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## Summary

A staked gill net was set and fished each week on the James, York and Rappahannock rivers in the spring of 2003. This was the sixth year of monitoring in a stock assessment program for American shad that was initiated in spring 1998. The primary objective is to establish a time series of catch rates that can be compared to historical catch rates recorded in logbooks voluntarily submitted by commercial fishers prior to the imposition of the current moratorium. The monitoring effort provides information on the current status of shad stocks relative to conditions prior to the moratorium dating to 1980 in the James and Rappahannock rivers. In the case of the York River, monitoring and additional gear calibration trials allow assessment of current status relative to conditions during the 1980s and the 1950's.

Sampling occurred for 11 weeks on the York River (25 February to 5 May 2003), 12 weeks on the James River ( 25 February - 12 May 2003) and 13 weeks on the Rappahannock River (25 February - 19 May 2003). After 21 April, post-spawning fish were mixed with pre-spawning fish in the catch on all rivers. Only pre-spawning fish were included in the monitoring summaries. A total of 1,168 female American shad (1,970 kg total weight) was captured. The 2003 catch was larger than the catch in 2002 ( 787 females weighing $1,260 \mathrm{~kg}$ total weight).

Total numbers and weights of females in 2003 were highest on the James River ( $\mathrm{n}=453$, $751 \mathrm{~kg})$. York River catches of females ( $\mathrm{n}=376,633 \mathrm{~kg}$ ) exceeded those in the Rappahannock River ( $\mathrm{n}=339$, 586 kg ). Numbers of males captured were: York River, 203; James, 179; Rappahannock, 100. The total weight of all males captured was 629 kg .

Based on age estimates from scales, the 1998 (age 5) year class of female American shad was the most abundant on all three rivers, with age-specific seasonal catch rates exceeding $0.03 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}$. The 1997 year class (age 6) was abundant on the James and York rivers with seasonal catch rates also exceeding $0.03 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}$. Total instantaneous mortality rates of females calculated from age-specific catch rates were: York River,1.20; James River, 1.09; and Rappahannock River, 0.77. Total instantaneous mortality rates of males calculated from age-specific catch rates were: York River, 1.38; James River,1.07; and Rappahannock River, 0.62.

Otoliths of 276 American shad captured on the James River and otoliths of 96 specimens captured on the York River were scanned for hatchery marks. The proportion of the sample with hatchery marks on the James and York rivers was 51.4 \% (142 of 276 fish) and $3.1 \%$ (3 of 96 fish), respectively. In 1998 and 1999, prevalence of hatchery fish on the James River was low (4-8 \%). The increase in catch rates observed on the James River since 2000 is due to the influx of mature hatchery fish released since 1995. Of these hatchery-released cohorts, the 1996 and 1997 year classes have dominated catches thus far. In all, nine year classes (1992-2000) of hatchery fish have been captured in the monitoring program.

The geometric mean catch of juvenile American shad captured in daylight seine hauls in 2003 was: James River, 0.04; Rappahannock River, 0.659; York River (below

Westpoint), 9.04; Mattaponi River, 8.55; Pamunkey River, 13.11. The evening push net survey in the Mattaponi and Pamunkey rivers was discontinued in 2002.

Between-reader comparisons of age determination using scales were conducted. In separate trials, two trained readers agreed $52.1 \%$ (trial 1) and $59.2 \%$ (trial 2) of the time when both age and number of spawning marks were considered; $62.5 \%$ (trial 1) and $67.3 \%$ (trial 2) of the time when only age was considered. Test of symmetry in both trials yielded significant results ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ), indicating that there were systematic differences between the readers when they disagreed. In both comparisons, one reader consistently assigned an age that was one year greater than the other reader when they disagreed.

Twenty-six species of fishes were taken as by-catch in the staked gill net monitoring gear for a total of 23,225 specimens. The total number of striped bass captured was 5,645 (James River, $\mathrm{n}=3,742$; York River, $\mathrm{n}=1,291$; Rappahannock River, $\mathrm{n}=612$ ). Live striped bass captured in the gear were counted and released. The proportions of dead striped bass on each river were: James River, $54.1 \%$; York River, $28.9 \%$; and the Rappahannock River, 62.3\%.

Comparison trials of multifilament nets (identical to the type used in the 1950's) and monofilament nets (used in the 1980's and in current monitoring) were conducted in 2002 and 2003. A Poisson main effects model yielded a significant difference in catch between the two net types in each year and when data from both years were combined. The expected ratio of the catches (current monitoring and 1980's catch rates to 1950's catch rates) was estimated to be 2.16 (with $95 \%$ confidence limits of $1.65,2.83$ ). This correction factor was applied to the 1950s log book data of Mr. Malvin Green and used to establish a proposed restoration target for the York River.

A seasonal catch index was calculated by estimating the area under the curve of daily catch versus day for the years 1998-2003 and for each year of the historical record of staked gill net catches on each river. On the York River, the seasonal catch index in 2003 was 8.98. During the five years of monitoring, the index has been variable with high values (>12) in 1998 and 2001 and lower values (<9) in other years. The average of the historical data during the 1980's on the York River is 3.96 . The average of the current monitoring data is higher (11.70) but this average is lower than the average of catch indexes from log book records in the 1950s (19.54). These older data were adjusted for differences in the efficiency of multifilament and monofilament nets using the results of comparison trails in 2002 and 2003.

On the James River, the 2003 index (9.34) is the highest value recorded since 1998. Index values in 2000-2003 are higher than those in 1998 and 1999 ( 1.46 and 1.30, respectively). The average of the historical data during the 1980's on the James River is 8.88. The average of the current monitoring data is lower (5.36).

The catch index on the Rappahannock River in 2003 (7.10) is higher than any previous year of monitoring and higher than all years in the historical data. The average of the historical data during the 1980's on the Rappahannock River is 1.76 . The average of the current monitoring data is higher (3.41).

In recent years of monitoring (2000-2003), mean age of females has increased on all rivers, suggesting higher survival. In 1999, mean age abruptly increased on all rivers and then dropped again in 2000. One possible explanation for this change is failure of age-4 fish to recruit in 1999. This may have been a result of low juvenile abundance in 1995. All forms of the juvenile index (push net and seine data) depict failed juvenile recruitment on all rivers in that year.

## Preface

Concern about the decline in landings of American shad (Alosa sapidissima) along the Atlantic coast prompted the development of an interstate fisheries management plan (FMP) under the auspices of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Management Program (ASMFC 1999). Legislation enables imposition of federal sanctions on fishing in those states that fail to comply with the FMP. To be in compliance, coastal states are required to implement and maintain fishery-dependent and fishery-independent monitoring programs as specified by the FMP. For Virginia, these requirements include spawning stock assessments, the collection of biological data on the spawning run (e.g., age-structure, sex ratio, spawning history), estimation of total mortality, indices of juvenile abundance, and evaluation of restoration programs by detection and enumeration of hatchery-released fish. This annual report documents continued compliance with Federal law. Since 1998, scientists at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science have monitored the spawning run of American shad in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers. The information resulting from this program is reported annually to the ASMFC, has formed the basis for a number of technical papers published in the professional literature, and is contributing substantially to our understanding of the status and conservation of this important species. Data collected in the Virginia monitoring program will be used in revised stock assessment of American shad scheduled for peer review in 2005.

## Introduction

A moratorium on the taking of American shad (Alosa sapidissima) in the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries was established by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC) beginning 1 January 1994. The prohibition applied to both recreational and commercial fishers, and was imposed at a time when commercial catch rates of American shad in Virginia's rivers were experiencing declines. At the time, data from the commercial fishery were the best available for assessing the status of individual stocks. Catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) data were compiled from logbooks that recorded landings by commercial fishermen using staked gill nets at various locations throughout the middle reaches of the James, York and Rappahannock rivers. The logbooks were voluntarily provided to the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) during the period 1980-1993, and subsequently used in an assessment of the status of American shad stocks along the Atlantic coast by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (ASMFC) (ASMFC 1999).

Since the moratorium, there have been no monitoring programs that provided direct assessment of stock recovery. The ban on in-river fishing in Virginia remained in effect, creating a dilemma for managers who needed reliable information in order to make a rational decision on when the in-river ban could safely be lifted. To address this deficiency, we proposed a method of scientific monitoring to estimate catch rates relative to those recorded before the prohibition of in-river fishing in 1994. This monitoring program began in 1998 and consisted of sampling techniques and locations that were consistent with, and directly comparable to, those that generated historical logbook data collected by VIMS during the period 1980-1992 in the York, James and Rappahannock rivers. The results of the sixth year in the sampling program (2003) are reported in this document and compared to some results in previous years of monitoring. Detailed results of the first five years of sampling (1998-2002) are reported in previous annual reports (Olney and Hoenig 2000a, 2000b; Olney and Hoenig 2001a; Olney and Maki 2002, Olney 2003a). Copies of these reports available upon request.

In addition to the objective of assessment of stock recovery in Virginia's rivers, there are other significant information needs. First, extensive efforts are being made to rehabilitate shad stocks through release of hatchery-raised fish. Evaluating the success of these programs requires determination of the survival of the stocked fish to adulthood. Second, there is an extensive time series of observations on juvenile shad abundance from push net surveys in the York River and seine surveys in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers. These juvenile index data could have utility for predicting future spawning run sizes and confirming the health of the stocks.

These ongoing studies of American shad in Virginia waters are significant for recreational fisheries for at least three reasons.

- American shad fight well when angled using light tackle. The recreational fishery is closed in Virginia but is popular in Florida, North Carolina, Maryland and several other states. Anecdotal information suggests that there were historical recreational fisheries for American shad on the James, Mattaponi and Rappahannock rivers. Currently, many anglers catch and release American shad and legally harvest hickory shad (Alosa mediocris) on the James River near Richmond, the Mattaponi River above Walkerton, the Rappahannock River near Fredricksburg as well as the Nottoway and Black rivers near

Franklin, Virginia. Thus, development of a recreational shad fishery in Virginia could constitute an important opportunity to expand or restore recreational fishing opportunities if the stocks are rehabilitated and managed carefully.

- American shad are important for trophic and ecological reasons. Spawning site selection by adults as well as the abundance and occurrence of juveniles are closely linked to water quality and the availability of good fish habitat. The shads and river herrings (Alosa and Dorosoma) form an important prey group for striped bass and other recreationally important species in Chesapeake Bay. The decaying carcasses of post-spawning anadromous fishes are known to play an important role in nutrient and mineral recycling in riverine and estuarine systems. In recent years, there have been shifts in community structure in the major tributaries to the Bay with striped bass and gizzard shad numbers increasing greatly. Monitoring changes in abundance of key species is essential for understanding community dynamics.
- Monitoring the shad spawning run using historic gear also allows for a description of the by-catch associated with a commercial fishery for shad in Virginia's rivers. This is important for determining the impact of a re-opened commercial fishery for shad on other recreationally important species, especially striped bass.


## Background

Herring and shad have supported recreational and commercial fisheries along the east coast of the United States and within the Chesapeake Bay since colonial times. They also play a vital ecological role. Juvenile Alosa are an important prey species for striped bass and other recreational species while they remain on their freshwater and upper estuarine nursery grounds. In the autumn they move to coastal waters where they are subjected to predation by many types of marine piscivores until they return to their native streams to spawn for the first time at ages 3 to 7 (Maki et al., 2001).

Attempts to manage and conserve Virginia's stocks of American shad date to colonial times. Before Virginia was settled, native Americans caught American shad in large quantities using a seine made of bushes (Walburg and Nichols 1967). Shad were so plentiful that they could be speared with pointed sticks as they swam on the flats (VCF 1875). The early settlers used haul seines, and utilized shad as a major food supply (Walburg and Nichols 1967). By 1740, shad were less abundant, presumably due to fishing and obstructions that prevented the fish from reaching their spawning grounds. Concerned colonists passed laws requiring the removal of dams or the building of fish passages, and prohibiting hedges and other obstructions (VCF 1875). In 1771, the Virginia Assembly passed a law requiring that a gap for fish passage be built in dams adhering to specific dimensions, and that it be kept open from February 10 to the last day of May. However, due to the approaching conflict of the Revolutionary War, the law was never enforced (VCF 1875).

The shad fishery of Chesapeake Bay became important about 1869, and developed greatly in the ensuing years. Fishing gear used included haul seines, pound nets, and staked gill nets (Walburg and Nichols 1967). Catches reached a low in 1878, and the U.S. Fish Commission and

Virginia Commission of Fisheries instituted an artificial hatching program in 1875. By 1879 the fishery began to improve, and the increase in catches led biologists to believe that the shad fishery was largely dependent upon artificial propagation. However, by the early 1900's the decline in shad harvests resumed despite improved hatching methods and increased numbers of fry released (Mansueti and Kolb 1953).

Stevenson (1899) provided important information on catch and effort in the American shad fishery in Virginia during the fishing season in 1896. Using an average weight per female of 1.7 kg , the following fishery statistics can be obtained from his report. On the lower James River, 60,750 females (approximate weight: $103,278 \mathrm{~kg}$ ) were landed by staked gill nets totaling approximately $79,263 \mathrm{~m}$ in length. On the York River, 28, 232 females (approximate weight: 49, 994 kg ) were landed by staked gill nets totaling approximately $5,874 \mathrm{~m}$ in length. The value of these roe shad was approximately $\$ 4,000$. On the Rappahannock River, 104,118 females (approximate weight: $177,000 \mathrm{~kg}$ ) were landed by staked gill nets totaling $24,694 \mathrm{~m}$ in length. The local value of these shad was approximately $\$ 8,000$. Seasonal catch averages (total female weight/total length of net) depict higher seasonal catch rates on the York River ( $8.5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}$ ) and the Rappahannock River ( $7.2 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}$ ) than on the James River ( $1.3 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}$ ) in 1896. Stevenson (1899) also reported large catches of American shad on the Chicahominy and Appomattox rivers in 1896.

Today, many American shad stocks along the eastern seaboard of the United States are in low abundance (Figure 1) and there is evidence of recent and persistent stock declines of American shad in three of 12 systems, based on a recently completed stock assessment (ASMFC 1999). Two of these are Virginia stocks in the Rappahannock and York rivers. Large catches no longer occur as they did at the turn of the century. Commercial American shad landings in Virginia decreased from 11.5 million pounds in 1897 to less than a million pounds in 1982 (Figure 1). Over-fishing, dam construction, pollution, and loss of natural spawning grounds are a few of the factors that may be related to this decline. Historically, the majority of American shad were captured within the rivers. Beginning in 1984, the largest proportion of American shad taken in Virginia's fishery was captured offshore. The overall impact of this shift in the fishery on egg production and annual recruitment of Virginia stocks is unknown. Genetic studies of the catch composition of Virginia and Maryland's coastal landings have suggested that the intercept fishery claims a highly variable proportion of Virginia's riverine stocks (Brown and Epifanio 1994). American shad were pursued by recreational fishermen in Virginia in the past, but the extent and success of this activity is not easily assessed.

