E

# VIRGINIA RECREATIONAL FISHING DEVELOPMENT FUND SUMMARY PROJECT APPLICATION*

**NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT:**
Dr. Hongsheng Liao, Mr. Scott Haga, and Dr. Cynthia M. Jones
Old Dominion University
800 W 46th St.
Norfolk, VA 23508

**PROJECT LEADER (name, phone, e-mail):**
Dr. Hongsheng Liao, Mr. Scott Haga, and Dr. Cynthia M. Jones
757-683-4497 cjones@odu.edu

**PRIORITY AREA OF CONCERN:**

Research and Data Collection

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

Center for Quantitative Fisheries Ecology
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, VA 23508

**DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF PROJECT:**

Sheepshead Population Dynamics in Chesapeake Bay, Virginia

**PROJECT SUMMARY:**

Recreational catch of sheepshead in Virginia, estimated by MRFSS, has been increasing in recent years. This increase has made local anglers such as the Coastal Conservation Association (CCA) concerned about sheepshead population status as the fishery develops. However, little is known about the Chesapeake Bay sheepshead population beyond minimal catch statistics. Moreover, the population in Chesapeake Bay may be a local stock governed by its unique vital rates. Therefore, specific data on population dynamics of sheepshead stock in Chesapeake Bay must be obtained to provide a scientific base for its management. We are proposing a three-year project to examine age composition, annual growth and mortality rates, and reproductive status of sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay, using this information to establish a baseline for stock assessment of this species in Chesapeake Bay. We present the second year's study here.

**EXPECTED BENEFITS:**

*Fisheries management*
Population characteristics of sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay will be evaluated and reported to VMRC as basic information for conducting initial stock assessment and for making management policies.

The results of this study will indicate the level of fishing that results in a sustainable exploitation of this stock, and whether this stock is separate from those in North Carolina, such that it can be managed independently by Virginia.

**COSTS:**

Year Two

| | |
|---|---|
| **VMRC Funding:** | $65,777 |
| **Recipient Funding:** | $ 8,946 |
| **Total Costs:** | **$74,723** |

**Detailed budget must be included with proposal.**

**Updated 6/1/05**

***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 : Due dates are June 15 (Jul. – Nov. Cycle) and December 15 (Jan. – May Cycle)**

**Sheepshead Population Dynamics in Chesapeake Bay, Virginia (Year 2)**

Proposal for consideration by the Virginia Recreational Fishing Advisory Board

Cynthia M. Jones, Hongsheng Liao, and Scott Haga
Center for Quantitative Fisheries Ecology
Old Dominion University

**Statement of Problem**

Recreational anglers have expressed interest in carefully developing a fishery for sheepshead (*Archosargus probatocephalus*) in Chesapeake Bay. Recreational catch of sheepshead in Virginia, estimated by the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS 2005), increased from 1,583 to 4,924 fish from 1999 to 2004 with a peak of 8,513 fish in 2003 (Figure 1). Although sheepshead is not a major fishery in Chesapeake Bay, this increase has raised concern about the population status of this species as the fishery develops.

The Coastal Conservation Association (CCA) has been the first to express concern about overfishing on sheepshead population in Chesapeake Bay. They believe that information on population dynamics of sheepshead should be collected and provided to fishery management before any negative impact of overfishing occurs on sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay (Personal communication with CCA).

All the previous studies on sheepshead were done for fish from the South Atlantic Bight and Gulf of Mexico. Little is known about the Chesapeake Bay population beyond minimal catch statistics. Moreover, the population of sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay may be a local stock governed by its unique vital rates if it follows the structure found in the Gulf where fish exhibit subpopulation differences (Beckman et al. 1991; Matlock 1992; Render and Wilson 1992). Therefore, specific data on population dynamics of sheepshead stock in Chesapeake Bay must be obtained to provide a scientific base for its management.

In our first year of sampling (Summer 2006) we hope to provide information on size-at-age, mortality, and growth curves. These are essential data in establishing harvest levels scientifically. In our second year (Summer 2007) for which we seek continued funding, we hope to evaluate the reproductive pattern and success of sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay. This second year is especially important so that we can collect sufficient numbers of imminent spawners from which we estimate fecundity. This data on fecundity is crucial in setting harvests so that enough fish survive to continue the population.

