

**HABITAT USE PATTERNS OF NEWLY-SETTLED SPOTTED SEATROUT**  
*Cynoscion nebulosus* IN GULF COAST ESTUARIES.

**Prepared by**

**Todd Neahr**  
**April 2005**

**A Thesis Submitted  
in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Degree of**

**MASTER OF SCIENCE**

**The Graduate Biology Program  
Department of Physical and Life Sciences  
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi**

**Approved:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. Gregory W. Stunz, Chair**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. David McKee, Member**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. James Tolan, Member**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. Grady Price-Blount, Chairman**  
Department of Physical and Life Sciences

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. Frank Pezold, Dean**  
College of Science and Technology

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

Format: Fishery Bulletin

## ***Abstract***

Estuaries are notable for high diversity making them one of the most productive marine ecosystems. Many fish species of economic importance use estuaries during at least one phase of their life cycle. Despite the recognition of the importance of habitat within estuaries, there are considerable gaps in knowledge concerning the specific patterns of habitat use for many important fishery species including the spotted seatrout *Cynoscion nebulosus*. The primary goal of this study was to examine the habitat use patterns of newly-settled spotted seatrout in three Texas Coastal Bend bays. In each bay, newly-settled trout were sampled using an epibenthic sled in three different habitat types: seagrass (*Halodule wrightii*), marsh edge (*Spartina alterniflora*), and nonvegetated bottom. These results suggest bay specific patterns of habitat use with the highest juvenile spotted seatrout densities occurring in seagrass meadows. A secondary goal was to examine spotted seatrout habitat use in marsh dominated bay systems from Barataria Bay, Louisiana to the seagrass dominated systems of the Lower Laguna Madre, Texas using data provided by NOAA Fisheries Service, Galveston, Texas. The NOAA Fisheries Service determined nekton abundance using enclosure samplers along the Gulf Coast from 1982 to 1997. These data show that in areas with no submerged aquatic vegetation, highest densities of juvenile spotted seatrout occurred at the marsh edge open water interface. Spotted seatrout habitat selection was examined using experimental mesocosms. These trials were conducted for both hatchery-reared and wild-caught spotted seatrout by subjecting them to selection trials using every possible pair-wise combination of common estuarine habitat types. The general pattern was that hatchery-reared and wild-caught mesocosm fish showed selection patterns for structured habitats

(oyster reef, seagrass beds and marsh edge) over nonvegetated bottom, but selection among structured habitat types did not show strong patterns. Size related habitat selection patterns were also observed, where habitat selection was not as apparent for larger individuals. These results suggest that structured habitat types, particularly seagrass meadows and marshes, are important nursery habitat for juvenile spotted seatrout and strong habitat selection patterns may diminish as fish grow.

## Table of Contents

|                        | Page |
|------------------------|------|
| Abstract.....          | ii   |
| Table of Contents..... | iv   |
| List of Tables.....    | v    |
| List of Figures.....   | vi   |
| Acknowledgements.....  | ix   |
| Introduction.....      | 1    |
| Methods.....           | 6    |
| Results.....           | 15   |
| Discussion.....        | 41   |
| References.....        | 48   |

## List of Tables

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Table 1. Mean densities ( $\pm$ SE ) of spotted seatrout by bay and habitat types: Nonvegetated bottom (NVB); Marsh Edge (ME); Seagrass (SAV). Mean densities represented in number of juvenile spotted seatrout per m <sup>2</sup> .....   | 26   |
| Table 2 Mean densities $\pm$ SE ( $n$ = number of drop samples) of spotted seatrout per bay in the comparative study and over all habitat types: Nonvegetated bottom (NVB); Marsh Edge (ME); Seagrass (SAV). Mean densities represented in number of juvenile spotted seatrout per m2. * denotes single sampling event..... | 30   |

## List of Figures

|            |   | Page |
|------------|---|------|
| Figure 1.  | Map of the Coastal Bend, Texas showing sampling sites in Aransas Bay (AB), Corpus Christi Bay (CCB) and the Upper Laguna Madre (ULM).....   | 8    |
| Figure 2.  | Map of bays in the western Gulf comparative study: Barataria Bay (BB), Galveston Bay (GB), Matagorda-Lavaca Bay (MB), San Antonio Bay (SAB), Aransas Bay (AB), and Lower Laguna Madre (LLM).....                            | 11   |
| Figure 3.  | Mean salinity (ppt) of Aransas Bay, Corpus Christi Bay and the Upper Laguna Madre. The error bars represent $\pm$ standard error of the mean.....   | 16   |
| Figure 4.  | Mean water temperature ( $^{\circ}$ C) of Aransas Bay, Corpus Christi Bay and the Upper Laguna Madre. The error bars represent $\pm$ standard error of the mean.....  | 17   |
| Figure 5.  | Mean dissolved oxygen (ppm) for Aransas Bay, Corpus Christi Bay and the Upper Laguna Madre. The error bars represent $\pm$ standard error of the mean.....  | 18   |
| Figure 6.  | Monthly mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted collected with epibenthic sleds from Aransas Bay, Corpus Christi Bay and the Upper Laguna Madre.....  | 20   |
| Figure 7.  | Length frequency distribution of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with epibenthic sleds ( $n = 27$ fish) from Aransas Bay...  | 21   |
| Figure 8.  | Length frequency distribution of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with epibenthic sleds ( $n = 29$ fish) from Corpus Christi Bay.....   | 22   |
| Figure 9.  | Length frequency distribution of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with epibenthic sleds ( $n = 5$ fish) from the Upper Laguna Madre.....  | 23   |
| Figure 10. | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with epibenthic sleds from all habitat types in Aransas Bay ( $n = 54$ ), Corpus Christi Bay ( $n = 54$ ) and the Upper Laguna Madre ( $n = 36$ )..... | 24   |