In spring 1994, the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (VDGIF) and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) began a hatchery-restocking effort in the James and Pamunkey rivers. Adult shad from the Pamunkey River are used as brood stock, eggs are stripped and fertilized in the field, and larvae are reared in the VDGIF hatchery at Stephensville, Virginia, and the USFWS hatchery at Harrison Lake, Virginia. Prior to release, the larvae are immersed in an oxytetracycline (OTC) solution that marks otoliths with a distinctive epifluorescent ring. The success of this ongoing program has recently been documented by Olney et al. (2003) who report that catch rates by monitoring gear are increasing as large numbers of mature hatchery fish are returning to the James River. In general, prevalence of hatchery fish returning as adults to the York system is low ( $\sim 4$ \% each year; Olney and Hoenig 2000a, 2000b, 2001a; Olney and Maki 2002). Annual monitoring of the abundance of juvenile Alosa (American shad, hickory shad, blueback herring and alewife) was conducted on the Pamunkey River system during 1979-2002. After

1995, juveniles bearing the OTC mark were collected by VIMS and VDGIF. The data show that hatchery-released larval shad constituted 0.1-8 \% of the total catch of juveniles on the Pamunkey River during the $4-\mathrm{y}$ period (1995-1999).

Prior to 1991, there were no restrictions on the American shad commercial fishery in Virginia rivers and the Chesapeake Bay. A limited season (4 February - 30 April) was established for 1991 by the Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC), and kept in place in 1992. In 1993, a further limitation to the season was established (15 March - 15 April 1993). However, due to bad weather conditions, the season was extended through 30 April. A complete moratorium was established in 1994. The current regulation states that:
"On and after 1 January 1994 it shall be unlawful for any person to catch and retain possession of American shad from the Chesapeake Bay or its tidal tributaries." (VMRC Regulation 450-01-0069).

In 1997 and 1998, during a series of public hearings, commercial fishing interests asked that the in-river ban on shad fishing be lifted. This proposal was opposed by the VMRC staff, scientists of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, and representatives of various other public and private agencies. The Commission decided to leave the ban in place but also decried the lack of information necessary to assess the recovery of Virginia stocks of American shad. The current monitoring project began in the spring of 1998 in response to the VMRC's request for information.

In spring 2003, Virginia imposed a $40 \%$ reduction in effort on the ocean intercept (gillnet) fishery prosecuted on the coast. This reduction in effort was mandated by the ASMFC. According to Amendment 1 (ASMFC 1999), "[States] must begin phase-out reduction plans for the commercial ocean-intercept fishery for American shad over a five-year period. States must achieve at least a $40 \%$ reduction in effort in the first three years, beginning January 1, 2000." The Virginia offshore fishery is scheduled for full closure by 31 December 2004.

## Current Information

There is mandatory reporting of offshore catches to the VMRC. These data can be accessed through the VMRC website (http://www.state.va.us/mrc/homepage.htm). Annual monitoring of the abundance of juvenile Alosa (American shad, hickory shad, blueback herring and alewife) was conducted on the York River system with a push net developed in the late 1970s (Kriete and Loesch, 1980). The data record extends back to 1979 but sampling was not conducted during 1987-1990. The push net survey was terminated in 2002 when it was determined that the survey results were highly correlated with those of the striped bass seine survey (Wilhite et al., 2003). Although fewer individual fish are collected each year in the seine survey as compared to the evening push net survey, the seine survey has larger geographic coverage (all three rivers in Virginia vs. the Mattaponi and Pamunkey river only) and the data record is uninterrupted since 1979. Since the American shad monitoring program began in 1998, ten papers on various aspects of the biology of American shad and the VIMS stock assessment program have appeared in peer-reviewed journals (Maki et al., 2001a; Olney et al., 2001; Olney and Hoenig, 2001b, Maki et al., 2002; Bilkovic et al. 2002a; Bilkovic et al. 2002b; Olney and McBride, 2003; Olney et al., 2003; Walter and Olney, 2003; Wilhite et al., 2003). Reprints of these papers are available on
request. Currently, one manuscript that reports patterns of survival and growth of juvenile American shad on the Pamunkey River is in review. In addition, two draft manuscripts (one reporting migratory habits of American shad in the York River; another reporting the role of the moratorium in the regulatory process related to the King William reservoir project) are completed (please see abstracts as Appendix 1).

## Objectives

The primary objectives of the monitoring program have remained largely unchanged since 1998: (1) to establish time series of relative abundance indices of adult American shad during the spawning runs in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers; (2) to relate contemporary indices of abundance of American shad to historical log-book data collected during the period 1980-1992 and older data if available; (3) to assess the relative contribution of hatchery-reared and released cohorts of American shad to adult stocks; (4) to relate recruitment indices (young-of-the-year index of abundance) of American shad to relative year-class strength and age-structure of spawning adults; and (5) to determine the amount of by-catch of other species in the staked gill nets.

In 2002 and 2003, an additional objective was to determine an efficiency factor that can used to relate catch rates of multifilament nets (used by shad fishers in the 1950s) to monofilament nets (used by fishers in the 1980s and in current monitoring). These comparison trials are required to make the data available from voluntary logbooks in the 1950s comparable to more recent data (see Olney and Hoenig 2001 for background). Using this approach, we have established proposed restoration targets for the York River stock.

## Methods

The 2003 sampling methods were the same as those in 1998-2002. In 1998, a fishery-independent monitoring protocol was developed that was as similar as possible to traditional shad fishing methods in the middle reaches of Virginia's rivers. When the in-river fishing moratorium was imposed in 1994, commercial fishermen who held permits for existing stands of staked gill nets (SGNs) were allowed to retain priority rights for the locations of those stands in the various rivers. VIMS has records of the historic fishing locations (Figures 2-4), and one of these locations on each river (the James, York and Rappahannock) was used to monitor catch rates by SGN's in 1998-2000. Three commercial fishermen were contracted to prepare and set SGN poles, hang nets, replace or repair poles or nets, and set nets for each sampling event during the monitoring period. Two of these commercial fishermen, Mr. Raymond Kellum (Bena, Virginia) and Mr. Marc Brown (Rescue, Va), were authors of the historical logbooks on the James and York rivers. However, authors of historic logbooks on the Rappahannock River were either retired or not available. Thus, we chose a commercial fisherman (Mr. Jamie Sanders, Warsaw, VA) who had previous experience in SGN fishing but who had not participated in the shad fishery on the Rappahannock River in the 1980's. Scientists accompanied commercial fishermen during each sampling trip, and returned the catch to the laboratory.

One SGN, 900 ft ( approximately 273 m ) in length, was set on the York and James rivers (Figures 5-6). One staked gill net, 912 ft (approximately 276 m ) in length, was set on the Rappahannock River (Figure 7). Locations of the sets were as follows: lower James River near
the James River Bridge at river mile $10\left(36^{\circ} 50.0^{\prime} \mathrm{N}, 76^{0} 28.8^{\prime} \mathrm{W}\right)$; middle York River near Clay Bank at river mile 14 ( $37^{\circ} 20.8^{\prime} \mathrm{N}, 76^{\circ} 37.7^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ ); and middle Rappahannock River near the Rappahannock River bridge (at Tappahannock) at river mile $36\left(37^{0} 55.9^{\prime} \mathrm{N}, 76^{0} 50.4^{\prime} \mathrm{W}\right)$. Historical catch-rate data on the York and James rivers were derived from nets constructed of 4 7/8" stretched-mesh monofilament netting, while historic data from the Rappahannock River were based on larger mesh sizes (nets constructed of $5^{\prime \prime}$ stretched-mesh). To insure that catch rates in the current monitoring program were comparable to logbook records, nets on the York and James rivers were constructed of $47 / 8^{\prime \prime}(12.4 \mathrm{~cm})$ stretched-mesh monofilament netting, while nets on the Rappahannock River were constructed of 5 " ( 12.7 cm ) netting. Panel lengths were consistent with historical records ( 30 ft each on the James and York rivers; 48 ft each on the Rappahannock River). Each week, nets were fished on two succeeding days (two 24-h sets) and then hung in a non-fishing position until the next sampling episode. Occasionally, weather prevented the regularly scheduled sampling on Sunday and Monday, and sampling was either postponed, canceled or re-scheduled for other days. Sampling occurred for 11 weeks on the York River (25 February to 5 May 2003), 12 weeks on the James River ( 25 February - 12 May 2003) and 13 weeks on the Rappahannock River (25 February - 19 May 2003). Surface water temperature and salinity was recorded at each sampling event.

To compare catch rates of American shad in multifilament nets with monofilament nets, we fished a staked gill net consisting of five $30-\mathrm{ft}$ panels of multifilament net ( 4.75 inch stretched mesh) adjacent to five equally sized panels of monofilament net ( 4.88 inch stretched mesh) for each of two consecutive days each week (usually the same days of regular monitoring) in March and April. On the first day, we randomly chose the location (shore side or channel side) where the old (multifilament) net type was fished. On the next day, the locations of the two nets were switched by removing the nets and rehanging them in reverse order. Mr. Raymond Kellum was contracted to do the fishing and a scientist accompanied the fisher each time the net was fished. It is important to note that the location of this test fishing was in the same York River segment where the 1950s data originated. All fish caught were brought back to the laboratory for processing in the same manner as those fish caught at the monitoring sites. We modeled the logarithm of the catches as:
where $\eta$ is the grand mean; $\operatorname{pos}_{h}$ is the effect of position $h$; day ${ }_{i}$, the effect of day $I$; $w k_{j}$, the effect of week j ; net $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{k}}$, the effect of net type k ; year ${ }_{\mathrm{l}}$, the effect of each year and $\varepsilon_{\mathrm{hijk}}$ is a Poisson error term. Our null hypothesis is that the mean catch of female American shad per standard set of the new net type, _new, is less than or equal to the mean of the old net type, _old:


SAS procedure GENMOD with a Poisson error and log link was used to fit this generalized linear model. We tested a one-sided hypothesis because we felt it was likely that changes in fishing practices would increase fishing power rather than decrease it. By rejecting the above null hypothesis, we establish that an increase in efficiency has occurred.

Individual American shad collected from the monitoring sites were measured and weighed on a Limnoterra FMB IV electronic fish measuring board interfaced with a Mettler PM

30000-K electronic balance. The board recorded measurements (fork length, total length and body depth) to the nearest mm , received weight input from the balance, and allowed manual input of additional data (such as field data and comments) or subsample designations (such as gonadal tissue and otoliths) into a data file for subsequent analysis. Catches of all other species were recorded on log sheets by observers on each river. By-catch was recorded in the field and released (if alive) or returned to the laboratory (if dead). For striped bass (Morone saxatilis), separate records were kept of the number of live and dead fish in the nets.

Sagittal otoliths were removed from samples of adult American shad, placed in numbered tissue culture trays, and stored for subsequent screening for hatchery marks. To do this, otoliths were mounted on slides, then ground and polished by hand using wet laboratory-grade sandpaper. Personnel from Virginia Commonwealth University (Mr. Dave Hopler) assisted in this evaluation.

Scales for age determination were removed from a mid-lateral area on the left side posterior to the pectoral-fin base of each fish. Scales were cleaned with a dilute bleach solution, mounted and pressed on acetate sheets, and read on a microfilm projector by one individual (B. Watkins, VIMS) using the methods of Cating (1953). Ages were determined by a different reader in 1998-2002 (K. Maki). To assess the differences between readers, 49 samples were randomly chosen from 2003 samples and aged by each reader twice. Each reader then made a third reading on those fish for which the initial two readings disagreed and established a final age and spawning mark assignment. In addition, 48 scales were randomly chosen from 2000 samples. In the case of these comparisons, there was only one reading by each reader. Differences between readers were analyzed using a test of symmetry (Hoenig et al. 1995). The test is performed as a chi square test. A significant chi square statistic indicates that there is a systematic difference between aging methods.

Catch data from each river was summarized in terms of a standardized catch index (the area under the curve of daily catch rate versus time of year). The catch index, the duration of the run in days, the maximum daily catch rate in each year and the mean catch rate in each year were compared to summaries of historical logbook data to provide a measure of the relative size of the current shad runs. In the historical data, catches are reported daily through the commercial season with occasional instances of skipped days due to inclement weather or damaged fishing gear. In the current monitoring data, catches on two successive days are separated by up to five days (usually Tuesday-Saturday) in each week of sampling. In some rare cases, catches are separated by more than five days. To compute the catch index, we estimated catches on skipped days using linear interpolation between adjacent days of sampling.

## Results

## Catches of American shad by staked gill nets in 2003

Fishing days, numbers of American shad captured, and catch rates (males and females) are reported in Tables 1-7 and Figures 9-10. After 21 April 2004, post-spawning American shad were mixed with pre-spawning ("roe") fish in the catch on all rivers (Table 2). Post-spawning fish were identified macroscopically (following Olney et al. 2001) and had lower total weights at size (Figure 8). Post-spawning fish have not been previously observed in the staked gill net monitoring program and their appearance may have been related to above average stream flow and low water
temperatures in spring 2003. Since the historic fishery was a roe fishery, since spent or partially spent fish were not routinely captured or marketed in the historic fishery, and since spent or partially-spent fish have not been previously observed in regular monitoring, post-spawning fish were removed from the monitoring sample.

A total of 1,650 pre-spawning American shad ( 482 males:1,168 females) were captured. The total weight of the sample was $2,598.4 \mathrm{~kg}$. The 2003 catch was larger than the catch in 2002 ( 1,070 females weighing $1,617 \mathrm{~kg}$ total weight; Olney 2003). Catches in 2003 were lowest on the Rappahannock River ( 439 total fish, 100 males and 339 females), higher on the York River (579 total fish, 203 males and 376 females) and highest on the James River ( 632 total fish, 179 males and 453 females).

On the James River, catches of females peaked on 16 March-22 April 2003 when catch rates exceeded $0.42 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{m}$ or $0.10 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}$. During that period on the James River, $81 \%$ ( 365 of 453) of the total number of females was captured. On the York River, catches of females peaked between 16 March and 6 April 2003 when catch rates approached or exceeded 0.48 fish $/ \mathrm{m}$ or 0.10 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}$. During that period on the York River, $63 \%$ ( 235 of 376 ) of the total number of females was captured. Catches of females on the Rappahannock River peaked 24 March-21 April 2003 and again on 4-5 May when catch rates exceeded $0.50 \mathrm{fish} / \mathrm{m}$ or $0.08 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{m}$. During those periods on the Rappahannock River, $87 \%$ (296 of 339) of the total number of females was captured. The highest recorded daily catch by weight occurred on 4 April 2003 when 65 female American shad (106.9 kg ) were taken in the York River (Table 5). As in previous years of monitoring, numbers and catch rates of males were lower than catch rates of females throughout the period. Sex ratios (males:females) were: York River, 0.351:0.649; James River, 0.283:0.712; Rappahannock River, $0.228: 0.772$. It is important to note that the monitoring gear mimics an historical fishery that was selective for mature female fish.

The duration of the 2003 spawning run (defined as the number of days between the first and last observation of a catch rate that equals or exceeds 0.01 female $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}$ ) was estimated to be 72 days on the James River (25 February - 12 May), 70 days on the York River ( 25 February - 4 May) and 79 days on the Rappahannock River (3 March - 19 May). Biological characteristics of the American shad in 2003

Age, mean length ( mm TL) and mean weight ( g ) of American shad in staked gill nets are summarized in Tables 9-10 and frequency distributions of total length are depicted in Figures 11-12. Mean total length at age of males and females ranged from 462-558 mm TL and 462-588 mm TL, respectively. Mean weight at age of males and females ranged from $1.14-2.28 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $1.16-2.48 \mathrm{~kg}$, respectively.

