High Frequency Side Scan Sonar Fish Reconnaissance by Autonomous Underwater Vehicles

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2015-0301.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	15-Apr-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Grothues, Thomas; Rutgers University, Marine and Coastal Sciences Newhall, Arthur; Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering Dept. Lynch, James; Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering Dept. Vogel, Kaela; University of North Carolina Wilmington, Department of Marine Biology Gawarkiewicz, Glen; Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering Dept.
Keyword:	SURVEYS < General, ACOUSTIC EQUIPMENT < General, SAMPLING < General, REMOTE SENSING < General, PELAGIC FISH < General
Note: The following files were submitted by the author for peer review, but cannot be converted to PDF. You must view these files (e.g. movies) online.	
bluefish_lineup.wmv tiger_shark_follow.wmv blue_runners_clip.wmv little_tunny_Sept11.mp4 GOPR01602_amberjack.mp4 GOPR01602_barracuda.mp4	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1 High Frequency Side Scan Sonar Fish Reconnaissance by Autonomous Underwater Vehicles

2

3 Thomas M. Grothues

4 Rutgers University Marine Field Station, 800 c/o 132 Great Bay Blvd., Tuckerton, NJ 08087

5

6 Arthur E. Newhall

7 Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering Dept.

8 266 Woods Hole Rd., MS# 11, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1050

9

10 James F. Lynch

11 Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Applied Ocean Physics and Engineering Dept.

12 266 Woods Hole Rd., MS# 11, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1050

13

14 Kaela S. Vogel

15 Department of Marine Biology, University of North Carolina Wilmington, Wilmington, NC 28701,

16 Currently: University of California Davis, Department of Mathematics, One Shields Ave., Davis CA,

17 95616

18

19 Glen G. Gawarkiewicz

20 Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Physical Oceanography Dept.

21 266 Woods Hole Rd., MS# 21, Woods Hole, MA 02543-1050

22

23 Running Title: Fish reconnaissance by autonomous underwater vehicles

24 Abstract

25 A dichotomy between depth penetration and resolution as a function of sonar frequency, draw
26 resolution, and beam spread challenges fish target classification from sonar. Moving high frequency
27 sources to depth using autonomous underwater vehicles (AUVs) mitigates this and also co-locates
28 transducers with other AUV-mounted short-range sensors to allow a holistic approach to ecological
29 surveys. This widely available tool with a pedigree for bottom mapping is not commonly applied to
30 fish reconnaissance and requires the development of an interpretation of pelagic reflective features, re-
31 visitation of count methods, image-processing rather than wave-form recognition for automation, and
32 an understanding of bias. In a series of AUV mission test cases, side scan sonar (600 and 900 kHz)
33 returns often resolved individual school members, spacing, size, behavior, and (infrequently) species
34 from anatomical features and could be intuitively classified by ecologists - but also produced artifacts.
35 Fish often followed the AUV and thus were videographed, but in doing so removed themselves from
36 the sonar aperture. AUV-supported high frequency side scan holds particular promise for survey of
37 scarce large species or for synergistic investigation of predators and their prey because the spatial scale
38 of observations may be similar to those of predators.

39

40 CJFAS Keywords: Survey, Acoustics Equipment, Sampling, Remote Sensing, Pelagic Fishes

41 Other Keywords: fish, side scan sonar, autonomous underwater vehicle, imaging

42 Introduction

43

44 Since the discovery of the dynamic deep scattering layer in the 1940s, sonar has developed as the
45 primary tool for remote sensing of marine biomass. Fish reconnaissance has developed since then as
46 both a science and a commercial application to include split beam, spread spectrum (CHIRP),
47 multibeam, imaging, and side scan sonar (SSS) transducers (Hewitt et al. 1976, Farmer et al. 1999,
48 Makris et al. 2006, Boswell et al. 2008, Pena et al. 2014). Continued development is supported by a
49 lexicon for characterizing acoustic backscatter from fishes (Kalikhaman and Yudanov 2006), but
50 classification and enumeration remain a challenge (Demer et al. 2009). Interpretation of reflected low
51 frequency sonar (LFS, here referring to ~40 to 200 kHz) commonly used in fish finder applications is
52 based primarily on quantification of echo strength and resonance relative to the impulse (Nakken and
53 Olsen 1977, Kieser et al. 1993, Bertrand et al. 1999, Sunardi et al. 2008). Low frequency (LF), long
54 wavelength waves echo off proportionately smaller objects as non-intuitive Rayleigh scatter and this is
55 sensitive to the fish's tissue density, the presence or absence of gas bladders and their shape,
56 musculature, recent depth "history", polarity and orientation within a school, gut fullness, orientation to
57 the sonar source, and the number and distribution of individuals within a school (see review by
58 Kalikhaman and Yudanov, 2006, and numerous papers in a special symposium publication, see Demer
59 et al. 2009). The resolution of LF is further constrained to rendering of the reflection on a limited pixel
60 field so that, especially over long ranges, schools rather than individual fish or their features are
61 rendered as an object, especially since scattering organisms include species with solitary, aggregating,
62 or schooling habits, and can range three orders of magnitude in individual body length from cm to m
63 scale (Pena et al. 2014). Over long distances, the beam also spreads, decreasing resolution. The issue of
64 wavelength versus animal size in sonar scatter is well recognized, since lower frequencies have been

necessary to penetrate ocean depths below a surface survey vessel. Thus, investigation of scatter from low frequency sonar remains an important topic of research.

Complementary to further development of LFS is the application of high frequency sonar (HFS, 500 - 1000 kHz) by sinking the HF transducers to the depth of interest either on tow cables or mounted on autonomous underwater vehicles (AUVs). HFS, and especially high frequency side scan sonar (HFSSS) produces imagery that is intuitive in the lateral two-dimensional field, and this can include imagery of animals in the water column (O'Driscoll 1997, Grothues et al. 2009, Holliday et al. 2009). (Wavelengths of size similar or smaller than the target fish echo as Geometric scatter to produce an echogram with features of the target's shape and size.) The application and capability of HFSSS has been greatly increased in recent years, but primarily for the use of bottom imaging to detail benthic habitat features rather than fish themselves (e.g. Able et al. 1987, Bell et al. 2006). HFSSS is also frequently mounted on AUVs for military, geological, and anthropological tasks (Hibbert 1997, Hagen et al. 2003, Chapple 2009). While single and multibeam up and down-looking LFS (Fernandes et al. 2000, Trenkel et al. 2009, Scalabrin et al. 2009), and even cameras (e.g. Tolimieri et al. 2008, Smale et al. 2012, Seiler et al. 2012) have been deployed on AUVs specifically for fisheries applications, HFSSS use on AUVs is still largely unexploited for fish reconnaissance, perhaps owing to its pedigree as a tool for imaging bottom bedforms. In fact, water column targets are typically removed when producing side scan "mosaics" that stitch individual image files into bottom feature maps.

The goal of this paper is to describe fish data from pelagic HFSSS on AUVs, accounting for differences from common near-surface vessel-mounted or towed applications. The specific motivation for the use of two (600 and 900 kHz) HFSSS systems discussed in this paper was to employ their imagery for: 1) mapping bathymetry and bedforms in an experimental area to aid in modeling propagation along lower frequency (0.7 to 2 kHz range) acoustic paths (Newhall et al. 2016), and 2) to provide meter-scale

90 information on the distribution of fish and other biota for acoustic scattering experiments. This paper
91 focuses on the second of these motivations, although the AUVs used were built for tasks like the first.
92 Basic HFSSS units are a commercial, off-the-shelf (COTS) technology that many AUV owners have
93 incorporated into their vehicles. They are relatively inexpensive, and simple to use for bottom mapping.
94 It is also well known that such systems see objects in the water column such as fish; since this data is
95 available, even if it is not optimized for fish detection and imaging, it can and should be used to
96 augment other means of examining fish. Currently there is no common practice for deploying,
97 interpreting, and communicating results of HFSSS on AUVs for fish, especially in the deep water
98 column for pelagic species where this presents special opportunities. In particular, we address four
99 broad themes including benefits and constraints. These are:

100

101 1) The co-location of sonar with other short-range sensors (hydrographic, photographic) allows holistic
102 ecological surveys.

103

104 2) Interpretation of these surveys requires the development of a standard and wider recognition for
105 reflective features and understanding of distortion specific to HFSSS in the water column, especially as
106 this can then be automated through image-processing rather than wave-form processing.

107

108 3) The use of transect methods to count fish is appropriate, but requires review of the statistical
109 methods applied to those from other platforms as well as new empirical studies to account for the
110 mechanics and biases of HFSSS on an AUV platform.

111

112 4) The relationship between the AUV and fish behavior must be further investigated.

113

Here, we discuss these issues with data from several AUV missions in coastal and continental slope habitats.

Materials and Methods

Sonar returns discussed here are primarily from six AUV missions, some conducted specifically for sonar fish reconnaissance, but examples of features from other missions are also shown in order to illustrate specific points. All missions utilized REMUS-100 model (Hydroid, Inc. Pocasset, MA) vehicles from Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution or Rutgers University. The base REMUS-100 AUV is a 1.6 m long x 0.19 diameter torpedo-shaped vehicle driven to speeds of up to 5 knots by a single stern propeller. Although specifications differed among these vehicles based on their specialized sensor packages, all supported a two-channel (port and starboard) Marine Sonics Technology (White Marsh, Virginia) side scan sonar system operating at either 600 or 900 kHz, a YSI conductivity-temperature sensor (CT, Yellow Springs Instruments, Ohio) reporting every second, and two (upward and downward looking) Workhorse 1200 kHz acoustic current Doppler profilers (ADCP, Teledyne RD Instruments, Poway, California). The Rutgers AUV also hosted colored dissolved organic matter (CDOM), chlorophyll-a (both Wet Labs, Inc., Philomath, OR), and dissolved oxygen (Aanderaa Analytic Instruments, Bergen, Norway) optical sensors. During several of the missions discussed, these vehicles also supported GoPro Hero® high definition (HD) video cameras. Missions last up to 10 h.