|            |   |    |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 11. | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with epibenthic sleds from marsh edge, nonvegetated bottom, and seagrass habitat types from all samples collected in Aransas and Corpus Christi Bays. Horizontal lines along x-axis represent Tukey's post hoc comparisons among habitat types, and habitats sharing horizontal lines are not significantly different.....   | 27 |
| Figure 12. | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with epibenthic sleds from nonvegetated bottom and seagrass habitat types from all samples collected in the Upper Laguna Madre (N = 36).....   | 28 |
| Figure 13. | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with a drop sampler in marsh edge, nonvegetated bottom, and seagrass habitat types from Barataria ( $n = 20$ ), Galveston ( $n = 1394$ ), Matagorda – Lavaca ( $n = 300$ ), San Antonio ( $n = 260$ ), Aransas ( $n = 100$ ) and Lower Laguna Madre ( $n = 98$ ) estuaries. Mean densities were calculated from mean densities of multiple studies over different years and seasons..... | 31 |
| Figure 14. | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with a drop sampler in Barataria, Galveston, Matagorda – Lavaca, San Antonio, Aransas and Lower Laguna Madre estuaries among multiple seasons: Winter ( $n = 160$ ), Spring ( $n = 636$ ), Summer ( $n = 425$ ), Fall ( $n = 991$ ). Mean densities were calculated from mean densities of multiple studies over different years and seasons.....  | 32 |
| Figure 15  | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with a drop sampler in marsh edge ( $n = 1338$ ) and nonvegetated bottom ( $n = 376$ ) habitat types from Barataria ( $n = 20$ ), Galveston ( $n = 1394$ ) and Matagorda – Lavaca ( $n = 300$ ) estuaries. Mean densities were calculated from mean densities of multiple studies over different years and seasons.....  | 34 |
| Figure 16. | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with a drop sampler in marsh edge ( $n = 100$ ), nonvegetated bottom ( $n = 100$ ), and seagrass ( $n = 60$ ) habitat types from San Antonio Bay. Mean densities were calculated from mean densities of multiple studies over different years and seasons.....   | 35 |
| Figure 17. | Mean density ( $\pm$ SE) of newly-settled spotted seatrout collected with a drop sampler in marsh edge ( $n = 30$ ), nonvegetated bottom ( $n = 35$ ), and seagrass ( $n = 35$ ) habitat types from Aransas Bay. Mean densities were calculated from mean densities of multiple studies over different years and seasons.....   | 36 |

|            |  |    |
|------------|--|----|
| Figure 18. | Mean percent occurrence ( $\pm$ SE) of wild-caught spotted seatrout (23.33 mm $\pm$ 1.08) in each habitat type for all possible habitat pair wise comparisons. Each pair wise comparison represents twelve replicate mesocosms. Significant results from paired Student's t-tests are indicated by * = $p < 0.05$ .....                            | 38 |
| Figure 19. | Mean percent occurrence ( $\pm$ SE) of hatchery-reared spotted seatrout (24.59mm $\pm$ 0.24) in each habitat type for all possible habitat pair wise comparisons. Each pair wise comparison represents twelve replicate mesocosms. Significant results from paired Student's t-tests are indicated by * = $p < 0.05$ , and *** = $p < 0.001$ ..... | 39 |
| Figure 20. | Mean percent occurrence ( $\pm$ SE) of wild-caught spotted seatrout (65.77mm $\pm$ 1.60) in each habitat type for all possible habitat pair wise comparisons. Each pair wise comparison represents twelve replicate mesocosms. Significant results from paired Student's t-tests are indicated by ** = $p < 0.01$ .....                            | 40 |

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Greg Stunz for the support he has provided on my journey as a graduate student at Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi. He has been a very attentive mentor providing the necessary supervision and guidance with regards to my research project and career goals. In addition, I would like to thank my remaining committee members Dr. David McKee and Dr. James Tolan for their attention to detail and high degree of availability for questioning. This study would not have been possible without the contributions from the Texas Research Development Fund (formerly the Texas Excellence Fund). I greatly appreciate the efforts from members of the TAMUCC Fisheries Ecology Lab and additional volunteers that assisted with sampling events and lab sorting. I specifically would like to acknowledge the assistance of Heather Barackman, Sarah Bayer, Amanda Bushon, Jason James, Suraida Nanez-James, Michelle Kirlin, Lew Lampton, Ben Lowe, Megan Reese and Lynne Shearer. Most importantly, I would like to thank my parents for their guidance and overall interest in my graduate career.