**Background**

Previous studies of sheepshead have been conducted mainly in Florida and states in Gulf of Mexico, providing general information about the species. Beckman et al. (1991) found that annual rings formed once a year and that females had faster growth, reaching larger maximum size than males in Louisiana waters. Render and Wilson (1992) also reported that sheepshead were 50% mature by age 2, and all males and females were mature over age 3 and 4, respectively in Louisiana. Although it is reported that sheepshead are relatively long-lived species and reach ages in excess of 20 years (Beckman et al. 1991), the oldest sheepshead in Georgia was 14 years based on otolith ageing (Music and Pafford 1984). Tremain (2004) reported that the movement of sheepshead only occurred between their spawning areas and surrounding waters in Florida. To date, there is no evidence that sheepshead migrate along the U. S. Atlantic coast. The best review of sheepshead biological characteristics and population dynamics was found in stock assessment reports documented by Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (Murphy and MacDonald 2000). They confirmed that sheepshead did not migrate along the U. S. Atlantic coast and that their maturity and growth rates could be different among the regions.

Historically, an increasing demand for a fish species resulted in increased management regulations on the species, concomitant with its decline in abundance. For example, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department imposed more regulations on use of gears, size, bag, and possession limits on sheepshead in response to dramatically increased fishing pressure during 1980s (Matlock 1992). Recently, sheepshead are becoming a more important fishery along the U. S. Atlantic coast, which requires more information on regional or local stocks in order to establish fishery management strategies on a regional scope. Unlike Florida, which has done long-term thorough stock assessments of sheepshead due to its importance there, both Georgia and South Carolina have only begun their initial stages of sheepshead stock assessment (Sedberry 2002; Georgia DNR 2004). Both states have started either monitoring or stock assessment programs for sheepshead.

However, no thorough studies have been conducted and little is known about sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay, although there is a potential that sheepshead may become more popular. Miller et al. (1996) listed sheepshead as a benthivores and nonresident species without any natural reproduction in Chesapeake Bay. However, they lacked information on population dynamics, and further there is evidence to indicate reproduction in the Bay region. Sheepshead in North Carolina is the closest population to the one in Chesapeake Bay but knowledge is also limited there. For example, Schwartz (1990) was only able to use scales to age fish up to eight years and did not provide any information on older fish age composition in North Carolina. The Virginia Game Fish Tagging Program has trained anglers to tag a variety of fish species, including sheepshead. So far, the tagging program has not collected sufficient information to further our knowledge of sheepshead. For example, they had only one recapture each year of tagged sheepshead in 2000, 2001, and 2002, respectively (Lucy and Bain 2002). To effectively manage this species, fisheries managers must first obtain detailed scientific information to identify the Chesapeake Bay sheepshead as a separate stock, to understand population dynamics of the stock, and then to conduct stock assessment for sheepshead fishery management.

Fish population characters such as age composition, growth and mortality rates, and reproduction status are primary information for recognition of putative stocks at the practical fisheries management level (Ihssen et al. 1981; Cadrin et al. 2005). Moreover, such data are necessary in a variety of stock assessment models such as ADAPT, FAST, MUTIFAN, which are used by fisheries scientists to establish effective management strategies. For example, the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) has been using ADAPT to conduct stock assessment of Atlantic striped bass (*Morone saxatilis*) for many years, providing fisheries managers with population dynamics information of this species. The population of this species has recovered from near depletion during 1980s, and which is considered as one of the most successful examples of fisheries management (Richards and Rago 1999). Therefore, collecting high quality information on age composition, growth and mortality rates, and reproduction status is the first and critical step to identify a fish stock and further to conduct assessment of the stock, especially a near-virgin stock.

**Significance**

By definition, a virgin stock is an unexploited standing stock (Gulland 1971), naturally regulated by density-dependent processes and characterized by a high proportion of old fish, slow individual growth rates, and low total mortality rates (Van den Avyle and Hayward 1999). Two signs may indicate that sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay is most likely to be very close to a virgin stock. First, exploitation in Chesapeake Bay is very low compared to other Atlantic regions. For example, the inland recreational catch are 1980 (±1,980 SE) and 3,854 (±2,008 SE) fish in Maryland and Virginia in 2004, respectively, whereas the recreational catch are 70,604 (±13,626 SE), 125,790 (±30441 SE), 143,422 (±31,840 SE), and 2,986,156 (±155,280 SE) fish in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida in 2004, respectively (MRFSS 2005). Second, fishermen have been continuously reporting that they catch much larger sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay than other Atlantic regions. So either sheepshead grow larger here than elsewhere, or mortality is so low that fish get much older and larger here.

