

## BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus truncatus*): Northern North Carolina Estuarine System Stock

### STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The coastal morphotype of bottlenose dolphin is continuously distributed along the Atlantic coast south of Long Island, New York, to the Florida peninsula, including inshore waters of the bays, sounds and estuaries. Several lines of evidence support a distinction between dolphins inhabiting coastal waters near the shore and those present primarily in the inshore waters of the bays, sounds and estuaries. Photo-identification (photo-ID) and genetic studies support the existence of resident estuarine animals in several areas (Caldwell 2001; Gubbins 2002; Zolman 2002; Gubbins *et al.* 2003; Mazzoil *et al.* 2005; Litz 2007), and similar patterns have been observed in bays and estuaries along the Gulf of Mexico coast (Wells *et al.* 1987; Balmer *et al.* 2008). Recent genetic analyses using both mitochondrial DNA and nuclear microsatellite markers found significant differentiation between animals biopsied along the coast and those biopsied within the estuarine systems at the same latitude (NMFS unpublished data). Similar results have been found off the west coast of Florida (Sellas *et al.* 2005).

The Northern North Carolina Estuarine System (NNCES) stock is defined as animals that occupy estuarine waters of Pamlico Sound during summer months (July-August). The ranging patterns of bottlenose dolphins in photo-ID studies supports the presence of a group of dolphins within these waters that are distinct from both dolphins occupying estuarine and coastal waters in southern North Carolina and animals in the Northern and Southern Migratory stocks that occupy coastal waters of North Carolina at certain times of the year (Read *et al.* 2003; NMFS 2001; NMFS unpublished data). In addition, stable isotope analysis of animals sampled along the beaches of North Carolina between Cape Hatteras and Bogue Inlet during February and March showed very low stable isotope ratios of  $^{18}\text{O}$  relative to  $^{16}\text{O}$  (referred to as "depleted oxygen"; Cortese 2000). One explanation for the depleted oxygen signature is a resident group of dolphins in Pamlico Sound that move into nearby coastal waters in the winter (NMFS 2001). The estuarine waters of Pamlico Sound had previously been included in the abundance estimates and stock assessment reports for the Northern migratory stock and the winter "mixed" North Carolina management unit of coastal bottlenose dolphins (Waring *et al.* 2007). However, they are now recognized as a distinct stock based upon these differences in seasonal ranging patterns and stable isotope signatures.

The seasonal movements of the NNCES stock are best described using a combination of tag telemetry and long-




Figure 1. The summer (July-September) distribution of bottlenose dolphins occupying coastal and estuarine waters in North Carolina and Virginia. Locations are shown from aerial surveys (triangles), satellite telemetry (circles) and photo-identification studies (squares). Sightings assigned to the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System stock are shown with filled symbols. Photo-identification data are courtesy of Duke University and the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

term photo-ID studies. Animals captured and released near Beaufort, North Carolina, were fitted with satellite-linked transmitters during November 1999 (3 animals), April 2000 (8 animals) and April 2006 (5 animals) (NMFS unpublished data). In addition, long-term photo-ID studies have been conducted in waters of North Carolina that include records of both these tagged animals and animals that were captured and freeze-branded near Beaufort, North Carolina, during summer months (Duke University unpublished data; University of North Carolina at Wilmington unpublished data; NMFS unpublished data). Of these tagged or freeze-branded animals, 18 occupied waters of northern Pamlico Sound during summer months and hence were identified as belonging to the NNCES stock. The NNCES stock occurs primarily within the waters of Pamlico Sound north of Core Sound during summer months (July-August). There is evidence that some of these animals also move into nearshore coastal waters along the northern coast of North Carolina and into coastal waters of Virginia and perhaps into Chesapeake Bay. One animal that was tagged near Virginia Beach in September 1998 was observed to move south into waters of Pamlico Sound and had a photo-ID record within the sound during July (NMFS unpublished data). In addition, there are photo-ID matches between inshore waters of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Pamlico Sound (Urian, pers. comm.) that also demonstrate movements of NNCES animals between these areas. Therefore, it is presumed that the spatial range of NNCES animals during summer and fall months (July-October) includes Pamlico Sound, nearshore (< 1 km from shore) coastal waters of northern North Carolina, and nearshore and estuarine waters of Virginia (Figure 1).

There are fewer tag-telemetry data for assigned NNCES animals during winter months. However, photo-ID studies, available tag data and stable isotope data indicate that the stock moves out of the waters of Pamlico Sound into coastal waters south of Cape Hatteras during late fall and through winter (November-April). Tag telemetry records show that NNCES animals move as far south as the New River during winter months (January-February) (NMFS unpublished data). The Northern Migratory stock also occupies the nearshore coastal waters of North Carolina during these months, and hence there is likely overlap between these stocks, particularly between Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout.

