

# The Economic Impacts of Recreational Fishing in the Galveston Bay System

Prepared by

Andrew Ropicki<sup>1</sup>  
Daniel Hanselka<sup>2</sup>  
Rebekka Dudensing<sup>3</sup>  
Julie Massey<sup>4</sup>  
John O'Connell<sup>5</sup>  
Terrie Looney<sup>6</sup>

December 12, 2016



---

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor and Extension Economist, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service/Texas Sea Grant

<sup>2</sup> Extension Associate, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service

<sup>3</sup> Assistant Professor and Extension Economist, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service

<sup>4</sup> Galveston County Coastal and Marine Extension Agent, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service/Texas Sea Grant

<sup>5</sup> Brazoria County Coastal and Marine Extension Agent, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service/Texas Sea Grant

<sup>6</sup> Chambers and Jefferson Counties Coastal and Marine Extension Agent, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service/Texas Sea Grant

## Executive Summary

The objective of this report was to estimate the economic impacts of marine recreational fishing in the Galveston Bay System. The estimates presented include only impacts associated with fishing trips and not spending on durable goods (fishing gear, rods, boats, etc.) related to fishing. The data used to estimate the economic impacts came from fishing effort estimates provided by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and a National Marine Fisheries Service study titled: “The Economic Contribution of Marine Angler Expenditures in the United States, 2011.” Major findings include:

- Total annual economic impacts of marine recreational fishing in the Galveston Bay System were estimated to be:
  - 1,607 jobs,
  - \$55.7 million in labor income,
  - \$87.2 million in value-added (contribution to Texas GDP), and
  - \$152.1 million in output (sales value of goods and services).
- More recreational fishing trips were taken to the Galveston Bay System across all three trip types (for-hire, private vessel, and shore) than any other Texas bay system.
- Galveston Bay System recreational fishing economic impacts were twice as large as any other Texas bay system.
- Resident anglers accounted for most angler-trips (~98%) and economic impacts (~96%).

## Introduction

The Galveston Bay System covers approximately 540 square miles and is separated from the Gulf of Mexico by the Bolivar Peninsula, Galveston Island, and Follets Island. The bay system includes East Bay, West Bay, and Trinity Bay. Sections of the bay system are located in Brazoria, Galveston, Harris, and Chambers counties. The bay system is fed by the Trinity and San Jacinto rivers and connects to the Gulf of Mexico through Bolivar and San Luis passes (Moretzsohn et al. 2016). The bay system provides suitable habitat for numerous fin fish species as well as crabs, shrimp, and oysters (Moretzsohn et al. 2016). The large size of the bay system along with its varied habitats (oyster reefs, grass flats, and mud bottom) allow for numerous recreational fishing opportunities. Species commonly targeted by anglers include spotted seatrout, flounder, and red and black drum.

The abundant fishing opportunities available in the Galveston Bay System make recreational fishing a favored pastime of both locals and visitors to the area. The Texas economy benefits from these fishing trips through angler spending on goods and services such as lodging, food, ice, bait, and fuel. In this paper, we estimate the annual economic impacts of Galveston Bay System recreational fishing on the Texas economy. Our analysis combines data from the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) on recreational fishing in the Galveston Bay System with Texas marine recreational angler spending estimates from a National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) report (Lovell, Steinback, and Hilger 2013) to estimate economic impacts. The analysis presented covers three types of bay fishing: 1) for-hire fishing trips utilizing a guide or charter service, 2) fishing from a private vessel, and 3) fishing from shore<sup>7</sup>.

## Recreational Angler Effort Data

Data on fishing effort by bay system in the state of Texas are collected annually by the TPWD through their creel surveys. TPWD conducts creel surveys throughout the year at specified boat-access sites along the Texas coast from Port Arthur to Port Isabel. More than 1,000 surveys are scheduled annually on randomly selected weekdays and weekend days, with site survey frequency proportional to site fishing pressure, meaning more active sites are surveyed more frequently (Green 2016). While the major objective of the surveys is to determine how many fish are being caught, TPWD also uses the data gathered to estimate fishing effort (number of trips) in each bay system,

---

<sup>7</sup> Shore fishing includes fishing from fishing piers.

including the Galveston Bay System. Table 1, shown below, provides TPWD estimates of recreational angler effort in the Galveston Bay System for anglers employing for-hire vessels (charter trips), fishing from private vessels, and shore anglers. The estimates are provided in “angler-trips,” which accounts for multiple anglers on a trip; for instance, if four anglers went fishing together, it would represent four angler-trips, not a single group fishing trip. The percentage of anglers from Texas is also included. The estimates for private vessel and for-hire effort is from the 2014-2015 fishing year, while the estimate for shore fishing effort is from the 2013-2014 fishing year<sup>8</sup>.