Reconnaissance missions over the continental shelf of North Carolina were conducted in 2011 and 2012 primarily to locate and identify fish targets to study the scatter and attenuation of low frequency sound (Newhall et al. 2016). In 2011, three consecutive missions across the shelf emulated a single long transect at a depth of 15-20 m, with an additional partial leg beyond the shelf break following the

138 contour to 80 m, but returning at the 20 m level to finish the transect. Only the upper layer of the
 139 transect is analyzed here. In 2012, passive hydrophones were moored in vertical stationary arrays, and a
 140 moving low frequency source (also AUV-mounted) navigated through the study area. Low frequency
 141 (0.7 – 2 kHz) scatter and attenuation was characterized by calculating the difference between the
 142 (relatively) un-attenuated signal and that which was recorded by the passive hydrophone array on the
 143 other side of or oblique to fish. This required knowledge of the distribution, identification, number,
 144 size, and orientation of potential target fish, which was provided by HFSSS from the three AUVs
 145 navigating similar paths at different depths, and was complemented by cameras (Newhall et al. 2016).
 146 Other missions discussed here were pilots in preparation for that work, or were tasked with tracking
 147 fish implanted with acoustic tags for which the LFSSS and other sensors provide complementary data
 148 (e.g. Grothues et al. 2009, 2010, Coleman 2015), including unpublished results from missions in the
 149 Gulf of Mexico and over the Hudson Canyon off New Jersey.

150

151 Sonar imaging

152 Echoes from the AUV's HFSSS are mapped to a pallet of 512 pixels cross-track (see Table 1 for
 153 specifications). Echoes may come from many directions in a disk-like configuration (or at least a lobed
 154 approximation of such) normal to the vehicle's path, including from above the vehicle, so that a
 155 cylinder (or approximately so) is imaged as the AUV moves forward (Figure 2). However, if the sea
 156 bottom intersects this cylinder as a plane because of a low altitude-above-sea-bottom mission, the
 157 imaged volume is reduced. Further, objects in the water column may be masked from bottom or surface
 158 returns because the image is not vertically explicit as it is for split beam or multibeam sonar
 159 (Trevorrow 2001). The downward looking form of a broad or lobed fan beam is approximated only
 160 when the source is near the surface so that only the lower half or less of a horizontal cylinder is imaged
 161 (Figure 2). Because the pixel number is set, constraining accepted backscatter recording to a shorter
 162 delay (and therefore distance) provides higher pixel density for a given area. The re-interpretation of

HFSSS applied from an AUV well below the surface and well above the bottom is an important consideration of this paper and is reviewed in the Results section below.

Data Analysis and Automated Processing

HFSSS returns were reviewed first by eye in the “waterfall” mode of the host software (SS-Review PC, Marine Sonics Inc.), which represents sections of continuous records as “tiles” of two-dimensional images with the x-axis as the cross-field range and the y-axis as elapsed time (60 s) approximating distance (typically 130 m due to the commonly used 1.8 m/s AUV speed) along the mission path (transect). The images were not stitched together into mosaics for review and the water column was not removed. Reviewers marked the location of likely fish targets with a unique identifier and noted their latitude, longitude, and time stamp (to the second). In the case of large fish targets, they also noted the length of the target image, and in the case of fish schools, the area occupied by the visible part of the school. Targets were classified based on characteristics of size, shape, number, spacing, and within-group orientation. Artifacts that could lead to misinterpretation of HFSSS data were also identified.

The time stamps of targets were matched with the time stamped data of the AUV’s navigational and sensor data stream so that the target could be not only geo-referenced but resolved into multivariate environmental space of temperature, salinity, and depth (and potentially also dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll-a, and chromatic dissolved organic matter as available from the particular vehicle’s sensors). Likewise, video was reviewed and targets identified and their timestamp matched with that of the AUV’s navigational and sensor data (including the HFSSS). Video was compared to the image made by the sonar and the lag between likely sonar contacts and video contacts was calculated. The relationship between that lag time and the distance of fish from the AUV during sonar contact was identified and recorded.

187

188 As a demonstration of automated processing, a script was developed to find rays (Order Rajiformes)
189 swimming in the water column. Rays are a diverse group of fishes that are distinctive in shape and
190 typically large and sparsely distributed and so are appropriate for a proof of concept for such a
191 technique. The script a) sequentially loaded and read all image files in a directory, each containing a
192 time- and georeferenced section of the data from a mission, b) converted each to a black and white
193 binary image file, c) detected edges (abrupt changes in pixel value in only one of the two dimensions)
194 to segment the image into objects d) measured the potential object shape using an Object Area
195 Distribution and Symmetry Algorithm (OADaSA) Detection and Segmentation process. The scoring of
196 objects based on their symmetry distinguished objects of interest from amorphous segmentation
197 artifacts created during the process of isolating the fish from the background. OADaSA converts an
198 object represented by a set of perimeter points to an object represented by two sets of orthogonal area
199 slices referenced by position along the object's major axis (Figure 3). Area values for each half of the
200 object were then queried for the cumulative distribution/ area balance point, quantitative bilateral
201 symmetry, and percent of total area on each side of the major axis. Identified image objects were
202 scored on the basis of a symmetry rating and grouped into "fish school" and "ray" classes. Fish schools
203 were discriminated from lone fish by using an unsupervised classification algorithm, DBSCAN
204 (Density Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise) which can discover clusters of arbitrary
205 shape (Ester et al. 1996). Image segmentation was accomplished using the basic MATLAB
206 (MathWorks, Inc.) Image Processing Toolbox along with a 2D MATLAB implementation of level set
207 methods (Sumengen 2005; an in-depth treatment can be found in Osher and Fedkiw 2003). These
208 algorithms are treated in the medical imaging (Kockara et al. 2010; Zhang et al. 2008) and machine
209 learning (Chan and Vese 2001) literature, including application HFSSS data (Lianantonakis and Petillot
210 2005), and are not detailed further here.

211

212

213 Statistical Considerations

214 Statistical considerations are those that affect the confidence of counting fish and associating them to
215 their environment through an understanding of probability and error sources. These include knowledge
216 of the water volume being effectively sensed, the behavior of fish in response to the AUV that either
217 increases or decreases the probability of their detection (either at all or multiple times including effects
218 of avoidance, attraction, or schooling), classification, and mapping. A body of literature has explored
219 use of different formulae for quantifying organisms in transect sample designs, including algorithms
220 that recognize decreasing probability of detection with distance from the observer, or as a function of
221 angle from the observer, or of the reaction of the observed individuals. As an example for discussion,
222 we use a simple graphical representation of the distribution of different fish classes relative to water
223 characteristics. For common classes of these discrete target objects, we calculated a smoothed estimator
224 of distribution as a probability density function (PDF, kernel method following Worton 1989).
225 Estimates were centered and unit-variance standardized and related to each other through correlation
226 analysis. These were post-hoc and not tested as regression analysis of specific hypotheses, which is
227 beyond the focus of this paper.

228

229 Results

230

231 A number of image features were intuitively characterized as fish and other animals, including single large
232 but well-defined rays and large and small fish groups. These were resolved into one of six major
233 categories; “rays”, “large singletons”, “loose schools”, “bait balls”, “patrols”, and “followers” (Figure
234 4). The ray class included members of the whiptail rays (Fam. Dasyatidae, commonly “sting rays”)
235 with thin tails and most of the pelvic fins encompassed by the perimeter of the pectoral fin “disk”, a

236 manta ray (*Manta birostris*, Fam. Mobulidae), with diagnostic cephalic fins well resolved and separated
237 from devil ray (*Mobula hypostoma*), on the basis of size and tail/body ratio) (Figure 4A, top row), and
238 an example of what is likely an Atlantic guitarfish (*Rhinobatos lentiginosus*, the only local member of
239 Fam. Rhinobatidae) but possibly an Atlantic angel shark (*Squatina dumeril*), both of which have
240 similar elongate outlines with separated pectoral and pelvic fins and a fleshy caudal peduncle. “Patrol”
241 referred to highly organized structures, either single or double lines of similar-sized members with even
242 spacing, or sometimes in a “v” shape (reminiscent of flying geese flocks) (Figure 4 A, middle rows).
243 This organization is frequently seen in areal imagery in socially foraging predatory fish such as tuna.
244 These were sometimes imaged in proximity to bait balls. “Followers” referred to fish that paced the
245 AUV abeam so that they stayed within HFSSS aperture to return long sinuous object features from
246 many meters to as much as a km in length (Figure 4, middle and bottom rows). This behavior is
247 described further below. “Bait ball” designated a tightly packed school of fish, with members spaced
248 equal to or less than a body length from each other, and frequently so tight as to overlap and form a
249 single large image object without texture except at the edges (Figure 5). These did not show a common
250 axis of travel when members were distinguishable, and numbered typically on the order of hundreds
251 when individuals were distinguishable. In the Gulf of Mexico missions in particular, these tightly
252 packed schools formed lacy structures (Figure 5 bottom right). In some cases, they were apparently
253 under attack by larger predators also visible in the sonar image. The “loose schools” class designated a
254 group of fishes that were clearly oriented to each other, with a common long axis direction and often a
255 well-defined leading but not trailing edge, and members spaced much greater than individual body
256 lengths from each other (Figure 6 top row). These typically contained on the order of tens of members.
257 “Large singletons” referred to large, strongly reflective targets in the water column, either globose or
258 elongate, that were not oriented to other targets or the AUV. They may have included turtles, which
259 were regularly seen on the surface and while diving in the area or potentially large jellies, or any single
260 members of those fish that formed patrols. The “few scattered fish” or “numerous scattered fish”

classes reflected the fact that “singletons” were often too common in a single image frame to be counted individually, but while not organized relative to each other were very characteristic of a particular tile. Separation of these classes was subjective. Moreover, these two classes represent an area more than an individual point count, with important consideration to how they should be handled statistically.