The 1997 and 1998 year classes (ages 5 and 6) of female American shad were the most abundant on all three rivers (Table 11). On the James River, eight age classes of females were represented (1993-2000, ages 3-10) and the sample was dominated by age- 5 fish ( $51.4 \%$ of the total that were aged). On the York River, eight age classes of females were represented (1993-2000, ages 3-10) and the sample was dominated by age-5 fish ( $41.1 \%$ of the total that were aged). On the Rappahannock River, five age classes of females were taken (1994-1998, ages $5-9)$. Age- 5 fish made up $59.2 \%$ of the aged sample. The 1996, 1997 and 1998 year classes of males were the most abundant on all three rivers (Table 12). These year classes (ages 5-7) of
male American shad constituted 90.1\% (York River), 94.5\% (Rappahannock River) and 84.9\% (James River) of the aged sample.

Age-specific catch rates of American shad are reported in Tables 11-12 and depicted in Figure 13. Total instantaneous mortality $(\mathrm{Z})$ was estimated using simple linear regression analysis of the natural log of age-specific catch on the descending limb of the catch curve. Total instantaneous mortality rates of females were: York River, $1.20\left(\mathrm{r}^{2}=0.98\right)$; James River, $1.09\left(\mathrm{r}^{2}=\right.$ $0.98)$; and Rappahannock River, $0.77\left(r^{2}=0.99\right)$. Total instantaneous mortality rates of males calculated from age-specific catch rates were: York River, $1.38\left(\mathrm{r}^{2}=0.94\right)$; James River, $1.07\left(\mathrm{r}^{2}=\right.$ $0.88)$; and Rappahannock River, $0.62\left(\mathrm{r}^{2}=0.92\right)$.

Spawning histories of American shad collected in 2003 are presented in Tables 13-14. On the James and York rivers, fish (both sexes combined) ranged in age from 3-10 years with 0 (virgin) to 5 spawning marks. On the Rappahannock River, fish (both sexes combined) ranged in age from 4-9 years with 0-5 spawning marks. The following percentages of fish in each river had a least one prior spawn (termed "repeat spawners"): York River, $70.8 \%$ ( 162 virgins in a sample of 554); James River 45.9\% (330 virgins in a sample of 611); Rappahannock River 45.8\% (231 virgins in a sample of 426 fish). The percentages of fish with at least one prior spawn on the York River in previous years were: 1998, 40.2\%; 1999, 67.3\%; 2000, 31.1 \%; 2001, 38.8 \% ; 2002, 59.5\% (Olney and Hoenig 2000a, 2000b, 2001a; Olney and Maki 2002; Olney 2003).

## Comparison of multifilament and monofilament nets

Catches in the comparison nets (Table 15) totaled 217 shad in 2002 ( 158 were females) and 160 fish in 2003 ( 124 females). Mean lengths and weights of males and females were similar between the old (multifilament) and new (monofilament) nets. Catches of females in the combined sample (2002 and 2003 data) were higher in the monofilament net ( 188 females) than in the multifilament net ( 94 females). Catches were highest during the week of 17 March in 2002 and 23 March in 2003 (Figures 14-15).

A Poisson main effects model yielded a highly significant difference in catch between the two net types in 2002 ( $\mathrm{p}<0.0001$, Table 16) and a significant difference in 2003 ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$, Table 17). When data from both years were combined, the estimated effect of the monofilament net relative to the multifilament net (in essence, the log relative risk) was 0.7703 . This value can be converted into a relative fishing power by exponentiation. Thus, the expected ratio of catches (current catch rates to historical catch rates) is $\exp (0.7703)=2.16$. In other words, in these trials, the monofilament net caught more than twice as many females as the multifilament net used in the 1950s. The standard error ( 0.13 ) is small and the $95 \%$ lower and upper confidence intervals on the relative fishing power $(\exp (0.7703 \pm 2 * 0.13))$ are 1.65 and 2.83 , respectively. Thus, the monofilament net is more efficient than the multifilament net and the estimation has reasonably high precision. This correction factor (2.16) was applied to the historic log book data (catches in 1953-1957) of Mr. Malvin Green, who used multifilament nets in his staked gill net sets in the York River near Aberdeen creek (Olney and Hoenig 2001). The resulting corrected data are depicted in Table 19. During the 1950s, Malvin Green's corrected annual catch index ranged from 8.70-33.95. The mean corrected catch index was 19.54.

Evaluation of hatchery origin of American shad in 2003

James River - Otoliths of 276 American shad captured in staked gill nets on the James River were scanned for hatchery marks. The proportion of the 2003 sample with hatchery marks was $51.4 \%$ ( 142 of 276 fish). The biological attributes of these specimens are presented in Table 20. The prevalence of hatchery-reared fish was low in spring 1998 ( $8.2 \%$; 14 of 170 adults) and 1999 ( $3.6 \%$; 7 of 177 adults). Prevalence rose abruptly in spring 2000 ( $40.3 \% ; 156$ of 387 adults) and has remained near that level. In most years, fish with hatchery tags from rivers other than the James River were among those counted. These strays were not included in the estimates of hatchery prevalence and are as follows (year captured as an adult, number, river of release): 1999, $\mathrm{n}=1$, Patuxent River (Maryland); 2000, $\mathrm{n}=7$, Pamunkey River (Virginia) and Juniata River (Pennsylvania); 2001, n= 3, Pamunkey River, Juniata River, and the western branch of the Susquehanna River (Pennsylvania); 2002, $n=1$, Pamunkey River, $n=2$ unknown tag. In 2003, there were no stray fish.

Most hatchery-reared adults taken in 2000-2003 had OTC marks that indicated these specimens were released in 1995 or 1996 or in 1997-2001. These tags could not be easily differentiated microscopically, however. Because of this, we determined the year of release of hatchery fish using scale-determined ages (Tables 13, 20 and 21). In 1998, hatchery-reared fish captured in our monitoring gear ( $n=14$ ) were ages 4 or 5 (released as fry in 1993 or 1994). In 1999, hatchery-reared fish (n=6) were ages 5, 6 or 7 (released as fry in 1992, 1993 or 1994). In these years (1992-1994), hatchery production was below 2 million fry annually (Table 21). Since 1995, hatchery production has exceeded 5 million fry released annually.

During 2000-2003, hatchery-reared fish captured in the staked gill nets were ages 3-9 (released as fry in 1992-2000). The highest numbers captured thus far were released in 1995-1998. The 1996 year class of hatchery-reared American shad first appeared as age 4, continues to recruit and is well represented in 2000-2002 samples. This year class has constituted $32.3 \%$ of the hatchery-marked catch (Table 21). The 1997 year class first appeared at age 3 and its contribution (31.3\%) is almost equivalent to the 1996 year class. The 1998 year class first appeared in moderate numbers in 2002 and its recruitment increased substantially in 2003. Additional recruitment of the 1998, 1999 and 2000 year classes is expected in future years of monitoring.

Most hatchery fish captured in the James River in 2000 and 2001 were virgins (no spawning marks on the scales) that had matured at age 4 or 5 . In these two years, proportions of the sample that had spawned at least once were: 2000, $28.2 \%$; 2001, $39.8 \%$. In 2002, the proportion of repeat spawners increased to $54.2 \%$ ( 65 virgins in a sample of 142 fish). In 2003, the proportion of repeat spawners was $42.2 \%$ ( 71 virgins in a sample of 137 hatchery fish).

York River - Otoliths of 96 adult specimens captured in staked gill nets on the York River were scanned for hatchery marks. The proportion of the sample with marks was $3.1 \%$ ( 3 of 96 fish). The biological characteristics of these specimens is reported in Table 22. By comparison, the proportion of previous samples with marks was $4.8 \%$ ( 5 of 104 fish in 2002), $4.8 \%$ ( 9 of 186 fish in 2001) and 2.2\% (4 of 180 fish in 2000).

## Juvenile abundance of American shad

Tables 23-25 report index values of juvenile abundance of American shad based on push
net surveys on the Pamunkey and Mattaponi rivers (1979-2002) and seine surveys (1979-2003) on the James and Rappahannock rivers, the main stem of the York River, the Pamunkey River and the Mattaponi River. Traditionally, the push net juvenile index has been reported as maximum geometric mean catch rate. However, the results of a recent analysis (Wilhite et al., 2003) of the push net data indicates that this form of the index is not preferred. Instead, cruise-specific catch rates of juvenile American shad, reported as mean catch rates over all stations sampled each week, were used to estimate the annual geometric mean catch for each river, the area under the catch curve for each river annually, and the combined area under the catch curve of both rivers annually. In the push net data, the time series of the combined area under the catch curve for both rivers depicts above average (>1,536.9) abundance of juveniles in the York River system in 1996-1998 and 2000-2001 relative to the other years in the recent record (since 1991), while index values were low in 1991, 1992, 1995, 1999 and 2002 (Figure 16). This survey was discontinued in 2002.

The seine survey data on the James River (Table 24) depict no measurable recruitment during most years. This observation is consistent with those of independent survey results below Bosher's Dam on the James River (VDGIF, T. Gunter, pers. comm.). A few juveniles were captured in 1984, 1998 and 2003. On the Rappahannock River, the highest JAI values ( $>0.5$ ) were recorded in 1982, 1989 and 2003. The Rappahannock River time series depicts no measurable recruitment in 1980-1981, 1985, 1988, 1991-1992, 1995 and 2002.

With the exception of 2003 data, juvenile index values based on the seine survey are consistently higher on the Mattaponi River than they are on the Pamunkey River and the York River (Table 25). In the time series, recruitment is highest ( $>7.0$ on the Mattaponi River and $>3.0$ on the York River) in 1982, 1984-85, 1996 and 2003.

Low or no measurable juvenile abundance in any year could result in a proportional decrease in recruitment of mature fish into the river at age 4 or 5 . Figure 20 depicts mean age of females captured by staked gill nets since 1998. With the exception of 1999, mean age increases in the time series, probably reflecting higher survival of mature fishes, especially repeat spawners. In 1999, mean age increased abruptly on all three rivers reflecting the low abundance of age 4 and age 5 fish relative to older cohorts. It is noteworthy that all forms of the juvenile index (push net and seine survey) depict failed or low recruitment on all rivers in 1995, an observation that could be related to the rise in mean age of the 1999 catch of age-4 adults in the monitoring program. Low abundance of juvenile American shad was also observed in 2001 and 2002 surveys of on all rivers. A similar signal (abrupt increase in mean age) in the 2005 and 2006 adult monitoring sample could serve to validate the ability of the JAI to predict years of failed recruitment.

## Between-reader aging comparisons

Ages determined from scales by two readers (K. Maki and B. Watkins) are reported in Table 26. In the case of 2000 scale comparisons, the two readers agreed $52.1 \%$ of the time when both age and number of spawning marks were considered and $62.5 \%$ of the time when only age was considered. The test of symmetry yielded a significant result ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ), indicating that there were systematic differences between the readers when they disagreed. In the second trial (2003 scale comparisons), the two readers agreed $59.2 \%$ of the time when both age and number of spawning marks were considered and $67.3 \%$ of the time when only age was considered. As in the
previous comparison, the test of symmetry yielded a significant value ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) indicating that there were systematic differences between the readers when they disagreed. In both the 2000 and 2003 comparisons, one reader consistently assigned an age that was one year greater than the other reader when they disagreed.

## By-catch of striped bass and other species in 2003

Daily numbers and seasonal totals of striped bass and other species captured in staked gill nets are reported in Tables 27-29. Twenty-six species of fishes were taken as by-catch in the staked gill net monitoring gear for a total of 23,225 specimens. The most commonly encountered by-catch species were: menhaden (Brevoortia tyrannus), gizzard shad (Dorasoma cepedianum), striped bass (Morone saxatilis), white catfish (Ictalurus catus), blue catfish (Ictalurus furcatus), channel catfish (Ictalurus punctatus), white perch (Morone americana), hickory shad (Alosa mediocris), Atlantic croaker (Microponias undulatus), weakfish (Cynoscion regalis) and summer flounder (Paralichthys dentatus). Three Atlantic sturgeon were captured and released on the James River in 2003. Patterns of occurrence of by-catch differed between rivers (Figures 21-22). In the York and Rappahannock rivers, catches of menhaden and gizzard shad predominated. In James River, catches of menhaden and striped bass predominated.

The total number of striped bass captured was 5,645 (James River, $\mathrm{n}=3,742$; York River, $\mathrm{n}=1,291$; Rappahannock River, $\mathrm{n}=612$ ). Live striped bass captured in the gear were counted and released. The proportions of dead striped bass on each river were: James River, 54.1\%; York River, $28.9 \%$; and the Rappahannock River, $62.3 \%$.

Seasonal catch indexes, 1980-1992 and 1998-2003

A seasonal catch index was calculated by estimating the area under the curve of daily catch versus day for the years 1998-2003 and for each year of the historical record of staked net catches on each river (Tables 30-32 and Figures 23-28). Seasonal catch indices in 2003 were: York River, 8.98; James River, 9.34; Rappahannock River, 7.10.

## Discussion

The staked gill net monitoring program continues to be useful for assessment of the current status of stocks of American shad in Virginia. It is the only direct method available to determine the size of the spawning runs relative to what was obtained in the decades prior to the moratorium. The program also provides information for evaluating the hatchery-based restoration program, validating the juvenile index of abundance and for determining the amount of by-catch that could be expected in a commercial fishery if the in-river fishing ban is lifted. The program will provide required data for the upcoming coast wide stock assessment, scheduled for peer review in early 2005. In June 2004, VIMS scientists will join other scientists in the Chesapeake Bay region to compile data for a regional stock assessment at an ASMFC-sponsored workshop in Baltimore.

Abrupt increases in the prevalence of hatchery-released adult American shad and higher catch indexes in our monitoring gear in recent years (2000-2003) confirm a large scale influx of mature virgin hatchery fish since the James River restoration program began in 1992 (Olney et al.,
2003). The age composition of the monitoring catch is consistent with the timing of releases of large numbers of hatchery released fish. While catches of wild American shad have been relatively constant during the six years of monitoring in the James River (200-300 kg annually), the catches of hatchery fish have increased dramatically by two orders of magnitude. Thus, the increase in spawning biomass cannot be attributed to natural production of wild fish. The monitoring data suggest that a continuation of the hatchery program at present levels of production, in combination with fishing moratoria, are effective components of a recovery program for this stock. Additional data on the movements, reproductive behavior and genetic integrity of wild fish in the James River would serve to clarify the effects of the introduced hatchery cohorts on the wild stocks. Reproductive isolation of wild fish from the hatchery-introduced cohorts (and their progeny) could enhance genetic heterogeneity in the stock. Isolation could be achieved if wild cohorts spawn in locations (i.e., down-river of the existing fish passage at Bosher's Dam) that are not chosen by hatchery cohorts. This could be determined through a detailed study of movements, residency and spawning behavior of the stock. Since we cannot distinguish the progeny of hatchery fish using OTC markers, a genetic survey that could identify wild and hatchery components could enhance our understanding of stock dynamics and the extent to which hatchery fish dominate the population.

In 1998, states were required to develop and submit restoration targets for stocks under moratorium. Virginia presented preliminary targets to the Plan Review Team of the ASMFC Shad and River Herring Management Board with the proviso that these targets would be revised as appropriate historical data became available. Criteria to achieve restoration targets were proposed as either:

1) a three-year period during which the catch index remains at or above the target level in the staked gill net monitoring of the spawning run.
2) a three-year period during which the average catch index is above the target level and the target level is exceeded in two of the years
3) a significant increasing trend over a five-year period with the target exceeded in the last two years.

