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The blue crab, *Callinectes sapidus* Rathbun, is found in all major coastal habitats along the mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts of the United States, including large embayments, barrier island-lagoonal systems, and coastal marsh, mangrove and seagrass systems. Ecologically important, blue crabs may control abundances of other estuarine benthic species (Hines et al., 1990). The blue crab also supports valuable commercial and recreational fisheries from New Jersey to Texas; commercial landings of 249.3 million pounds of hard blue crabs in 1993 had a dockside value of 126.6 million dollars (NMFS, 1994). Blue crab stocks vary interannually within and between regions as reflected in fishery catch records, which have been compiled since the early 1900s, and in fishery-independent data sets. This variability apparently is unrelated to fishing pressure and has been attributed to environmental influences on blue crab recruitment.

Published studies of blue crab biology date back to the turn of the century (Hay, 1905), but our understanding of the early life history of the species has been markedly refined over the past 3 decades. The complete larval development (7 zoea and 1 megalopa) of the blue crab was not described until 1959 (Costlow and Bookhout, 1959), and early accounts of blue crab life history suggested that the larval stages were retained within estuaries (Churchill, 1919; Van Engel, 1958). During the 1960s and early 1970s, however, studies of larval/postlarval distributions indicated that blue crab larvae might not be retained in estuaries but instead are exported to coastal waters with subsequent return by postlarvae (megalopae) or juveniles (Nichols and Keney, 1963; Tagatz, 1968; Dudley and Judy, 1971; King, 1971; Williams, 1971; Sandifer, 1975).

The possibility that blue crab larvae are exported from estuarine systems has profound implications for the ecology, population structure, and fishery management of the species, and has spurred considerable research focused on understanding blue crab recruitment dynamics. Since the late 1970s, studies have shown convincingly that zoeal behavior promotes upward movement to surface waters (Sulkin et al., 1980), and that the vast majority of larvae are flushed out to coastal waters where development to the megalopa stage occurs (Stuck and Perry, 1981; Dittel and Epifanio, 1982; Provenzano et al., 1983; McConaughy et al., 1983; Epifanio et al., 1984; Brookins and Epifanio, 1985; D. F. Johnson, 1985). Boicourt (1982) suggested that wind-driven surface currents during summer in the mid-Atlantic Bight may be responsible for retaining blue crab larvae in the vicinity of their natal estuary against the general drift of shelf waters. This hypothesis was supported by subsequent observational and modelling studies (Johnson et al., 1984; D. R. Johnson, 1985; Epifanio et al. 1989). The megalopa stage appeared to be the stage that returned to the estuary, but the mechanism(s) by which this is accomplished remained problematic (D. R. Johnson, 1985; Maris, 1986; Sulkin and Epifanio, 1986; Sulkin and van Heukelem, 1986).

Our understanding of blue crab ecology has benefited from interactions among blue crab researchers over the past decade, beginning with the Portunid Ecology Workshop, hosted by the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center in 1987. The following year, Old Dominion University, the Virginia Institute of Marine
Science, the Virginia Sea Grant College Program and NOAA's Office of Estuarine Programs hosted the Blue Crab Conference in Virginia Beach, VA. During this conference, papers were presented on blue crab morphology, physiology, ecology and life history. The proceedings were published in the Bulletin of Marine Science, Volume 46, Number 1 (1990). Several papers addressed aspects of blue crab recruitment, including estimates of fecundity (Prager et al., 1990), spawning-stock size (Jones et al., 1990), larval transport (Johnson and Hess, 1990), settlement of megalopae (Olmi et al., 1990; van Montfrans et al., 1990), juvenile habitat utilization (Orth and van Montfrans, 1990; Ryer et al., 1990; Thomas et al., 1990; Wilson et al., 1990; Wolcott and Hines, 1990), and stock-recruit relationships (Lipcius and van Engel, 1990).

A subset of participants from the Virginia Beach meeting recognized that studies of blue crab recruitment could benefit from a more coordinated approach, possibly including a cooperative program to provide a broader perspective on factors influencing population dynamics. A steering committee from the Virginia Institute of Marine Science and the Virginia Sea Grant Program developed a plan to promote a coordinated research effort.

