

**Recruitment and age dynamics of *Anguilla australis*
and *A. reinhardtii* glass eels in the estuaries of
New South Wales**



Picture by C. Briand

Veronica Silberschneider
2005

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Environmental Sciences
University of Technology, Sydney

Certificate of Authorship

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that this thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of candidate

Acknowledgements

During my pursuit to collect glass eels for this thesis I have travelled approximately 60000 km. At times, the road seemed quite lonely but research is never a solo endeavour, as testament by the number of people I wish to thank for their assistance.

I would like to thank Dr David Booth for enabling me to undertake this research and for his advice and support. I would especially like to thank my co-supervisor Dr Bruce Pease for his continued guidance, for fostering my enthusiasm for glass eels and for his never-ending supply of theories to answer the mysteries of the eel. Also, the Australian Postgraduate Award provided financial support for this thesis and I would like to thank them for the opportunity of doing this research without the financial burden.

I also extend thanks to the staff and postgraduate students from the Department of Environmental Sciences at the University of Technology, Sydney for their assistance during my candidature, especially the core group of students in the marine laboratory for their camaraderie. I appreciate the way in which the staff of the Microstructural Analysis Unit (MAU), particularly Ric Wuhrer and Katie McBean, were forthcoming with their expertise and assistance.

Much of the work done for this thesis was done in association with NSW Fisheries and I would like to thank them for providing the facilities and support. Also, early work for this thesis was done in conjunction with the “Assessment of eastern Australian glass eel stocks and associated eel aquaculture (project no. 97/312)” study funded by the Fisheries Research and Development Corporation. Therefore, I would like to thank them for the opportunity to do this research.

Throughout the years of this research many people have provided advice, technical assistance and friendship. For those reasons, I would like to thank the members of the “Eel Team”, Darren Reynolds, Trudy Walford and Chris Walsh for assistance in the field, database management and expertise. I would also like to thank all the NSW Fisheries staff members, too numerous to name, who provided encouragement,

friendship and research assistance, especially those who helped me stay awake during the 24 hour experiments and who helped me “shake sheep”. I must make special mention of the wonderful NSW Fisheries librarians, Mrs Carolyn Bland and Kathy Bown, who’s ability to find even the most obscure reference, almost instantly, was invaluable. I also extend this gratitude to John Matthews for assisting in making the images seen in this thesis presentable.

My many field trips were made so much more enjoyable, and safe, by my Upper Lansdowne Family – Ruth, Peter, the girls and the pets. Meeting you was a gift and you will all share a special place in my heart. May our visits continue, albeit without going to the muddy banks of the Lansdowne River. I would also like to thank the landholders who allowed me to enter their properties every month to access my sampling sites.

Finally, yet most importantly, I would like to thank my family and friends for their continued support and understanding throughout the course of my study. I thank my parents who always encouraged me to further my studies and who always believed in my ability to accomplish my dreams. Lastly, to my wonderful husband John, thankyou for your support, encouragement, patience and inspiration, and for allowing me the freedom to fulfil a personal goal.

Table of contents

Certificate of Authorship	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of contents	v
List of Figures	viii
List of Tables	xi
Abstract	xiv
Chapter 1: General Introduction	1
1.1 <i>Life History of Anguilla</i>	1
1.2 <i>Importance and justification for study of eels</i>	4
1.3 <i>Eel research and management in New South Wales</i>	6
1.4 <i>Aims of this study</i>	7
1.5 <i>References</i>	8
Chapter 2: A novel artificial habitat collection device for studying resettlement patterns in anguillid glass eels	12
2.1 <i>Abstract</i>	12
2.2 <i>Introduction</i>	13
2.3 <i>Methods</i>	14
2.3.1 <i>Sampling Details</i>	14
2.3.2 <i>Experiment 1: Retention of glass eels in collectors</i>	15
2.3.3 <i>Experiment 2: Effects of collector area on glass eel catches</i>	16
2.3.4 <i>Experiment 3: Effect of collector tuft density on glass eel catches</i>	17
2.3.5 <i>Experiment 4: Effect of collector ageing on glass eel catches</i>	18
2.3.6 <i>Experiment 5: Diel patterns of glass eel resettlement and influence of collection interval on estimates of resettlement</i>	18
2.3.7 <i>Experiment 6: Abundance of glass eels in habitat collectors as an index of the relative abundance of glass eels moving through the estuary</i>	19
2.4 <i>Results</i>	19
2.4.1 <i>Glass eel samples</i>	19
2.4.2 <i>Experiment 1: Retention of glass eels in collectors</i>	20
2.4.3 <i>Experiment 2: Effects of collector area on glass eel catches</i>	20
2.4.4 <i>Experiment 3: Effect of collector tuft density on glass eel catches</i>	20
2.4.5 <i>Experiment 4: Effect of collector ageing on glass eel catches</i>	21
2.4.6 <i>Experiment 5: Diel pattern of glass eel resettlement and influence of collection interval on estimates of resettlement</i>	22
2.4.7 <i>Experiment 6: Abundance of glass eels in habitat collectors as an index of the relative abundance of glass eels at the sampling site</i>	25