It is very unusual to find a near-virgin stock in Maryland and Virginia in 2006, and it is also unusual for stakeholders to request study of a fish stock before it is fully exploited--such as sheepshead stock in Chesapeake Bay. Taking this opportunity, we will be able to estimate natural mortality, and monitor and examine the response of sheepshead stock as fishing pressure increases in Chesapeake Bay. The information from the project will benefit Virginia recreational anglers as follows.

1) Theoretically, when a virgin stock is open to exploitation for a certain time, population characters start to change. For example, age composition may shift from a majority of older fish to younger fish and individual growth rates may increase. By modeling the sheepshead population in Chesapeake Bay, we may examine and test a variety of theories for its management.

2) This study will also contribute biological, ecological, and conservation knowledge on sheepshead in a broad geological range. It has been reported that sheepshead are widespread from Nova Scotia to Brazil (Robins and Ray 1986). However, we have not found any studies on sheepshead population north of North Carolina. Knowledge of this

species in Virginia will provide information to conservation of this species and especially on the potential of connectivity between stocks.

## Objectives

This study is the first to evaluate sheepshead population dynamics in the Chesapeake Bay and determine whether there is evidence that it is a separate stock, governed by its own vital rates, separate from other Atlantic regions and to establish a baseline for stock assessment of this species in Chesapeake Bay. Our specific objectives are to: 1) examine age composition of the sheepshead population; 2) estimate their annual growth rates; 3) estimate annual mortality rates; and 4) evaluate their reproductive status in Chesapeake Bay.

The results of the project from the first year will provide us with the preliminary knowledge of sheepshead population dynamics in Chesapeake Bay, such as length at age, population growth rate and mortality rate specifically in 2006. However, it is necessary and essential to continue the project for next two years due to two reasons. First, fish population growth, mortality, and reproduction activity could vary with environmental conditions annually and even dramatically. A three-year research study will show such variability, broaden our understanding of this population in general, and provide less biased information to the fishery management. Second, technically, reproductive status is difficult to determine because it requires that a large number of gravid females are caught and evaluated. Typically, we will see only a few gravid females among 500 fish that are landed. It is this problem that requires us to sample over three years – so that we will be able to determine the impact of fishing on the sheepshead's ability to replace itself through reproduction.

With the information above, we will be able to evaluate sheepshead management in the region to enhance recreational angling experiences.

## Preliminary Results from Year One Sampling (Summer 2006)

The project officially started on May 1, 2006. We hired a master's student Mr. Scott Haga and have trained him on field and lab work. Scott Haga conducted a pilot study on comparing ageing using sheepshead otoliths (ear stone), opercula and pelvic spines. He has found that otoliths are the most appropriate hard parts to be used to age sheepshead. He will report the results from the pilot study after he analyzes sufficient samples by Fall 2006.

Up to the middle of June 2006, we collected 13 sheepshead from anglers and the commercial fishery. We aged the fish using otoliths and checked their maturity macroscopically (Table 1). The ovaries from the six females have been preserved in 10% buffered formalin for later histology analysis.

**Methods**

*Field work*

Over the past four years, sheepshead has been predominantly caught by recreational anglers in the Chesapeake Bay with over sixty percent of landings made by anglers (MRFSS 2005). Moreover, fish size varies spatially and between the recreational and commercial fisheries. To obtain a complete range of sizes, it will be necessary to sample sheepshead from both fisheries sectors. We anticipate that anglers will provide some of the samples needed for age and fecundity estimates, but this may have to be augmented by fishery-cooperative or fishery-independent sampling if gonads can't be obtained in "fresh" condition. Commercial sampling will provide a broader range of sizes to determine age composition than can be obtained solely from angling. If "fresh" gonads cannot be obtained from either fishery in sufficient numbers, then we will undertake fishery-independent sampling.

