
<b>Table.6.3.</b>	Recording regime for turtle temporal call patterns.	163
<b>Table.6.4.</b>	Number of ‘chirp’ calls made by turtles.	165
<b>Table.6.5.</b>	Average temperatures experienced by each turtle group in the temporal calling study.	166
<b>Table.6.6.</b>	Total number of calls in each ‘chirp’ category.	167

## LIST OF MAPS

<b>Map.2.1.</b>	Map of the Swan Coastal Plain showing distribution of wetlands and study sites.	19
<b>Map.2.2.</b>	Map showing expanded view of the urban study sites Blue Gum Lake, Piney Lake and Quenda Wetland which also shows their proximity to urban roads and the Leach Highway.	20
<b>Map.2.3.</b>	Map showing expanded view of the inland study sites: Glen Brook Dam and Lake Leschenaultia.	21
<b>Map.3.1.</b>	Macroinvertebrates found at Glen Brook Dam identified from sweeps taken at recording sites in weeks 2 & 3.	68
<b>Map.3.2.</b>	Macroinvertebrates found at Lake Leschenaultia identified from sweeps taken at recording sites in weeks 2 & 3 of recordings.	69
<b>Map.3.3.</b>	Macroinvertebrates found at Blue Gum Lake identified from sweeps taken at recording sites in weeks 2 & 3 at dawn and weeks 1 & 2 at midday, dusk and midnight.	70