Several artifacts were also identified that could have been confused with biota and many of these were clearly above the AUV or even on the water surface, including the underside of the skiff and outboard motor used to launch the AUVs (Figure 6 middle left), vessel wakes, and the undersides of breaking waves. Vertical instrument mooring lines returned crescent-shaped image objects because the radius of the signal/echo path is longer both above and below the depth of the AUV and intercepts only part of the line as a chord through the ensonified cylinder; these could appear similar to “followers” (Figure 6 middle right). On several missions closer to the seabed, returns from the seabed masked portions of schools which were otherwise clearly visible in the water column (Figure 5 middle). When returns were strong, such as of dense aggregations or large fish, these could still be distinguished; further, their acoustic shadows on the seabed could assist in their detection and calculation of their depth (Figure 4 third row left, Figure 5, bottom row). One type of artifact that could confound both human and simple automated counts is the doubling of images from very strong echo returns (Figure 6 bottom left). This happened particularly from large fish such as amberjack (*Seriola dumereli*) that so closely paced the vehicle that the echo from the back lobe of the transducer on the opposite side of the vehicle registered on the transducer on the same side of the fish with a delay that is characteristically one and a half times the distance between the transducers. Near the bottom, a similar effect results from multipath. Finally, artifacts from acoustic modem calls between the support vessel and the AUV or cross talk from other AUVs in the vicinity could potentially be counted as patrols by novice reviewers or algorithms because

of regular spacing and staggering, but these are extremely linear and regimented and typically weaker than fish (e.g. Figure 6 middle right, consequent with mooring line).

Of the 202 total targets in three cross-shelf missions from September 2011 for which they were quantified, the most common type encountered was few scattered fish (64 incidents), followed by bait balls (36 incidents), large singletons (26), patrols (25), loose schools of large individuals (16), followers (11), and rays (3). These were distributed unevenly relative to depth, hydrography, and distance across the shelf in the September survey off Cape Hatteras, NC (Figure 7). Three nominal classes (patrol, bait ball, loose school), were further examined because they were common. The distributions of all three (represented by kernel smoothing) peaked with varying degree of association to the shelf break and the shelfbreak front (Figure 7). Loose schools were most closely associated with the front and rarely were imaged far from it. The distributions of presumed predatory patrols and bait balls were much broader across the shelf and were highly and significantly correlated to each other, with patrols slightly favoring the offshore side of the front. Patrols were also significantly but less strongly correlated with loose schools, but loose schools were not correlated with bait balls at least on the cross-shelf scale (Table 2). During a similar mission over the Hudson River Canyon, NJ, a strong vertical front was not encountered. Salinity was low and generally restricted to a narrow band between 32.2 and 32.7 (except for a very thin surface lens with salinity as low as 30) but temperature difference in 3 strata exceeded 12 °C. Bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) were encountered in all of these and in the thermoclines between them (Figure 8).

A review of transect sampling methods and count treatments shows that most are for planar application, such as terrestrial survey or aerial survey of thin ocean surface layer for mammals, tunas, or elasmobranchs (e.g. Leatherwood 1979, Blaylock 1988, Bonhommeau et al. 2010) (Table 3). A

potential exception is for diver and submersible transects, but these are generally for reef fish with benthic or structural orientation, rather than for pelagic fishes. In general among the statistical formulae for the estimation of density (D) from animal counts (n) is the measure of sighting distance (r), sighting angle (θ), and perpendicular distance (x), for use in an estimator function a such that in a transect of length L

$$D = n/(2La),$$

to take into account the probability of detecting fauna at different distances or angles. Such functions rest on four assumptions (detection is certain, animals don't move for subsequent detection, sightings are independent, and there is no measurement error) which are rarely met. For example, ground birds are cryptic and counted when flushed, but less so when the counter is distant (Gates et al. 1968). Cetaceans have species-specific avoidance or attraction responses starting many km distant from survey vessels (Palka and Hammond 2001). Therefore, a fixed-width strip estimate creates a bias. In another example, for areal counts of marine animals, the aircraft that hosts an observer itself blocks some angles of vision and is corrected in formula (Leatherwood et al. 1982). For an AUV using side scan sonar, θ is always 90° and so r and x are the same and are fixed to the accepted echo return delay (here to a distance of 30 m) in the sonar's initialization file. However, the transect cylinder is not perfectly cylindrical, or is potentially weak or distorted outside of stronger lobes, and moreover masking by the bottom returns can cut the effective strip width substantially for some fish like "loose school" but not for others (see examples in Figure 4, also Misund et al. 1995, Trevorrow 2001). Various formulas address such biases as effective strip width and flushing (Table 3). A two-observer system (Turnock and Quin 1991, Buckland and Turnock 1992) is useful in calculating a response bias (attraction or avoidance) by using a second (typically independent) observer team. This is improved by Palka and Hammond (2001) for two teams on a single platform, by looking at orientation of the organisms (in their case cetaceans) to the platform in different quadrats representing independent observations of what cetaceans did as the vessel approached them or left them behind and corrected for

potential pre-encounter orientation. In some ways, the two (left and right) sonar channels of the AUV's side scan could emulate the two observer team, although the imaged distance may be much less than the response distance. Coefficients thus need to be developed explicitly for AUVs and the side scan sonars they mount.

Video imagery, as a "second" observer was able to identify a number of the species and also their response bias because the AUV attracted them and because the camera was mounted to face aft (Figure 9). Earlier attempts with forward facing cameras imaged no fish, although followers were apparent in the sonar record. Of 10 imaged species (Table 4), 7 were predatory and these species were also imaged more frequently. These could be seen approaching the AUV from the sides both above (Supplementary Material Video 1, bluefish_clip, Supplementary Material Video 2, tiger_shark_follow) and below (Supplementary Material Video 3, blue_runners_clip, Supplementary Material Video 4, little_tunny), but also from far behind, possibly without having entered the HFSSS aperture (Supplementary Material Video 5, amberjack). Only one sequence showed a bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*) approaching the vehicle from in front and above and then turning sharply to fall in line behind and alongside it with other individuals. However, blue runner (*Caranx crysos*) also followed the AUV after converging on it from all directions in numbers approaching a hundred individuals (see also Newhall et al. 2016) (Supplementary Material Video 3, blue_runners_clip); these are generally zooplanktivores that may take small bait fishes (Carpenter 2002). In one instance, the AUV passed through a school of bait fish < 10 cm length and most likely round scad (*Decapturus punctatus*) which appeared to scatter rather than follow the AUV. Scattering is also visible in HFSSS from another mission (in turbid water that carried no camera) where the AUV passed directly through a bait ball (Figure 5, bottom left).

Fish that were imaged by camera following the AUV stayed behind it for durations of seconds to several minutes and there was a tendency for larger schools to remain for longer periods (Table 4) (Supplementary Material Video 3, blue_runners_clip). However, calculation of a very long “follower” feature in a mission without a camera shows that at least one individual paced the vehicle alongside for a duration of 3 minutes (320 m). Fish often followed so closely that images were compromised by the AUV’s propeller and control fins given the narrow “head on” view (Supplementary Material Video 1, bluefish_clip, Supplementary Material Video 2, tiger_shark_follow); however, fish broke contact by “peeling” away rather than falling behind or passing the AUV forwards (Supplementary Material Video 6, barracuda) . The peeling away behavior afforded an opportunity for the camera to image the fish in broadside, which aided in identification (Figure 9).

During the time that fish were lined up behind and following the AUV they were not in the HFSSS aperture. Of 46 image contacts with bluefish, only 22 could be associated with corresponding marks in the side scan sonar records, indicating that a number of these individuals were not imaged on sonar around the time that they were detected by the camera. Right-size sonar targets were found between - 64.0 to 95.9 s of corresponding video imagery and generally preceded the photo imaged target with a skewed distribution of median -17.5 s and mean -7.7 s, (S.D. = 38.04 s). The distance of contacts corresponding to the video imaged targets range between 20.9 m and 0.5 m, but was uncorrelated with lag time to imagery ($\rho = 0.18$, $p = 0.48$). Inspection of the residuals showed that most of the variance was accounted for in the near field while distant targets all had longer lag. This is indicative of fish approaching the vehicle from the side and then pacing or falling in behind it, much like a dog attacking a bicyclist. This pattern is readily apparent in supplementary material posted as video imagery (see Figure 9 caption).

Automated detection of objects in 1536 trial HFSSS files from May 2012 cruise off Cape Hatteras, NC, resulted in 324 (21%) sonar image tiles being flagged for further review. Of those, 88 (27.2%) proved to be artifacts of pitch angle created when the AUV ascended or descended (the change in distance to the surface reflection creates a symmetrical “v” with a continuous edge) and were easily identified and eliminated from the list of images of interest. Another 49 (15%) of the 324 sonar image tiles contained fish schools, large fish-like objects, or rays. Of those image objects (n=16) that were first scored by independent human review as rays, 87.5% were also classified as such by the algorithm. “Missed” (relative to human review) detections owed primarily to failure of the segmentation algorithm in separating the ray outline from bottom reflection.

Discussion

AUVs have previously mounted sonar for the purpose of fish reconnaissance, although low frequency (38-200 kHz, see review by Trenkel et al. 2009). Most have been on deep-diving vehicles targeting benthic or suprabenthic fish with down-looking beams where the AUV’s proximity allowed differentiation between the bottom and target by increasing local resolution (Fernandes et al. 2003), or targeting anchovy, herring, or krill biomass measures in the “acoustic dead zone” near the surface that would otherwise be directly underneath a surface survey vessel (Scalabrin et al. 2009) using up-looking beams (Breirley et al. 2012). High frequency (700 – 1850 kHz) side and up looking sonar in Tracor Acoustic Profiling Systems have been deployed in somewhat analogous sampling models as presented here to achieve holistic ecosystem measurement at small (zooplankton) scales. In these cases, high frequency sonar was incorporated with low frequency bands and deployed simultaneously with oceanographic sensors and optical instruments to understand trophodynamics as either moored (Holliday et al. 2009) or towed packages (Lbourges-Dhaussy et al. 2009). Both used acoustic returns to

405 create volumetric estimates by size class, with photo imaging or net samples to supervise
406 classifications. The latter coupled this further with traditional low frequency (38 kHz) volumetric
407 assessment of sardine and anchovy distribution. The disparity in scaling of these instruments meant that
408 coupling models relied on kriging between stations separated on the order of 18 km (Lbourges-Dhaussy
409 et al. 2009). There are relatively few published attempts to use HFSSS, in the band spectrum defined
410 here, for fish study on any platform. Of these, most are for sturgeon in riverine or estuarine habitats
411 where the river bed is also imaged and of interest, and where the shadows are also diagnostic (Thomas
412 and Hass 2004, Grothues et al. 2009, Flowers and Hightower 2013). One (Grothues et al. 2009) utilized
413 an AUV, and this also imaged the bottom for understanding this benthic specie's relation with habitat.
414 The combination has not been previously used in pelagic applications. This technology is commonly
415 available but underutilized, perhaps owing to a misunderstanding of its function and interpretation
416 among biologists and the common practice of presenting it in the mosaicked form that eliminates the
417 water column.