**Table 1. Galveston Bay System Recreational Fishing Effort by Angler Type**

<u>Angler Type</u>	<u>Angler Trips</u>	<u>% Texan</u>
For-Hire	31,767	85.8%
Private Vessel	278,821	98.8%
Shore	554,552	97.7%

#### Recreational Angler Spending Data

Data on recreational angler spending were gathered from a NMFS report titled “The Economic Contribution of Marine Angler Expenditures in the United States, 2011.” This report used survey results to estimate marine recreational fishing expenditures for each coastal state. The report defined marine recreational fishing as: “... fishing for finfish in the open ocean or any body of water that is marine or brackish for sport or pleasure.” The surveys collected data on angler-trip expenditures related to their most recent marine recreational fishing trip. The data gathered were used to calculate the economic impacts of marine recreational fishing at the state and national level (Lovell, Steinback, and Hilger 2013). The analysis presented in this paper adjusts the trip expenditure estimates to account for changing prices (fuel) and general inflation and calculates current estimates of the economic impacts associated with marine recreational fishing in Texas.

---

<sup>8</sup> TPWD creel survey data are annualized for a fishing year spanning from May 15<sup>th</sup> to May 14<sup>th</sup>. TPWD collects shore angler effort data less frequently, and the 2013-2014 creel year represents the most recent estimate of shore angler effort.

Texas survey data were collected through a mail survey of fishers with valid Texas fishing licenses that allowed marine recreational fishing in 2011<sup>9</sup>. Surveys were conducted monthly throughout the year to capture seasonality in trip expenditures. The survey response rate was 17.6%; 1,025 of the 5,820 mail surveys sent out were at least partially completed<sup>10</sup> (Lovell, Steinback, and Hilger 2013). The survey asked respondents questions about their expenditures related to their most recent marine fishing trip and spending on marine fishing-related durable goods (tackle, clothing, boats, license fees, etc.) during the previous year<sup>11</sup>. Respondents were asked to report what they personally spent on themselves and others and to not include any money that was spent on them by others; the question was asked in this manner in an attempt to calculate per-angler expenditures and not per-angling-party expenditures. For multi-day trips that included other activities (sightseeing, beach-going, etc.), fishers were asked to estimate expenses related to the entire trip and not just the days spent fishing. Although all spending on multi-day trips was included in survey responses, reported mean trip expenditures were for an angler-trip, which was defined as a single day of fishing for a single angler (Lovell, Steinback, and Hilger 2013). Mean angler-trip expenditures from the report are presented in Table 2 by angler effort type (for-hire, private vessel, and shore) and residency status. The next section outlines the calculation of angler-trip economic impact estimates.

### Angler-Trip Economic Impact Estimates

The first step in calculating the angler-trip economic impact estimates was to update the 2011 spending estimates to account for inflation and price changes. Spending estimates were updated to 2015 values. Fuel costs were adjusted to account for the decrease in fuel costs that occurred between 2011 and 2015<sup>12</sup>. All other expense categories were adjusted for inflation using the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics CPI figures<sup>13</sup>. After accounting for inflation and lower fuel costs, mean angler-trip costs fell an average of 5% across the different angling types (for-hire, private boat, and shore) and angler types (resident and non-resident).

---

<sup>9</sup> Some Texas fishing licenses are restricted to freshwater fishing only; these were excluded from the sample frame. The license holders that were included in the sample frame were: resident fishing and hunting combination, resident all-water, resident marine, non-resident all-water, and non-resident marine.

<sup>10</sup> Some responses did not have all questions answered.

<sup>11</sup> The analysis presented in this paper focuses on fishing trip expenditures and their impacts; durable goods expenditures are not included in the analysis.

<sup>12</sup> The United States Energy Information Administration website was used to estimate changes in fuel costs. Per the website, the average fuel cost was \$3.37/gallon in 2011 and \$2.17/gallon in 2015. Mean angler-trip fuel expenditures were divided by the 2011 value and then multiplied by the 2015 value.

<sup>13</sup> Estimated inflation was 5.5% between 2011 and 2015.