At that time, targets were proposed as the maximum catch index $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m}$ per season rounded to the nearest whole number) observed during the 13-y period 1980-1992 (Tables 30-32) These values are: Rappahannock River, 6; York River, 10; and James River, 29.

Voluntary logbooks of catches from the York River exist in the archives of the Department of Fisheries Science (Figure 29). These historical records from the 1950s form the basis for the gear comparison trials conducted in 2002 and 2003 in the York River. Based on these comparisons, we have concluded that the multifilament nets of the type used in the 1950s have approximately half of the fishing power of monofilament nets used in the 1980s and the current monitoring. Thus, the older data have been adjusted upward (by a factor of 2.16) to make appropriate comparisons with current monitoring results. This adjustment of the 1950s data yields revised restoration targets for the York River stocks as depicted in Figure 30. The 1950s data (Table 19) include two years of a high index (26-33), two years of a moderate index (14) and one low index year (8.7, 1955). Rather than using a maximum catch index of 10 observed in the 1980s for the York River, we propose a revised catch index of 19.5, the mean of the catch index values
observed in 1953-1957 (Table 19).

Voluntary log books from the 1950s also exist for the James River. The most extensive data are those of Mr. J. C. Smith who fished staked gill nets on the upper James River in 1954-1957, just above the mouth of the Chickahominy River. Current monitoring on the James River is well below this location, complicating comparisons with Smith's log books. We are continuing to search the microfilm records in hopes of discovering additional data that may be more useful. There are no historic records in department archives for the Rappahannock River. As a result, we have not revised the originally proposed targets for the James and Rappahannock rivers.

On the York River, the seasonal catch index in 2003 was 8.98 . During the five years of monitoring, the index has been variable with high values (>12) in 1998 and 2001 and lower values (<9) in other years. The average of the historical data during the 1980's on the York River is 3.96. The average of the current monitoring data is higher (11.70) but this average is lower than the average of catch indexes from log book records in the 1950s (19.54). In recent years of monitoring (2000-2003), mean age of females has increased, suggesting higher survival. Our overall assessment of the York River stock is that it has recovered to a level that exceeds its abundance during the 1980s. However, during that period, the stock level was low and incapable of supporting an active fishery. The stock is currently well below the proposed 1950s target (Figure 30) when abundance of American shad was higher and harvest was apparently sustainable (Nichols and Massmann 1963).

On the James River, the 2003 index (9.34) is the highest value recorded since 1998 but below the proposed target of 29. Index values in 2000-2003 are higher than those in 1998 and 1999 (1.46 and 1.30, respectively). The average of the historical data during the 1980's on the James River is 8.88 . The average of the current monitoring data is lower (5.36). As noted previously, hatchery cohorts are recruiting in high proportions to the population and mean age of females has increased in recent years of monitoring (2000-2003). Our overall assessment for the James River is that the stock remains at a low level of abundance and requires continued protection and restoration.

On the Rappahannock River, the index in 2003 (7.10) is higher than any previous year of monitoring and higher than all years of the historic data. The 1998-2003 average (3.41) is above the average of the historical data (1.76) and the 2003 index is above the proposed target of 6 . In recent years of monitoring (2000-2003), mean age of females has increased, suggesting higher survival. It should be noted that since the catch index for the Rappahannock River is low in the historical data relative to the York and James rivers, there is uncertainty about what an appropriate target level should be for this stock. There is little evidence of severe stock decline in the Rappahannock River, although such a decline was reported in the most recent stock assessment (ASMFC 1999). We conclude that present status of the Rappahannock River stock is stable with evidence of increasing abundance. It should be noted that VDGIF personnel began a hatchery-release program on the upper Rappahannock River in spring 2003. The restoration program uses progeny of Potomac River brood stock.
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Table 1. Summary of sampling dates, total number and total weight of American shad captured in staked gill nets in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers, spring 2003.

| Stock | Sampling <br> dates in <br> 2003 | Total <br> females | Total <br> males | Total <br> female <br> weight <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Total <br> male <br> weight <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$ | Total Fish | Total <br> weight <br> $(\mathrm{kg})$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| James River | $2 / 25-5 / 12$ | 453 | 179 | 750.5 | 235.8 | 632 | 986.4 |
| York River | $2 / 25-5 / 5$ | 376 | 203 | 633.1 | 261.7 | 579 | 894.8 |
| Rappahannock <br> River | $2 / 25-5 / 19$ | 339 | 100 | 585.9 | 131.3 | 439 | 717.2 |
| Totals |  | 1,168 | 482 | $1,969.5$ | 628.8 | 1,650 | $2,598.4$ |

Table 2. Total length, fork length and total weight of post-spawning female American shad taken in staked gill nets in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers, spring 2003. These individuals were removed from the monitoring data.

| River | Date | Specimen <br> Number | Total Length (mm) | Fork Length (mm) | Total Weight $(\mathrm{g})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James River | 5/4/2003 | 8585 | 491 | 430 | 1054.7 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8456 | 525 | 464 | 1237.7 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8457 | 569 | 508 | 1492.2 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8458 | 468 | 414 | 1216.6 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8459 | 543 | 474 | 1321.7 |
|  | 5/11/2003 | 8595 | 488 | 436 | 1190.7 |
|  | 5/11/2003 | 8596 | 572 | 512 | 1597.7 |
|  | 5/11/2003 | 8598 | 542 | 478 | 1419.6 |
| Rappahannock River | 5/4/2003 | 8580 | 566 | 512 | 1354.9 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8443 | 532 | 474 | 1285.1 |
|  | 5/11/2003 | 8601 | 546 | 478 | 1238.4 |
|  | 5/12/2003 | 8610 | 518 | 454 | 1190 |
|  | 5/18/2003 | 8615 | 548 | 491 | 1486 |
| York River | 4/21/2003 | 8214 | 552 | 489 | 1565.3 |
|  | 4/21/2003 | 8216 | 536 | 474 | 1437.3 |
|  | 4/21/2003 | 8220 | 521 | 456 | 1212.9 |
|  | 4/21/2003 | 8225 | 564 | 494 | 1532.2 |
|  | 4/21/2003 | 8234 | 512 | 451 | 1645.7 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8333 | 527 | 465 | 1367.7 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8335 | 505 | 443 | 1088.6 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8336 | 526 | 460 | 1181 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8338 | 546 | 480 | 1377.9 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8339 | 540 | 472 | 1324.2 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8340 | 556 | 486 | 1422.8 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8341 | 505 | 439 | 1095.3 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8342 | 528 | 462 | 1301.9 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8343 | 554 | 486 | 1599.4 |


| York River | 4/27/2003 | 8344 | 450 | 395 | 793.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8346 | 574 | 512 | 1496.6 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8347 | 546 | 478 | 1359.7 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8348 | 510 | 445 | 1175.9 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8349 | 522 | 464 | 1145.2 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8350 | 548 | 481 | 1557.3 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8351 | 517 | 458 | 1070.8 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8353 | 573 | 508 | 1541.3 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8354 | 549 | 479 | 1368.8 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8356 | 552 | 488 | 1487 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8358 | 524 | 462 | 1140.7 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8359 | 519 | 456 | 1155.1 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8360 | 548 | 488 | 1416.6 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8361 | 572 | 504 | 1581.1 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8362 | 542 | 476 | 1320.8 |
|  | 4/27/2003 | 8363 | 474 | 418 | 908.4 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8374 | 528 | 466 | 1294.6 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8375 | 551 | 486 | 1408.5 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8376 | 562 | 493 | 1456.4 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8377 | 510 | 456 | 1261.8 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8378 | 576 | 504 | 1445.3 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8379 | 538 | 476 | 1284.1 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8380 | 551 | 489 | 1345.9 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8381 | 538 | 476 | 1246.4 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8382 | 522 | 464 | 1158.9 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8383 | 547 | 478 | 1332.1 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8384 | 534 | 472 | 1366.2 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8385 | 544 | 482 | 1327.5 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8386 | 542 | 482 | 1253.5 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8387 | 535 | 469 | 1531.1 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8388 | 548 | 476 | 1242.8 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8389 | 580 | 522 | 1709 |


|  | 4/28/2003 | 8390 | 518 | 457 | 1272.6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| York River | 4/28/2003 | 8391 | 553 | 492 | 1422.6 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8392 | 526 | 462 | 1236.9 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8393 | 538 | 477 | 1451.4 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8394 | 534 | 468 | 1278.1 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8395 | 520 | 460 | 1241 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8396 | 545 | 478 | 1397.5 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8397 | 548 | 482 | 1443.4 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8398 | 540 | 472 | 1338.7 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8399 | 514 | 454 | 1332.3 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8400 | 505 | 451 | 993.6 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8401 | 537 | 473 | 1220.9 |
|  | 4/28/2003 | 8402 | 564 | 492 | 1550.8 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8502 | 533 | 474 | 1383.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8503 | 586 | 518 | 1729.4 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8505 | 543 | 482 | 1284.7 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8507 | 540 | 471 | 1395.1 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8508 | 553 | 490 | 1451.6 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8509 | 516 | 454 | 1081.7 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8510 | 528 | 466 | 1176.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8511 | 522 | 464 | 1362.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8512 | 536 | 472 | 1361.2 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8513 | 532 | 474 | 1279.8 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8514 | 556 | 490 | 1421.4 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8515 | 536 | 474 | 1290.3 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8516 | 516 | 454 | 1061 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8517 | 511 | 442 | 958.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8518 | 558 | 488 | 1518.8 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8520 | 556 | 492 | 1448.8 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8521 | 531 | 474 | 1267.2 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8522 | 536 | 476 | 1362.3 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8523 | 552 | 489 | 1368.6 |


|  | 5/4/2003 | 8524 | 548 | 485 | 1336.3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8525 | 538 | 482 | 1361.7 |
| York River | 5/4/2003 | 8526 | 544 | 488 | 1346.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8527 | 562 | 498 | 1397.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8528 | 558 | 488 | 1535.1 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8530 | 575 | 509 | 1444.6 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8531 | 544 | 482 | 1285.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8532 | 524 | 454 | 1119.4 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8533 | 525 | 462 | 1186.4 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8534 | 542 | 478 | 1371.1 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8535 | 580 | 508 | 1629 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8536 | 544 | 479 | 1329.5 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8538 | 536 | 474 | 1356.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8539 | 508 | 453 | 1174.4 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8540 | 566 | 500 | 1756.7 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8541 | 525 | 464 | 1298.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8542 | 482 | 424 | 983 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8543 | 482 | 429 | 956.2 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8544 | 536 | 476 | 1205 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8545 | 528 | 468 | 1305.8 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8546 | 536 | 465 | 1331.9 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8547 | 548 | 484 | 1507.5 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8548 | 565 | 502 | 1481.6 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8549 | 528 | 471 | 1218.1 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8550 | 527 | 471 | 1221.7 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8552 | 530 | 468 | 1413.7 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8553 | 540 | 480 | 1293.3 |
|  | 5/4/2003 | 8554 | 582 | 514 | 1719.5 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8469 | 552 | 487 | 1181.8 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8470 | 524 | 456 | 1097.8 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8471 | 542 | 472 | 1307 |
|  | 5/5/2003 | 8472 | 512 | 450 | 1231.3 |


|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8474 | 555 | 486 | 1373.7 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8480 | 528 | 470 | 1464.8 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8481 | 550 | 490 | 1362.2 |
| York River | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8482 | 533 | 472 | 1351 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8483 | 492 | 432 | 970.1 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8484 | 570 | 499 | 1468.3 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8485 | 555 | 498 | 1525.7 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8486 | 544 | 488 | 1299.7 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8488 | 551 | 488 | 1329 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8491 | 547 | 482 | 1462 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8492 | 552 | 495 | 1332.5 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8493 | 528 | 471 | 1341.2 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8494 | 560 | 495 | 1562.8 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8495 | 522 | 462 | 1225.9 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8497 | 530 | 464 | 1218.4 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8498 | 521 | 464 | 1327.2 |
|  | $5 / 5 / 2003$ | 8499 | 536 | 474 | 1167.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. Dates of capture, number, total weight (g) and catch rates (numbers per m; kg per m ) of female American shad taken in staked gill net monitoring on the James River, spring 2003.

| Date | Day of year | Number | Catch Rate (count/m) | Total weight $(\mathrm{g})$ | Catch Rate (kg/m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2/25/2003 | 56 | 4 | 0.086 | 7,082.8 | 0.025 |
| 2/26/2003 | 57 | 3 | 0.066 | 5,098.8 | 0.019 |
| 3/2/2003 | 62 | 4 | 0.089 | 6,299.7 | 0.023 |
| 3/3/2003 | 63 | 3 | 0.066 | 5,176.5 | 0.019 |
| 3/9/2003 | 69 | 10 | 0.223 | 20,074.7 | 0.075 |
| 3/10/2003 | 70 | 13 | 0.284 | 24,623.0 | 0.090 |
| 3/16/2003 | 76 | 33 | 0.693 | 59,955.1 | 0.210 |
| 3/17/2003 | 77 | 31 | 0.678 | 54,252.7 | 0.198 |
| 3/23/2003 | 83 | 31 | 0.678 | 52,282.7 | 0.191 |
| 3/24/2003 | 84 | 37 | 0.809 | 58,832.3 | 0.214 |
| 3/30/2003 | 90 | 53 | 1.030 | 87,797.5 | 0.284 |
| 3/31/2003 | 91 | 25 | 0.547 | 37,768.8 | 0.138 |
| 4/6/2003 | 97 | 29 | 0.634 | 49,198.2 | 0.179 |
| 4/7/2003 | 98 | 45 | 0.984 | 71,007.7 | 0.259 |
| 4/13/2003 | 104 | 21 | 0.459 | 34,668.2 | 0.126 |
| 4/14/2003 | 105 | 19 | 0.416 | 31,752.0 | 0.116 |
| 4/21/2003 | 112 | 21 | 0.459 | 33,775.8 | 0.123 |
| 4/22/2003 | 113 | 20 | 0.437 | 32,396.8 | 0.118 |
| 4/27/2003 | 118 | 13 | 0.279 | 19,919.0 | 0.071 |
| 4/28/2003 | 119 | 16 | 0.357 | 24,666.7 | 0.092 |
| 5/4/2003 | 125 | 9 | 0.201 | 14,989.6 | 0.056 |
| 5/5/2003 | 126 | 9 | 0.197 | 12,543.9 | 0.046 |
| 5/11/2003 | 132 | 2 | 0.037 | 2,875.8 | 0.009 |
| 5/12/2003 | 133 | 2 | 0.050 | 3,510.9 | 0.015 |
| Totals |  | 453 |  | 750,549.2 |  |

Table 4. Dates of capture, number, total weight and catch rates (numbers per m; kg per m) of male American shad taken in staked gill net monitoring on the James River, spring 2003.