2.5 Discussion	26
2.6 References	29
Chapter 3: Recruitment dynamics of <i>Anguilla australis</i> and <i>A. reinhardtii</i> glass eels in NSW	33
3.1 Abstract	33
3.2 Introduction.....	35
3.3 Methods.....	40
3.3.1 Site selection	40
3.3.2 Sampling Protocol.....	43
3.4 Results	46
3.4.1 Spatial recruitment patterns.....	46
3.4.2 Temporal recruitment patterns	51
3.4.3 Long term seasonal and inter-annual recruitment patterns at Audley.....	56
3.4.4 Changes in species composition with time	64
3.4.5 Condition (K)	67
3.4.6 Pigmentation	67
3.5 Discussion	76
3.5.1 Spatial and temporal recruitment patterns.....	76
3.5.2 Physical and morphological differences of glass eels.....	81
3.5.3 Changes in species composition with time	83
3.6 References	90
Chapter 4: Estuarine habitat preferences of <i>Anguilla australis</i> and <i>A. reinhardtii</i> glass eels as inferred from laboratory experiments	101
4.1 Abstract.....	101
4.2 Introduction.....	102
4.3 Methods.....	104
4.4 Results	108
4.5 Discussion	112
4.6 References	115
Chapter 5: Age structure of recruiting <i>Anguilla australis</i> and <i>A. reinhardtii</i> glass eels to New South Wales	120
5.1. Abstract	120
5.2. Introduction.....	121
5.3. Methods.....	126
5.3.1. Daily increment validation in the laboratory	126
5.3.2. Otolith preparation	127
5.4. Results	129
5.4.1. Daily increment validation.....	129
5.4.2. Otolith morphology and measurements	131

5.4.3. Spatial patterns in age	136
5.4.4. Temporal patterns in age.....	142
5.4.5. Relationship between total age and glass eel length, weight and pigmentation stage	144
5.4.6. Estimated hatch dates.....	147
5.5. <i>Discussion</i>	149
5.6. <i>References</i>	159
Chapter 6: General Discussion	167
6.1 <i>References</i>	174
Appendix 1	177