Recreational sampling:

In May and June of 2006, we worked closely with the VA CCA, local marinas, angler's clubs, and anglers in person. Mr. Larry Snider from the VA CCA has been acting voluntarily as the project coordinator between the VA CCA and ODU, enhancing communication between the recreational anglers and us. We had a meeting with Mr. Tom Powers from the VA CCA, and discussed many details on how to promote the project, how to communicate with anglers, and how to collect data, etc. We have located coolers with ice at Long Bay Pointe Marina every day and at Little Creek Marina, Taylors Landing Marina, Bubba Marina, and Shore Dr. Marina on weekends along Shore Drive from Norfolk to Virginia Beach. Recreational fishermen are encouraged to donate their sheepshead or sheepshead carcass at each of these locations. We gave a presentation about this project to the Tidewater Anglers Association with great feedback, and have scheduled the same presentation at the Tidewater Kayak Anglers Association on the 12th of July. We are working with other five angler's clubs to arrange presentations. We have also contacted many individual anglers personally who are known to specifically target sheepshead and they have been eager to participate in the project.

To promote collection of fish, we distributed project brochures to these marinas and to angler's clubs. We developed a sheepshead research website where fishermen could check the ages, sex, and maturity of the fish they have donated (http://www.odu.edu/sci/cqfe/research/sheepshead%20project/sheepshead_project.htm). At the website, fishermen also can monitor the progress of the project so that they will know where and how to help the project in the future.

During the second year of the project, we will continue to sample sheepshead in this way, and based on knowledge that we obtained in the first year, we will develop new collection points. We anticipate that this will allow us to collect most of the reproductive organs we will need for fecundity estimates. If insufficient numbers of fish are collected by volunteers, then we will augment samples to reach the target of thirty fish bi-weekly. If the fish show signs of reproduction, we will sample more heavily during that period of time.

Commercial sampling
Sheepshead are caught commercially in pound nets. Pound nets are known not to be size selective. This will allow us to collect samples that represent the age and size composition of the population. We will use the help of the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC), which samples the commercial sector daily. VMRC employees will contact us anytime they intercept sheepshead. We will measure all the sheepshead we encounter, and we will then sub-sample randomly the commercial fish catch by purchasing boxes of fish (50 lbs. Box).

Fishery Independent Sampling
If the number of samples is insufficient from the commercial and recreational sector, charter boats will be used to collect sheepshead. Any charter boat captains with experience fishing for sheepshead will be contacted randomly for a full day of fishing on the bay. This will supplement the number of samples needed for this study.

*Lab work*

Once fish are collected they will be brought to the Center for Quantitative Fisheries Ecology (CQFE) at Old Dominion University (ODU) where they will be measured, weighed and the otoliths and gonads will be removed.

Otolith processing:
We will use a "bake and thin-section" technique to process sheepshead otoliths for age determination developed by the CQFE. The otolith will be secured to a microscope slide, and sectioned on a Buehler Isomet saw equipped with two Norton diamond wafering blades separated by a 0.4 mm stainless steel spacer, positioned so that the wafering blades straddles the focus. The otolith section will be placed into a ceramic "Coors" spot plate well and baked in a Thermolyne 1400 furnace at $400^{o}$C. Baking time will be dependent on otolith size and gauged by color, with a light caramel color desired. The baked thin-section will be placed on a labeled glass slide and covered with a thin layer of Flo-texx mounting medium.

Gonad processing:
Histological sections of ovaries will follow the methods of Wells (1994) who examined the effect of different preservatives on the ability to discriminate amongst several different cellular structures. He found that preservation of ovaries in buffered formalin (5% vol:vol) minimally affected the ability of standard staining techniques, hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) to resolve intra-ovarian structures associated with spawning. Therefore in this study, ovaries will be preserved in formalin and histological sections will be stained with H&E for fecundity estimation. Each ovary will be cut in half and three replicate 1 $cm^3$ ovarian samples will be taken from each female, making sure that samples are taken from the tunica to the lumen to assure representative parts of gonadal material are sampled.
*Data Analysis*

Age determination:
Otoliths are read under a microscope using polarized light and an image analysis system. Procedures to establish quality assurance and reliability of age readings are incorporated into our laboratory protocols. We measure precision between age readings done by all readers so that we have consistency. Otoliths are read double-blind (with no knowledge of time or place of capture, or length of fish). A randomly selected subsample is read twice by the same reader and by another reader to test consistency among and between readers (Campana et al. 1995, DeVries and Frie 1996). We use a symmetry test (Bowker 1948) to measure precision and to observe tendencies to over- or underestimate age. Because it is also important to maintain consistency in age readings between years, we insert a sample of hard parts read in prior years among currently collected samples following double-blind procedures to test year-to-year consistency in ageing (Campana et al. 1995). We test for potential differences with repeated-measures ANOVA. Such vigilance keeps our age readings consistent and reliable from year to year.