| Date | Day of year | Number | Catch Rate <br> $($ count $/ \mathrm{m})$ | Total weight <br> $(\mathrm{g})$ | Catch Rate <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m})$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2 / 25 / 2003$ | 56 | 12 | 0.257 | 15929.7 | 0.057 |
| $2 / 26 / 2003$ | 57 | 2 | 0.044 | 2725.3 | 0.010 |
| $3 / 2 / 2003$ | 62 | 6 | 0.134 | 7517.2 | 0.028 |
| $3 / 3 / 2003$ | 63 | 3 | 0.066 | 4319.8 | 0.016 |
| $3 / 9 / 2003$ | 69 | 15 | 0.335 | 19501.5 | 0.073 |
| $3 / 10 / 2003$ | 70 | 19 | 0.416 | 23830.8 | 0.087 |
| $3 / 16 / 2003$ | 76 | 34 | 0.714 | 46958.0 | 0.164 |
| $3 / 17 / 2003$ | 77 | 26 | 0.569 | 33866.8 | 0.123 |
| $3 / 23 / 2003$ | 83 | 23 | 0.503 | 30278.7 | 0.110 |
| $3 / 24 / 2003$ | 84 | 11 | 0.241 | 15650.0 | 0.057 |
| $3 / 30 / 2003$ | 90 | 8 | 0.156 | 9947.3 | 0.032 |
| $3 / 31 / 2003$ | 91 | 2 | 0.044 | 2831.0 | 0.010 |
| $4 / 6 / 2003$ | 97 | 4 | 0.087 | 4560.8 | 0.017 |
| $4 / 7 / 2003$ | 98 | 5 | 0.109 | 6194.0 | 0.023 |
| $4 / 13 / 2003$ | 104 | 2 | 0.044 | 3019.1 | 0.011 |
| $4 / 14 / 2003$ | 105 | 2 | 0.044 | 2267.9 | 0.008 |
| $4 / 21 / 2003$ | 112 | 2 | 0.044 | 2172.8 | 0.008 |
| $4 / 22 / 2003$ | 113 | 119 | 1 | 0.044 | 3061.8 |

Table 5. Dates of capture, number, total weight $(\mathrm{g})$ and catch rates (numbers per m; kg per m) of female American shad taken in staked gill net monitoring on the York River, spring 2003.

| Date | Day of year | Number | Catch Rate (count/m) | Total weight $(\mathrm{g})$ | Catch Rate (kg/m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2/25/2003 | 56 | 1 | 0.022 | 1,384.1 | 0.005 |
| 2/26/2003 | 57 | 9 | 0.197 | 16,308.3 | 0.059 |
| 3/2/2003 | 62 | 3 | 0.066 | 4,458.2 | 0.016 |
| 3/3/2003 | 63 | 12 | 0.214 | 18,544.4 | 0.055 |
| 3/9/2003 | 69 | 13 | 0.284 | 21,853.6 | 0.080 |
| 3/10/2003 | 70 | 14 | 0.306 | 24,807.9 | 0.090 |
| 3/16/2003 | 76 | 24 | 0.525 | 46,342.4 | 0.169 |
| 3/17/2003 | 77 | 25 | 0.547 | 46,526.5 | 0.170 |
| 3/23/2003 | 83 | 33 | 0.815 | 54,806.2 | 0.226 |
| 3/24/2003 | 84 | 38 | 0.831 | 63,741.2 | 0.232 |
| 4/4/2003 | 95 | 65 | 1.422 | 106,986.5 | 0.390 |
| 4/5/2003 | 96 | 28 | 0.639 | 45,917.7 | 0.175 |
| 4/6/2003 | 97 | 22 | 0.481 | 34,774.5 | 0.127 |
| 4/7/2003 | 98 | 16 | 0.350 | 25,722.3 | 0.094 |
| 4/14/2003 | 105 | 13 | 0.284 | 22,675.4 | 0.083 |
| 4/15/2003 | 106 | 17 | 0.372 | 28,565.3 | 0.104 |
| 4/20/2003 | 111 | 12 | 0.262 | 20,149.4 | 0.073 |
| 4/21/2003 | 112 | 16 | 0.350 | 26,508.7 | 0.097 |
| 4/27/2003 | 118 | 8 | 0.181 | 12,536.8 | 0.047 |
| 5/4/2003 | 125 | 3 | 0.043 | 4,234.3 | 0.015 |
| 5/5/2003 | 126 | 4 | 0.084 | 6,244.4 | 0.022 |
| Totals |  | 376 |  | 632,038.9 |  |

Table 6. Dates of capture, number, total weight and catch rates (numbers per m; kg per m) of male American shad taken in staked gill net monitoring on the York River, spring 2003.

| Date | Day of year | Number | Catch Rate <br> $($ count $/ \mathrm{m})$ | Total weight <br> $(\mathrm{g})$ | Catch Rate <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2 / 25 / 2003$ | 56 | 18 | 0.394 | $23,149.9$ | 0.084 |
| $2 / 26 / 2003$ | 57 | 16 | 0.350 | $20,919.4$ | 0.076 |
| $3 / 2 / 2003$ | 62 | 5 | 0.109 | $7,350.7$ | 0.027 |
| $3 / 3 / 2003$ | 63 | 19 | 0.338 | $24,945.1$ | 0.074 |
| $3 / 9 / 2003$ | 69 | 16 | 0.350 | $20,209.7$ | 0.074 |
| $3 / 10 / 2003$ | 70 | 15 | 0.328 | $19,957.6$ | 0.073 |
| $3 / 16 / 2003$ | 76 | 15 | 0.328 | $20,088.8$ | 0.073 |
| $3 / 17 / 2003$ | 77 | 22 | 0.481 | $29,294.7$ | 0.107 |
| $3 / 23 / 2003$ | 83 | 13 | 0.321 | $16,685.3$ | 0.069 |
| $3 / 24 / 2003$ | 94 | 22 | 0.481 | $28,752.4$ | 0.105 |
| $4 / 4 / 2003$ | 96 | 7 | 0.153 | $9,156.2$ | 0.033 |
| $4 / 5 / 2003$ | 97 | 3 | 0.068 | $3,577.2$ | 0.014 |
| $4 / 6 / 2003$ | 98 | 6 | 0.131 | $7,714.7$ | 0.028 |
| $4 / 7 / 2003$ | 105 | 4 | 0.087 | $4,983.4$ | 0.018 |
| $4 / 14 / 2003$ | 106 | 2 | 0.044 | $2,830.9$ | 0.010 |
| $4 / 15 / 2003$ | 111 | 1 | 0.022 | $1,145.6$ | 0.004 |
| $4 / 20 / 2003$ | 112 | 118 | 4 | 0.022 | 981.2 |

Table 7. Dates of capture, number, total weight (g) and catch rates (numbers per m; kg per m ) of female American shad taken in staked gill net monitoring on the Rappahannock River, spring 2003.

| Date | Day of year | Number | Catch Rate <br> $($ count $/ \mathrm{m})$ | Total weight <br> $(\mathrm{g})$ | Catch Rate <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $3 / 9 / 2003$ | 69 | 1 | 0.004 | $1,604.6$ | 0.006 |
| $3 / 10 / 2003$ | 70 | 1 | 0.004 | $2,225.1$ | 0.008 |
| $3 / 16 / 2003$ | 76 | 7 | 0.025 | $13,552.3$ | 0.049 |
| $3 / 17 / 2003$ | 77 | 3 | 0.011 | $5,856.6$ | 0.021 |
| $3 / 23 / 2003$ | 83 | 5 | 0.018 | $9,080.8$ | 0.033 |
| $3 / 24 / 2003$ | 84 | 15 | 0.054 | $30,866.3$ | 0.111 |
| $4 / 2 / 2003$ | 95 | 42 | 0.151 | $77,834.9$ | 0.280 |
| $4 / 3 / 2003$ | 96 | 50 | 0.180 | $86,363.2$ | 0.311 |
| $4 / 6 / 2003$ | 97 | 37 | 0.133 | $59,958.4$ | 0.216 |
| $4 / 7 / 2003$ | 105 | 23 | 0.072 | $38,314.1$ | 0.120 |
| $4 / 13 / 2003$ | 106 | 21 | 0.072 | $35,291.7$ | 0.121 |
| $4 / 14 / 2003$ | 111 | 29 | 0.104 | $49,483.8$ | 0.178 |
| $4 / 20 / 2003$ | 112 | 14 | 0.050 | $25,108.1$ | 0.090 |
| $4 / 21 / 2003$ | 118 | 16 | 0.051 | $25,983.1$ | 0.083 |
| $4 / 27 / 2003$ | 119 | 5 | 0.021 | $7,787.2$ | 0.033 |
| $4 / 28 / 2003$ | 125 | 9 | 27 | 0.095 | $46,363.7$ |

Table 8. Dates of capture, number, total weight and catch rates (numbers per $\mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{kg}$ per m) of male American shad taken in staked gill net monitoring on the Rappahannock River, spring 2003.

| Date | Day of year | Number | Catch Rate <br> $($ count $/ \mathrm{m})$ | Total weight <br> $(\mathrm{g})$ | Catch Rate <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{m})$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $3 / 9 / 2003$ | 69 | 2 | 0.008 | $2,384.1$ | 0.009 |
| $3 / 10 / 2003$ | 70 | 3 | 0.011 | $4,359.4$ | 0.016 |
| $3 / 16 / 2003$ | 76 | 4 | 0.014 | $5,507.8$ | 0.020 |
| $3 / 17 / 2003$ | 77 | 2 | 0.007 | $2,955.1$ | 0.011 |
| $3 / 23 / 2003$ | 83 | 54 | 0.018 | $7,279.0$ | 0.026 |
| $3 / 24 / 2003$ | 95 | 10 | 0.036 | $14,341.2$ | 0.052 |
| $4 / 2 / 2003$ | 96 | 19 | 0.068 | $24,024.6$ | 0.086 |
| $4 / 3 / 2003$ | 97 | 34 | 0.122 | $43,861.7$ | 0.158 |
| $4 / 6 / 2003$ | 98 | 2 | 0.007 | $2,020.3$ | 0.007 |
| $4 / 7 / 2003$ | 105 | 3 | 0.009 | $4,100.9$ | 0.013 |
| $4 / 13 / 2003$ | 106 | 7 | 0.024 | $8,756.5$ | 0.030 |
| $4 / 14 / 2003$ | 111 | 2 | 0.007 | $2,731.7$ | 0.010 |
| $4 / 20 / 2003$ | 112 | 1 | 0.004 | $1,411.5$ | 0.005 |
| $4 / 21 / 2003$ | 118 | 3 | 0.010 | $3,701.7$ | 0.012 |
| $4 / 27 / 2003$ | 125 | 1 | 0.004 | $1,210.7$ | 0.005 |
| $5 / 4 / 2003$ | 133 | 1 | 0.004 | $1,420.0$ | 0.005 |
| $5 / 12 / 2003$ | 100 |  | 0.004 | $1,235.7$ | 0.004 |
| Totals |  | 1 |  | $131,301.9$ |  |

Table 9. Mean total length (mm) and mean weight (g) of female American shad captured in gill nets in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers, spring 2003. The abbreviation NA is "not aged." Age estimates are based on examination of scales following Cating (1953).

| River | Year Class | Number | Mean length | Standard Deviation | Mean Weight | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James River | NA | 23 | 514.2 | 32.3 | 1,541.8 | 343.4 |
|  | 2000 | 2 | 459.5 | 16.3 | 1,240.0 | 207.0 |
|  | 1999 | 52 | 483.2 | 20.9 | 1,389.8 | 203.1 |
|  | 1998 | 225 | 506.3 | 22.9 | 1,577.2 | 226.4 |
|  | 1997 | 113 | 525.4 | 21.9 | 1,779.6 | 274.1 |
|  | 1996 | 33 | 555.8 | 24.5 | 2,039.1 | 400.4 |
|  | 1995 | 10 | 553.4 | 16.7 | 2,050.0 | 259.1 |
|  | 1994 | 2 | 582.5 | 19.1 | 2,476.7 | 140.2 |
|  | 1993 | 1 | 575.0 |  | 2,158.7 |  |
| York River | NA | 138 | 535.6 | 24.3 | 1,355.4 | 206.5 |
|  | 2000 | 1 | 462.0 |  | 1,155.1 |  |
|  | 1999 | 27 | 480.0 | 18.0 | 1,319.3 | 147.4 |
|  | 1998 | 150 | 502.6 | 22.2 | 1,549.8 | 224.9 |
|  | 1997 | 114 | 525.2 | 24.0 | 1,785.1 | 266.4 |
|  | 1996 | 51 | 540.9 | 22.4 | 1,913.1 | 277.0 |
|  | 1995 | 18 | 548.8 | 19.8 | 2,001.2 | 349.4 |
|  | 1994 | 3 | 579.3 | 32.6 | 2,341.2 | 309.6 |
|  | 1993 | 1 | 548.0 |  | 1,570.8 |  |
| Rappahannock River | NA | 15 | 514.3 | 34.9 | 1,511.8 | 307.0 |
|  | 1999 | 35 | 479.1 | 22.6 | 1,388.3 | 190.3 |
|  | 1998 | 174 | 502.8 | 20.6 | 1,590.0 | 209.2 |
|  | 1997 | 72 | 531.7 | 23.3 | 1,897.0 | 278.4 |
|  | 1996 | 31 | 557.3 | 21.1 | 2,174.9 | 307.3 |
|  | 1995 | 12 | 571.1 | 22.5 | 2,351.3 | 395.2 |
|  | 1994 | 5 | 588.2 | 15.7 | 2,464.7 | 263.1 |

Table 10. Mean total length (mm) and mean weight (g) of male American shad captured in
gill nets in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers, spring 2003. The
abbreviation NA is "not aged." Age estimates are based on examination of scales following Cating (1953).

| River | Year Class | Number | Mean length | Standard <br> Deviation | Mean Weight | Standard <br> Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James River | NA | 6 | 491.3 | 23.3 | 1352.7 | 215.4 |
|  | 1999 | 21 | 465.8 | 23.8 | 1143.3 | 156.3 |
|  | 1998 | 62 | 469.5 | 21.7 | 1201.5 | 174.1 |
|  | 1997 | 58 | 490.4 | 20.4 | 1378.5 | 200.1 |
|  | 1996 | 27 | 504.9 | 24.8 | 1482.2 | 190.9 |
|  | 1995 | 3 | 506.7 | 20.0 | 1563.4 | 272.3 |
|  | 1994 | 2 | 557.5 | 2.1 | 2275.2 | 49.2 |
| York River | NA | 14 | 486.9 | 16.9 | 1366.9 | 115.6 |
|  | 2000 | 1 | 387.0 |  | 493.2 |  |
|  | 1999 | 9 | 458.6 | 19.3 | 1139.9 | 145.0 |
|  | 1998 | 44 | 471.4 | 15.8 | 1204.2 | 146.5 |
|  | 1997 | 74 | 487.7 | 16.5 | 1314.2 | 167.2 |
|  | 1996 | 53 | 488.5 | 15.5 | 1309.5 | 172.6 |
|  | 1995 | 7 | 507.7 | 17.1 | 1506.1 | 183.2 |
|  | 1994 | 1 | 530.0 |  | 1637.6 |  |
| Rappahannock River | NA | 4 | 474.3 | 17.2 | 1211.5 | 135.3 |
|  | 1999 | 5 | 462.2 | 12.5 | 1137.5 | 121.9 |
|  | 1998 | 50 | 475.8 | 17.8 | 1243.0 | 140.5 |
|  | 1997 | 20 | 487.3 | 14.2 | 1350.3 | 137.7 |
|  | 1996 | 16 | 504.3 | 16.0 | 1489.6 | 131.0 |
|  | 1995 | 5 | 512.4 | 9.9 | 1556.3 | 141.5 |

Table 11. Number, total weight and seasonal catch rates (total number per season per m; total weight per season per m) by year class of female American shad in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers captured in staked gill nets, spring, 2003. Age estimates are based on examination of scales following Cating (1953). Abbreviations are: NA, not aged.