In February 1989, a workshop was held at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science to explore an inter-regional, cooperative research strategy aimed specifically at understanding recruitment processes and population dynamics of blue crab. The primary goal of this workshop was to outline a research program on blue crab recruitment by identifying short and long term research priorities. Key accomplishments of the workshop were: 1) an assessment of current knowledge across regions and estuary types, 2) an assessment of the critical information gaps, and 3) development of an inter-regional cooperative research plan to examine spatial and temporal patterns of postlarval settlement (Smith et al., 1989). Workshop participants (the Blue Crab Recruitment Group) adopted a standardized protocol to examine relative settlement of megalopae in estuaries based on methodology modified from van Montfrans et al. (1990). In addition, the group agreed to protocol for sharing data, proprietary rights of data, data management, and publication. Researchers at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science agreed to assume responsibility for data management and, with Virginia Sea Grant, program coordination.

Data for this collaborative effort were first collected in 1989 in three estuaries (Delaware Bay, Chesapeake Bay, and Charleston Harbor, SC). Over the next several years, comparable settlement data were acquired in 12 estuaries from Delaware Bay to Galveston Bay (Sea Grant Programs in several states are acknowledged for partial support of these studies). The group, including state, federal, and university researchers, met annually (usually in conjunction with the Marine Benthic Ecology Meetings) to share information and chart directions. Despite the lack of comprehensive funding for the program, the participants displayed notable cooperation in acquiring a unique data set with fine temporal resolution (daily) and broad geographical scope. Efforts to understand the recruitment ecology of blue crabs was not limited to the megalopa stage, however, and the group has studied all life stages in an attempt to construct a clear picture of blue crab ecology, which can be used for management of the species.

In November 1993, at the Estuarine Research Federation Conference in Hilton Head, SC, we chaired a symposium entitled "Blue Crab Recruitment: Environmental Control and Population Regulation." This issue of the Bulletin of Marine Science presents the proceedings of that symposium. Twenty-three papers were presented during the symposium, the abstracts of which appear after the full papers in this issue. Thirteen full papers are presented herein, organized within three...
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Epifanio (1995) provides a review of efforts to understand transport of blue crab zoeae and megalopae, while the three other papers in this group focus on transport of megalopae into estuaries. These papers do not achieve consensus on what processes are important for transporting megalopae into estuaries. Epifanio argues that southward-blowing winds are important for ingress into Delaware Bay. Blanton et al. (1995) hypothesize that downwelling-favorable (southward) winds are also important in South Carolina, but the data do not support their hypothesis. Johnson (1995) concludes that wind was not an effective transport mechanism for returning megalopae to Chesapeake Bay. Finally, Olmi (1995) argues that ingress of megalopae in Chesapeake Bay/York River is facilitated by westward winds and spring tides. Clearly, there is need of additional work to understand the processes that influence immigration of megalopae to estuaries.

The second group of papers report settlement of megalopae on artificial settlement substrates (the Blue Crab Recruitment Group studies mentioned above). Metcalf et al. (1995) provide a comparison of substrate designs and deployment positions in the water column. Temporal settlement data are presented for sites in North Carolina (Mense et al., 1995), Georgia (Wrona et al., 1995) and Mississippi (Perry et al., 1995). Further, van Montfrans et al. (1995) and Rabalais et al. (1995) provide comparisons among sites on the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts, respectively. Settlement is episodic at all sites examined. Patterns of settlement (timing and magnitude) appear to be largely site-specific, although meteorological events may synchronize peak settlement across broad geographic areas. Lunar/tidal influences on settlement are apparent at some, but not all, sites. Average numbers of megalopae on artificial settlement substrates are considerably greater along the Gulf of Mexico coast than along the Atlantic coast.

While larval/postlarval supply sets the upper limits of recruitment, post-settlement processes act on the initial settlers to determine eventual demographics of the population. Papers by Heck and Coen (1995), Hines and Ruiz (1995), and Dittel et al. (1995) report studies of predation on juvenile blue crabs. Predation rates on recently settled juveniles are extremely high, and may be higher along the Gulf of Mexico Coast than along the Atlantic Coast because of higher settlement rates and a broader suite of predators (Heck and Coen, 1995). Even larger juveniles (>20 mm) experience high predation mortality, largely resulting from cannibalism. In areas where sea grasses are not available, juvenile blue crabs may find partial refuge from predation in shallow waters (Dittel et al., 1995; Hines et al., 1995).

Advances in our understanding of blue crab recruitment ecology have coincided with, and benefitted from, a great deal of recent attention to recruitment ecology in diverse marine and estuarine systems. We hope these proceedings in the Bulletin of Marine Science contribute to the stimulating work on recruitment in marine systems. We view this symposium proceedings as a "progress report" in our understanding of blue crab population dynamics.
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