

**VIRGINIA RECREATIONAL FISHING DEVELOPMENT FUND
SUMMARY PROJECT APPLICATION***

I

<p>NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:</p> <p>Virginia Institute of Marine Science P. O. Box 1346 Gloucester Point, VA 23062-1346</p>	<p>PROJECT LEADER(name, phone, e-mail)</p> <p>Mary C. Fabrizio 804-684-7308 mfabrizio@vims.edu</p>
<p>PRIORITY AREA OF CONCERN</p> <p>Research</p>	<p>PROJECT LOCATION</p> <p>Brackens and Wormley Ponds (York R.), Kamp's Millpond (Rappahannock R.) and Wareham's Pond (James R.)</p>
<p>DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF PROJECT</p> <p>Estimating relative abundance of young-of-year American eel, <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>, in the Virginia tributaries of Chesapeake Bay, 2011</p>	
<p>PROJECT SUMMARY:</p> <p>The need for fisheries-independent data from monitoring surveys is essential to many of the fishery management plans (FMP) for the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) and other management agencies. Specifically, this project meets the mandates of the ASMFC's FMP for American eel. Monitoring of glass eels (young-of-year) as they enter the estuary will provide estimates of recruitment in Virginia and allow for long-range planning for future harvestable stocks.</p>	
<p>EXPECTED BENEFITS:</p> <p>Recreational and commercial fishermen will benefit from this study as it will provide the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) and ASMFC with an index of annual recruitment for juvenile American eels. The American eel is an important bait fishery in Virginia for game fish such as striped bass and cobia. Additionally, the American eel commercial fishery in Virginia from 2000-2006 landed an average of 116,458 lbs. Estimates of year class strength provide an "early warning" of recruitment success or failure, and are vital for proper species management.</p>	
<p>COSTS:</p> <p>VMRC Funding: \$46,574 Recipient Funding: \$8,569 TOTAL COST: \$55,143</p> <p align="right">1 January – 31 December 2011</p> <p>Detailed budget included with proposal.</p>	

Updated 11/12/08

*This form alone does not constitute a complete application, see application instructions or contact Sonya Davis at 757-247-8155 or sonya.davis@mrc.virginia.gov

Estimated Cost:

VMRC American eel budget Jan 1, 2011 - Dec 31, 2011				
Personnel	Time	Grant	VIMS Match	Total
Tuckey, Co-PI	10%	5,985		5,985
Lowery	15%	5,652		5,652
Brooks	15%	5,640		5,640
Halvorson	15%	5,420		5,420
Rhea	5%	1,452		1,452
Total		24,149		24,149
Fringe Benefits @ 40%		9,660		9,660
Supplies				
Field and lab supplies		1,000		1,000
Travel				
Field Sites		2,050		2,050
Regional Meeting		400		400
Indirect Costs @ 25%		9,315	8,569	17,884
TOTAL		46,574	8,569	55,143

Facilities and Administrative Costs: F&A costs are assessed at 25% for funds provided by Marine Recreational Fishing Advisory Board. Due to the critical nature of the funding shortfall, VIMS will provide a major portion of the F&A costs associated with this project.

Proposal Submitted to:

Virginia Marine Resources Commission
Marine Recreational Fishing Advisory Board
2400 Washington Avenue, Newport News, VA 23607

By


THE VIRGINIA INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

**Estimating relative abundance of young-of-year American eel,
Anguilla rostrata, in the Virginia tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay, 2011**

1 January – 31 December 2011




Dr. Mary C. Fabrizio
Principal Investigator




Dr. Troy D. Tuckey
Co-Principal Investigator



Dr. John E. Graves
Chair, Dept. of Fisheries Science



Jane A. Lopez
Director, Sponsored Programs



Dr. Roger Mann
Director for Research and Advisory Services

March 31, 2010

Estimating relative abundance of the young-of-year American eel, *Anguilla rostrata*, in the Virginia tributaries of Chesapeake Bay, 2011

Introduction

American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*) range from New Brunswick to Florida and in recent years, harvests from US coastal states and the Canadian Maritime Provinces have declined (Meister and Flagg 1997; Haro et al. 2000). Although landings from Chesapeake Bay typically represent about 63% of the annual US commercial harvest of American eel (ASMFC 2000), in 2007 commercial landings in Virginia and Maryland represented only 52% of US landings (pers. comm., National Marine Fisheries Service, Fisheries Statistics Division, Silver Spring, MD), suggesting that some areas may be subject to more pronounced declines in recent years.