418
419 Inexpensive HFSSS imaging is not designed to, and will not compete with multi-frequency and
420 broadband backscatter sonars, multi-beam sonars, acoustic cameras, and variants thereof, which also
421 can be incorporated into an AUV payload, for acoustically imaging fish. Instead, it stands to fill an
422 important niche in research on a spatial scale fitting between camera imagery and LF sonar, and differs
423 substantially in applicability and analytical approach. On the fine end of the resolution and range scale,
424 cameras have also been mounted as a primary fish sensing tool on AUVs mostly for benthic fish
425 because the distance to the subject is easily constrained to be in the focal and visibility range by the
426 altitude-over-bottom (Tolimieri et al. 2008, Seiler et al. 2012, Smale et al. 2012). These applications
427 utilize static frames and machine learning for image recognition similar to that described for HFSSS
428 here. The AUVs used (e.g. SeaBED) have accordingly been slow-moving, purpose built machines
429 (Hsing et al. 2003). On a slightly longer range scale, multibeam imaging sonar extends vision to

approximately 20 m, but also differs from single beam HFSSS in that it produces moving (video-like) images (see review by Martignac et al. 2012). Imaging sonar in fisheries applications is usually statically mounted in constrained areas such as rivers or fish ladders (but see Able et al. [2013, 2014] for examples of mobile deployments) and moving fish are thus differentiated from a static background (Boswell et al. 2008); but it is side-looking and HF (typically above 900 kHz) (Martignac et al. 2012). Imaging sonar has been mounted forward-looking on a REMUS AUV but for obstacle avoidance (Hsieh et al. 2005), not for fish surveys. Between these and LFS, AUV-mounted HFSSS is demonstrated here to be useful to examine especially the distribution and association of infrequently occurring pelagic meso-level consumers (e.g. scombrids, carangids, and rays) as individuals or small (10s of individuals) schools. It is well placed, for example, to supplement fishery-dependent long-line by-catch data for mobulid ray stock-assessment (e.g. Mas et al. 2014). It is a fishery-independent method that also complements satellite telemetry of the same (Jaune et al. 2014), which is reliant on ray catches and very few individuals. However, this needs to be further developed in application. On the previous AUV/HFSSS riverine application, the size of adult sturgeon at 1 - 3 m long is diagnostic of identity and shadows on the bottom also helped reveal features such as the heterocercal caudal fin and posterior dorsal fin placement. This will not always be the case in pelagic applications, but the images of rays shown here demonstrate the potential.

While there is little diversity in the structuring seen in HFSSS images of sturgeon (they are all single fish or milling aggregations), these studies are noteworthy because they demonstrate the applicability of HFSSS to the survey of fish that should not or cannot be easily captured for survey, or where density or abundance estimates from capture methods are seriously biased by the behaviors of the fish or by the differences in the environment over which they are distributed. The use of an AUV by Grothues et al. (2009) was helpful but not critical to accomplishing the survey task (it was incidental to an AUV-supported telemetry project tracking sturgeon). The AUV's role in coupled fish/hydrographic survey

455 becomes important in pelagic systems where search areas are wide and habitat is defined by fronts and
456 fluid structures that may be just meters in thickness but occur well below the surface. In this, the few
457 non-sturgeon studies of HFSSS use, even without AUVs, are also noteworthy. In general, the impetus
458 for side scan use has been to survey fishes in shallow water or at least shallow depth strata, either in
459 rivers (Burwen and Fleischman 1998) where down looking sonar is ineffectual at finding near-surface
460 fish because only a very small volume right under the ship can be ensonified, which is also typically
461 avoided by the fish (Ona and Torreson 1988, Gerlotto and Freon 1992, Soria et al. 1996, Trevorrow and
462 Claytor 1998). Trevorrow (2001) used 300 kHz, mid-frequency by our definition here, to observe fish
463 in near-surface water when resolving depth at high precision was specifically the issue. In that case, the
464 issue of low depth precision noted by us was resolved with a narrow beam sector scanning instrument
465 (Trevorrow 2001). Side scan is also applied at low frequency for this reason; LFSSS at 12 kHz
466 (Farmer et al. 1999), and 100 kHz (Trevorrow 1997) was used to study salmon (*Oncorhynchus spp*)
467 and herring (*Clupea* or *Alosa*) in broad shallow water bodies. The side-looking sonar arrays were able
468 to image a much greater volume of water, with the long-distance penetration advantage of low
469 frequency sonar being otherwise wasted in shallow water. These arrays were also towed below the
470 surface (at 35 m in 60 to 220 m total water depth, Farmer et al. 1999) similar to the way our AUVs
471 were deployed. However, as appropriate to the applied frequency, fish were still classified and
472 quantified based on reverberation ratios. Discrete salmon targets (~ 1 m) and schools (but not
473 individuals) of the smaller (<0.4 m each) herring were identified. A study in Tasmania utilized side
474 scan sonar in order to survey the patchiness of forage fish schools that form near the water surface,
475 which is difficult to do from a surface vessel with downward looking sonar (O'Driscoll 1997). That
476 study applied sonar at 130 kHz, which, although intermediate in frequency relative to the individual
477 size of fishes studied (barracouta, *Thyrsites atun*; jack mackerel, *Trachurus murphyi*; slender tuna,
478 *Allothunnus fallai*) and probably sprat (*Sprattus antipodum* or *S. muelleri*), produced intuitive imagery

479 of the schools that they form and were useful in relating them to the presence of marine birds and
480 hydrography.

481

482 The tasking of AUVs to find and identify aggregations or schools of medium-sized fish in open water
483 in our study was stimulated by the synergistic use of AUVs for a different purpose. One AUV was
484 tasked with rapid mobility of an omnidirectional LF sonar source to study scattering and attenuation
485 (Newhall et al. 2016). Two additional AUVs roved over the same area to identify the presence, size and
486 location of fish schools that could be targets of the LF scattering experiment. The experiment
487 highlighted strengths and constraints in applying this technology in a primary, rather than support role.
488 These include capability, bias, classification, and automation, as treated below.

489

490 Capability

491 The use of an AUV to support deep HFSSS emulates the use of aerial photography to document the
492 presence of fish and mammals that are not amenable to trawl, net, or capture using other fishery-
493 dependent methods, but without the bias of being limited to animals using the very uppermost (1-4 m)
494 of the water column (Bonhommeau et al. 2010). It also emulates the use of drop cameras which are
495 often used to ground truth LFS, but at an intermediate scale between LFS and cameras in both
496 resolution and range. Further, it offers methods for ground truthing that are not available to aerial
497 survey, such as close-up photography and acoustic tag detection of sentinel individuals from the same
498 AUV platform and importantly, for statistical association with their environment. Acoustic telemetry of
499 tagged individuals from an AUV has been demonstrated in two very different applications: the
500 continuous following of a given targeted individual shark (Manii 2012) and the mapping of a number
501 of different individuals to describe movement and relationship to hydrography (Eiler et al. 2014,
502 Coleman 2015), together with verifying the identity of sonar contacts (Grothues et al. 2009, Grothues et

al. 2010). Payload control, the ability to autonomously reroute an AUV in mission in response to incoming data such as telemetry (Grothues et al. 2010, Manii 2012) in order to acquire better or more data in patchy systems, is rapidly developing and will also complement the development of adaptive acoustic sampling designs practiced by piloted vessels (e.g. Harbitz et al. 2009).

An important aspect of the use of AUVs for fish reconnaissance is the concurrent oceanographic data which is collected (*sensu* Lebourges-Dhuassy et al. 2009 using towed equipment). During the pilot study in September, 2011, the hydrographic conditions included a near surface buoyant, low salinity plume which was likely associated with the Chesapeake Bay outflow plume. This plume had a cross-shelf extent of at least 35 km and was much larger in spatial extent than the normal 5-7 km cross-shelf scale. The observations in September, 2011 were shortly after the passage of Hurricane Irene, which caused extensive rainfall and subsequent flooding on the eastern seaboard. Similarly, the observations in May, 2012 occurred during anomalous warming conditions (Chen et al. 2014) over the Middle Atlantic Bight and Gulf of Maine. Thus, the use of the AUV platforms also provides a detailed high-resolution hydrographic context for the interpretation of the spatial and temporal variability of the fish distributions.

Bias

Bias is a problem with all fisheries and scientific survey techniques and perhaps especially so in the case of pelagic environments, where different species are sparsely and patchily distributed over wide potential areas not associated with static structures (such as benthic forms), or are associated with dynamic hydrographic or biological structures that are not always apparent until after surveying (Pennington 1983, Boulinier et al. 1998, Kimura and Somerton 2006, Davoren 2013) or range widely in size. Non-extractive surveys are less biased to inter-species relative abundance and size than capture sampling (Silveira et al. 2002) because different capture techniques invariably target aspects of habit or

528 morphology (e.g. bait attraction, thigmotaxis or phototaxis, trawl or gill nets, etc.) that differ among
529 species. Acoustic surveys are non-extractive, and low frequencies can sample wide areas quasi-
530 synoptically to resolve patchiness so that it can be treated statistically (Kimura and Somerton 2006).
531 While the AUV potentially mitigates some bias in the acoustic approach, it differs from that of vessel
532 mounted and perhaps towed sonar in a number of respects.