The movements of animals from the NNCES stock are distinct from those of the Southern North Carolina Estuarine System stock (SNCES). Some of the animals tagged or freeze-branded near Beaufort moved south to Cape Fear and occupied nearshore coastal and estuarine waters during winter months. During summer and fall, these animals moved north and occupied inshore and nearshore coastal waters near Cape Lookout including Bogue Sound and Core Sound. It is probable that there is spatial overlap between these two estuarine stocks during late summer and fall in the waters near Beaufort. However, SNCES stock animals were not observed to move north of Cape Lookout in coastal waters nor into the main portion of Pamlico Sound during summer (NMFS unpublished data; Duke University unpublished data; University of North Carolina at Wilmington unpublished data). These movement patterns are consistent with those in resightings of individual dolphins during a photo-ID study that sampled much of the estuarine waters of North Carolina (Read *et al.* 2003). Read *et al.* (2003) suggested that movement patterns, differences in group sizes, and habitats are consistent with two stocks of animals occupying estuarine waters of North Carolina. Finally, genetic analysis of samples from animals in waters of southern North Carolina (between Cape Lookout and the North Carolina/South Carolina border) demonstrate significant differentiation from animals occupying waters from Virginia and further north and waters of South Carolina (Rosel *et al.* 2009).

In summary, during summer and fall months (July-October), the NNCES stock occupies waters of Pamlico Sound and nearshore coastal and estuarine waters of northern North Carolina to Virginia Beach (Figure 1). It likely overlaps with animals from the Southern Migratory stock in coastal waters during these months. During late fall and winter (November-March), the NNCES stock moves out of estuarine waters and occupies nearshore coastal waters between the New River and Cape Hatteras. It overlaps with the Northern Migratory stock during this period, particularly between Cape Lookout and Cape Hatteras. It appears that the region near Cape Lookout including Bogue Sound and Core Sound is an area of overlap with the SNCES stock during late summer.

## **POPULATION SIZE**

Read *et al.* (2003) provided the first and only available abundance estimate of bottlenose dolphins that occur within the estuarine portion of the NNCES stock range. This estimate was based on a photo-ID mark-recapture survey of a portion of North Carolina waters inshore of the barrier islands, conducted during July 2000. Because the survey did not sample all of the estuarine waters where dolphins are known to occur, the estimates of abundance may be negatively biased. Read *et al.* (2003) estimated the number of animals in the inshore waters of North Carolina equivalent to that of the NNCES stock to be 919 (95% CI 730 - 1,190, CV=0.13). Gubbins *et al.* (2003) also conducted a photo-ID mark-recapture study and provided an abundance estimate (513, CV=0.13) for inshore and nearshore waters near Beaufort, North Carolina, but this area represented only a small portion of the NNCES stock area and included animals in coastal waters. Goodman *et al.* (2007) conducted seasonal, strip-transect aerial surveys of southwestern Pamlico Sound from July 2004 through April 2006. Their survey area sampled

approximately 25% or less of the waters within the NNCES stock boundaries. Mean seasonal abundance estimates ranged from a low of 54 (CV=0.46) during June-August 2005 (summer), to a high of 426 (CV=0.35) during September-November 2004 (autumn), but seasonal patterns were not consistent among years. For example, the estimate for spring of 2005 was only 71 (CV=0.39) while the estimate for spring of 2006 was 323 (CV=0.35). The abundance estimate from Read *et al.* (2003) is the best abundance estimate for the stock in estuarine waters; however, this estimate is more than 8 years old, and hence cannot be used to calculate  $N_{\min}$  or PBR.

Since both tag-telemetry studies and photo-ID records indicate that some portion of the NNCES stock occurs in coastal waters between Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, and Virginia during summer months, it is appropriate to include animals from summer aerial surveys of these areas in the abundance estimate. Aerial surveys to estimate the abundance of coastal bottlenose dolphins in the Atlantic were conducted during winter (January-February) and summer (July-August) of 2002. Survey tracklines were set perpendicular to the shoreline and included coastal waters to depths of 40 m. The surveys employed a stratified design so that most effort was expended in waters shallower than 20 m deep where a high proportion of observed bottlenose dolphins were expected to be of the coastal morphotype. The surveys employed two observer teams operating independently on the same aircraft to estimate visibility bias. Abundance estimates were calculated using line-transect methods and distance analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001). The 2002 surveys included two teams of observers to derive a correction for visibility bias. The independent and joint estimates from the two survey teams were used to quantify the probability that animals available to the survey on the trackline were missed by the observer teams, or perception bias, using the direct-duplicate estimator (Palka 1995).

