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- Electrical Guidance System (EGS)
- Flow Velocity Enhancement System (FVES)
Large Flume Testing with EGS and FVES

Test Facility Design

- Upstream isolation screen (19-mm mesh)
- Temporary wall
- Acclimation pen (1.8 m L x 1.2 m W) location for blocks 1 and 2
- EGS Electrode (typ) Downstream isolation screen (19-mm mesh)
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Experimental Design

- Test Conditions: EGS, FVES, combined stimuli, control
- 5 replicate trials conducted with each condition; 30 eels per trial
- 2-hr trial duration
- Track each eel with 3D acoustic telemetry system
- Record number of eels downstream of stimulus field, in bypass collection bin, and that remain upstream.
# Test Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Trials</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Flume Water Temp Range ($^\circ$C)</th>
<th>Acclimation Pen Location</th>
<th>Number of Electrodes</th>
<th>Electrode Position for Control/FVES Trials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/13-14</td>
<td>13.9 - 14.2</td>
<td>mid/wall</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>above water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/15-16</td>
<td>15.6 - 16.7</td>
<td>mid/wall</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>above water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/23-24</td>
<td>15.6 - 16.0</td>
<td>upstream/center</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>above water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/27-28</td>
<td>14.7 - 15.1</td>
<td>upstream/center</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>above water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10/29-30</td>
<td>15.3 - 15.9</td>
<td>upstream/center</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>above water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (C)</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>10.2 - 10.3</td>
<td>upstream/center</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>in water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calculation of Eel Movement and Direction

- The position where an eel first entered a stimulus zone of coverage was determined.

- For intervals of 5, 10, 20, 60, 300, and 600 seconds, the last observation of each time period was established.

- Using the first and last positions observed, differences were computed for x, y, and z coordinates and time.

- Direction was computed as an angle in the x-y plane and speed was calculated as the Euclidean distance in three dimensions between the first and last position divided by the difference in time.
Results

- Recollection Bin Data (insufficient for determining avoidance/guidance)
- 1-hr Density Plots
- 10-min Density Plots
- Eel Track Examples
- Analysis of Eel Direction and Speed after Stimulus Encounter
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Analysis of Eel Movement
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Analysis of Eel Movement

*Stimulus Treatments vs. Controls*

- Few statistical differences in mean direction and directional distribution between stimulus and control trials for any of the time intervals evaluated (5 – 600 seconds).

- Eel movement direction for each stimulus and control trials was typically non-uniform and in the downstream direction, particularly after the acclimation pen was moved upstream.

- Analysis of control data with and without electrodes in water indicated physical presence of electrodes initially influenced eel behavior but this effect was not evident after 60 seconds.
Summary and Conclusions

- Recollection data (i.e., proportion of fish removed from each bin) could not be used to calculate guidance efficiency.
- 1-hr eel tracking density plots indicated differences in eel distributions between blocks with different test facility configurations.
- 10-min density plots did not demonstrate any consistent differences in eel distributions between treatment and control trials.
- Statistical analysis of eel movements (speed and direction) did not demonstrate any consistent differences between treatment and control trials.
- There appeared to be an initial avoidance reaction of eels to the physical presence of the electrodes during control trials when they were suspended in the water.
- Supplemental analyses of tracking data being considered to further explore potential avoidance and guidance responses to each stimulus.
- In hindsight, several changes could be made to study methods and test facility design to improve ability to detect behavioral responses.