List of Figures

Fig. 1.1 – Life-cycle of Anguillid eels	3
Fig. 2.1 – Number of glass eels per tuft (log transformed) caught in full-size collectors (open circles) and half-size collectors (solid circles) with distance from the causeway drain. n = 6 collectors per treatment.	21
Fig. 2.2 – Average glass eel abundance using artificial habitat collectors sampled every three hours during the 24 hour period from A) 1730 hrs on 18/7/99 to 1730 hrs on 19/7/99 (mean + s.e., n = 3) and B) 1730 hrs on 22/7/99 to 1730 hrs on 23/7/99 (mean + s.e., n = 3).	23
Fig. 2.3: Average glass eel abundance using artificial habitat collectors sampled every three (black bars), six (white bars) and twelve hours (hatched bars) during the 24 hour period from A) 1730 hrs on 18/7/99 to 1730 hrs on 19/7/99 (mean + s.e., n = 3) and B) 1730 hrs on 22/7/99 to 1730 hrs on 23/7/99 (mean + s.e., n = 3).	24
Fig. 3.1 – Location of sampled estuaries in NSW. Delineation of each bioregion is shown by dashed line.	42
Fig. 3.2 – Catch per unit effort (CPUE) of newly arrived shortfin glass eels at each site. Filled circles indicate downstream temperature, open circles indicate upstream temperature.	48
Fig. 3.3 – CPUE of newly arrived longfin glass eels at each site. Filled circles indicate downstream temperature, open circles indicate upstream temperature.	50
Fig. 3.4 – Relationship between recruitment of newly arrived shortfins (filled circles) and newly arrived longfins (open circles) with sea surface temperature.	55
Fig. 3.5 – CPUE of newly arrived shortfin glass eels at Audley from 1998 – 2002. Filled circles indicate downstream temperature, open circles indicate upstream temperature.	58
Fig. 3.6 – CPUE of newly arrived longfin glass eels at Audley from 1998/99 – 2001/02. Filled circles indicate downstream temperature, open circles indicate upstream temperature.	60
Fig. 3.7 – Relationship between recruitment of newly arrived shortfins (filled circles) and newly arrived longfins (open circles) with sea surface temperature.	63
Fig. 3.8 – Percent change in species composition in catch at each site. Filled circles indicate shortfins, open circles indicate longfins. Where neither species is indicated, the catch was zero.	65
Fig. 3.9 – Percent change in species composition at Audley from 1998 - 2002. Filled circles indicate shortfins, open circles indicate longfins. Where neither species is indicated, the catch was zero.	66
Fig. 3.10 – Sea surface temperature diagram for 28/11/00. Modified from diagram downloaded from www.aodc.gov.au	88
Fig. 3.11a – Sea surface temperature diagram for 19/6/01. Modified from diagram downloaded from www.aodc.gov.au	88
Fig. 3.11b – Sea surface temperature diagram for 17/7/01. Modified from diagram downloaded from www.aodc.gov.au	89
Fig. 4.1 - Diagram of a modified tank used in laboratory habitat preference experiments.	106
Fig. 5.1 – Environmental Scanning Electron Microscope (ESEM) image of the primordium (P), core (C) and part of the leptocephalus growth zone (LGZ). .	123

Fig. 5.2 – Whole otolith showing leptocephalus growth zone (LGZ) and post-metamorphic growth zone (PMGZ).....	123
Fig. 5.3 – Glass eel otolith stained with alizarin complexone (AC), as seen by fluorescent ring, and overlaid with the ESEM image of the same otolith. Note that the dark check mark on the ESEM image corresponds to the fluorescent mark.	130
Fig. 5.4 – Relationship between experimental period and the number of increments counted distal to the AC mark. Line indicates equal increment counts and experimental days.....	130
Fig. 5.5 – A) Shows a composite of ESEM images of an <i>A. reinhardtii</i> otolith’s LGZ (144 increments counted) taken at 5000x magnification. B) Shows an ESEM image of the same glass eel’s PMGZ (48 increments counted) taken at 3500x magnification. Arrow indicates end of LGZ in both images.	133
Fig. 5.6 – Comparison of shortfin A) otolith radii, B) LGZ and C) PMGZ with the number of increments counted in each region. n = 20 for each comparison. .	134
Fig. 5.7 – Comparison of longfin A) otolith radii, B) LGZ and C) PMGZ with the number of increments counted in each region. n = 25 for each comparison. ..	135
Fig. 5.8 – Distance between each increment in the otoliths of shortfins at each site. Increment series for each eel is indicated by a separate line. n = 5 for each site.	140
Fig. 5.9 – Distance between each increment in the otoliths of longfins at each site. Increment series for each eel is indicated by a separate line. n = 5 for each site.	141
Fig. 5.10 – Total age of shortfins related to glass eel A) length, B) weight and C) pigmentation stage. n = 25 for each comparison.	145
Fig. 5.11 – Total age of longfins compared to glass eel A) length, B) weight and C) pigmentation stage. n = 40 for each comparison.	146
Fig. A1a – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Tweed R. sample, * indicates months of peak recruitment.	178
Fig. A1b – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Lansdowne R. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	179
Fig. A1c – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Audley sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	180
Fig. A1d – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Mullet Ck. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	181
Fig. A1e – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Croobyar Ck. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	182
Fig. A1f – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Boggy Ck. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	183
Fig. A1g – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Tweed R. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	184