The second step in estimating the angler-trip economic impacts was to use IMPLAN, an input-output analysis software package, to determine how spending on recreational fishing impacted the Texas state economy (IMPLAN Group LLC. 2015). Each type of trip expenditure (fuel, lodging, food, etc.) is included in an IMPLAN sector that matches the type of business activity it represents, and the economic impacts associated with spending in each sector are calculated. Once the appropriate IMPLAN sectors were identified, the IMPLAN model was run to estimate the associated impacts. Four different economic impact measures were calculated: employment, labor income, value-added, and output. Employment measures the number of jobs created by the marine recreational fishing expenditures. Labor income measures the wages paid to those employed due to marine recreational fishing in the Galveston Bay System. Value-added measures the increase in Texas GDP due to the spending of recreational fishers, and output measures the total value of goods and services purchased because of Galveston Bay System recreational fishing. Labor income is a component of value-added, which is a share of output; thus, these figures cannot be summed. The economic impacts estimated in this report are state-level impacts. Respondents to the NMFS survey were asked to report their trip expenditures incurred in the State of Texas; as such, we are unable to determine what percentage of spending occurred in the Galveston Bay System area. Because we are unable to determine where in Texas expenditures were incurred, estimating city or county level impacts was not feasible. The IMPLAN sectors associated with each expense category are presented in Table 3<sup>14</sup>.

For each impact measure, three different effect types were estimated: direct, indirect, and induced. Direct effects are directly attributable to marine recreational fishing and include spending on goods and services by recreational anglers. Indirect effects are due to changes in inter-industry purchases as businesses used by recreational fishers purchase more goods and services from other businesses; an example of an indirect effect would be increased recreational fishing leading bait shops to buy more bait from commercial bait fishers. Induced effects include increased purchases of goods and services by those employed due to marine recreational fishing (bait fish retailers, charter guides, etc.).

---

<sup>14</sup> An examination of Table 3 will highlight differences between the IMPLAN sectors we used in our calculations of economic impacts and those used in the NMFS study. For a few of the expense categories, we felt different IMPLAN sectors better fit the expense than the sectors selected by the NMFS researchers.

**Table 2. Mean Angler-Trip Expenditures by Fishing Type (from Lovell, Steinback, and Hilger 2013)**

	For-Hire		Private Boat		Shore	
	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident
Auto Fuel	\$54.94	\$85.63	\$46.04	\$36.93	\$44.52	\$47.26
Auto Rental	\$0.00	\$22.57	\$0.00	\$14.27	\$0.04	\$3.16
Bait	\$4.26	\$2.55	\$13.60	\$10.20	\$12.33	\$10.35
Boat Fuel	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$32.99	\$16.11	\$0.00	\$0.00
Boat Rental	\$6.72	\$5.89	\$1.98	\$0.66	\$0.00	\$0.00
Charter Fees	\$205.77	\$152.20	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Crew Tips	\$13.86	\$19.65	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Fish Processing	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.09
Food from Grocery Stores	\$34.16	\$27.89	\$32.74	\$15.64	\$33.16	\$32.21
Food from Restaurants	\$37.31	\$30.41	\$23.84	\$28.68	\$24.39	\$24.82
Gifts/Souvenirs	\$8.13	\$24.83	\$1.70	\$8.94	\$3.04	\$10.24
Ice	\$5.45	\$2.42	\$4.19	\$3.17	\$2.87	\$3.50
Lodging	\$38.56	\$67.44	\$22.35	\$21.35	\$33.84	\$48.66
Parking & Site Access	\$0.58	\$4.64	\$1.68	\$1.59	\$2.33	\$2.60
Public Transportation	\$0.00	\$13.55	\$0.00	\$21.37	\$0.02	\$3.56
Tournament Fees	\$0.00	\$0.11	\$1.74	\$2.71	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>\$409.74</u></b>	<b><u>\$459.78</u></b>	<b><u>\$182.85</u></b>	<b><u>\$181.62</u></b>	<b><u>\$156.54</u></b>	<b><u>\$186.45</u></b>

**Table 3. IMPLAN Sectors**

Expense Category:	IMPLAN Sectors	IMPLAN Sector Descriptions
Auto Fuel	402	Retail - Gasoline Stores
Auto Rental	442	Automotive Equipment Rental & Leasing
Bait	404	Retail - Sporting Goods
Boat Fuel	402	Retail - Gasoline Stores
Boat Rental	443	General and Consumer Goods Rental
Charter Fees	414	Scenic and Sightseeing Transportation
Crew Tips	414	Scenic and Sightseeing Transportation
Fish Processing	93	Seafood Product Preparation & Packaging
Food from Grocery Stores	400	Retail - Food & Beverage Stores
Food from Restaurants	501	Full Service Restaurants
Gifts & Souvenirs	406	Retail - Miscellaneous
Ice	402	Retail - Gasoline Stores
Lodging - Hotels & Motels	499	Hotels & Motels
Lodging - Other Accommodations	500	Other Accommodation
Parking & Site Access	512	Other Personal Services - Parking
Public Transportation	408	Air Transportation