| River | Year Class | Number | Total Weight (kg) | Total effort (days) | Catch Rate (numbers per m) | Catch Rate <br> (kg per m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James River | 2000 | 2 | 2.48 | 24.2 | 0.0003 | 0.0004 |
|  | 1999 | 52 | 72.27 | 24.2 | 0.0078 | 0.0109 |
|  | 1998 | 225 | 354.87 | 24.2 | 0.0339 | 0.0535 |
|  | 1997 | 113 | 201.10 | 24.2 | 0.0170 | 0.0303 |
|  | 1996 | 33 | 67.29 | 24.2 | 0.0050 | 0.0102 |
|  | 1995 | 10 | 20.50 | 24.2 | 0.0015 | 0.0031 |
|  | 1994 | 2 | 4.95 | 24.2 | 0.0003 | 0.0007 |
|  | 1993 | 1 | 2.16 | 24.2 | 0.0002 | 0.0003 |
|  | NA | 23 | 35.46 | 24.2 | 0.0035 | 0.0053 |
| York River | 2000 | 1 | 1.16 | 22.1 | 0.0002 | 0.0002 |
|  | 1999 | 27 | 35.62 | 22.1 | 0.0045 | 0.0059 |
|  | 1998 | 150 | 232.47 | 22.1 | 0.0247 | 0.0383 |
|  | 1997 | 114 | 203.50 | 22.1 | 0.0188 | 0.0336 |
|  | 1996 | 51 | 97.57 | 22.1 | 0.0084 | 0.0161 |
|  | 1995 | 18 | 36.02 | 22.1 | 0.0030 | 0.0059 |
|  | 1994 | 3 | 7.02 | 22.1 | 0.0005 | 0.0012 |
|  | 1993 | 1 | 1.57 | 22.1 | 0.0002 | 0.0003 |
|  | NA | 138 | 187.04 | 22.1 | 0.0228 | 0.0308 |
| Rappahannock | 1999 | 35 | 48.59 | 26.2 | 0.0048 | 0.0067 |
|  | 1998 | 174 | 276.67 | 26.2 | 0.0239 | 0.0380 |
|  | 1997 | 72 | 136.59 | 26.2 | 0.0099 | 0.0188 |
|  | 1996 | 31 | 67.42 | 26.2 | 0.0043 | 0.0093 |
|  | 1995 | 12 | 28.22 | 26.2 | 0.0016 | 0.0039 |
|  | 1994 | 5 | 12.32 | 26.2 | 0.0007 | 0.0017 |
|  | NA | 15 | 22.68 | 26.2 | 0.0021 | 0.0031 |

Table 12. Number, total weight and seasonal catch rates (total number per season per m; total weight per season per m) by year class of male American shad in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers captured in staked gill nets, spring, 2003. Age estimates are based on examination of scales following Cating (1953). Abbreviations are: NA, not aged.

| River | Year Class | Number | Total Weight (kg) | Total effort (days) | Catch Rate (numbers per m) | Catch Rate (kg per m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| James River | 1999 | 21 | 24.01 | 24.2 | 0.0032 | 0.0036 |
|  | 1998 | 62 | 74.49 | 24.2 | 0.0094 | 0.0112 |
|  | 1997 | 58 | 79.96 | 24.2 | 0.0087 | 0.0121 |
|  | 1996 | 27 | 40.02 | 24.2 | 0.0041 | 0.0060 |
|  | 1995 | 3 | 4.69 | 24.2 | 0.0005 | 0.0007 |
|  | 1994 | 2 | 4.55 | 24.2 | 0.0003 | 0.0007 |
| NA |  | 6 | 8.12 | 24.2 | 0.0009 | 0.0012 |
| York River | 2000 | 1 | 0.49 | 22.1 | 0.0002 | 0.0001 |
|  | 1999 | 9 | 10.26 | 22.1 | 0.0015 | 0.0017 |
|  | 1998 | 44 | 52.99 | 22.1 | 0.0073 | 0.0087 |
|  | 1997 | 74 | 97.25 | 22.1 | 0.0122 | 0.0160 |
|  | 1996 | 53 | 69.40 | 22.1 | 0.0087 | 0.0114 |
|  | 1995 | 7 | 10.54 | 22.1 | 0.0012 | 0.0017 |
|  | 1994 | 1 | 1.64 | 22.1 | 0.0002 | 0.0003 |
| NA |  | 14 | 19.14 | 22.1 | 0.0023 | 0.0032 |
| Rappahannock River | 1999 | 5 | 5.69 | 26.2 | 0.0007 | 0.0008 |
|  | 1998 | 50 | 62.15 | 26.2 | 0.0069 | 0.0085 |
|  | 1997 | 20 | 27.01 | 26.2 | 0.0027 | 0.0037 |
|  | 1996 | 16 | 23.83 | 26.2 | 0.0022 | 0.0033 |
|  | 1995 | 5 | 7.78 | 26.2 | 0.0007 | 0.0011 |
| NA |  | 4 | 4.85 | 26.2 | 0.0005 | 0.0007 |

Table 13. Spawning histories of American shad (combined sexes) collected in spring, 2003 in the York and James rivers. Table entries are numbers of fish (York River, $n=554$; James River, $\mathrm{n}=611$ ). Ages are based on scale analysis. Numbers in bold are virgins in year class. Numbers in parentheses are the numbers of fish in the James River ( $\mathrm{n}=137$ ) with hatchery marks on otoliths. Dashes indicate that age at maturity of individuals in some year classes is yet to be determined. The table truncates at age 7 since American shad are mature by that age (Maki et al., 2001).

Age at Maturity

| York River <br> Year Class | Age at <br> Capture | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 3 | $\mathbf{2}$ | - | - | - | - |
| 1999 | 4 | 2 | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | - | - | - |
| 1998 | 5 | 5 | 78 | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ | - | - |
| 1997 | 6 | 7 | 97 | 69 | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | - |
| 1996 | 7 | 0 | 52 | 40 | 12 | 0 |
| 1995 | 8 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 6 | 0 |
| 1994 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1993 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |

Age at Maturity

| James River <br> Year Class | Age at <br> Capture | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 3 | $\mathbf{2}(1)$ | - | - | - | - |
| 1999 | 4 | $1(1)$ | $\mathbf{7 2}(13)$ | - | - | - |
| 1998 | 5 | $1(0)$ | $75(20)$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1}(32)$ | - | - |
| 1997 | 6 | $5(0)$ | $65(19)$ | $57(22)$ | $\mathbf{4 4 ( 1 5 )}$ |  |
| 1996 | 7 | 0 | $22(2)$ | $32(8)$ | $5(0)$ | $\mathbf{1}(0)$ |
| 1995 | 8 | 0 | $2(1)$ | $8(1)$ | $3(1)$ | 0 |
| 1994 | 9 | 0 | 0 | $1(0)$ | $3(1)$ | 0 |
| 1993 | 10 | 0 | 0 | $1(0)$ | 0 | 0 |

Table 14. Spawning histories of American shad (combined sexes) collected in spring, 2003 in the Rappahannock River. Table entries are numbers of fish $(\mathrm{n}=426)$. Ages are based on scale analysis. Numbers in bold are virgins in year class. Dashes indicate that age at maturity of individuals in some year classes is yet to be determined. The table truncates at age 7 since American shad are mature by that age (Maki et al., 2001).

Age at Maturity

| Rappahannock <br> River <br> Year Class | Age at <br> Capture | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2000 | 3 | 0 | - | - | - | - |
| 1999 | 4 | 0 | $\mathbf{4 0}$ | - | - | - |
| 1998 | 5 | 0 | 51 | $\mathbf{1 7 3}$ | - | - |
| 1997 | 6 | 1 | 33 | 41 | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | - |
| 1996 | 7 | 0 | 25 | 18 | 4 | 0 |
| 1995 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| 1994 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 1993 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 15. Comparison of catches in multifilament (4.75-in mesh) and monofilament nets (4.88-in mesh) during spring 2002 and 2003. Both nets are constructed with \#139 twine-sized material.

| Net type <br> in 2002 | Sex | Number Caught | Mean Total <br> Length (mm) | Mean Weight (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| multifilament | male | 17 | 475 | 1,245 |
| multifilament | female | 47 | 502 | 1,543 |
| monofilament | male | 42 | 478 | 1,259 |
| monofilament | female | 111 | 506 | 1,602 |
| Total |  | 217 |  |  |


| Net type <br> in 2003 | Sex | Number Caught | Mean Total <br> Length (mm) | Mean Weight (g) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| multifilament | male | 12 | 480 | 1,223 |
| multifilament | female | 47 | 449 | 1,615 |
| monofilament | male | 24 | 486 | 1,319 |
| monofilament | female | 77 | 513 | 1,638 |
| Total |  | 160 |  |  |

Table 16. Analysis of parameter estimates for 2002 data from the Poisson main effects model (females only).

| Parameter | DF | Estimate | Std Err | Chi Square | Pr>Chi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 1 | -1.1723 | 0.6024 | 3.79 | 0.0517 |
| Week 1 | 1 | 1.8315 | 0.6215 | 8.69 | 0.0032 |
| Week 2 | 1 | 2.6173 | 0.5969 | 20.03 | $<0.0001$ |
| Week 3 | 1 | 2.3026 | 0.6055 | 14.46 | 0.0001 |
| Week 4 | 1 | 1.8458 | 0.6213 | 8.83 | 0.0030 |
| Week 5 | 1 | 1.2993 | 0.6513 | 3.98 | 0.0461 |
| Week 6 | 1 | 2.2883 | 0.6058 | 14.27 | 0.0002 |
| Position | 1 | 0.4861 | 0.1656 | 8.61 | 0.0033 |
| Day | 1 | 0.1428 | 0.1621 | 0.78 | 0.3784 |
| Net | 1 | 0.8966 | 0.1769 | 25.69 | $<0.0001$ |

Table 17. Analysis of parameter estimates for 2003 data from the Poisson main effects model (females only).

| Parameter | DF | Estimate | Std Err | Chi Square | Pr>Chi |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept | 1 | 1.1495 | 0.3175 | 13.11 | 0.0003 |
| Week 1 | 1 | 0.8494 | 0.3087 | 7.57 | 0.0059 |
| Week 2 | 1 | 0.2385 | 0.3455 | 0.48 | 0.4900 |
| Week 3 | 1 | 0.5878 | 0.3220 | 3.33 | 0.0680 |
| Week 4 | 1 | -1.3197 | 0.5628 | 5.50 | 0.0190 |
| Position | 1 | -0.0528 | 0.2004 | 0.07 | 0.7924 |
| Day | 1 | -0.2842 | 0.2022 | 1.98 | 0.1598 |
| Net | 1 | 0.5766 | 0.2084 | 7.66 | 0.0057 |

Table 18. Results of the Poisson main effects model (net type, females only) for 2002 and 2003.

| Year | Estimate | p -value | Relative <br> Fishing <br> Power | Standard <br> Error | 95\% <br> Confidence <br> Interval |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2002 | 0.8966 | $<0.0001$ | 2.45 | 0.18 | $1.72,3.49$ |
| 2003 | 0.5766 | 0.0057 | 1.78 | 0.21 | $1.17,2.70$ |
| $2002 \& 2003$ | 0.7703 | $<0.0001$ | 2.16 | 0.13 | $1.65,2.83$ |

Table 19. Historical catch and effort data of American shad by staked gill nets in the York River, Virginia. Historical data are taken from the voluntary log books of Malvin Green, Aberdeen Creek,Virginia. The data were originally recorded as numbers of female shad per day and converted using average female weight of 3.2 lbs . Catch rates are expressed as female $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{d}$ and multiplied by 2.16 to adjust for the lower fishing power of multifilament nets compared to monofilament nets.
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|r|r|}\hline \text { Year } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Total } \\ \text { females }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Effort } \\ \left(10^{3} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{yr}\right)\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Duration of } \\ \text { run (d) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Highest } \\ \text { Catch Rate }\end{array} \\ \hline 1953 & 2161 & 36.0 & 56 & 0.549 & 0.205 & 14.88 \\ \hline \text { Rate Catch }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Area under } \\ \text { the Catch } \\ \text { Curve }\end{array}\right]$.

Table 20. River of origin, age, number of spawns, fork length (FL), total length (TL), total weight (TW) and sex of American shad with hatchery marks taken in staked gill net monitoring on the James River in 2003. Data are sorted by spawning history and age. Age estimates are based on scales following Cating (1953).

| Specimen <br> Number | Origin | Age | Spawns | FL (mm) | TL (mm) | TW (g) | Sex |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7515 | 97-01 James | 3 | 0 | 399 | 448 | 1,093.6 | F |
| 6826 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 415 | 469 | 1,184.8 | M |
| 6873 | 95-96 James | 4 | 0 | 428 | 484 | 1,355.8 | F |
| 6926 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 420 | 475 | 1,422.8 | F |
| 6928 | 95-96 James | 4 | 0 | 384 | 434 | 917.6 | M |
| 7107 | 95-96 James | 4 | 0 | 418 | 475 | 1,251.9 | M |
| 7135 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 428 | 490 | 1,445.9 | F |
| 7181 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 432 | 483 | 1,246.5 | F |
| 7193 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 408 | 464 | 1,285.7 | F |
| 7451 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 392 | 446 | 1,147.6 | F |
| 7461 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 425 | 478 | 1,354.5 | F |
| 7481 | 95-96 James | 4 | 0 | 426 | 486 | 1,518.7 | F |
| 7495 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 427 | 482 | 1,385.5 | F |
| 7874 | 97-01 James | 4 | 0 | 414 | 474 | 1,221.7 | F |
| 6822 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 462 | 526 | 1,736.8 | F |
| 6834 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 427 | 483 | 1,375.0 | M |
| 6956 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 432 | 487 | 1,277.7 | F |
| 6966 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 468 | 536 | 1,812.5 | F |
| 7113 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 450 | 517 | 1,686.1 | F |
| 7159 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 468 | 526 | 1,666.9 | F |
| 7169 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 397 | 456 | 1,084.9 | M |
| 7278 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 441 | 500 | 1,680.8 | F |
| 7310 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 392 | 450 | 1,023.6 | F |
| 7314 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 438 | 502 | 1,432.0 | F |
| 7318 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 441 | 504 | 1,516.4 | F |
| 7324 | 95-96 James | 5 | 0 | 448 | 506 | 1,606.3 | F |
| 7463 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 445 | 512 | 1,718.0 | F |