Fig. A1h – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Lansdowne R. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	185
Fig. A1i – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Audley sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	186
Fig. A1j – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Mullet Ck. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	187
Fig. A1k – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Croobyar Ck. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	188
Fig. A1l – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Boggy Ck. sample. * indicates months of peak recruitment.	189
Fig. A1m – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Audley sample over 5 years.....	190
Fig. A1m continued – Proportion of pigmentation development of shortfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Audley sample over 5 years.....	191
Fig. A1n – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Audley sample over 4 years.....	192
Fig. A1n continued – Proportion of pigmentation development of longfins, according to Ege (1939), in each monthly Audley sample over 4 years.	193

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Species composition of glass eels caught in each experiment.....	20
Table 2.2: Spatial distribution of glass eels in each collector, numbered one to 10, in Experiment 1 from the causeway drain to the estuary bank	20
Table 3.1 – Structural details of barriers where glass eels were sampled.....	41
Table 3.2 – Total number of newly arrived (n) and previously arrived (p) shortfin glass eels collected at each site and time. na = not sampled.....	47
Table 3.3 – Total number of newly arrived (n) and previously arrived (p) longfin glass eels collected at each site and time. na = not sampled.....	49
Table 3.4 – Relative abundance of longfins at each site from November 2000 – October 2001.....	51
Table 3.5 – Relationship between newly arrived shortfins and sea surface temperature (SST), downstream temperature (DT) and the difference between these two parameters (SST-DT) at each site. Correlation coefficients (r) are shown with significant correlations shown in bold.....	53
Table 3.6 – Relationship between newly arrived longfins and sea surface temperature (SST), downstream temperature (DT) and the difference between these two parameters (SST-DT) at each site. Correlation coefficients (r) are shown with significant correlations shown in bold.....	54
Table 3.7 – Total number of newly arrived (n) and previously arrived (p) shortfin glass eels collected at Audley from 1998 – 2002. na = not sampled.....	56
Table 3.8 – Total number of newly arrived (n) and previously arrived (p) longfin glass eels collected at Audley from 1998 – 2002. na = not sampled.....	59
Table 3.9 – Relative abundance of longfins at each site from November 2000 – October 2001.....	59
Table 3.10 – Relationship between newly arrived shortfins and sea surface temperature (SST), downstream temperature (DT) and the difference between these two parameters (SST-DT) at Audley. Correlation coefficients (r) are shown and significant correlations are shown in bold.....	61
Table 3.11 – Relationship between newly arrived longfins and sea surface temperature (SST), downstream temperature (DT) and the difference between these two parameters (SST-DT) at Audley. Correlation coefficients (r) are shown and significant correlations are shown in bold.....	62
Table 3.12 - ANOSIM pairwise tests for shortfins showing months where there were significant differences in pigmentation frequencies between sites, as indicated by the pairwise R values.....	69
Table 3.13 - SIMPER analyses showing pigmentation stages of shortfins that contributed most to the dissimilarity in pigmentation frequencies between sites that were significantly different from each other. T = Tweed R., L = Lansdowne R., A = Audley, M = Mullet Ck., C = Croobyar Ck., B = Boggy Ck. Ege (1936) pigmentation stages are listed with the percent contribution that each stage contributed to the dissimilarity appearing in parentheses.....	69
Table 3.13 continued - SIMPER analyses showing pigmentation stages of shortfins that contributed most to the dissimilarity in pigmentation frequencies between sites that were significantly different from each other. T = Tweed R., L = Lansdowne R., A = Audley, M = Mullet Ck., C = Croobyar Ck., B = Boggy Ck. Ege (1936) pigmentation stages are listed with the percent contribution that each stage contributed to the dissimilarity appearing in parentheses.....	70