533

534 Bias associated with use of an AUV to mount HFSSS includes the fact that the two dimensional
535 imagery flattens a three dimensional distribution, especially in the absence of ocean floor returns upon
536 which shadows can be seen and used to calculate altitude over bottom. This has been addressed
537 technically by multibeam sonar that divides the ensonified area among many thin, spatially explicit
538 beams (e.g. Gerlotto et al. 1999) and which is becoming available on AUVs, but is still uncommon and
539 expensive. However, the depth uncertainty of single beam HFSSS is limited to the sonar's small range.
540 In understanding these limits, a mission is seen to approximate a distorted tubular transect, and the
541 limitation can be used to define depth sample strata. Another bias is the selective removal from sonar
542 "vision" by following behavior, and the lengthening of acoustic images by along-side pacing behavior,
543 and conversely it's shortening when the target moves in retrograde. A better understanding of this bias
544 could be achieved through studies in instrumented observatories that can follow numerous fishes in fine
545 scale, such as by Time Difference of Arrival (trilateration) of high signal rate acoustic telemetry
546 (Cooke et al. 2005, Brown et al. 2010) while AUVs are run through the observatory. The use of
547 acoustically tagged sentinel animals can also be used to measure the likelihood that individuals or even
548 schools are acquired multiple times as a function of search path geometry following a mark-recapture
549 model. In practice, this can be mitigated by the use of cameras to document following and calculate an
550 error rate as we did here. The attraction that causes bias is also a benefit to recognizance because it
551 provides some level of ground truthing by attracting fish that are in the search area but potentially
552 beyond the HFSSS range into both the sonar and camera aperture. These same issues appear as the

debate over the use of baited versus un-baited static camera traps (Harvey et al 2007, Schobernd et al. 2014). The developing conclusion in those studies is that baited camera traps tend to document higher and more correct species diversity values while possibly overestimating abundance (or density) of scavenger or predatory species at least on reefs because these species might not otherwise be seen at all. Assemblages resolved from baited camera samples were more discriminant with respect to habitat, and replicate samples from baited cameras had less variance than unbaited cameras (Harvey et al. 2007). The greater statistical confidence results primarily from the assurance that hard-to detect species show themselves (Harvey et al. 2007). These findings are favorable to the use of AUVs, which may in essence bait themselves for the scarcer fast moving predatory species such as sharks and tunas. However, continued study of the extent and mechanism of the bias is necessary. In the baited camera trap analogy, the type of bait and direction and extent of the scent plume may impact the results (Harvey et al. 2007). Likewise, and also similar to divers (Watson and Harvey 2007) the AUV has a number of features which may be species-specific attractants and may work over different ranges and directions, including sound in a wide frequency band ranging from the acoustic instruments themselves to the mechanical (motor, bearings, and servos) and hydrological noise of propulsion, and also lights (blue, yellow, green, and red) from the dissolved oxygen, CDOM, and chlorophyll *a* sensors, painted hull color, and electrical and magnetic noise from the processors and navigation instruments. The contribution of these factors to attraction is testable by masking, muting, or changing the colors or sources in replicate missions as has been done on a limited basis for fisheries survey ship sounds (Handegard et al. 2015) especially if done in an observatory such as mentioned above.

Pelagic fish are typically remote and thus unobservable other than by sonar, are often randomly and sparsely or patchily distributed, do not cooperate with acousticians to present a good aperture, and if held in tanks are no longer representative of their natural state. Even tethering active fishes changes sonar returns although it can provide important baseline information (Nakken and Olsen 1977).

578 Identifying individuals in order to build supervised classification schemes is typically done through
579 parallel sampling programs that seek probabilistic determination (ground truthing) or actual target
580 identity (verification) (e.g. Bertrand et al. 1999, Doray et al. 2007). The best resolution to uncertainty
581 in the classification application comes from a combination of both. The current project relied on
582 verification by video imaging and also ground truthing by fishing, which confirmed the suspected
583 identity and size of little tunny (*Euthynnus alletteratus*), dolphinfish (*Coryphaena hippurus*),
584 amberjack (*Seriola dumereli*), blue runner, and posited the identity of bait balls as round herring
585 (*Etremeus teres*) and Spanish sardine (*Sardinella aurita*) in September 2011 and May 2012,
586 respectively, as the exclusive fish gut contents of tuna caught in the study area. This is because an
587 echogram contains information not just about individual targets but about the dynamics of targets with
588 each other; in essence there is ecological information that can help inform sonar interpretation and
589 ecological knowledge that could be gained from sonar if the approach allowed synergistic sampling of
590 other variables (Shen et al. 2009). The class names we chose are expressive of commonly occurring
591 intuitive forms and carry some ecological interpretation. We accept that they are not exhaustive; rather
592 a systematic refinement of classification is introduced here as a challenge for further work.

593

594 Automation

595 There are a number of Machine Learning (ML) algorithms for multi-labeling (Bishop 2006). These
596 find features of an image including, for example, gradients in pixel value and relate the shape and
597 distribution of these to training sets identified by the researcher. Shapes or other underlying features
598 will then be used to classify similarities and differences using such tools as principle components
599 analysis, cluster, or similar ordination analysis, and will also produce hydrographic association
600 statistics (e.g. with principal or canonical correspondence analysis, Lebourges-Dhuassy et al. 2009
601 Shen et al. 2009). Classification from acoustical backscatter properties through such algorithms is not
602 new to fish reconnaissance in low frequency down-view sonar (e.g. Cabriera et al. 2009 and Charef et

603 al. 2010, both using neural net and discriminant function algorithms for sonograms made at 38 kHz),
604 but the algorithms of choice will likely differ because of the plan view and resolution of individual fish
605 in the school. The use of fast Fourier transform (FFT) algorithms, which parse the grey-scale value of
606 pixels of an image space into vectors of different frequencies, are particularly interesting for
607 discriminating among types of schooling fishes because of the repetitive and even nature of the high
608 reflectance (fish) and low reflection (school interstitial space) of the image. This method is useful in
609 classifying ocean bedforms (Fakiris and Papatheodorou 2009), of which some, such as sand ripple
610 fields, are similar to fish schools in appearance.

611

612 Robots, and AUVs in particular, have demonstrated a niche for themselves in performing many other
613 mundane and deep tasks and especially benthic side scan survey (Hibbert 1997, Moline et al. 2005,
614 Clarke et al. 2010), including side scan surveys of fish (Grothues et al. 2009). They can work under ice
615 with far less disturbance than for a towed system below an icebreaker (Fernandes et al. 2003). Further,
616 they can work from and alongside vessels already engaged in other sensor deployment tasks to greatly
617 increase the survey footprint with little or no additional crew. Thus, they can complement other survey
618 methods. Ongoing work promises cooperative-adaptive swarming behaviors (Belbechir et al. 2010).
619 Many engineering challenges have been met to bring AUVs from experimental vehicles to applications,
620 but further challenges must be met in this new task. In regards to the search for sparse large fish,
621 OADaSA allowed high performance in images with poor segmentation properties. The large cut in
622 human processing time and high fidelity detection rate could make AUV-supported side scan sonar a
623 viable tool for surveying rays and other pelagic fish research. It is relatively immune in this application
624 to problems that arise for automated side scan sonar detection by AUV of objects on the seabed, such
625 as anti-shipping mines (Chapple 2009). The algorithm accuracy can be improved by implementing
626 different segmentation techniques. The most exciting implication of this is the formation of a basis for
627 in-situ classification to drive AUV responsive navigation (payload control), including for other fishes.

628 Further study promises to let AUVs search pelagic environments with patchy fish distribution in the
629 same way that the predators do, such as the application of Levy-flight or run-and-tumble search path
630 models (Humphries et al. 2010, Saldivar 2012, Watkins and Rose 2013) that use locally-sensed
631 environmental cues to modify the AUVs' navigation.

632

633 Acknowledgements

634

635 AUV missions were funded by an Office of Naval Research grant to the Woods Hole Oceanographic
636 Institution and Rutgers University. Camera and sonar scoring tasks, as well as development of sonar
637 automated detection and classification were assisted by interns (Daniel Wo, Patrick Looney, Gillian
638 Schreiver) some of which were supported through Research Experience for Undergraduates (REU)
639 grants from the National Science Foundation. Amy Kukulya and Joseph Dobarro programmed the
640 AUVs. Deployment was ably managed with help from the captain and crew of *R/V Hugh R. Sharp*,
641 members of WHOI buoy shop, and Fred Jaffre. The field work was supported by the Office of Naval
642 Research under grant N00014-11-1-0160. We thank Benjamin Reeder (CDR/USN) for his support
643 throughout the field program.

644

645 References

646

647 Able, K.W., Grothues, T.M., and Kemp, I.M. 2013. Fine-scale distribution of pelagic fishes relative to
648 a large urban pier. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **476**: 185-198.

649

650 Able, K.W., Grothues, T.M., Rackovan, J.L., and Buderman, F.E.. 2014. Application of mobile dual-
651 frequency identification sonar (DIDSON) to fish in estuarine habitats. *Northeast. Nat.* **21**(2): 192-209.

652

653 Able, K.W., Twichell, D.C. Grimes, C.B., and Jones, R.S. 1987. Sidescan sonar as a tool for detection
654 of demersal fish habitats. Fish. Bull. **85**(4): 725-736.

655

656 Allen B., Stokey R., Austin T., Forrester N., Goldsborough R., Purcell M., and von Alt, C. 1997.

657 REMUS: A small low cost AUV; system description, field trials and performance results. *In*

658 Proceedings of MTS/IEEE OCEANS Conference, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 6-9 October 1997. IEEE,

659 Piscataway, NJ. pp. 994-1000.

660

661 Belbachir, A., Lacroix, S., Ingrand, F., Perrier, M., and Opderbecke, J. 2010. Cooperative-adaptive

662 algorithms for targets localization in underwater environment. Autonomous Underwater Vehicles

663 (AUV). IEEE/OES.1-7 doi:10.1109/AUV.2010.5779650.

664

665 Bell, R.E., Flood, R.D., Carbotte, S., Ryan, W.B.F., McHugh, C., Cormier, M., Versteeg, R.,

666 Bokuniewicz, H., Ferrini, V.L., Thissen, J., Ladd, J.W., and Blair, E.A. 2006. Benthic Habitat Mapping

667 in the Hudson River Estuary. *In* The Hudson River Estuary. *Edited by* J. Levinton, and John R.W.

668 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England. pp. 51-64.

669

670 Bertrand, A., Josse, E., and Masse, J. 1999. In situ target-strength measurements of bigeye (*Thunnus*

671 *obesus*) and yellowfin tuna (*Thunnus albacores*) by coupling split-beam echodounder observations and

672 sonic tracking. ICES J. Mar. Sci. **56**(1): 51-60. doi:10.1006/jmsc.1998.0430.

673

674 Blaylock, R.A. 1988. Distribution and abundance of the bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*

675 (Montagu, 1821), in Virginia. Fish. Bull. **86**: 797-805.