| 7469 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 450 | 500 | 1,738.5 | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7475 | 95-96 James | 5 | 0 | 448 | 514 | 1,677.6 | F |
| 7513 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 418 | 474 | 1,330.3 | F |
| 7872 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 442 | 508 | 1,434.0 | F |
| 7884 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 446 | 506 | 1,557.2 | F |
| 7890 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 450 | 520 | 1,524.3 | F |
| 7894 | 95-96 James | 5 | 0 | 419 | 478 | 1,364.8 | F |
| 7908 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 433 | 497 | 1,484.8 | F |
| 8018 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 456 | 528 | 1,745.3 | F |
| 8034 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 394 | 458 | 1,144.1 | M |
| 8048 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 436 | 494 | 1,486.8 | F |
| 8052 | 95-96 James | 5 | 0 | 450 | 516 | 1,750.2 | F |
| 8264 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 486 | 552 | 2,190.3 | F |
| 8274 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 418 | 472 | 1,313.4 | F |
| 8280 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 475 | 536 | 1,585.0 | F |
| 8309 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 441 | 495 | 1,507.2 | F |
| 8317 | 95-96 James | 5 | 0 | 462 | 526 | 1,550.5 | F |
| 8422 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 429 | 486 | 1,386.0 | F |
| 8432 | 97-01 James | 5 | 0 | 459 | 528 | 1,771.2 | F |
| 6687 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 427 | 488 | 1,378.5 | F |
| 6922 | 95-96 James | 6 | 0 | 426 | 484 | 1,386.7 | M |
| 7121 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 486 | 555 | 2,283.6 | F |
| 7517 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 475 | 536 | 1,910.4 | F |
| 7906 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 438 | 495 | 1,532.6 | F |
| 8026 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 450 | 518 | 1,683.4 | F |
| 8046 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 462 | 536 | 2,026.0 | F |
| 8134 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 456 | 526 | 1,644.0 | F |
| 8144 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 446 | 518 | 1,716.6 | F |
| 8148 | 95-96 James | 6 | 0 | 456 | 520 | 1,845.0 | F |
| 8150 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 462 | 522 | 1,723.9 | F |
| 8266 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 464 | 525 | 1,705.8 | F |
| 8412 | 95-96 James | 6 | 0 | 494 | 564 | 2,259.0 | F |


| 8430 | 97-01 James | 6 | 0 | 450 | 514 | $1,568.3$ | F |
| :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 7101 | 97-01 James | 4 | 1 | 395 | 450 | $1,062.6$ | M |
| 6701 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 392 | 442 | 992.7 | M |
| 6728 | 95-96 James | 5 | 1 | 464 | 519 | $1,598.4$ | F |
| 6867 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 449 | 516 | $1,448.6$ | M |
| 6918 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 474 | 539 | $1,936.3$ | F |
| 6938 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 400 | 460 | $1,088.7$ | M |
| 6946 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 420 | 477 | $1,214.0$ | M |
| 6958 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 407 | 464 | $1,182.0$ | M |
| 6970 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 458 | 523 | $1,875.6$ | F |
| 6974 | 95-96 James | 5 | 1 | 490 | 551 | $2,017.7$ | F |
| 7099 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 428 | 487 | $1,112.0$ | M |
| 7117 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 464 | 523 | $1,753.4$ | F |
| 7177 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 436 | 498 | $1,434.3$ | M |
| 7288 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 415 | 468 | $1,187.1$ | M |
| 7306 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 464 | 526 | $1,746.0$ | F |
| 7312 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 428 | 480 | $1,507.8$ | F |
| 7316 | 95-96 James | 5 | 1 | 417 | 475 | $1,163.8$ | F |
| 7471 | 97-01 James | 5 | 1 | 1 | 466 | 538 | $1,897.6$ |


| 6920 | 97-01 James | 6 | 1 | 480 | 546 | 2,214.6 | F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7147 | 97-01 James | 6 | 1 | 472 | 536 | 1,818.5 | F |
| 7167 | 95-96 James | 6 | 1 | 469 | 540 | 1,875.0 | F |
| 7173 | 95-96 James | 6 | 1 | 432 | 483 | 1,382.4 | F |
| 7437 | 97-01 James | 6 | 1 | 460 | 522 | 1,473.1 | F |
| 7455 | 97-01 James | 6 | 1 | 416 | 476 | 1,292.9 | F |
| 7479 | 95-96 James | 6 | 1 | 459 | 518 | 1,782.7 | F |
| 8016 | 97-01 James | 6 | 1 | 480 | 546 | 1,971.1 | F |
| 8030 | 97-01 James | 6 | 1 | 466 | 540 | 1,863.5 | F |
| 8032 | 95-96 James | 6 | 1 | 434 | 503 | 1,374.0 | F |
| 8313 | 95-96 James | 6 | 1 | 470 | 529 | 1,968.1 | F |
| 8416 | 97-01 James | 6 | 1 | 452 | 520 | 1,232.2 | F |
| 6693 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 438 | 494 | 1,388.1 | M |
| 6742 | 95-96 James | 6 | 2 | 419 | 474 | 1,369.7 | M |
| 6744 | 95-96 James | 6 | 2 | 474 | 532 | 1,983.5 | F |
| 6748 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 392 | 446 | 1,022.5 | M |
| 6830 | 95-96 James | 6 | 2 | 456 | 512 | 1,731.1 | F |
| 6849 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 431 | 484 | 1,333.1 | M |
| 6863 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 492 | 560 | 2,207.0 | F |
| 6930 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 443 | 504 | 1,559.3 | M |
| 6934 | 95-96 James | 6 | 2 | 425 | 478 | 1,355.3 | M |
| 6944 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 441 | 506 | 1,383.5 | M |
| 6950 | 95-96 James | 6 | 2 | 428 | 478 | 1,340.2 | M |
| 7137 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 446 | 507 | 1,502.4 | M |
| 7139 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 413 | 464 | 1,148.3 | M |
| 7199 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 427 | 479 | 1,260.1 | M |
| 7290 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 449 | 501 | 1,750.5 | F |
| 7439 | 95-96 James | 6 | 2 | 485 | 546 | 1,859.2 | F |
| 8060 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 486 | 556 | 1,982.9 | F |
| 8136 | 95-96 James | 6 | 2 | 466 | 536 | 1,905.2 | F |
| 8272 | 97-01 James | 6 | 2 | 466 | 526 | 1,672.5 | F |
| 6730 | 97-01 James | 7 | 2 | 420 | 477 | 1,381.0 | M |


| 6732 | 95-96 James | 7 | 2 | 516 | 581 | $2,422.2$ | F |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6818 | 95-96 James | 7 | 2 | 474 | 548 | $2,075.3$ | F |
| 6871 | 97-01 James | 7 | 2 | 490 | 564 | $2,219.0$ | F |
| 6932 | 97-01 James | 7 | 2 | 411 | 474 | $1,219.5$ | M |
| 6948 | 95-96 James | 7 | 2 | 512 | 572 | $2,479.3$ | F |
| 7207 | 97-01 James | 7 | 2 | 444 | 508 | $1,661.6$ | F |
| 8428 | 97-01 James | 7 | 2 | 490 | 558 | $1,521.7$ | F |
| 6756 | 94 James | 8 | 2 | 443 | 508 | $1,582.4$ | M |
| 7294 | 97-01 James | 7 | 3 | 451 | 512 | $1,549.8$ | M |
| 8424 | 95-96 James | 7 | 3 | 485 | 554 | $1,391.3$ | F |
| 6697 | 95-96 James | 8 | 3 | 487 | 549 | $2,200.4$ | F |
| 8022 | 95-96 James | 9 | 3 | 527 | 596 | $2,575.8$ | F |
| 6691 | 95-96 James | 8 | 4 | 460 | 526 | $1,825.7$ | M |

Table 21. Total numbers in seven year classes of hatchery-marked American shad taken in staked gill nets in the James River, 1998-2003. Ages are based on examination of scales. Hatchery production data courtesy of the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries.

| Hatcher <br> y Year <br> Class | Hatchery <br> Production <br> (millions) | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | Total | Percent <br> Contribution |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1992 | 0.05 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.2 |
| 1993 | 0.50 | 7 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 10 | 1.9 |
| 1994 | 1.60 | 7 | 3 | 9 |  |  | 1 | 19 | 3.7 |
| 1995 | 5.30 |  |  | 59 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 79 | 15.2 |
| 1996 | 5.80 |  |  | 53 | 62 | 43 | 10 | 168 | 32.3 |
| 1997 | 5.90 |  |  | 2 | 27 | 78 | 56 | 163 | 31.3 |
| 1998 | 10.00 |  |  |  |  | 13 | 52 | 65 | 12.5 |
| 1999 | 7.30 |  |  |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 2.7 |
| 2000 | 8.90 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 2001 | 9.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 | 8.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 | 8.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 71.75 | 14 | 6 | 124 | 98 | 142 | 137 | 520 | 97.1 |

Table 22. Age, number of spawns, fork length (FL), total length (TL), total weight (TW) and sex of American shad with York River hatchery marks taken in staked gill net monitoring on the York River in 2003. Age estimates are based on scales following Cating (1953).

| Specimen | Age | Spawns | FL (mm) | TL (mm) | TW (g) | Sex |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7777 | 6 | 1 | 468 | 534 | $2,083.0$ | female |
| 8255 | 5 | 0 | 456 | 508 | $1,672.3$ | female |
| 8487 | 7 | 3 | 425 | 480 | 993.0 | male |

Table 23. Indexes of abundance of juvenile American shad in pushnet surveys on the Mattaponi and Pamunkey rivers, 1979-2002. Geometric means (GM) and areas under the catch curve (AUC) were estimated from cruise-specific catch rates for each year. Data are not available for 1988-1990. Values are re-calculated from earlier versions of this time series following Wilhite et al. (2003).

| Year | Mattaponi <br> Mean GM | Pamunkey <br> Mean GM | Mattaponi <br> AUC | Pamunkey <br> AUC | Combined <br> AUC |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1979 | 7.1 | 5.1 | $1,163.5$ | 940.5 | $2,104.1$ |
| 1980 | 6.6 | 1.2 | 635.8 | 126.5 | 762.3 |
| 1981 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 343.2 | 107.1 | 450.3 |
| 1982 | 4.4 | 0.6 | 327.9 | 32.5 | 360.4 |
| 1983 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 300.1 | 105.1 | 405.2 |
| 1984 | 9.5 | 0.7 | 446.2 | 26.6 | 472.8 |
| 1985 | 10.7 | 3.3 | 585.8 | 143.2 | 729.0 |
| 1986 | 11.2 | 3.2 | 616.5 | 116.7 | 733.2 |
| 1987 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 229.0 | 4.8 | 233.8 |
| 1991 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 92.9 | 128.9 | 221.8 |
| 1992 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 40.7 | 1.9 | 42.6 |
| 1993 | 15.2 | 0.2 | 973.4 | 11.0 | 984.4 |
| 1994 | 14.7 | 2.2 | $1,074.0$ | 172.3 | $1,246.3$ |
| 1995 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 274.4 | 87.2 | 361.6 |
| 1996 | 88.9 | 14.8 | $6,325.7$ | $1,082.5$ | $7,408.2$ |
| 1997 | 29.8 | 2.4 | $2,102.6$ | 169.1 | $2,271.7$ |
| 1998 | 28.6 | 17.4 | 1.1 | $2,540.0$ | 89.5 |

Table 24. Indexes of abundance of juvenile American shad collected in beach seine surveys (1980-2003) on the James and Rappahannock rivers.. The index is the geometric mean catch per haul. Abbreviations are: SD, standard deviation; N, number of seine hauls.

| Year | James River | SD | N | Rappahannock River | SD | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 0 |  | 11 | 0 |  | 4 |
| 1981 | 0 |  | 12 | 0 |  | 4 |
| 1982 | 0 |  | 12 | 0.88 | 1.081 | 16 |
| 1983 | 0 |  | 8 | 0.32 | 0.549 | 4 |
| 1984 | 0.09 | 0.245 | 8 | 0.41 | 0.693 | 4 |
| 1985 | 0 |  | 16 | 0 |  | 8 |
| 1986 | 0 |  | 12 | 0.06 | 0.200 | 12 |
| 1987 | 0 |  | 16 | 0.12 | 0.315 | 16 |
| 1988 | 0 |  | 16 | 0 |  | 20 |
| 1989 | 0 |  | 16 | 0.52 | 0.894 | 25 |
| 1990 | 0 |  | 16 | 0.03 | 0.131 | 28 |
| 1991 | 0 |  | 20 | 0 |  | 31 |
| 1992 | 0 |  | 20 | 0 |  | 35 |
| 1993 | 0 |  | 20 | 0.13 | 0.441 | 31 |
| 1994 | 0 |  | 20 | 0.05 | 0.220 | 34 |
| 1995 | 0 |  | 20 | 0 |  | 33 |
| 1996 | 0 |  | 20 | 0.35 | 0.655 | 32 |
| 1997 | 0 |  | 20 | 0.16 | 0.444 | 35 |
| 1998 | 0.04 | 0.155 | 20 | 0.12 | 0.341 | 29 |
| 1999 | 0 |  | 20 | 0.02 | 0.117 | 35 |
| 2000 | 0 |  | 20 | 0.03 | 0.188 | 34 |
| 2001 | 0 |  | 20 | 0.04 | 0.163 | 35 |
| 2002 | 0 |  | 20 | 0 |  | 35 |
| 2003 | 0.04 | 0.155 | 20 | 0.59 | 0.659 | 28 |

Table 25. Indexes of abundance of juvenile American shad collected in beach seine surveys (1980-2003) on the Mattaponi, Pamunkey and York rivers.. The index is the geometric mean catch per haul. Abbreviations are: SD, standard deviation; N, number of seine hauls.

| Year | Mattaponi <br> River | SD | N | Pamunkey <br> River | SD | N | York <br> River | SD | N |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1980 | 1.75 | 1.059 | 21 | 0.51 | 0.825 | 9 | 1.13 | 1.000 | 33 |
| 1981 | 0.35 | 0.564 | 16 | 0.33 | 0.588 | 16 | 0.34 | 0.567 | 32 |
| 1982 | 13.03 | 1.256 | 16 | 0.51 | 0.543 | 12 | 4.40 | 1.502 | 28 |
| 1983 | 2.80 | 0.954 | 16 | 0.63 | 0.775 | 12 | 1.65 | 0.965 | 88 |
| 1984 | 16.97 | 1.125 | 16 | 0.06 | 0.200 | 12 | 4.34 | 1.660 | 28 |
| 1985 | 7.21 | 1.369 | 32 | 0.56 | 0.631 | 24 | 3.03 | 1.381 | 56 |
| 1986 | 0.87 | 0.902 | 24 | 0.00 |  | 18 | 0.43 | 0.744 | 42 |
| 1987 | 0.17 | 0.461 | 24 | 0.00 |  | 18 | 0.09 | 0.354 | 42 |
| 1988 | 0.00 |  | 40 | 0.00 |  | 24 | 0.00 |  | 64 |
| 1989 | 0.41 | 0.631 | 40 | 0.00 |  | 32 | 0.20 | 0.487 | 34 |
| 1990 | 0.18 | 0.473 | 40 | 0.00 |  | 32 | 0.09 | 0.351 | 76 |
| 1991 | 0.04 | 0.253 | 50 | 0.02 | 0.111 | 39 | 0.03 | 0.197 | 94 |
| 1992 | 0.00 |  | 39 | 0.00 |  | 32 | 0.00 |  | 75 |
| 1993 | 0.18 | 0.489 | 50 | 0.00 |  | 39 | 0.09 | 0.365 | 94 |
| 1994 | 1.69 | 1.142 | 50 | 0.15 | 0.435 | 39 | 0.80 | 0.977 | 94 |
| 1995 | 0.03 | 0.137 | 50 | 0.00 |  | 40 | 0.01 | 0.100 | 95 |
| 1996 | 14.61 | 1.352 | 49 | 1.97 | 1.294 | 39 | 5.79 | 1.572 | 93 |
| 1997 | 2.23 | 1.107 | 50 | 0.36 | 0.672 | 40 | 1.11 | 1.017 | 95 |
| 1998 | 2.11 | 1.206 | 48 | 0.06 | 0.356 | 38 | 0.86 | 1.052 | 91 |
| 1999 | 0.14 | 0.407 | 47 | 0.00 |  | 38 | 0.07 | 0.303 | 88 |
| 2000 | 5.56 | 1.33 | 39 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 31 | 1.76 | 1.338 | 74 |
| 2001 | 0.52 | 0.665 | 48 | 0.11 | 0.296 | 40 | 0.30 | 0.541 | 94 |
| 2002 | 0.17 | 0.408 | 48 | 0.02 | 0.11 | 40 | 0.09 | 0.308 | 93 |
| 2003 | 8.55 | 1.315 | 50 | 13.11 | 1.057 | 39 | 9.04 | 1.294 | 94 |