Table 3.14 - ANOSIM pairwise tests for longfins showing months where there were significant differences in pigmentation frequencies between sites, as indicated by the pairwise R values.	71
Table 3.15 - SIMPER analyses showing pigmentation stages of longfins that contributed most to the dissimilarity in pigmentation frequencies between sites that were significantly different from each other. T = Tweed R., L = Lansdowne R., A = Audley, M = Mullet Ck., C = Croobyar Ck., B = Boggy Ck. Ege (1936) pigmentation stages are listed with the percent contribution that each stage contributed to the dissimilarity appearing in parentheses.....	71
Table 3.15 continued - SIMPER analyses showing pigmentation stages of longfins that contributed most to the dissimilarity in pigmentation frequencies between sites that were significantly different from each other. T = Tweed R., L = Lansdowne R., A = Audley, M = Mullet Ck., C = Croobyar Ck., B = Boggy Ck. Ege (1936) pigmentation stages are listed with the percent contribution that each stage contributed to the dissimilarity appearing in parentheses.....	72
Table 3.15 continued - SIMPER analyses showing pigmentation stages of longfins that contributed most to the dissimilarity in pigmentation frequencies between sites that were significantly different from each other. T = Tweed R., L = Lansdowne R., A = Audley, M = Mullet Ck., C = Croobyar Ck., B = Boggy Ck. Ege (1936) pigmentation stages are listed with the percent contribution that each stage contributed to the dissimilarity appearing in parentheses.....	73
Table 3.16 - ANOSIM pairwise tests for shortfins and longfins at Audley showing months where there were significant differences in pigmentation frequencies between months, as indicated by the pairwise R values, and results of SIMPER analyses showing pigmentation stages that contributed most to the dissimilarity in pigmentation frequencies between months. Shortfins table - A = April, M = May, J = June, Jy = July, Au = August, S = September; Longfins table - Ja = January, F = February, Mh = March, A = April, M = May. Ege (1936) pigmentation stages are listed with the percent contribution that each stage contributed to the dissimilarity appearing in parentheses.....	75
Table 3.17 – Summary of recruitment timing for shortfin and longfin glass eels in eastern Australian states. Bars indicate month when at least one eel was caught. Shortfins depicted by white bars, longfins depicted by shaded bars.....	76
Table 4.1 – Layout of habitats in each experiment for (a) shortfin and (b) longfin glass eels where S = sand, SG = seagrass, RC = rocks/cobbles and M = mud. Note that tanks are circular so that habitats in sections 1 and 4 are adjacent. .	106
Table 4.2 Numbers of (a) shortfin and (b) longfin glass eels collected from each habitat type after each experiment.	110
Table 4.3. Comparisons of mean number of eels per habitat type and tests of significance from ANOVA (Latin square) and Duncan’s tests for habitat preferences of shortfin and longfin glass eels in Experiments 1 & 2 when tested in tanks. Significant differences between habitats are indicated in bold. A, B, C indicates Duncan’s test groupings of significantly different means of glass eels between habitat types.	111
Table 5.1 – Otolith diameter, radius, leptocephalus growth zone (LGZ) and post-metamorphic growth zones (PMGZ) at 4 and 5 sites for shortfins and longfins, respectively, with results of ANOVA included. Latitude and longitude of each site is in parentheses. Power < 0.2 for each ANOVA.....	132

Table 5.2 – Shortfin total age, LGZ and PMGZ increment counts at each site with results of ANOVA included. p values in bold show a significant difference. For each comparison, means with a different superscript letter were found to be significantly different from each other.....	137
Table 5.3 – Longfin total age, LGZ and PMGZ increment counts at each site with results of ANOVA included. Power < 0.2 for each ANOVA.....	138
Table 5.4 – Comparison of shortfin total age, LGZ age and PMGZ age at Audley between years, with results of ANOVA included. p values in bold show a significant difference. Means with a different superscript letter, within the same variable, were found to be significantly different from each other. Power < 0.3 for LGZ ANOVA.....	143
Table 5.5 – Comparison of longfin total age, LGZ age and PMGZ age at Audley between years, with results of ANOVA included. Power < 0.2 for each ANOVA.....	143
Table 5.6 – Comparison of longfin total age, LGZ age and PMGZ age at Audley between months in 1999, with results of ANOVA included. Power < 0.3 for each ANOVA.....	144
Table 5.7 – Spatial comparison of estimated hatch times, for each species caught in 2001, based on total ages. Latitude and longitude of each site is in parentheses. S = shortfins, L = longfins. Bars indicate hatch date range. Shortfins depicted by white bars, longfins depicted by shaded bars.....	147
Table 5.8 – Temporal comparison of estimated hatch dates, for each species caught at Audley, based on total ages. S = shortfins, L = longfins. Bars indicate estimated hatch date range. Shortfins depicted by white bars, longfins depicted by shaded bars.....	148