During the summer survey, 6,734 km of trackline were completed between Sandy Hook, New Jersey, and Ft. Pierce, Florida. All tracklines in the 0-20 m stratum were completed throughout the survey range while offshore lines were completed only as far south as the Georgia/Florida state line. A total of 185 bottlenose dolphin groups were sighted during summer including 2,544 individual animals.

In summer 2004, an additional aerial survey between central Florida and New Jersey was conducted. As with the 2002 surveys, effort was stratified into 0-20 m and 20-40 m strata with the majority of effort in the shallow depth stratum. The survey was conducted between 16 July and 31 August and covered 7,189 km of trackline. There were a total of 140 sightings of bottlenose dolphins including 3,093 individual animals. During the summer of 2004, water temperatures were significantly cooler than those during 2002 and earlier surveys conducted in 1995, and animals distributed farther south and overlapped spatially. It is probable that both the Northern Migratory and Southern Migratory stocks occurred in waters of northern North Carolina during the summer of 2004.

The best abundance estimate for the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System stock in coastal waters is therefore from the summer 2002 survey when there was less overlap among stocks. Survey data were post-stratified to estimate the abundance of dolphins within a strip extending from the shoreline to 1km from shore between Cape Lookout, North Carolina, and Virginia Beach, Virginia. Tag-telemetry records indicated that NNCES animals rarely ventured further away from shore. However, animals from the Southern Migratory stock do occur within this strip during summer months. Therefore, the estimate of abundance within this strip includes both NNCES animals and Southern Migratory animals and hence overestimates abundance. The resulting best abundance estimate for the NNCES stock in coastal waters is 468 (CV=0.32).

The best available abundance estimate for the NNCES stock is the combined abundance from estuarine and coastal waters. This combined estimate is 1,387 (CV=0.17). However, this estimate includes data that are more than 8 years old from Read *et al.* (2003). Hence, the abundance of the NNCES stock is currently unknown.

### **Minimum Population Estimate**

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normally distributed best abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile of the log-normal distribution as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). Because the only available comprehensive abundance for this stock is derived from data that are more than 8 years old, they may not be used to calculate the minimum population estimate, and as a result the minimum population estimate for the NNCES stock of bottlenose dolphins is unknown.

### **Current Population Trend**

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this stock.

### **CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES**

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. The maximum net productivity rate was assumed to be 0.04. This value is based on theoretical modeling showing that cetacean populations may not grow at rates much greater than 4% given the constraints of their reproductive life history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

## **POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL**

Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one-half the maximum productivity rate, and a “recovery” factor (MMPA Sec. 3. 16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size of the NNCES stock of bottlenose dolphins is unknown. The maximum productivity rate is 0.04, the default value for cetaceans. The recovery factor, which accounts for endangered, depleted, threatened stocks, or stocks of unknown status relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP), is assumed to be 0.5 because this stock is of unknown status. PBR for this stock of bottlenose dolphins is undetermined.

## **ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY**

### **Fishery Information**

The NNCES stock interacts with 3 Category II fisheries: the Atlantic blue crab trap/pot fishery, North Carolina long haul seine fishery and North Carolina inshore gillnet fishery. There is no systematic federal observer coverage of these fisheries by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), although the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries operates systematic coverage of the fall flounder gillnet fishery in Pamlico Sound (Price 2008). As a result, information about interactions with North Carolina inshore fisheries is based solely on stranding data and it is not possible to estimate the annual number of interactions or mortalities in these fisheries. The NNCES stock may also interact with the mid-Atlantic gillnet fishery, the mid-Atlantic haul/beach seine fishery and the Virginia Pound Net fishery. The magnitude of the interaction with each of these fisheries is unknown because of both uncertainty in the movement patterns of the stock and the spatial overlap between the NNCES stock and other bottlenose dolphin stocks in coastal waters. The total estimated average annual fishery mortality on the NNCES stock ranges between a minimum of 4.1 and a maximum of 22.6 animals per year. This range reflects the uncertainty in assigning observed or reported mortalities to a particular stock.