676

- 677 Bishop, C.M. 2006. Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning. Springer, New York, New York.
- 678
- 679 Bonhommeau, S., Farrugio, H., Poisson, F., and Fromentin, J. 2010. Aerial surveys of bluefin tuna in
680 the western Mediterranean Sea: Retrospective, prospective, perspective. Collect. Vol. Sci. Pap. ICCAT.
681 **65**(3): 801-811.
- 682
- 683 Boswell, K.M., Wilson, M.P., and Cowan, Jr., J.H. 2008. A semiautomated approach to estimating fish
684 size, abundance, and behavior from Dual - Frequency Identification Sonar (DIDSON) data. N. Amer. J.
685 Fish. Manage. **28**: 799 - 807.
- 686
- 687 Boulinier, T., Nichols, J.D., Sauer, J.R., Hines, J.E., and Pollock, K.H. 1998. Estimating Species
688 Richness: The Importance of Heterogeneity in Species Detectability. Ecol. Soc. Am. **79**(3): 1018–1028.
689 doi:10.1890/0012-9658(1998)079[1018:ESRTIO]2.0.CO;2.
- 690
- 691 Breierly, A.S., Fernandes, P.G., Brandon, M.A., Armstrong, F., Millard, N.W., McPhail, S.D.,
692 Stevenson, P., Pebody, M., Perret, J., Squires, M., Bone, D.G. and Griffiths, G.. 2003. An investigation
693 of avoidance by Antarctic Krill of *RRS James Ross* using the *Autosub-2* autonomous underwater
694 vehicle. Fish. Res. **60**: 596-576
- 695
- 696 Brown, H., Benfield, M.C., Keenan, S.F., and Powers, S.P. 2010. Movement patterns and home ranges
697 of a pelagic carangid fish, *Caranx crysos*, around a petroleum platform complex Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.
698 **403**: 205–218
- 699
- 700 Buckland, S.T. 1985. Perpendicular distance models for line transect sampling. Biometrics **41**: 177–
701 195. doi:10.2307/2530653.

702

703 Buckland, S.T., and Turnock, B.J. 1992. A robust line transect method. *Biometrics* **48**: 901-907.

704

705 Burnham, K. P., Anderson, and Laake, J. L. 1980. Estimation of density from line transect sampling of
706 biological populations. *Wildlife Monog. No.* **72**. 202 p.

707

708 Burwen, D., Fleischman, S., 1998. Evaluation of side-aspect target strength and pulse width as
709 potential hydroacoustic discriminators of fish species in rivers. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **55**: 2492-2502.

710

711 Cabreira, A.G., Tripode, M., and Madirolas, A. 2009. Artificial neural networks for fish-species
712 identification. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **66**(6): 1119-1129. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsp009.

713

714 Carpenter, K.E. 2002. The living marine resources of the Western Central Atlantic. Volume 3: Bony
715 Fishes Part 2 (Opistognathidae to Molidae, sea turtles, and marine mammals). *FAO Species*
716 *Identification guide for fisheries purposes and American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists.*
717 *No. 5.*

718

719 Chan, T.F., and Vese, L.A. 2001. Active Contours Without Edges. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.* **10**(2):
720 266 -277. doi:10.1109/83.902291.

721

722 Chapple, P. B. 2009. Unsupervised detection of mine-like objects in seabed imagery from autonomous
723 underwater vehicles. *OCEANS 2009, MTS/IEEE Biloxi - Marine Technology for Our Future: Global*
724 *and Local Challenges.* 6 pp.

725

- 726 Charef, A., Ohshimo, S., Aoki, I., and Al Absi, N. 2010. Classification of fish schools based on
727 evaluation of acoustic descriptor characteristics. *Fish. Sci.* **76**: 1-11 doi:10.1007/s12562-009-0186-x
728
- 729 Chen, K., Gawarkiewicz, G.G., Lentz, S.J., and Bane, J.M. 2014. Diagnosing the warming of the
730 Northeastern U.S. Coastal Ocean in 2012: A linkage between the atmospheric jet stream variability and
731 ocean response, *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans*, **119**, doi:10.1002/2013JC009393.
732
- 733 Clarke, M.E., Whitmire, C., Fruh, E., Anderson, J., Taylor, J., Rooney, J., Ferguson, S., and Singh, H.
734 2010. Developing the SeaBED AUV as a tool for conducting routine surveys of fish and their habitat in
735 the Pacific. *In* Proceedings of 2010 Autonomous Underwater Vehicles IEEE/OES Conference,
736 Monterey, Calif., 1-3 September 2010. IEEE, Piscataway, N.J. pp. 1 – 5.
737
- 738 Coleman, K.E. 2015. Understanding the winter flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus*) Southern
739 New England/ Mid-Atlantic stock through historical trawl surveys and monitoring cross continental
740 shelf movement. Masters Thesis. Graduate Program in Oceanography, Rutgers University.
741
- 742 Cooke, S.J., Niezgoda, G.H., Hanson, K.C., Suski, C.D., Phelan, F.J.S., Tinline, R., and Philipp, D.P.
743 2005. Use of CDMA acoustic telemetry to document 3-D positions of fish: Relevance to the design and
744 monitoring of aquatic protected areas. *Mar. Tech. So. J.* **39**(1): 17- 27.
745 doi:10.4031/002533205787521659.
746
- 747 Davoren, G. 2013. Distribution of marine predator hotspots explained by persistent areas of prey. *Mar.*
748 *Biol.* **160**(12): 3043-3058. doi:10.1007/s00227-013-2294-5.
749

- 750 Demer, D.A., Kloser, R.J., MacLennan, D.N., and Ona E. 2009. An introduction to the proceedings and
751 a synthesis of the 2008 ICES Symposium on the Ecosystem Approach with Fisheries Acoustics and
752 Complementary Technologies (SEAFACETS). ICES J. Mar. Sci. **66** (6): 961-965.
753 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsp146.
754
- 755 Doray, M., Josse, E., Gervain, P., Reynal, L., and Chantrel, J. 2007. Joint use of echosounding, fishing
756 and video techniques to assess the structure of fish aggregations around moored Fish Aggregating
757 Devices in Martinique (Lesser Antilles). Aquat. Living Resour. **20**(4): 357–366.
758 doi:10.1051/alr:2008004.
759
- 760 Eiler, J.H., Grothues, T.M., Dobarro, J.A., and Masuda, M.M.. 2014. Comparing autonomous
761 underwater vehicle (AUV) and vessel-based tracking performance for locating acoustically-tagged fish.
762 Mar. Fish. Rev. **75**(4): 27-42.
763
- 764 Ester, M., Kriegel, H., Sander, J., and Xu, X. 1996. A Density-Based Algorithm for Discovering
765 Clusters in Large Spatial Databases with Noise. *In* Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on
766 Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD-96), Portland, Oreg., 2-4 August 1996. Association for
767 the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence, Palo Alto, Cali. pp. 226-231.
768
- 769 Fakiris, E., and Papatheodorou, G. 2009. Sonar Class: A MATLAB toolbox for the classification of
770 side scan sonar imagery, using local textural and reverberational characteristics. Proc.3rd Int. Conf.
771 Exhibition on Underwater Acoustic Measurements: Technologies and Results. 21-26
772
- 773 Farmer, D.M., Trevorrow, M.V., and Pedersen, B. 1999. Intermediate Range Fish Detection with a 12-
774 kHz Sidescan Sonar. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **106**(5): 2481-2490.

775

776 Fernandes, P.G., Stevenson, P., Brierly, A.S., Armstrong, F., and Simmonds, E.J. 2003. Autonomous
777 underwater vehicles: future platforms for fisheries acoustics. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **60**: 684-691.

778

779 Fernandes, P.G., Brierly, A.S., Simmonds, E.J., Millard, N.W., McPhail, S.D., Armstrong, F.,
780 Stevenson, P., and Squires, M. 2002. Fish do not avoid survey vessels. *Nature*. **404**: 35-36.

781

782 Flowers, H.J., Hightower, E.J. 2013. A Novel Approach to Surveying Sturgeon Using Side-Scan Sonar
783 and Occupancy Modeling. *Mar. Coast. Fish. Dyn. Manag. Ecosys. Sci.* **5**(1): 211–223.

784 doi:10.1080/19425120.2013.816396.

785

786 Gates, C.E. 1979. Line transect and related issues, p. 71–154. *In* G. P. Patil and D. S. Robson (eds.).
787 Sampling Biological Populations. International Cooperative Publishing House, Fairland, Maryland.

788

789 Gates, C.E., Marshall W.H., and Olson, D.P. 1968. Line transect method of estimating grouse
790 population densities. *Biometrics* **24**(1):135-145 doi: 10.2307/2528465.

791

792 Gerlotto, F., and Freon, P., 1992. Some elements of vertical avoidance of fish schools to a vessel during
793 acoustic surveys. *Fish. Res.* **14**: 251-259.

794

795 Gerlotto, F., Soria, M., and Freon, P., 1999. From two dimensions to three: the use of multibeam sonar
796 for a new approach in fisheries acoustics. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **56**: 6-12.