Abstract

Shortfin eels (*Anguilla australis*) and longfin eels (*A. reinhardtii*) are true freshwater eels of the genus *Anguilla*. There are many mysteries still unsolved for the freshwater eel lifecycle, such as location of the spawning grounds, conditions that promote metamorphosis from the leptocephalid to glass eel phase, and the mechanisms that affect glass eel recruitment. In Australia, little is also known about the estuarine habitats of glass eels as they migrate towards freshwater, and the age at which these eels enter estuaries. Both species are of commercial importance in the estuary fishery where they are caught in eel traps for export. There is also a small, but potentially lucrative, aquaculture industry for ongrowing glass eels to market demand size. This thesis investigates the spatial and temporal recruitment of both species of glass eels to estuaries within NSW, the habitats that may be of importance to them as they continue their upstream migration, and the age at which these eels entered the estuaries.

Firstly, a new sampling device needed to be developed since conventional methods to catch glass eels often required constant observation of gear, multiple operators, specific physical site characteristics, and/or were expensive. The artificial habitat collectors that were developed were then used to sample six estuaries in NSW monthly within one week of the new moon. Shortfins showed a more consistent and defined recruitment across all sites than longfins, where the peak shortfin recruitment season was from April – August. Longfins recruited primarily from January – May but often recruited outside of this period. Five year collections at one of these sites provided important recruitment information. It appeared that longfins failed to recruit to this site during 2000/01, which could affect commercial catches of this species when they enter the fishery. The East Australian Current (EAC) probably transports glass eels from spawning sites in the Coral Sea southward to the east coast of Australia but there was no predicted lag time in the recruitment of eels from northern to southern estuaries. Therefore, it was not possible to predict the timing of recruitment of glass eels in one estuary based on the timing of recruitment in another more northern estuary.

When glass eels enter estuaries their upstream migration is assisted by the night flood tide. During the ebb tide, glass eels burrow into the substrate and resurface at the next night flood tide. The eels do not select particular habitats at this time, rather, their location is dictated by the tide. However, once glass eels reach the estuarine/freshwater interface, they may prefer more complex habitats such as seagrass/macrophytes or rocks/cobbles in which to hide during the day. At this interface, glass eels undergo a physiological change to adapt to a freshwater existence and this change may take up to a few weeks. During this time, glass eels commonly enter the water column during the night flood tide and may be able to locate more suitable habitats in which to hide during the day.

The ages of shortfin and longfin glass eels caught in estuaries were examined both spatially and temporally. As the EAC travels north to south, glass eels recruiting to the southern sites were expected to be older. However, shortfins that recruited to the northern-most site in this thesis were older than at all other sites while there was no difference in the ages of longfins. Also, when the ages of longfins that recruited during the main recruitment period were compared to the ages of longfins that recruited outside of this period, there was no difference in ages. Therefore, the hypothesis that these later recruiting eels may have been caught in an eddy prior to their estuarine arrival has been disproved. The ages of shortfins that recruited in two separate years were significantly different from each other and may be due to shortfins' ability to detrain more easily from the weaker currents that exist at these recruitment periods. Conversely, there was no difference in the ages of longfins that recruited in the same month during three separate years. The estimated hatch dates for shortfins was estimated at October to January, while for longfins, estimated hatch time was July to September for eels that recruited during the peak recruitment period. For longfins that recruited outside of the main recruitment period, estimated hatch times were from December to February. It is unknown, however, whether longfins have an extended spawning period, or whether silver eels arrived at the spawning grounds later and thus produced later arriving longfins. Continuous monitoring of glass eel recruitment to estuaries is necessary to determine whether there are long term declines in the recruitment of Australian eels similar to the declines recently observed for eels in Europe and Asia.