### **Mid-Atlantic Gillnet**

This fishery has the highest documented level of mortality of coastal morphotype bottlenose dolphins, and the sink gillnet gear in North Carolina is its largest component in terms of fishing effort and observed takes. Of 12 observed mortalities between 1995 and 2000, 5 occurred in sets targeting spiny or smooth dogfish, 1 was in a set targeting “shark” species, 2 occurred in striped bass sets, 2 occurred in Spanish mackerel sets, and the remainder were in sets targeting kingfish, weakfish or finfish generically (Rossman and Palka 2001). From 2001-2008, 7 additional bottlenose dolphin mortalities were observed in the mid-Atlantic gillnet fishery. Three mortalities were observed in 2001 with 1 occurring off of northern North Carolina during April and 2 occurring off of Virginia during November. Four additional mortalities were observed along the North Carolina coast near Cape Hatteras: 1 in May 2003, 1 in September 2005, 1 in September 2006 and 1 in October 2006. Because the Northern Migratory, Southern Migratory, Northern North Carolina Estuarine System and Southern North Carolina Estuarine System bottlenose dolphin stocks all occur in waters off of North Carolina, it is not possible to definitively assign all observed mortalities, or extrapolated bycatch estimates, to a specific stock. In addition, the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Plan (BDTRP) was implemented in May 2006 resulting in changes in the gear configurations and other characteristics of the fishery.

To estimate the mortality of bottlenose dolphins in the mid-Atlantic gillnet fishery, the available data were divided into the period from 2002 through April 2006 (pre-BDTRP) and from May 2006–2008 (post-BDTRP). Three alternative approaches were used to estimate bycatch rates. First, a generalized linear model (GLM) approach was used similar to that described in Rossman and Palka (2001). This approach included all observed mortalities from 1995-2008 where the fishing gear was still in use during the period from 2002-2008. Second, a simple ratio estimator of catch per unit effort (CPUE = observed catch / observed effort) was used based directly upon the observed data. Finally, a ratio estimator pooled across years was used to estimate different CPUE values for the pre-BDTRP and post-BDTRP periods. In each case, the annual reported fishery effort (represented as reported landings) was multiplied by the estimated bycatch rate to develop annual estimates of fishery-related mortality, again similar to the approach in Rossman and Palka (2001). To account for the uncertainty in the most appropriate of these 3 alternative approaches, the average of the 3 model estimates (and the associated uncertainty) are used to estimate the mortality of bottlenose dolphins for this fishery (Table 1). It should be noted that the extrapolated estimates of total mortality include landings from inshore waters where the NNCES stock is likely to occur.

Table 1. Summary of the 2002-2008 incidental mortality of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus truncatus*) in the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System stock in the commercial mid-Atlantic coastal gillnet fisheries. The estimated annual and average mortality estimates are shown for the period prior to the implementation of the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Plan (pre-BDTRP) and after the implementation of the plan (post-BDTRP). Three alternative modeling approaches were used, and the average of the 3 was used to represent mortality estimates. The minimum and maximum estimates indicate the range of uncertainty in assigning observed bycatch to stock. Observer coverage is measured as a proportion of reported landings (tons of fish landed). Data are derived from the Northeast Observer program, NER dealer data and NCDMF dealer data. Values in parentheses indicated the CV of the estimate.

| Period                        | Year         | Observer Coverage <sup>a</sup> | Min Annual Ratio        | Min Pooled Ratio | Min GLM         | Max Annual Ratio         | Max Pooled Ratio | Max GLM         |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| pre-BDTRP                     | 2002         | 0.01                           | 0                       | 0                | 15.64<br>(0.63) | 0                        | 39.45<br>(0.92)  | 33.69<br>(0.38) |
|                               | 2003         | 0.01                           | 0                       | 0                | 11.03<br>(0.58) | 49.46<br>(0.94)          | 12.77<br>(0.92)  | 19.29<br>(0.36) |
|                               | 2004         | 0.02                           | 0                       | 0                | 12.10<br>(0.62) | 0                        | 28.46<br>(0.92)  | 28.42<br>(0.34) |
|                               | 2005         | 0.03                           | 0                       | 0                | 11.84<br>(0.60) | 0                        | 22.58<br>(0.92)  | 23.01<br>(0.37) |
|                               | Jan-Apr 2006 | 0.03                           | 0                       | 0                | 1.40<br>(0.50)  | 0                        | 0                | 1.99<br>(0.37)  |
| <b>Annual Avg. pre-BDTRP</b>  |              |                                | Minimum: 3.47 (CV=0.30) |                  |                 | Maximum: 19.79 (CV=0.11) |                  |                 |
| post-BDTRP                    | May-Dec 2006 | 0.03                           | 0                       | 0                | 5.08<br>(0.42)  | 73.37<br>(0.69)          | 18.84<br>(0.68)  | 12.46<br>(0.36) |
|                               | 2007         | 0.03                           | 0                       | 0                | 8.32<br>(0.43)  | 0                        | 24.47<br>(0.68)  | 18.77<br>(0.34) |
|                               | 2008         | 0.01                           | 0                       | 0                | 8.14<br>(0.42)  | 0                        | 21.91<br>(0.68)  | 16.77<br>(0.34) |
| <b>Annual Avg. post-BDTRP</b> |              |                                | Minimum: 2.39 (CV=0.25) |                  |                 | Maximum: 18.99 (CV=0.11) |                  |                 |

<sup>a</sup> Observer coverage is reported on an annual basis for the entire fishery as a proportion of the reported tons of fish landed.