Age composition and growth:
To evaluate growth, observed length-at-age data will be fitted to a von Bertalanffy Growth function (Ricker 1975), by non-linear least square regression (S-PLUS 1999):

$$Lt = L_{inf}(1\text{-}e)^{(-k(t-t0))}),$$

$Lt$ = length at time t
$L_{inf}$ = asymptotic mean length
$t$ = time
$t_o$ = theoretical age at 0 length
$K$ = growth coefficient (instantaneous rate).

Likelihood ratio tests (Kimura 1980, Cerrato 1990) will be used to determine if differences exists between von Bertalanffy parameter estimates between sexes and years for mean fork length-at-age data:

$$\chi_k^2 = -N * Ln\left(\frac{RSS_\Omega}{RSS_w}\right)$$

Where k is the degrees of freedom (equals the number of constraints placed upon the fit), N is the total number of age groups from both curves combined, $RSS_\Omega$ is the total sum of squared residuals derived from fitting both curves separately and $RSS_w$ is the total sum of squared residuals derived from fitting the curves with one hypothesized constraints ie. $L_{inf}$ are the same, $t_0$are the same etc…

To determining the age distribution of the sheepshead population in the bay, we will use the large sample of fish we measured and the ages of the sub-samples and construct an age-length key. We can use the key to convert catch-at-size data into catch-at-age data. The keys specify the probability that fish of a given size belong to one of several age groups.

Mortality:
We will use the catch curve analysis to estimate the instantaneous rate of mortality. For this method, we simply plot the logarithms of frequency of occurrence against age. This results in a curve which has a steeply ascending left limb, a dome-shaped upper portion, and a long, descending right limb which is nearly straight. Assuming that fish increase in size by a constant amount from year to year, the slope of the right limb is equal to the negative of instantaneous total mortality (-Z). To estimate natural mortality, we will use two methods based on the longevity of sheepshead in the bay both described by Hewitt and Hoenig (2005). The first is based on a linear regression model (Hoenig 1983). He recommends using the predictive equation:

$$\ln(\widehat{M}) = 1.44 - 0.982 * \ln(t_{\max})$$

Where $\widehat{M}$ is estimate of natural mortality, and $t_{max}$ is the maximum age observed.

The second method to estimate natural mortality consists of determining the value of M such that 100(P)% of the animals in the stock survive to the age $t_{max}$ such that:

$$\hat{M} = \frac{-\ln(P)}{t_{\max}}$$

These two methods have been used extensively in work related to stock assessment for blue crab (*Callinectes sapidus*) (Hewitt and Hoenig 2005).

Reproduction Status:
It is straightforward to determine whether a fish is a batch or total spawner using histological samples of the gonads. Batch spawners show several developmental stages of oocytes at any given time. In the simplest case all developmental stages (excluding hydrated oocytes) of oocytes are present within one ovary. Similarly, group synchronous spawners would all have at least two distinct stages occurring simultaneously while asynchronous development is characterized by oocytes representing all stages of development and constant oocyte recruitment. The reproductive biology of Sheepshead was studied in the Gulf of Mexico (Render and Wilson 1992). The authors demonstrated that sheepshead in the Gulf of Mexico are batch spawners. We anticipate that Sheepshead in the Chesapeake Bay follow this pattern. If so, we must estimate both batch fecundity throughout the season and estimate the number of batches in a season.