797

798 Grothues, T.M., Dobarro, J., Higgs, A., Ladd, J., Niezgoda, G., and Miller, D. 2009. Use of a multi-
799 sensed AUV to telemeter tagged Atlantic sturgeon and map their spawning habitat in the Hudson

- 800 River, USA. *In* Proceedings of 2008 IEEE/OES. Conference of Autonomous Underwater Vehicles,
801 Woods Hole, Mass., 13-14 October 2008. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ. pp. 1-7.
802 doi:10.1109/AUV.2008.5347597.
803
- 804 Grothues, T.M., Eiler, J.H., and Dobarro, J. 2010. Collecting, interpreting, and merging fish telemetry
805 data from an AUV: remote sensing from an already remote platform. *In* Proceedings of 2010
806 IEEE/OES Conference of Autonomous Underwater Vehicles, Monterey, Calif., 1-3 September 2010.
807 IEEE, Piscataway, NJ. pp. 1-9. doi:10.1109/AUV.2010.5779658.
808
- 809 Hagen, P.E., Storkersen, N., Vestgard, K., and Kartvedt, P. 2003. The HUGIN 1000 autonomous
810 underwater vehicle for military applications. *In* Proceedings of OCEANS 2003 Conference, San Diego,
811 Calif., 22-26 September 2003. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ. pp. 1141 – 1145.
812 doi:10.1109/OCEANS.2003.178504
813
- 814 Handegard, N.O., Robertis, A.D., Rieucan, G., Boswell, K., Macaulay, G.J., and Jech, J.M. 2015. The
815 reaction of a captive herring school to playbacks of a noise-reduced and a conventional research vessel.
816 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **72**(4): 491-499.
817
- 818 Harbitz, A., Ona, E., and Pennington, M. 2009. The use of an adaptive acoustic-survey design to
819 estimate the abundance of highly skewed fish populations. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **66** (6): 1349-1354.
820 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsp088
821

822 Harvey, E.S., Cappo, M., Butler, J.J., Hall, N., and Kendrick, G.A. 2007. Bait attraction affects the
823 performance of remote underwater video stations in assessment of demersal fish community structure.
824 Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **350**: 245–254. doi:10.3354/meps07192.
825

826 Hewitt, R.P., Smith, P.E., and Brown, J.C. 1976. Development and use of sonar mapping for pelagic
827 stock assessment in the California current area. Fish. Bull., U.S. **74**(2): 281-300.
828

829 Hibbert, L. 1997. Key to an ocean of information. Prof. Engrg. **10**: 25-26.
830

831 Holliday, D.V., Donaghay, P.L., Greenlaw, C.F., Napp, J.M., and Sullivan, J.M. 2009. High-frequency
832 acoustics and bio-optics in ecosystems research. ICES J Mar Sci **66** (6): 974-980
833 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsp127.
834

835 Hsieh, J.B., Olsonbaker, J.I., and Fox, W.L.J. 2005. A Screening Application for Image Data Collected
836 by an Acoustic Lens Sonar. Technical Report APL-UW TR 0502. University of Washington. 30 pp.
837

838 Humphries, N. E. N. Queiroz, J. R. M. Dyer, N. G. Pade, M. K. Musyl, K. M. Schaefer, D. W. Fuller, J.
839 M. Brunnschweiler, T. K. Doyle, J. D. R. Houghton, G. C. Hays, C. S. Jones, L. R. Noble, V. J.
840 Wearmouth, E. J. Southall, and D.W. Sims. 2010. Environmental context explains Lévy and Brownian
841 movement patterns of marine predators. Nature **465**: 1066–1069. doi:10.1038/nature09116.
842

843 Jaine, F.R.A., Rohner, C.A., Weeks, S.J., Couturier, L.I.E., Bennett, M.B., Townsend, K.A., and
844 Richardson, A.J. 2014. Movements and habitat use of reef manta rays off eastern Australia: offshore
845 excursions, deep diving and eddy affinity revealed by satellite telemetry. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. **510**:
846 73–86.

847

848 Kalikhaman, I.L., and Yudanov, K.I. 2006. Acoustic Fish Reconnaissance. Taylor and Francis Group,
849 New York, N.Y.

850

851 Kieser, R., Mulligan, T. J., Richards, L.J., and Learnan, M. 1993. Bias correction of rockfish school
852 cross section widths from digitized echo sounder data. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **50**(8): 1801-1811. doi:
853 10.1139/f93-202.

854

855 Kimura, D.K., and Somerton, D.A. 2006. Review of Statistical Aspects of Survey Sampling for Marine
856 Fisheries. Rev. Fish. Sci. **14**(3): 245-283. doi: 10.1080/10641260600621761.

857

858 Kockara, S., Mete, M., Chen, B., and Aydin, K. 2010. Analysis of density based and fuzzy c-means
859 clustering methods on lesion border extraction in dermoscopy images. BMC Bioinf. **11**(Suppl 6):S26.
860 doi:10.1186/1471-2105-11-S6-S26.

861

862 Leatherwood, S. 1979. Aerial survey of the bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*, and the West Indian
863 manatee, *Trichechus manatus*, in the Indian and Banana rivers, Florida. Fish. Bull. **77**(1): 47–59.

864

865 Leatherwood, S., Show, I.T., Reeves, R. R., and Wright, M.B. 1982. Proposed modification of transect
866 models to estimate population size from aircraft with obstructed downward visibility. Rep. Intl.
867 Whaling Comm. **32**: 577–580.

868

869 Lebourges-Dhaussy, A. Coetzee, A., Hutchings, L., Roudaut, G., and Nieuwenhuys, C. 2009.

870 Zooplankton spatial distribution along the South African coast studied by multifrequency acoustics,

- 871 and its relationships with environmental parameters and anchovy distribution. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **66** (6):
872 1055-1062 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsp129.
- 873
- 874 Lianantonakis, M., and Petillot, Y.R. 2005. Sidescan sonar segmentation using active contours and
875 level set methods. *In* Proceedings of IEEE Oceans Europe International Conference, Brest, France, 20-
876 23 June, 2005. IEEE, Piscataway, N.J. pp. 719-724.
- 877
- 878 Makris N.C., Ratilal, P., Symonds, D., Jagannathan, S., Lee, S., and Nero, R.. 2006. Fish population
879 and behavior revealed by instantaneous continental-shelf-scale imaging. *Science* **311**: 660-663.
- 880
- 881 Manii, E. 2012. Autonomous tracking and following of sharks with an autonomous underwater vehicle.
882 Thesis. California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo.
- 883
- 884 Martignac, F., Daroux, A., Bagliniere, J.L., Ombredane, D., and Guillard, J., 2014. The use of acoustic
885 cameras in shallow waters: new hydroacoustic tools for monitoring migratory fish population. A review
886 of DIDSON technology. *Fish Fish.* **16**(3): 486–510.
- 887
- 888 Mas, F., Forselledo, R., and Domingo, A. 2014. Mobulid ray bycatch in longline fisheries in the
889 southwestern Atlantic Ocean. *Mar. Fresh. Res.* **66**: 767–777.
- 890
- 891 Misund, O., Aglen, A., and Fronaes, E., 1995. Mapping the shape, size, and density of fish schools by
892 echo integration and a high resolution sonar. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **52**: 11-20.
- 893
- 894 Moline, M.A., Blackwel, S.M., von Alt, C., Allen, B., Austin, T., Case, J., Forrester, N., Goldsborough,
895 R., Purcell, M., and Stokey, R. 2005. Remote environmental monitoring units: an autonomous vehicle

- 896 for characterizing coastal environments. *J. Atmos. Ocean. Tech.* **22**: 1797-1808.
897 doi:10.1175/JTECH1809.1.
- 898
- 899 Nakken, O., and Olsen, K. 1977. Target strength measurements of fish. *Rapp P.-V. Réun. - Cons. Int.*
900 *Explor. Mer.* **170**: 52-69.
- 901
- 902 Newhall, A.E., Lin, Y.T., Grothues, T. M., Lynch J.F., and Gawarkiewicz, G.G. 2016. A method of
903 observing acoustic scattering from fish schools using autonomous underwater vehicles. *IEEE J. Ocean.*
904 *Eng.* doi:10.1109/JOE.2016.2552878.
- 905
- 906 O'Driscoll, R. 1997. A side-scan sonar study of pelagic schooling fish off Otago, New Zealand. Ph.D.
907 thesis Department of Marine Science, The University of Otago, New Zealand, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- 908
- 909 Ona, E., and Toreson, R., 1988. Avoidance reactions of herring to a survey vessel studied by scanning
910 sonar. *ICES CM* 1988/H:46
- 911
- 912 Osher, S., and Fedkiw, R. 2003. *Level Set Methods and Dynamic Implicit Surfaces*. Springer- Verlag
913 New York, Inc., New York, N.Y.
- 914
- 915 Palka, D.L., and Hammond, P.S. 2001. Accounting for responsive movement in line transect estimates
916 of abundance. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **58**:777-787. doi: 10.1139/cjafs-58-4-777.
- 917
- 918 Pena, M., Olivar, M.P., Balbin, R., Lopez-Jurado, J.L., Iglesias, M., Miquel, J., and Jech, J.M. 2014.
919 Acoustic detection of mesopelagic fishes in scattering layers of the Balearic Sea (western
920 Mediterranean). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **71**(8): 1186-1197. doi: 10.1139/cjfas-2013-0331.

921

922 Pennington, M. 1983. Efficient Estimators of Abundance, for Fish and Plankton Surveys. *Biometrics*.
923 **39**(1): 281-286.

924

925 Saldivar, O. 2012. Levy flight as a robotic search pattern. Thesis. Department of Mechanical
926 Engineering. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

927

928 Scalabrin, C., Marfia, C., and Boucher, J.. 2009. How much fish is hidden in surface and bottom
929 acoustic blind zones? *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **66**: 1355-1363.

930

931 Schobernd, Z.H., Bacheler, N.M., Conn, P.B., and Trenkel, V. 2014. Examining the utility of
932 alternative video monitoring metrics for indexing reef fish abundance. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **71**(3):
933 464-471. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2013-0086.

934

935 Schweder, T. 1977. Point process models for line transect experiments, p. 221–242. *In* J. R. Barba, F.
936 Brodeau, G. Romier, and B. Van Cutsem, (eds.), *Recent Developments in Statistics*. North Holland
937 Publishing Company, New York.

938

939 Seiler, J., Williams, A., and Barret, N. 2012. Assessing size, abundance, and habitat preferences of
940 Ocean Perch *Heliocolenus percooides* using a AUV-borne stereo camera system. *Fish. Res.* **129-130**:
941 64-72.

942

943 Shen, H., Dorn, M.W., Wespestad, V., and Quinn, T.J. 2009. Schooling pattern of eastern Bering Sea
944 walleye pollock and its effect on fishing behavior. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **66** (6): 1284-1288.
945 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsp071.

946

947 Silveira, L., Anah, T.A.J., and Diniz-Filho, J.A.F. 2002. Camera trap, line transect census and track
948 surveys: a comparative evaluation. *Biol. Conserv.* **114**(3): 351–355. doi:10.1016/S0006-
949 3207(03)00063-6.

950

951 Singh, H., Eustice, R., Pizarro, R., Roman, C. 2003. Optical and acoustic habitat characterization with
952 the Seabed AUV. *OCEANS 2003. Proceedings* **1**: 332 doi:10.1109/OCEANS.2003.178579.