#### Calculation and Presentation of Economic Impacts

Angler-trip economic impacts were calculated for all three angling types (for-hire, private vessel, and shore) for both Texas resident and non-resident anglers. Total economic impacts from recreational fishing in the Galveston Bay System were calculated as the product of TPWD estimates of angler-trips, and the estimated economic impacts per angler-trip. The economic impacts from for-hire, private vessel, and shore anglers are presented in Tables 4, 5, and 6, respectively. Shore fishing accounted for the largest share of economic impacts by fishing type (~60%), followed by private vessel (~27%) and for-hire (~13%). Total impacts across all three angler types (for-hire, private vessel, and shore) are presented in Table 7. Galveston Bay System recreational fishing economic impacts were more than twice as large as any other Texas bay system due to the greater number of angler-trips taken.

**Table 4. Economic Impacts of Galveston Bay System For-Hire Recreational Fishing**

<b>For-Hire Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	91.86	\$3,575,971	\$4,490,002	\$9,259,599
Indirect Effect	32.05	\$1,773,371	\$2,783,959	\$4,897,142
Induced Effect	33.44	\$1,554,504	\$2,708,682	\$4,753,774
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>157.35</u></b>	<b><u>\$6,903,847</u></b>	<b><u>\$9,982,643</u></b>	<b><u>\$18,910,514</u></b>
<b>For-Hire Non-Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	16.11	\$609,057	\$843,489	\$1,630,320
Indirect Effect	5.20	\$286,824	\$459,994	\$815,338
Induced Effect	5.60	\$260,447	\$453,827	\$796,471
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>26.91</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,156,328</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,757,311</u></b>	<b><u>\$3,242,129</u></b>
<b>For-Hire Total</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	107.97	\$4,185,028	\$5,333,491	\$10,889,919
Indirect Effect	37.25	\$2,060,195	\$3,243,953	\$5,712,479
Induced Effect	39.04	\$1,814,951	\$3,162,509	\$5,550,245
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>184.26</u></b>	<b><u>\$8,060,174</u></b>	<b><u>\$11,739,953</u></b>	<b><u>\$22,152,643</u></b>

**Table 5. Economic Impacts of Galveston Bay System Private Vessel Recreational Fishing**

<b>Private Vessel Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	312.54	\$8,627,717	\$12,398,431	\$20,656,659
Indirect Effect	53.42	\$2,763,585	\$4,890,988	\$8,785,769
Induced Effect	71.57	\$3,329,348	\$5,802,326	\$10,182,797
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>437.56</u></b>	<b><u>\$14,720,651</u></b>	<b><u>\$23,091,745</u></b>	<b><u>\$39,625,225</u></b>
<b>Private Vessel Non-Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	4.32	\$133,130	\$210,613	\$367,304
Indirect Effect	0.87	\$48,273	\$86,619	\$160,252
Induced Effect	1.14	\$52,994	\$92,356	\$162,080
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>6.33</u></b>	<b><u>\$234,397</u></b>	<b><u>\$389,588</u></b>	<b><u>\$689,636</u></b>
<b>Private Vessel Total</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	316.86	\$8,760,847	\$12,609,044	\$21,023,962
Indirect Effect	54.28	\$2,811,858	\$4,977,607	\$8,946,022
Induced Effect	72.71	\$3,382,342	\$5,894,681	\$10,344,877
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>443.89</u></b>	<b><u>\$14,955,048</u></b>	<b><u>\$23,481,333</u></b>	<b><u>\$40,314,861</u></b>

**Table 6. Economic Impacts of Galveston Bay System Shore-Based Recreational Fishing**

<b>Shore Angler Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	677.28	\$18,367,635	\$27,094,968	\$45,520,010
Indirect Effect	119.70	\$6,190,986	\$10,811,158	\$19,532,779
Induced Effect	154.44	\$7,183,168	\$12,518,980	\$21,970,092
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>951.42</u></b>	<b><u>\$31,741,789</u></b>	<b><u>\$50,425,106</u></b>	<b><u>\$87,022,881</u></b>
<b>Shore Angler Non-Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	19.44	\$544,380	\$830,051	\$1,392,228
Indirect Effect	3.62	\$189,193	\$329,201	\$596,931
Induced Effect	4.61	\$214,455	\$373,752	\$655,915
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>27.67</u></b>	<b><u>\$948,028</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,533,004</u></b>	<b><u>\$2,645,074</u></b>
<b>Shore Angler Total</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	696.72	\$18,912,015	\$27,925,019	\$46,912,238
Indirect Effect	123.32	\$6,380,179	\$11,140,360	\$20,129,710
Induced Effect	159.05	\$7,397,623	\$12,892,732	\$22,626,007
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>979.09</u></b>	<b><u>\$32,689,816</u></b>	<b><u>\$51,958,110</u></b>	<b><u>\$89,667,955</u></b>