Batch fecundity can be defined as the number of ripened oocytes in the ovary immediately prior to spawning (Bagenal 1978). Two methods will be used to estimate fecundity. For hydrated specimens, the hydrated oocyte method will be used (Hunter et al. 1985). In this method, a sub-sample of the gonad is weighed to the nearest 0.1mg. The number of hydrated oocytes is counted and the projection of batch fecundity is calculated by the product of the hydrated count and the weight of the gonads for both lobes. For specimens that are fully matured but not hydrated, an oocyte size-frequency distribution method will be employed (MacGregor 1957, Hunter et al. 1985). With this method the most advanced modal group of oocytes size classes is determined visually by constructing a size-frequency distribution of the oocytes. The total number of oocytes that constitute the most advanced mode is assumed the spawning batch. This method yields similar results as the hydrated method if highly advanced oocytes are used (Hunter and Goldberg 1980; Laroche and Richardson 1980). Typically, determining the number of batches in a season is difficult. However, by sampling frequently over the course of the spawning season we can estimate the number of batches by examining the proportion of the population with post-ovulatory follicles present (evidence of recent spawning). The inverse of this proportion gives the average time between batches. For example, if 30% of the population has post-ovulatory follicles then the average interval between batches is 3 days. Thus, we can estimate the age-specific, batch fecundity and by summing over the spawning season and we can determine total fecundity for the population using characteristics from the sampled population.

## Expected Results

*Fisheries management*

Population characters of sheepshead in Chesapeake Bay will be defined and reported to VMRC as basic information to conducting future stock assessment and to making management policies.

*Academic contributions*

Two manuscripts will be submitted to peer-reviewed journals. One is about sheepshead growth and mortality in Chesapeake Bay, another is about sheepshead reproduction status in Chesapeake Bay.

## Timeline for Year 2007-2008

*Year 2007-2008*

<u>May to August</u>

1. Continue sampling to collect commercially harvested fish.
2. Continue to receive samples from recreational anglers.
3. Process ovary samples for batch fecundity estimation and histological preparation.
4. Process Sheepshead otoliths for age and growth analysis.
5. Ovarian samples are sent for histological preparation (determinations of reproductive strategy).

<u>September to April</u>

1. Ageing using otoliths.
2. Preliminary fecundity estimates for sheepshead in the Chesapeake Bay.
3. Create a yield per recruit model to determine biological reference points and report the findings to the VMRC and the Recreational Board.

**References**

Bagenal, T., and E. Braum 1978. Eggs and early life history. In Bagenal, T. (ed.), Methods for assessment of fish production in freshwaters. P. 165-201. Blackwell Scientific Publications, London.

Beckman, D. W., A. L. Stanley, J. H. Render, and C. A. Wilson. 1991. Age and growth-rate estimation of sheepshead *Archosargus probatocephalus* in Louisiana waters using otoliths. Fishery Bulletin 89: 1-8.

Bowker, A.H. 1948. A test for symmetry in contingency tables. Journal of the American Statistical Association 43:572-574.

Cadrin, S. X., K. D. Friedland, and J. R. Waldman. 2005. Stock Identification Method: Applications in fishery science. Elservier Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Campana, S.E., M.C. Annaud, and J.J. McMillan. 1995. Graphical and statistical methods for determining the consistency of age determinations. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 124:131-138.

DeVries, D.R. and R.V. Frie. 1996. Determination of Age and Growth. Pages 483-512 in B.R. Murphy and D.W. Willis, editors, Fisheries techniques, 2nd edition, American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

Georgia DNR. 2004. Management Plan: Sheepshead. Coastal Resources Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources, GA, http://crd.dnr.state.ga.us/content/displaycontent.asp?txtDocument=350.

Gulland, J. A. 1971. The fish resources of the ocean. Fishing News (Books) Ltd, Surry, England.

Hewitt, D. A. and J. M. Hoenig. 2005. Comparison of two approaches for estimating natural mortality based on longetivity. Fish. Bull. 103:433-437.

Hoenig, J. M. 1983. Empirical use of longetivety data to estimate mortality rates. Fish. Bull. 82:898-903.

Hunter, J.R., N.C. H. Lo, and R.J.H. Leong. 1985. Batch fecundity in multiple spawning fishes. In Lasker, R. (ed), An egg production method for estimating spawning biomass of pelagic fish: Application to the northern anchovy, *Engraulis mordax*, p. 67-77. NOAA Tech. Rep. 36.

Hunter, J.R., and B.J. Macewicz. 1985. Measurement of spawning frequency in multiple spawning fishes. In Lasker, R. (ed), An egg production method for estimating spawning biomass of pelagic fish: Application to the northern ancchovy, *Engraulis mordax*, p. 79-94. NOAA Tech. Rep. 36.