In addition to catch statistics, fishery-independent surveys can be used to monitor changes in abundance, particularly for young life stages of American eel. The recent decrease in abundance of young-of-year (YOY) American eel observed along the US coast appears to exhibit some degree of synchrony (Sullivan et al. 2006). Hypotheses for the decline in abundance include locational shifts in the Gulf Stream, pollution, overfishing, parasites, and barriers to fish passage (Castonguay et al. 1994; Haro et al. 2000). Additionally, factors such as unfavorable wind-driven currents may affect glass eel recruitment on the continental shelf and may have a greater impact than fishing mortality or continental climate change (Knights 2003).

Recognizing the need for accurately portraying recruitment declines, US Atlantic coastal states began implementing annual surveys for YOY American eels in 2000. These surveys are intended to "...characterize trends in annual recruitment of the YOY eels over time [to produce a] qualitative appraisal of the annual recruitment of American eel to the U.S. Atlantic Coast" (ASMFC 2000). These surveys fulfill the need to collect American eel data using both fishery-dependent and fishery-independent methods as mandated by the interstate Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for the American eel, which was adopted by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) in November 1999. A recent American eel stock assessment report (ASMFC 2006) emphasized the importance of the coast-wide surveys as indicators of sustained recruitment over the historical coastal range and as an early warning of potential range contraction of the species.

Life History

The American eel is a catadromous species that occurs along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of North America and inland in the St. Lawrence Seaway and Great Lakes (Murdy et al. 1997). The species is panmictic and supported throughout its range by a single spawning population (Haro et al. 2000; Meister and Flagg 1997).

Spawning takes place during winter to early spring in the Sargasso Sea. Eggs hatch into leaf-shaped transparent ribbon-like larvae called leptocephali, which are transported by ocean currents (over 9-12 months) in a generally northwesterly direction and can grow to 85 mm TL (Jenkins and Burkhead 1993). Within a year, metamorphosis into the next life stage (glass eel) occurs in the Western Atlantic near the east coast of North America. A reduction in length to about 50 mm TL occurs prior to reaching the continental shelf (Jenkins and Burkhead 1993).

In the Chesapeake Bay area (Maryland and Virginia), coastal currents and active migration transport glass eels into estuaries from February to June (Able and Fahay 1998). Glass eel migration appears to occur in waves with perhaps a fortnightly periodicity related to tidal currents (Ciccotti et al. 1995), and YOY eel may use freshwater “signals” to enhance recruitment to local estuaries (Sullivan et al. 2006). The magnitude, timing, and spatial pattern of upstream migration of glass eels may be affected by alterations in freshwater flow (Facey and Van Den Avyle 1987).

As glass eels grow, they become pigmented (elver stage), and within 12 to 14 months eels acquire a dark color with underlying yellow (yellow eel stage). Many eels migrate upriver into freshwater rivers, streams, lakes, and ponds, whereas other yellow eels remain in estuaries (Jessop et al. 2008). Most of the eel’s life is spent in these freshwater and brackish habitats as a yellow eel. Metamorphosis into the silver eel stage occurs during the seaward migration that takes place from late summer through autumn. Age at maturity varies greatly with latitude; American eel from Chesapeake Bay mature and migrate at an earlier age than eels from northern areas (Hedgepeth 1983). In Chesapeake Bay, most mature eels are less than 10 years old, although mature eels have been found to range between 8 and 24 years (Owens and Geer 2003). Upon maturity, eels migrate back to the Sargasso Sea, spawn, and die (Haro et al. 2000).

Objectives

The objectives of this study are to:

1. determine the spatial and temporal components of American eel recruitment to the Virginia tributaries of Chesapeake Bay by monitoring the run of glass eels; and
2. collect basic biological information (length, weight, pigment stage) on glass eels.