953

954 Smale, D.A., Kendrick, G.A., Harvey, E.S., Langlois, T.J., Hovey, R.K., Van Miel, K.P.,
955 Waddington, K.I., Bellchambers, L.M., Pember, M.B., Babcock, R.C., Vanderklift, M.A., Thomson,
956 D.P., Jakuba, M.V., Pizzaro, O., and Williams, S.B. 2012. Regional-scale benthic monitoring for
957 ecosystem-based fisheries management (EBFM) using an autonomous underwater vehicle. *ICES J.*
958 *Mar. Sci.* **69**(6): 1108-1118

959

960 Soria, M., Freon, P., and Gerlotto, F., 1996. Analysis of vessel influence on spatial behaviour of fish
961 schools using a multi-beam sonar and consequences for biomass estimates by echo-sounder. *ICES J.*
962 *Mar. Sci.* **53**: 453-458.

963

964 Sumengen. B. 2005. A MATLAB toolbox implementing Level Set Methods.

965

966 Sunardi, Din, J., Bidin, R., Hassan, R., and Seman, N. 2008. *In situ* Fish Target Strength Measurements
967 Compared with X-Ray Images of Swimbladder. *In Proceedings of the International Conference on*
968 *Computer and Communication Engineering*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 13-15 May 2008. IEEE,
969 Piscataway, NJ. pp. 1089 – 1092.

970

- 971 Thomas, M.V. and Hass, R.C. 2004. Abundance, age structure, and spatial distribution of lake sturgeon
972 *Acipenser fulvescens* in the St. Clair System. State of Michigan Department of Natural Resources.
973 Lansing, MI. Fisheries Division Research Report No. 2067 25 pp.
974
- 975 Tolimieri, N., Clarke, M.E., Singh, H., and Goldfinger, C. 2008. Evaluating the SeaBED AUV for
976 monitoring groundfish in untrawlable habitat. In Reynolds, J.R., Greene, H.G. (eds.) Marine Habitat
977 Mapping Technology for Alaska. Alaska Sea Grant College Program, University of Alaska Fairbanks.
978 doi:10.4027/mhmta.2008.09.
979
- 980 Trenkel, V.M., Berger, L., Bourguignon S., Doray, M., Fablet, R., Masse, J., Mazauric, V., Poncelet,
981 C., Quemener, G., and Scalabrin. C. 2009. Overview of recent progress in fisheries acoustics made by
982 Ifremer with examples from the Bay of Biscay. Aquat. Living Resour. **22**: 433-445.
983
- 984 Trevorrow, M. V., 1997. Detection of migratory salmon in the Fraser River using 100 kHz sidescan
985 sonars. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **54**: 1619 -1629.
986
- 987 Trevorrow, M. V. 2001. An evaluation of a steerable sidescan sonar for surveys of near-surface fish.
988 Fish. Res. **50**: 221-234.
989
- 990 Trevorrow, M. V., and Claytor, R.. 1998. Detection of herring schools in shallow waters using high-
991 frequency sidescan sonars. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **55**: 1419-1429.
992
- 993 Turnock, B. J., and Quinn, T.J. II. 1991. The effect of responsive movement on abundance estimation
994 using line transect sampling. Biometrics. 47: 701-715
995

- 996 Watson, D.L., and Harvey, S.H. 2007. Behaviour of temperate and sub-tropical reef fishes
997 towards a stationary SCUBA diver. *Mar. Freshwater Behav. Physiol.* **40**(2): 85–103. doi:
998 10.1080/10236240701393263.
999
- 1000 Watkins, K. S. and Rose, K.A. 2013. Evaluating the performance of individual-based animal movement
1001 models in novel environments. *Ecol. Modelling.* **250**: 214– 234.
1002
- 1003 Worton, B.J., 1989, Kernel methods for estimating the utilization distribution in home-range studies.
1004 *Ecology.* **70**(1): 164-168
1005
- 1006 Zhang, Y., Matuszewski, B.J., Shark, L.K., and Moore, C.J. 2008. Medical Image Segmentation Using
1007 New Hybrid Level-Set Method. *In* International Conference on Biomedical Visualisation, London,
1008 England, 9-11 July 2008. IEEE, Piscataway, N.J., pp. 71-76.
1009

1010 Table 1. Side scan sonar specifications

	Rutgers AUV	WHOI AUVs (2)
Frequency	600kHz	900 kHz
Operating Range	75 m	40 m
Horizontal beam width	0.4°	0.4°
Vertical beam width	40°	40°
Transducer depression angle from horizontal	10°	10°
Transmission pulse (Tone burst)	10 us	6.7 us
Digital across-track resolution	~ 1 cm, range dependent	~ 1 cm, range dependent
Digital along-track resolution	~ 2 cm, SOG dependent	~ 2 cm, SOG dependent
Acoustic across-track resolution	1.5 cm	1.0 cm
Acoustic along-track resolution	15.24 cm	10.16 cm
End of near -field	9.3 m	6.2 m

1011
1012
1013

1014

1015 Table 2. Correlation between standardized particle density function estimates of distribution of 3
1016 nominal fish classes (patrol, bait ball, and loose school) with distance across the continental shelf of
1017 Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, USA based on side scan sonar survey by an AUV (See Figure 5).

	F _{bait ball}	F _{loose school}
F _{patrol}	rho = 0.8988 p < 0.0001	rho = 0.3549 p = 0.0003
F _{bait ball}		rho = 0.0978 p = 0.3329

1018

1019

1020 Table 3. Some modifications of line transect estimators and their application to AUV supported fish
1021 recognizance.

Estimator	Modification	Relation to AUV	Citations
Hayne and Modified Hayne	Addresses bird flushing response to investigator	Fish react to AUV, but response distance is unknown	Gates et al. 1968 Burnham and Anderson 1976 Gates 1979
Fourier Series Estimator	Modifies transect width based on observed distribution of x	Recognizes the potential for echo weakening with distance from AUV	Burnham et al. 1980
Shape restricted estimator	Concave curvilinear decrease in detection probability relative to x	May be useful for transect width shoulder created by bottom reflection masking of fish	Johnson and Routledge 1985
View hindrance correction	$x \sim x/2$	Moves transect centerline outboard to assume blind spot near for aircraft, maybe similar to reduction under nadir	Leatherwood et al. 1982.
Distance methods	Clumped and fixed distributions	May be useful for schooling fish	Buckland 1985

Quadrat and point count Methods	Generally for dense non-motile organisms/plants	May be useful for classification of regions based on tiles, such as FSM/MSF	Schweder 1977
Responsive Movement	Modification of distance methods using two observers for 4 sectors, takes animal orientation relative to platform into account as bias estimates	Left and right sonar channels can act as two observers, but describing orientation is from sonar is difficult, AUV has only 2 sectors	Turnock and Quinn 1991. Buckland and Turnock 1992. Palka and Hammond, 2001.

1022
1023

1024

Table 4. Incidents of fish imaged in the aft-facing video camera and the mean duration of following

1025

behavior. No following behavior is indicated by “0”.

Species	Timed incidents	Mean Duration (s)
Blue Runner (<i>Caranx crysos</i>)	7	65
Amberjack (<i>Seriola dumereli</i>)	10	138
Tiger shark (<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>)	2	67
Other shark	2	25
Barracuda (<i>Sphyraena barracuda</i>)	1	26
Little Tunny (<i>Euthynnus alletteratus</i>)	2	30
Dolphin fish (<i>Coryphaena spp.</i>)	1	3
Bluefish (<i>Pomatomus saltatrix</i>)	43	11
Round Scad (<i>Decapturus punctatus</i>)	1	0
Stingray (<i>Dasyatis spp.</i>)	1	0

1026

▼

1027

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Schematic showing flattening and then removal of water column echo returns for georectification and preparation of alignment into mosaics of multiple “tiles”. Mosaic not shown.

Figure 2. Above) Schematic of the approximate split disk ensonified area around a submerged AUV or tow body. Below) Translation of the features normally seen in an un-georectified image tile where the sss intersects both the bottom and the surface. No fish are shown in this image.

Figure 3. Automated processing of side scan images for rays as a model for algorithm development to extend to fish school classification. A) The image is converted to black and white format, objects are delineated by edge-detection and segmentation, and are filtered by size. A guitarfish, recognized on the basis of separated pectoral and pelvic fins and thick tapering tail appears in the image tile at lower left. B) Targets are measured along longest and orthogonal axis. C) The distribution of width (y) along various distances of length (x) is calculated to define shape, by an Object Area Distribution and Symmetry Algorithm (OADaSA) for one parameter of classification.

Figure 4. Diversity of fish classes imaged by HFSSS. First row, “rays” including manta and sting rays. Second and third row left, “patrols”. Third row right and fourth row, “Followers”.

Figure 5. Diversity of fish classes imaged by HFSSS. “Bait balls”

Figure 6. Diversity of fish classes imaged by HFSSS. First row, “Loose schools”. Second and third rows, artifacts including underside of semi-rigid skiff, mooring line, and doubling of fish reflectors pacing the AUV.

Figure 7. Cross-shelf distribution of incidents of “bait ball” and “patrol” classes off Cape Hatteras, NC in the shallow transect relative to temperature and salinity as measured by the AUV. Ascending spikes in the temperature record and descending spikes in the salinity record occur when the AUV periodically ascends through warmer fresher layers to the surface to check it’s estimated position using GPS and thus profiles the water column.

Figure 8. The temperature and salinity (TS) experienced by bluefish (open blue circles) during their approach and photo imaging of the AUV superimposed over the total TS field encountered by the vehicle during a mission over the north western Hudson River Canyon off New Jersey. Temperature and salinity of bluefish occurrence are linearly interpolated from the first sighting of the fish in the camera using the nearest (every 1 s) temperature and salinity logged by the AUV.

Figure 9. Screen grabs of fish peeling away from or approaching (shark) the AUV after or prior to following. Top left, bluefish, top right, tiger shark, bottom left, blue runner, bottom right, little tunny. Video of these and additional interactions are available as Supplementary Material.

Figure 1.

1074
1075 Figure 2.

1076

B

Figure 3.

1081

1082

1083 Figure 4

1084

1085 Figure 5

1086
1087 Figure 6
1088

1089

1090 Figure 7.

1091

1092

1093 Figure 8.

1094

1095 Figure 9