Table 26. Ages of 48 American shad collected in 2000 and 49 American shad collected in 2003 as determined by two independent readers of scales. Bold numbers are where the two readers agree. Numbers with the same superscript are compared in the test of symmetry.

| 2000 |  |  | Reader 2 ages |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reader 1 <br> ages | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 3 | $\mathbf{1}$ | $0^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | $1^{(1)}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $11^{(2)}$ | $1^{(5)}$ |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | $2^{(2)}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $4^{(3)}$ |  |  |  |
| 6 |  | $0^{(5)}$ | $0^{(3)}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $1^{(4)}$ |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  | $1^{(4)}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{1}$ |


| 2003 |  |  | Reader 2 ages |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reader 1 <br> ages | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3 | $\mathbf{0}$ | $1^{(1)}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | $0^{(1)}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $2^{(2)}$ |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | $0^{(2)}$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $4^{(3)}$ |  |  |
| 6 |  |  | $0^{(3)}$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $5^{(4)}$ |  |
| 7 |  |  |  | $1^{(4)}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $3^{(5)}$ |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | $0^{(5)}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |

Table 27. Daily numbers and seasonal totals of striped bass live or dead (SB) and other species captured by staked gill net in the York River, 2003.

| Date | Live SB | Dead SB | Total SB | Other species | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2/25/2003 | 181 | 57 | 238 | 51 | 289 |
| 2/26/2003 | 116 | 29 | 145 | 29 | 174 |
| 3/2/2003 | 160 | 16 | 176 | 48 | 224 |
| 3/3/2003 | 195 | 63 | 258 | 18 | 276 |
| 3/9/2003 | 45 | 8 | 53 | 140 | 193 |
| 3/10/2003 | 72 | 15 | 87 | 118 | 205 |
| 3/16/2003 | 25 | 8 | 33 | 78 | 111 |
| 3/17/2003 | 13 | 8 | 21 | 123 | 144 |
| 3/23/2003 | 30 | 23 | 53 | 278 | 331 |
| 3/24/2003 | 15 | 16 | 31 | 241 | 272 |
| 4/4/2003 | 17 | 14 | 31 | 549 | 580 |
| 4/5/2003 | 8 | 10 | 18 | 729 | 747 |
| 4/6/2003 | 5 | 14 | 19 | 609 | 628 |
| 4/7/2003 | 3 | 12 | 15 | 944 | 959 |
| 4/14/2003 | 12 | 20 | 32 | 425 | 457 |
| 4/15/2003 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 689 | 710 |
| 4/20/2003 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 473 | 483 |
| 4/21/2003 | 2 | 12 | 14 | 713 | 727 |
| 4/27/2003 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 633 | 638 |
| 4/28/2003 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 985 | 992 |
| 5/4/2003 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 509 | 517 |
| 5/5/2003 |  | 16 | 16 | 296 | 312 |
| Totals | 917 | 374 | 1,291 | 8,678 | 9,969 |

Table 28. Daily numbers and seasonal totals of live or dead striped bass (SB) and other species captured by staked gill net in the James River, 2003.

| Date | Live SB | Dead SB | Total SB | Other species | Total |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $2 / 25 / 2003$ | 210 | 103 | 313 | 35 | 348 |
| $2 / 26 / 2003$ | 248 | 203 | 451 | 78 | 529 |
| $3 / 2 / 2003$ | 321 | 159 | 480 | 63 | 543 |
| $3 / 3 / 2003$ | 220 | 114 | 334 | 82 | 416 |
| $3 / 9 / 2003$ | 88 | 106 | 194 | 67 | 261 |
| $3 / 10 / 2003$ | 121 | 160 | 281 | 66 | 347 |
| $3 / 16 / 2003$ | 83 | 161 | 244 | 60 | 304 |
| $3 / 17 / 2003$ | 68 | 105 | 173 | 69 | 242 |
| $3 / 23 / 2003$ | 53 | 94 | 147 | 160 | 307 |
| $3 / 24 / 2003$ | 46 | 87 | 133 | 385 | 518 |
| $3 / 30 / 2003$ | 27 | 81 | 108 | 329 | 437 |
| $3 / 31 / 2003$ | 23 | 46 | 69 | 409 | 478 |
| $4 / 6 / 2003$ | 9 | 13 | 22 | 172 | 194 |
| $4 / 7 / 2003$ | 20 | 19 | 39 | 386 | 425 |
| $4 / 13 / 2003$ | 25 | 41 | 66 | 362 | 428 |
| $4 / 14 / 2003$ | 96 | 46 | 72 | 29 | 261 |

Table 29. Daily numbers and seasonal totals of live or dead striped bass (SB) and other species captured by staked gill net in the Rappahannock River, 2003.

| Date | Live SB | Dead SB | Total SB | Other species | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2/25/03 |  |  |  | 10 | 10 |
| 2/26/03 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| 3/2/03 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 58 | 64 |
| 3/9/03 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 3/10/03 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| 3/16/03 | 31 | 20 | 51 | 22 | 73 |
| 3/17/03 | 21 | 16 | 37 | 18 | 55 |
| 3/23/03 | 11 | 7 | 18 | 3 | 21 |
| 3/24/03 | 45 | 45 | 90 | 6 | 96 |
| 4/2/03 | 27 | 23 | 50 | 142 | 192 |
| 4/3/03 | 16 | 17 | 33 | 99 | 132 |
| 4/6/03 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 162 | 185 |
| 4/7/03 | 7 | 28 | 35 | 132 | 167 |
| 4/13/03 | 11 | 10 | 21 | 140 | 161 |
| 4/14/03 | 10 | 14 | 24 | 118 | 142 |
| 4/20/03 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 167 | 188 |
| 4/21/03 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 145 | 165 |
| 4/27/03 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 312 | 319 |
| 4/28/03 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 333 | 339 |
| 5/4/03 | 8 | 41 | 49 | 369 | 418 |
| 5/5/03 | 6 | 44 | 50 | 427 | 477 |
| 5/11/03 |  | 33 | 33 | 316 | 349 |
| 5/12/03 | 1 | 19 | 20 | 286 | 306 |
| 5/18/03 |  | 6 | 6 | 257 | 263 |
| 5/19/03 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 173 | 179 |
|  | 231 | 381 | 612 | 3,708 | 4,320 |

Table 30. Summary of historical and recent catch and effort data of American shad by staked gill nets in the Rappahannock River, Virginia. Historical data are taken from the voluntary log books of Mr. M. Delano, Urbanna, Virginia. Catch rates are expressed as female $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{d}$. Duration of the run was not estimated in 1998 since monitoring began late in the season.

| Year | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effort } \\ & \left(10^{3} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{yr}\right) \end{aligned}$ | Duration of run (d) | Highest Catch Rate | Mean Catch Rate | Area under the Catch Curve |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 43.4 | 35 | 0.121 | 0.036 | 1.79 |
| 1981 | 112.1 | 57 | 0.032 | 0.011 | 1.89 |
| 1982 | 82.3 | 51 | 0.046 | 0.009 | 1.68 |
| 1983 | 106.7 | 59 | 0.093 | 0.031 | 0.59 |
| 1984 | 30.5 | 48 | 0.139 | 0.033 | 0.60 |
| 1985 | 77.2 | 60 | 0.136 | 0.029 | 1.83 |
| 1986 | 34.9 | 43 | 0.155 | 0.039 | 2.18 |
| 1987 | 23.3 | 37 | 0.090 | 0.023 | 0.97 |
| 1988 | 23.2 | 53 | 0.073 | 0.025 | 1.25 |
| 1989 | 16.2 | 44 | 0.856 | 0.123 | 6.19 |
| 1990 | 41.3 | 55 | 0.092 | 0.023 | 1.31 |
| 1991 | 25.9 | 54 | 0.129 | 0.022 | 1.13 |
| 1992 | 8.6 | 51 | 0.299 | 0.044 | 1.44 |
| Average of historical data |  |  |  |  | 1.76 |
| 1998 | 3.8 | ---- | 0.053 | 0.020 | 1.46 |
| 1999 | 5.7 | 42 | 0.055 | 0.026 | 1.30 |
| 2000 | 6.6 | 73 | 0.141 | 0.042 | 1.75 |
| 2001 | 6.6 | 72 | 0.167 | 0.070 | 5.77 |
| 2002 | 5.4 | 57 | 0.110 | 0.028 | 3.08 |
| 2003 | 7.2 | 72 | 0.311 | 0.094 | 7.10 |
| Average of current data |  |  |  |  | 3.41 |

Table 31. Summary of historical and recent catch and effort data of American shad by staked gill nets in the York River, Virginia. Historical data are taken from the voluntary log books of Mr. R. Kellum, Achilles, Virginia. Catch rates are expressed as female $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{d}$.

| Year | Effort <br> $\left(10^{3} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{yr}\right)$ | Duration <br> of run (d) | Highest <br> Catch Rate | Mean Catch <br> Rate | Area under the <br> Catch Curve |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1980 | 79.4 | 44 | 0.556 | 0.268 | 10.15 |
| 1981 | 86.4 | 51 | 0.259 | 0.121 | 4.35 |
| 1982 | 121.3 | 40 | 0.326 | 0.101 | 5.31 |
| 1983 | 171.4 | 48 | 0.548 | 0.12 | 0.066 |

Table 32. Summary of historical and recent catch and effort data of American shad by staked gill nets in the James River, Virginia. Historical data are taken from the voluntary log books of the Brown family, Rescue, Virginia. Catch rates are expressed as female $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{d}$.

| Year | Effort <br> $\left(10^{3} \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{yr}\right)$ | Duration <br> of run (d) | Highest <br> Catch Rate | Mean Catch <br> Rate | Area under the <br> Catch Curve |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1980 | 20.5 | 41 | 2.239 | 0.699 | 29.20 |
| 1981 | 67.7 | 41 | 0.547 | 0.130 | 5.20 |
| 1982 | 49.3 | 35 | 0.331 | 0.115 | 4.20 |
| 1983 | 94.0 | 57 | 1.274 | 0.297 | 16.50 |
| 1984 | 89.7 | 50 | 0.897 | 0.036 | 19.30 |
| 1985 | 91.3 | 45 | 0.295 | 0.103 | 4.90 |
| 1986 | 31.5 | 26 | 1.289 | 0.152 | 6.10 |
| 1987 | 30.1 | 30 | 0.352 | 0.085 | 2.70 |
| 1988 | 19.1 | 20 | 0.487 | 0.193 | 9.30 |
| 1989 | 31.5 | 30 | 0.331 | 0.176 | 6.40 |
| 1990 | 29.7 | 25 | 0.184 | 0.079 | 2.10 |
| 1991 | 28.3 | 40 | 0.138 | 0.062 | 1.90 |
| 1992 | 59.8 | 50 | 0.562 | 0.232 | 7.70 |
| Average of <br> historical data |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| 1998 | 3.8 | 50 | 0.198 | 0.051 | 5.38 |
| 1999 | 6.0 | 66 | 0.183 | 0.042 | 2.57 |
| 2000 | 7.2 | 70 | 0.279 | 0.086 | 2.99 |
| 2001 | 6.8 | 78 | 0.285 | 0.064 | 6.61 |
| 2002 | 6.5 | 71 | 0.205 | 0.054 | 5.01 |
| 2003 |  | 79 | 0.284 | 0.112 | 5.62 |
| Average of <br> current data |  |  |  |  | 9.34 |

Appendix 1 Abstracts of two recent manuscripts on American shad

Migratory behavior of American shad (Alosa sapidissima) in the York River, Virginia and a modified analytical model to estimate in-river exploitation from tag-recovery data

John E. Olney, Robert J. Latour, Brian E. Watkins, and Douglas G. Clarke


#### Abstract

Capture, handling and tagging American shad (Alosa sapidissima) may alter migratory behavior of ripening fish, causing some tagged individuals to cease the spawning run and return to sea. In a tagging study designed to assess fishery impacts, this altered behavior would reduce the number of tagged fish available to the target fishery, and result in under-estimation of exploitation rate and fishing mortality. This outcome assumes that the target fishery is prosecuted on ripening fish in the natal river and that tagging takes place in the river below the fishing grounds. To investigate this possibility, 29 pre-spawning adults were fitted with acoustic tags and released in the middle reaches of the York River, Virginia. Movements of individuals were remotely monitored at three hydrophone stations; one seven km downriver of the release site and one on each of the spawning tributaries, 48 and 56 km upriver of the release location. Almost half of the fish were apparently affected by capture, handling and tagging since these individuals either abandoned the migration or were detected at the downriver station and delayed in their upstream movements. All but two individuals were detected at least once at either upriver location. Movements of some fish appeared to be unaffected by capture since they were not detected at the downriver station and were detected on the spawning grounds 2-5 days after release. Eighteen fish remained on the spawning grounds for 17-51 days (average residency, 34.4 days) and were last detected at the downriver location, presumably migrating seaward. Residence time on the spawning grounds declined with successive releases. We were unable to account for eight fish that migrated to the spawning grounds but were not detected again. Fifteen shad (57\% of the total that migrated) originally selected spawning grounds on the Mattaponi River; the remaining fish selected the Pamunkey River. One fish resided for several weeks on both tributaries, suggesting some mixing of spawning locations. We conclude that tagging protocols designed to measure the impacts of fishing on American shad should include monitoring to assess altered migratory behavior and losses of tagged fish due to abandonment of migration. Furthermore, analytical methods to assess fishing mortality for American shad require modification and may remain subject to bias imposed by delayed migration.


Six fish and 600,000 thirsty folks - a fishing moratorium on American shad thwarts a controversial municipal reservoir project in Virginia, USA John Olney, Carl Hershner, Donna Bilkovic, Harry Wang, Lyle Varnell and Roger Mann


#### Abstract

Moratoria on fishing directly impact fishers, distributors, marketers and consumers of product and can have serious socio-economic implications. Moratoria can impact communities but usually populations closely linked to the banned activity. In an unprecedented example, a moratorium on fishing in Virginia has directly impacted a non-fishing citizenry by thwarting plans for a public utility. In May 2003, a panel empowered to regulate marine resources denied permission to withdraw raw water from a pristine freshwater river, the Mattaponi. The controversial action spoiled a multi-million dollar plan to establish the King William Reservoir, a water source considered essential to future growth and development in the region. The facility was designed to serve a projected 600,000 people in 2040 but the Mattaponi Indians, environmentalists, local citizens and commercial fishers opposed the plan. A central issue was conservation of American shad (Alosa sapidissima), an anadromous clupeid native to the U.S. east coast. An in-river moratorium on fishing for American shad imposed in 1994 remains in effect. In the reservoir debate, scientists advised the panel that the project would withdraw water in the center of the larval nursery area for this species and in a river that accounted for the highest statewide production of juveniles. Scientists recommended relocating the intake since losses of larvae to withdrawal could be counter to restoration goals of the moratorium. Using quantitative models of adult equivalency, municipal authorities argued that only six American shad would be lost annually to impingement or entrainment. The panel rejected this argument and proposals to mitigate losses.