The American eel management plan recommends sampling for YOY eels should be “located at the head of tide in small streams or estuaries, as close to the Atlantic Ocean as possible” (ASMFC 2000). In Virginia, this would include the areas along the Eastern Shore and Virginia Beach. However, these areas are small (most less than one acre) and probably present a sink rather than a source for eels. Because the majority of the fishery occurs in the tributaries to the Bay, areas near the head of the major tributaries are better suited for sampling eel recruitment.

Methods

Exploratory surveys were conducted by the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) during spring 2000 to establish appropriate sampling gear and methodologies to evaluate YOY American eel recruitment. Since 2001, both the VMRC Marine Recreational Fishing Advisory Board and the Commercial Fishing Advisory Board have supported this project. This study proposes to continue the sampling begun in 2000 to ensure reliable estimates of recruitment success for American eel by using survey designs and methods that insure sufficient temporal and spatial coverage. These methods meet or exceed the minimal sampling criteria for YOY American eel proposed by the ASMFC American Eel Technical Committee and approved by the American Eel Management Board.

To provide the necessary spatial coverage, four sites to be sampled include Bracken’s and Wormley Ponds on the York River, Kamp’s Millpond on the Rappahannock River, and Wareham’s Pond on the James River (see Figure 1).

Irish eel ramps will be used to continuously sample the runs at each site beginning in early March 2011 (see Brooks et al. 2002 for details on gear configuration). The ramps will be

checked 3 times per week to evaluate catch and determine fishing conditions for a minimum of six weeks according to ASMFC criteria. When catches no longer yield glass eels, sampling will be terminated.

A combined sample of 60 glass eels will be collected (if present), transported back to the laboratory, measured to the nearest 0.1 mm total length, weighed to the nearest 0.01 g, and pigment stage recorded according to Haro and Krueger (1988). The remaining catch will be enumerated and placed above the impediment. At each site, temperature, precipitation, time sampled, and condition of the gear will be recorded.

Glass eel and elver catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) data for each site are standardized to a 24-hour soak time for the Irish eel ramp. Indices will be calculated by the area under the curve (AUC) method because this method is insensitive to interannual variability in the recruitment pattern, and we believe more accurately characterizes recruitment (Tuckey and Fabrizio 2009).

Recent Observations and Future Work

The area-under-the-curve method is preferred to the 95% geometric mean index method because glass eel recruitment patterns vary in timing and magnitude and the 95% geometric mean is sensitive to those annual changes (Figures 2 and 3). Because elvers are captured throughout the monitoring period with no readily identifiable pattern, the elver index calculation method was less affected and comparisons between index methods showed similar results (Figures 4 and 5).

Overall, the time series shows that the total number of glass eels captured among all sites differs by several orders of magnitude with most caught at the two sites in the York River. The greatest number of glass eels captured in the York River peaked at nearly 91,000 glass eels in 2007, while the lowest number caught was 69 glass eels in 2009 (Figure 2, bottom). Out of ten years of eel collections at Bracken's Pond, the fewest number of glass eels were captured during 2009, representing a two orders-of-magnitude decrease from the previous year. Although fewer glass eels are typically captured on the James and Rappahannock rivers compared with the York River, 2009 ranked as the highest catch for the James River site (Figure 3, bottom). Catches of glass eels from the Rappahannock River in 2009 were the second lowest out of 10 years of survey data (Figure 3, bottom). Variability of glass eel catches has been found in other systems

with no clear pattern related to water temperature or lunar phase, and conflicting results related to water flow or precipitation (Overton and Rulifson 2009).

The extremely low catch of glass eels and elvers at Bracken's Pond in 2009 may be the result of changes to flow dynamics at the site. The Irish eel ramp at Bracken's Pond was submerged during the entire sampling period in 2009, a pattern that is different from other years. This may have resulted in an altered freshwater signal that reached glass eels in the main portion of the York River. The change in hydrology at this site will require alteration of the Irish ramp deployment methodology and an evaluation of its continued use as a monitoring location. The fact that Wormley pond shows a similar declining index in recent years suggests that the data from Bracken's Pond may still be of value.