There have been 3 observed takes in the mid-Atlantic gillnet fishery since 2001 that could potentially be assigned to the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System stock. However, in each of these cases, the take could potentially be assigned to the Southern Migratory stock since they occurred in near-shore coastal waters of northern North Carolina. Since observed mortalities (and effort) cannot be definitively assigned to a particular stock within certain regions and times of year, the minimum and maximum possible mortality on the NNCES stock are presented for comparison to PBR (Table 1).

Based upon these analyses, the minimum mortality estimate for the NNCES stock for the pre-BDTRP period was 3.47 (CV=0.30) animals per year, and that for the post-BDTRP period was 2.39 (CV=0.25) animals per year. The maximum estimates were 19.79 (CV=0.11) for the pre-BDTRP period and 18.99 (CV=0.11) for the post-BDTRP period (Table 1).

### **Beach Haul Seine/Beach-based Gillnet Gear**

Two coastal bottlenose dolphin takes were observed in beach haul seine gear: 1 in May 1998 and 1 in December 2000. These takes occurred during a striped bass fishery within the spatial and seasonal range of the Northern Migratory stock. Beach-based gillnet gear is now considered part of the mid-Atlantic gillnet fishery described above; however, it is not included in the observer program or resulting mortality estimates. Data from the Southeast Region Stranding Network from 2002 to 2008 include two confirmed reports of bottlenose dolphin mortalities in beach-based gillnet gear for striped bass during winter months off the coast of northern North Carolina: 1 in December 2002 and 1 in January 2008. A third possible mortality associated with this gear occurred during December 2002 (Southeast Regional Marine Mammal Stranding Network; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 21 September 2009 and 18 November 2009). Based upon their location and time of year, these mortalities were most likely animals from the Northern Migratory stock rather than the NNCES stock since they occurred north of Cape Hatteras in winter months.

### **Crab Pots and Other Pots**

Since there is no systematic observer program, it is not possible to estimate the total number of interactions or mortalities associated with crab pots. However, it is clear that interactions with pot gear are a common occurrence and result in mortalities of coastal morphotype bottlenose dolphins in some regions (Burdett and McFee 2004). Southeast Regional Marine Mammal Stranding Network data (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 21 September 2009 and 18 November 2009) from 2004 through 2008 include 13 reports of interactions between bottlenose dolphins and confirmed blue crab pot gear with the majority of these occurring in waters from Florida to South Carolina. In addition, there were 4 interactions documented with pot gear where the fishery could not be confirmed. In these cases, the gear was confirmed to be associated with a pot or trap, but may have been from a fishery other than blue crab (e.g., whelk fisheries in Virginia). Of the confirmed blue crab pot interactions, there was one reported mortality in this 5 year period in waters of Virginia and North Carolina. This case occurred in August 2004 and is most likely assigned to the NNCES stock. There was one mortality in pot gear where the fishery type could not be confirmed in Virginia. This mortality was reported in August 2007 and could be assigned to either the Southern Migratory or the NNCES stock.

### **Virginia and North Carolina Pound Nets**

Historical and recent stranding network data report interactions between bottlenose dolphins and pound nets in Virginia. Stranding data for 2004-2008 indicate 17 cases where bottlenose dolphins were removed from pound net gear, and it was determined that animals were entangled pre-mortem. In each case, the bottlenose dolphin was recovered directly from the fishing gear. Of these 17 cases, 14 were documented mortalities while 3 were released alive (S. Barco, Virginia Aquarium, unpublished data; Northeast Regional Marine Mammal Stranding Network; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 21 September 2009 and 18 November 2009). These interactions occurred primarily inside estuarine waters near the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay and in summer months. Nine of these mortalities occurred during the summer (July-September) when they could have impacted either the Southern Migratory or the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System stocks. The overall impact of the Virginia Pound Net fishery on the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System stock is unknown due to the limited information on the stock's movements, particularly whether or not it occurs within waters inside the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay. In addition, one bottlenose dolphin was recovered dead from pound net gear in North Carolina during August 2004. This mortality is most likely assigned to the NNCES stock.