Hunter, J. R., and S. R. Goldberg. 1980. Spawning incidence and batch fecundity in northern anchovy, *Engraulis mordax*. Fish Bull. U.S. 77: 641-652.

Ihssen, P. E., H. E. Booke, J. M. Casselman, J. M. McGlade, N. R. Payne, and F. M. Utter. 1981. Stock identification: materials and methods. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 38: 1838-1855.

Kimura, D. K. 1980. Likelihood methods for the von Bertalanffy growth curve. Fishery Bulletin 77. 765-776.

Laroche, J. L., and S. L. Richardson 1980. Reproduction of northern anchovy, *Engraulis mordax*, off Oregon and Washington. Fish. Bull. 78:603-618.

Lucy, J, and C. M. Bain III. 2002. Virginia game fish tagging program annual report 2002. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, VA. http://www.vims.edu/adv/recreation/2002/index.html.

MacGregor, J. S. 1957. Fecundity of the pacific sardine (*Sardinops caerulea*). Fish. Bull. 57:427-449.

Matlock, G. C. 1992. Growth of five fishes in Texas bays in the 1960s. Fishery Bulletin 90: 407-411.

Miller, T. J., E. D. Houde, and E. J. Watkins. 1996. Chesapeake Bay Fisheries: Prospects for multispecies management and sustainability. *Perspectives on Chesapeake Bay*, Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, MD. http://www.chesapeake.org/stac/pubs/litsyns/multi/multi_body.html.

MRFSS. 2005. Fisheries statistics in Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey. Fisheries Statistics Division, NOAA Fisheries: Office of Science and Technology. http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/index.html.

Murphy, M. D., and T. C. MacDonald. 2000. An assessment of the status of sheepshead in Florida waters through 1999. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, St. Petersburg, FL.

Render, J. H., and C. A. Wilson. 1992. Reproductive biology of sheepshead in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 121: 757-764.

Richards, R. A., and P. J. Rago. 1999. A case history of effective fishery management: Chesapeake Bay striped bass. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 19: 356-375.

Ricker, W. E. 1975. Computation and interpretation of biological statistics of fish populations. Bulletin of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. 191:1-367.

Robins, C. R., and G. C. Ray. 1986. A field guide to Atlantic coast fishes of North America. Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 354p.

Schwartz, F. J. 1990. Length-weight, age and growth, and landings observations for sheepshead *Archosargus probatocephalus* from North Carolina. Fishery Bulletin 88: 829-832.

Sedberry, G. 2002. Response to the Commission's follow-up questions. *In* The MARMAP program: essential long-term data series for fisheries management. U. S. Commission on Ocean Policy, Southeast Regional Meeting, January 15-16, 2002, Charleston, SC. http://www.oceancommission.gov/meetings.

S-Plus. 1999. S-Plus 4.5 Guide to Statistics. Data Analysis Products Division. Math Soft, Inc. Seattle, Washington.

Tremain, D. M., C. W. Harnden, and D. H. Adams. 2004. Muttidirectional movements of sportfish species between an estuarine no-take zone and surrounding waters of the Indian River Lagoon, Florida. Fishery Bulletin 102: 533-544.

Van den Avyle, M. J., and R. S. Hayward. 1999. Dynamics of exploited fish population. *In* Inland Fisheries Management in North America (Kohler and Hubert, eds.), p. 127-166. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland.

Wells, B. K. 1994. Reproductive biology of Chesapeake Bay Black Drum (*Pogonias cromis*), with an assessment of the fixatives and stains for histological examination of teleost ovaries. M. S. Thesis. Department of Biological Sciences, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA. 67 p.

**Laboratory Facilities**

In September 1997, the VMRC established The Age & Growth Laboratory at the CQFE at ODU to provide routine ageing of Virginia's marine finfish catch. The laboratory provides VMRC with the fundamental demographic data necessary for management. It is the mandate of this laboratory to help ensure Virginia's fish stocks remain a viable resource for future generations. To safeguard this resource, the Age & Growth Laboratory has established criteria that not only best suits the individual species, but also is consistent with other ageing facilities to allow for a coast-wide data exchange. Currently the lab is responsible for ageing 14 species of marine finfish. Bony structures presently being used to age fish include otoliths, scales, and opercula. However, we are examining additional hard (bony) structures, including pectoral fin rays, dorsal spines, anal spines, pelvic spines and vertebrae, for use as alternative ageing structures.