Throughout the duration of the survey, the number of elvers captured with Irish eel ramps was well below that of glass eels and ranged from as few as 3 elvers (Bracken's Pond, 2009) to as many as 1,968 elvers per year (Kamp's Millpond, 2003). Peak collections of elvers occurred during 2007 at both sites in the York River and the James River, but in the Rappahannock River 2007 ranked second lowest (Figures 4 and 5, bottom). The number of elvers captured during 2009 was extremely low in the Rappahannock and York rivers and below average in the James River compared with historic averages for these systems (Figure 5, bottom).

The timing of recruitment of glass eels in each pond appears to be related to the distance between the sampling site and the mouth of Chesapeake Bay (Figure 6). Earliest recruitment is observed at Wormley Pond on the York River (55.7 km from the mouth of the Bay), followed by Bracken's Pond (59.4 km), Wareham's Pond in the James River (77.8 km), and finally Kamp's Millpond on the Rappahannock River (101 km). Additionally, two sites located on the Virginia side of the Potomac River (> 101 km from the mouth of the bay) show much later recruitment peaks compared with other Virginia locations.

Variations in glass eel abundance as measured by the standardized geometric mean index are thought to reflect changes in annual recruitment of American eels to Chesapeake Bay tributaries, and subsequent adult abundance. However, this assumption has not been fully investigated. We are currently seeking separate funding to sample yellow phase American eels in the freshwater systems currently targeted for glass eel recruitment by VIMS. We intend to estimate the standing stock of yellow phase eels using electrofishing, fyke nets, or outflow traps,

which we are now testing in a pilot study at Wormley Pond (York River drainage, Yorktown, VA). The available nine-year time series of glass eel recruitment for sites in the Potomac, Rappahannock, York, and James river drainages provides a basis for comparison with age distributions of yellow or silver phase eels in these systems, as well as assessments of parasitic infection. This additional information will provide production estimates for lower Chesapeake Bay and further corroborate drainage-specific recruitment indices for glass eels.

Expected Results

This study will provide estimates of the timing and magnitude of recruitment of young-of-year American eel to the James, York, and Rappahannock rivers, major tributaries of the Chesapeake Bay. Furthermore, exploratory investigations of the eel standing stock will provide additional data with which to evaluate eel production and other biologically relevant concerns such as parasitic infection rates and severity; we are seeking other funding for these additional but complementary investigations. The information collected from this study will be beneficial to resource management agencies at state and federal levels, to better understand the stock-recruitment relationships of this species.

As before, results of the survey will be submitted to ASMFC, thus insuring the Virginia Marine Resources Commission complies with the ASMFC mandate. Survey results will also be provided to the ASMFC for future stock assessments of American eel. Lastly, results from this proposed study will be provided in quarterly reports and a final report to the VMRC MRFAB and presented at appropriate venues (peer-reviewed journals and presentations at professional fisheries meetings).

References

- Able, K. W. and M. P. Fahay. 1998. The First Year in the Life of Estuarine Fishes in the Middle Atlantic Bight. Rutgers University Press, New Jersey. 342 pp.
- ASMFC 2000. Interstate Fishery Management Plan for American eel, *Anguilla rostrata*. 79 pp.
- ASMFC 2006. Terms of Reference and Advisory Report to the American Eel Stock Assessment Peer Review. Stock Assessment Report No. 06-01. 23p.
- Brooks, H., M. T. Mathes and M. M. Montane. 2002. Evaluating recruitment of the American eel, *Anguilla rostrata*, to the Potomac River (Spring 2002). Final Report to the Potomac River Fisheries Commission. 22 pp.
- Castonguay, M. P., P. V. Hodson, M. J. Eckersley, J.-D. Dutil and G. Vereault. 1994. Why is recruitment of the American eel, *Anguilla rostrata*, declining in the St. Lawrence River and Gulf? Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci 51:479-488.
- Ciccotti, E, T. Ricci, M. Scardi, E. Fresi and S. Cataudella. 1995. Intraseasonal characterization of glass eel migration in the River Tiber: space and time dynamics. J. Fish Biol. 47:248-255.
- Facey, D. E. and M. J. Van Den Avyle. 1987. Species profiles: life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (North Atlantic)—American eel. U. S. Fish Wildl. Serv. Biol. Rep. 82(11.74). U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, TR EL-82-4. 28 pp.
- Haro, A.J. and W.H. Krueger. 1988. Pigmentation, size, and migration of elvers (*Anguilla rostrata* (Lesueur)) in a coastal Rhode Island stream. Can. J. Zool. 66: 2528-2533.
- Haro, A., W. Richkus, K. Whalen, W.-Dieter Busch, S. Lary, T. Brush, and D. Dixon. 2000. Population decline of the American eel: Implications for research and management. Fisheries 25(9): 7-16.
- Hedgepeth, M. Y. 1983. Age, growth and reproduction of American eels, *Anguilla rostrata* (Lesueur), from the Chesapeake Bay area. Masters Thesis. College of William and Mary. 61 pp.
- Jenkins, R. E. and N. M. Burkhead. 1993. Freshwater fishes of Virginia. American Fisheries Society. Bethesda, MD. 1079 pp.
- Jessop, B. M., D. K. Cairns, I. Thibault, and W. N. Tzeng. 2008. Life history of American eel *Anguilla rostrata*: new insights from otolith microchemistry. Aquat. Biol. 1:205-216.
- Knights, B. 2003. A review of the possible impacts of long-term oceanic and climate changes and fishing mortality on recruitment of anguillid eels of the Northern Hemisphere. The Science of the Total Environment 310(1-3):237-244.