### **Other Mortality**

There have been occasional mortalities of bottlenose dolphins during research activities including both directed live capture studies and fisheries surveys. From 2002 to 2009, there have been 15 reported interactions during research activities resulting in 13 documented mortalities of bottlenose dolphins. A mortality occurring in a turtle relocation trawl off of North Carolina during March 2002 could have been attributed to either the Southern Migratory stock or the NNCES stock. One mortality in a research beach seine was reported from June 2007 in northern North Carolina that was consistent with the spatial range of the Northern Migratory stock, the Southern Migratory stock or the NNCES stock. Finally, a mortality was observed in July 2007 in a research net in the Neuse River that is most likely from the NNCES stock.

Three bottlenose dolphins that were captured, tagged with satellite-linked transmitters, and released near Beaufort, North Carolina, during April 2006 by the NMFS as part of a long-term stock delineation research project were believed to have died shortly thereafter as a result of the capture or tagging (NMFS unpublished data). Two of

the animals were recovered stranded but because of advanced decomposition of the carcasses cause of death could not be determined. One of these two animals was known from long-term photo-ID and was likely of the Southern North Carolina Estuarine System stock. The third animal has not been observed subsequent to release, but patterns in the data received from its satellite tag were similar to that of the other two and indicated the fates were similar. These last two animals were, based on satellite-derived locations, most likely from the NNCES stock. All known human-caused mortalities including both commercial fisheries and research related mortalities are summarized in Table 2.

This stock inhabits areas with significant drainage from agricultural, industrial and urban sources, and as such is exposed to contaminants in runoff from those sources. The blubber of 47 bottlenose dolphins captured and released in and around Beaufort contained contaminant levels of some level, and 7 had unusually high levels of the pesticide methoxychlor (Hansen *et al.* 2004). While there are no estimates of indirect human-caused mortality from pollution or habitat degradation, Schwacke *et al.* (2002) found that the levels of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) observed in Beaufort female bottlenose dolphins would likely impair reproductive success, especially of primiparous females.

Table 2. Summary of annual reported and estimated mortality of bottlenose dolphins from the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System stock. Where minimum and maximum values are reported, there is uncertainty in the assignment of mortalities to this particular stock due to spatial overlap with other bottlenose dolphin stocks in certain areas and seasons. The reported mortalities in Virginia Pound Net, beach-based gillnet and crab pot fisheries are confirmed reports and are likely an underestimate of total mortalities in these fisheries.

| Year   | Mid-Atlantic Gillnet    | Virginia Pound Net <sup>a</sup> | Beach-based Gillnet | Blue Crab Pot                                       | Other Pot          | Research           | Total                   |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 2004   | Min = 4.0<br>Max = 18.9 | Min = 1<br>Max = 4              | 0                   | 1   | 0                  | 0                  | Min = 6.0<br>Max = 23.9 |
| 2005   | Min = 4.0<br>Max = 15.2 | Min = 0<br>Max = 1              | 0                   | 0   | 0                  | 0                  | Min = 4.0<br>Max = 16.2 |
| 2006   | Min = 2.2<br>Max = 35.6 | Min = 0<br>Max = 2              | 0                   | 0   | 0                  | 2                  | Min = 4.2<br>Max = 39.6 |
| 2007   | Min = 2.8<br>Max = 14.4 | Min = 0<br>Max = 1              | 0                   | 0   | Min = 0<br>Max = 1 | Min = 1<br>Max = 2 | Min = 3.8<br>Max = 18.4 |
| 2008   | Min = 2.7<br>Max = 12.9 | Min = 0<br>Max = 2              | 0                   | 0   | 0                  | 0                  | Min = 2.7<br>Max = 14.9 |
| Annual Average Mortality (2004-2008)   |                         |                                 |                     | Minimum Estimated = 4.1<br>Maximum Estimated = 22.6 |                    |                    |                         |
| <sup>a</sup> Pound nets also include a mortality observed in North Carolina in 2004. |                         |                                 |                     |   |                    |                    |                         |

### Strandings

Between 2004 and 2008, 422 bottlenose dolphins stranded along the Atlantic coast in North Carolina and Virginia that could be assigned to the NNCES stock (Table 3; Northeast Regional Marine Mammal Stranding Network, Southeast Regional Marine Mammal Stranding Network; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 21 September 2009 and 18 November 2009). The assignment of animals to a particular stock is impossible in some seasons and regions, particularly in coastal waters of North Carolina and Virginia. Therefore, it is likely that the counts below include some animals from either the Southern Migratory or Northern Migratory stocks. Within estuarine waters of North Carolina, where the probability

is very high that strandings are from the NNCES stock, there were a total of 73 strandings in this 5 year period. In addition, stranded carcasses are not routinely identified to either the offshore or coastal morphotype of bottlenose dolphin, therefore it is possible that some of the reported strandings were of the offshore form. In most cases, it was not possible to determine if a human interaction had occurred due to the decomposition state of the stranded animal. However, in cases where a determination could be made, the incidence of evidence of fisheries interactions was high. In cases where a determination could be made, 65% of stranded animals from Virginia, 41% of cases from coastal waters of North Carolina and 82% (14/17) of cases from North Carolina estuarine waters had evidence of human interaction. It should be recognized that evidence of human interaction does not indicate cause of death, but rather only that there was evidence of interaction with a fishery (e.g., line marks, net marks) or evidence of a boat strike, gunshot wound, mutilation, etc., at some point in the animal's life. Evidence of fishery interaction is by far the most common type of human interaction reported.