**Table. 7 Economic Impacts of Galveston Bay System Recreational Fishing (All)**

<b>Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	1,081.68	\$30,571,324	\$43,983,401	\$75,436,267
Indirect Effect	205.16	\$10,727,942	\$18,486,105	\$33,215,690
Induced Effect	259.45	\$12,067,020	\$21,029,987	\$36,906,663
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>1,546.32</u></b>	<b><u>\$53,366,286</u></b>	<b><u>\$83,499,493</u></b>	<b><u>\$145,558,619</u></b>
<b>Non-Resident</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	39.88	\$1,286,566	\$1,884,153	\$3,389,852
Indirect Effect	9.69	\$524,290	\$875,815	\$1,572,521
Induced Effect	11.35	\$527,896	\$919,935	\$1,614,466
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>60.91</u></b>	<b><u>\$2,338,752</u></b>	<b><u>\$3,679,903</u></b>	<b><u>\$6,576,839</u></b>
<b>Total</b>				
<b>Impact Type</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Labor Income</b>	<b>Value Added</b>	<b>Output</b>
Direct Effect	1,121.56	\$31,857,890	\$45,867,554	\$78,826,119
Indirect Effect	214.85	\$11,252,232	\$19,361,920	\$34,788,211
Induced Effect	270.80	\$12,594,916	\$21,949,922	\$38,521,129
<b><u>Total Effect</u></b>	<b><u>1,607.23</u></b>	<b><u>\$55,705,039</u></b>	<b><u>\$87,179,396</u></b>	<b><u>\$152,135,458</u></b>

## Concluding Remarks

Marine recreational fishing in the State of Texas is not only a popular recreational activity but also a valuable part of the Texas economy. Our analysis indicates that Galveston Bay System recreational fishing trips generate 1,607 jobs and \$55.7 million in labor income in Texas annually. Trip spending by Galveston Bay System recreational fishers is also responsible for \$152.1 million of economic activity and contributes \$87.2 million to the Texas economy every year. Although non-resident anglers spent more money per trip on average; economic impacts from resident fishing trips were much larger than non-resident impacts because 98% of the trips were by residents.

The results of this analysis are presented with some caveats regarding the data from the NMFS survey. The first issue is that the data were not specific to the Galveston Bay System; the survey gathered data on Texas marine recreational fishing regardless of where the fishing occurred. It is possible that Gulf of Mexico anglers spend more on fishing trips, on average, than bay anglers, which would lead to overstated economic impacts. Such a problem would be exacerbated if Gulf anglers were more willing to respond to the survey. Similar problems could arise if spending on fishing trips varied significantly by coastal region or bay system. The second issue concerns the possibility of response bias. Anglers were asked to report only what they personally spent on themselves or others and not to include expenses paid on their behalf by others (Lovell, Steinback, and Hilger 2013). If anglers that funded trips were more likely to respond to the survey than those being funded, the spending estimates at the angler-trip level would be skewed upwards, which would lead to overstated impacts. The NMFS survey did not look specifically at this form of response bias; the authors evaluated other possible forms of response bias and found no issues. While the issues noted could impact the findings of this analysis, we have no evidence that any of these issues exist (regional spending differences, bay vs. Gulf differences, non-response bias among non-paying anglers) and believe the results presented provide an appropriate estimate of the annual economic impacts of recreational fishing in the Galveston Bay System.

## References

- Green, L.M. "Coastal Creel Surveys." *Texas Parks and Wildlife Short Report*. Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. Retrieved 12/12/2016.
- IMPLAN Group LLC. 2015. IMPLAN Professional Version 3.0. Huntersville, North Carolina.
- Lovell, S., S. Steinback, and J. Hilger. 2013. The Economic Contribution of Marine Angler Expenditures in the United States, 2011. U.S. Dep. Commerce, NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-134, 188p.
- Moretzsohn, F., J.A. Sánchez Chávez, and J.W. Tunnell, Jr., Editors. 2016. GulfBase: Resource Database for Gulf of Mexico Research. World Wide Web electronic publication. <http://www.gulfbase.org>. Retrieved 12/12/2016.

Publication supported in part by an Institutional Grant (NA14OAR4170102) to the Texas Sea Grant College Program from the National Sea Grant Office, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce.

TAMU-SG-16-517