- Meister, A. L. and L. N. Flagg. 1997. Recent developments in the American eel fisheries of North America. FOCUS 22(1):1-4.
- Montane, M. M., W. A. Lowery, H. Brooks and A. D. Halvorson. 2006. Evaluating recruitment of American eel, *Anguilla rostrata*, to the Potomac River (Spring 2006). Final Report to the Potomac River Fisheries Commission. 26 pp.
- Murdy, E.O., R.S. Birdsong and J.A. Musick. 1997. Fishes of Chesapeake Bay. Smithsonian Institution Press. 324 pp.
- Overton, A. S. and R. A. Rulifson. 2009. Annual variability in upstream migration of glass eels in a southern USA coastal watershed. Environ. Biol. Fish. 84:29–37
- Owens, S. J. and P. J. Geer. 2003. Size and age structure of American eels in tributaries of the Virginia portion of the Chesapeake Bay. Pages 117-124 in D. A. Dixon (Editor). Biology, Management and Protection of Catadromous Eels. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 33, Bethesda, MD, USA.
- Sullivan, M. C., K. W. Able, J. A. Hare, and H. J. Walsh. 2006. *Anguilla rostrata* glass eel ingress into two, U. S. east coast estuaries: patterns, processes and implications for adult abundance. Journal of Fish Biology 69: 1081-1101.
- Tuckey, T. D. and M. C. Fabrizio. 2009. Evaluating relative abundance of young of year American eel, *Anguilla rostrata*, in the Virginia tributaries of Chesapeake Bay (Spring 2009). Final Report to the Virginia Marine Resources Commission. 30 pp.




Figure 1. Location of sampling sites in the Rappahannock (Kamp's Millpond), York (Bracken's Pond and Wormley Pond), and James (Wareham's Pond) rivers, Virginia.





Figure 2. Comparison of abundance indices calculated by the 95% geometric mean (Top) and area-under-the-curve (AUC, Bottom) methods for glass eels from Wormley Pond and Bracken's Pond.





Figure 3. Comparison of abundance indices calculated by the 95% geometric mean (Top) and area-under-the-curve (AUC, Bottom) methods for glass eels from Wareham's Pond and Kamp's Millpond.





Figure 4. Comparison of abundance indices calculated by the 95% geometric mean (Top) and area-under-the-curve (AUC, Bottom) methods for elvers from Wormley Pond and Bracken's Pond.





Figure 5. Comparison of abundance indices calculated by the 95% geometric mean (Top) and area-under-the-curve (AUC, Bottom) methods for elvers from Wareham's Pond and Kamp's Millpond.




Figure 6. Week of survey when peak counts of glass eels were observed in each river from 2001 to 2009. Two sites are monitored in the York and Potomac rivers each year (n = 18 observations per river). In the James River, one site was monitored beginning in 2003 (n=7 observations). In the Rappahannock River, one site was monitored each year (n=9 observations). Potomac River data are from Tuckey and Fabrizio, 2009.