Table 3. Strandings of bottlenose dolphins from North Carolina and Virginia that can possibly be assigned to the Northern North Carolina Estuarine System (NNCES) stock. Strandings observed in North Carolina are separated into those occurring within Pamlico Sound and other estuaries (Estuary) vs. coastal waters. Assignments to stock were based upon the understanding of the seasonal movements of this stock. However, particularly in coastal waters, there is likely overlap between the NNCES stock and other bottlenose dolphin stocks. HI = Evidence of Human Interaction, CBD = Cannot Be Determined whether an HI occurred or not. NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 21 September 2009 and 18 November 2009.

| State                    | 2004   |       |     | 2005   |       |     | 2006   |       |     | 2007   |       |     | 2008   |       |     |
|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|--------|-------|-----|--------|-------|-----|--------|-------|-----|--------|-------|-----|
|                          | HI Yes | HI No | CBD |
| North Carolina - Coastal | 6      | 8     | 25  | 7      | 7     | 41  | 1      | 7     | 25  | 5      | 8     | 26  | 5      | 5     | 28  |
| North Carolina - Estuary | 6      | 1     | 9   | 2      | 0     | 7   | 4      | 2     | 11  | 2      | 0     | 19  | 0      | 0     | 10  |
| Virginia <sup>a</sup>    | 13     | 5     | 10  | 7      | 9     | 13  | 9      | 3     | 17  | 6      | 3     | 19  | 8      | 1     | 22  |
| Annual Total             | 83     |       |     | 93     |       |     | 79     |       |     | 88     |       |     | 79     |       |     |

<sup>a</sup> Strandings from Virginia include primarily waters inside Chesapeake Bay during late summer through fall. It is likely that the NNCES stock overlaps with the Southern migratory stock in this area.

### STATUS OF STOCK

From 1995 to 2001, NMFS recognized only a single migratory stock of coastal bottlenose dolphins in the western North Atlantic, and the entire stock was listed as depleted as a result of the 1987-1988 mortality event. Scott *et al.* (1988) suggested that dolphins residing in the bays, sounds and estuaries adjacent to these coastal waters were not affected by the mortality event, and these animals were explicitly excluded from the depleted listing (Federal Register: 54(195), 41654-41657; 56(158), 40594-40596; 58(64), 17789-17791).

The status of the NNCES stock relative to OSP is unknown. The species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. There are insufficient data to determine population trends for this

stock. The annual average of human caused mortality for this stock ranges between a minimum of 4.1 and a maximum of 22.6, but this is an underestimate of total mortality associated with commercial fisheries. The most recent abundance estimate is greater than 8 years old, and therefore PBR is undetermined. There is insufficient information available to determine whether the total fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. However, the total human-caused mortality and serious injury is most likely greater than 10% of PBR and may approach or exceed PBR. Because the stock size is currently unknown, and relatively few mortalities and serious injuries would exceed PBR, the NMFS considers this stock to be a strategic stock.