**Budget for Year Two**

| | VMRC |
|---|---|
| **PERSONEL:** | |
| **Salary of Jones (1 month)** | **11,230** |
| **Casual Employee** | **20,000** |
| **Fringe Benefits** | **4,617** |
| | **$35,847** |
| | |
| **GENERAL EXPENSES:** | |
| **Travel/Sample collection** | **8,320** |
| **Supplies for otolith processing** | **955** |
| | **$9,275** |
| | |
| **SUBCONTRACT EXPENSES:** | |
| **Reproductive organ processing** | **$7,500** |
| | |
| **TOTAL DIRECT COSTS** | **52,622** |
| **INDIRECT COSTS** | **13,155** |
| **TOTAL SPONSOR COST** | **65,777** |
| **ODU Match** | **8,946** |
| | |
| **TOTAL PROJECT COSTS** | **$74,723** |

**Budget justification**

Personnel costs for Scott Haga will be for sample collection, processing, and data analysis. Other Professional (Dr. Liao) will be overseeing the project, coordinating sample collections, assisting data analysis in his role as laboratory manager. Dr. Jones will be providing her expertise with population dynamics and statistical issues, and will supervise Mr. Haga's research.

We will subcontract the Tidewater Technical to prepare fish reproductive organs for reproductive status analysis. I had a subcontract with this company before on a previous project. The cost is $15 per slide. We are planning to hire charter boats to collect fish samples for us when sample sizes are insufficient from both recreational and commercial fisheries.

Travel costs consist of two parts. 1) Sample collection: We estimate traveling around 4000 miles per year around Chesapeake Bay to collect samples from recreational and commercial fisheries with a mileage compensation of $0.41 per mile. 2) Meeting attendance: We will be giving presentations of this project to local angling clubs and to professional groups.

The remainder of funds goes to sample collection, processing supplies, and information exchange with local communities and organizations, such as fish clubs. We are requesting $500 to publish brochures and promotional material.

Table 1. Thirteen sheepshead caught so far have been aged and their sex and maturity have been evaluated.

| Fish ID | Weight (lb.) | Total Length (inches) | Standard Length (mm) | Fork Length (mm) | Total length (mm) | Sex | Maturity* | Age |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 14.5 | 293 | 333 | 369 | Male | 2 | 9 |
| 2 | 5.085 | 19 | 395 | 445 | 486 | Male | 2 | 5 |
| 3 | 3.976 | 18.5 | 369 | 425 | 469 | Male | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | 4.404 | 19 | 385 | 438 | 486 | Female | 3 | 5 |
| 5 | 2.502 | 16 | 319 | 362 | 405 | Female | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | 2.302 | 15 | 314 | 314 | 383 | Male | 2 | 3 |
| 7 | 8.938 | 22.8 | 461 | 525 | 580 | Male | 2 | 17 |
| 8 | 8.54 | 23.6 | 480 | 550 | 607.5 | Female | 3 | Processing |
| 9 | 7.042 | 21 | 444 | 496 | 541 | Female | 4 | Processing |
| 10 | 19.855 | 26 | 588 | 623 | 661 | Female | 3 | Processing |
| 11 | 12.100 | 24 | 534 | 578 | 611 | Female | 3 | Processing |
| 12 | 9.50 | 24 | 492 | 550 | 612 | Female | 3 | Processing |
| 13 | 10.82 | 24.6 | 502 | 561 | 625 | Female | 3 | Processing |

*****Maturity is evaluated from 1 to 5. Female Maturity 1 to 5 are defined as follows:

1. Ovaries are small and tubular with many blood vessels.
2. Ovaries are large with colored liquid in them.
3. Small eggs are present and granular looking.
4. Eggs are ripe and flow freely, indicating that the fish are spawning.
5. Ovaries are large but deflated with some remaining eggs, indicating that the fish have spawned.

**Figure Legend**

Annual total recreational catch of sheepshead (A+B1+B2, all modes and areas combined) in Virginia from 1999 to 2004. Catch is in number of fish. The vertical bar is standard error. The total catch gradually increased from 1999 to 2004 with a peak in 2003.