#### REFERENCES CITED

- Balmer, B.C., R.S. Wells, S.M. Nowacek, D.P. Nowacek, L.H. Schwacke, W.A. McLellan, F.S. Scharf, T.K. Rowles, L.J. Hansen, T.R. Spradlin and D.A. Pabst. 2008. Seasonal abundance and distribution patterns of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) near St. Joseph Bay, Florida, USA. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* 10(2): 157-167.
- Barlow, J., S.L. Swartz, T.C. Eagle and P.R. Wade. 1995. U.S. marine mammal stock assessments: Guidelines for preparation, background, and a summary of the 1995 assessments. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-6, 73 pp.
- Buckland, S. T., D. R. Andersen, K. P. Burnham, J. L. Laake, D. L. Borchers and L. Thomas. 2001. Introduction to distance sampling: Estimating abundance of biological populations. Oxford University Press, New York. 432 pp.
- Burdett, L. G. and W. E. McFee. 2004. Bycatch of bottlenose dolphins in South Carolina, USA, and an evaluation of the Atlantic blue crab fishery categorization. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* 6(3): 231-240.
- Caldwell, M. 2001. Social and genetic structure of bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Jacksonville, Florida. Ph.D. thesis. University of Miami. 143 pp.
- Cortese, N. A. 2000. Delineation of bottlenose dolphin populations in the western Atlantic Ocean using stable isotopes. Master's thesis from University of Virginia, Charlottesville. 118 pp.
- Goodman, M.A., J.B. McNeill, E. Davenport and A.A. Hohn 2007. Protected species aerial survey data collection and analysis in waters underlying the R-5306A Airspace: Final report submitted to U.S. Marine Corps, MCAS Cherry Point. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-551, 25 pp.
- Gubbins, C. 2002. Association patterns of resident bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in a South Carolina estuary. *Aquat. Mamm.* 28: 24-31.
- Gubbins, C.M., M. Caldwell, S.G. Barco, K. Rittmaster, N. Bowles and V. Thayer 2003. Abundance and sighting patterns of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) at four northwest Atlantic coastal sites. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.* 5(2): 141-147.
- Hansen, L.J., L.H. Schwacke, G.B. Mitchum, A.A. Hohn, R.S. Wells, E.S. Zolman and P.A. Fair 2004. Geographic variation in polychlorinated biphenyl and organochlorine pesticide concentrations in the blubber of bottlenose dolphins from the U.S. Atlantic coast. *Sci. Total Environ.* 319: 147-172.
- Litz, J.A. 2007. Social structure, genetic structure, and persistent organohalogen pollutants in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Biscayne Bay, Florida. Ph.D. thesis. University of Miami. 140 pp.
- Mazzoil, M., S.D. McCulloch and R.H. Defran 2005. Observations on the site fidelity of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Indian River Lagoon, Florida. *Fla. Sci.* 68(4): 217-226.
- NMFS. 2001. Stock structure of coastal bottlenose dolphins along the Atlantic coast of the US. NMFS/SEFSC Report prepared for the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.
- Palka, D. 1995. Abundance estimate of the Gulf of Maine harbor porpoise. pp. 27-50. *In: A. Bjørge and G.P. Donovan. Biology of Phocoenids. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm., Special Issue 16, Cambridge, U.K.*
- Price, B. 2008. Sea turtle bycatch monitoring of the 2007 fall gillnet fisheries in southeastern Pamlico Sound, North Carolina. Completion report for activities under Endangered Species Act Section 10 Incidental Take Permit # 1528. NC Division of Marine Fisheries, Morehead City, NC, 25 pp.
- Read, A.J., K.W. Urian, B. Wilson and D.M. Waples 2003. Abundance of bottlenose dolphins in the bays, sounds, and estuaries of North Carolina. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 19(1): 59-73.
- Rosel, P. E., L. Hansen and A. A. Hohn. 2009. Restricted dispersal in a continuously distributed marine species: Common bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* in coastal waters of the western North Atlantic. *Mol. Ecol.* 18: 5030-5045.
- Rossmann, M. C. and D. L. Palka. 2001. Bycatch estimates of coastal bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the

- U.S. mid-Atlantic gillnet fisheries for 1996 to 2000. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 01-15, 77 pp.
- Schwacke, L.H., E.O. Voit, L.J. Hansen, R.S. Wells, G.B. Mitchum, A.A. Hohn and P.A. Fair 2002. Probabilistic risk assessment of reproductive effects of polychlorinated biphenyls on bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) from the southeast United States coast. *Environ. Toxicol. Chem.* 21(12): 2752-2764.
- Scott, G.P., D.M. Burn and L.J. Hansen 1988. The dolphin dieoff: Long-term effects and recovery of the population. Conference proceedings, Oceans '88. IEEE Cat. No. 88-CH2585-8.
- Sellas, A.B., R.S. Wells and P.E. Rosel 2005. Mitochondrial and nuclear DNA analyses reveal fine scale geographic structure in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Gulf of Mexico. *Conserv. Genet.* 6(5): 715-728.
- Wade, P.R. and R.P. Angliss 1997. Guidelines for assessing marine mammal stocks: Report of the GAMMS Workshop April 3-5, 1996, Seattle, Washington. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-12, 93 pp.
- Waring, G.T., E. Josephson, C.P. Fairfield-Walsh and K. Maze-Foley, eds. 2007. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments – 2007. NOAA Tech Memo. NMFS-NE-205, 415 pp.
- Wells, R.S., M.D. Scott and A.B. Irvine 1987. The social structure of free ranging bottlenose dolphins. pp. 247-305. *In: H. Genoways (ed.) Current Mammalogy, Vol. 1. Plenum Press, New York.*
- Zolman, E.S. 2002. Residence patterns of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Stono River estuary, Charleston County, South Carolina, U.S.A. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 18: 879-892.