COMMON BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (Tursiops truncatus truncatus): Western North Atlantic Northern Migratory Coastal Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Geographic Range and Coastal Morphotype Habitat

The coastal morphotype of common bottlenose dolphins is continuously distributed along the Atlantic coast south of Long Island, New York, around the Florida peninsula and into the Gulf of Mexico. Based on differences in mitochondrial DNA haplotype frequencies, coastal animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico and the western North Atlantic represent separate stocks (Rosel et al. 2009; Duffield and Wells 2002). On the Atlantic coast, Scott et al. (1988) hypothesized a single coastal migratory stock ranging seasonally from as far north as Long Island, to as far south as central Florida, citing stranding patterns during a high mortality event in 1987-1988 and observed density patterns. More recent studies demonstrate that the single coastal migratory stock hypothesis is incorrect, and there is instead a complex mosaic of stocks residing in coastal waters of the western North Atlantic (Rosel et al. 2009; McLellan et al. 2003).

The coastal morphotype is morphologically and genetically distinct from the larger, more robust morphotype that occupies habitats further offshore (Hoelzel et al. 1998; Mead and Potter 1995; Rosel et al. 2009). Aerial surveys conducted between 1978 and 1982 (CETAP 1982) north of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, identified two concentrations of bottlenose dolphins, one near the coast within the 25-m isobath and the other offshore of the 50-m isobath and concentrated at the continental shelf edge. The lowest density of bottlenose dolphins was observed over the continental shelf. It was suggested, therefore, that north of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, the coastal morphotype is restricted to waters < 25 m deep (Kenney 1990). Similar patterns were observed during summer months in more recent aerial surveys (Garrison and Yeung 2001; Garrison et al. 2003). However, south of Cape Hatteras during both winter and summer months, there was no clear longitudinal discontinuity in bottlenose dolphin sightings (Garrison and Yeung 2001; Garrison et al. 2003).

To address the question of the distribution of coastal and offshore morphotypes in coastal and continental shelf waters along the Atlantic coast, tissue samples were collected in coastal, shelf and slope waters from New England to Florida between 1997 and 2006. Genetic analyses using mitochondrial DNA sequences of these biopsies identified individual animals to the coastal or offshore morphotype. Using the genetic results from all surveys combined, a logistic regression was used to model the probability that a particular bottlenose dolphin group was of the coastal morphotype as a function of environmental variables including depth, sea surface temperature, and distance from shore. These models were used to partition the bottlenose dolphin groups observed during aerial surveys between the two morphotypes (Garrison et al. 2003).

The genetic results and spatial patterns observed in aerial surveys indicate both regional and seasonal differences in the longitudinal distribution of the two morphotypes in coastal Atlantic waters. During summer months, all biopsy samples collected from coastal waters north of Cape Lookout, North Carolina (< 20 m deep), were of the coastal morphotype, and all samples collected in deeper waters (> 40 m deep) were of the offshore morphotype. South of Cape Lookout, the probability of an observed bottlenose dolphin group being of the coastal morphotype declined with increasing depth. In intermediate depth waters, there was spatial overlap between the two morphotypes. Offshore morphotype bottlenose dolphins were observed at depths as shallow as 13 m, and coastal morphotype dolphins were observed at depths of 31 m and 75 km from shore (Garrison et al. 2003).

Winter samples were collected primarily from coastal waters in North Carolina and Georgia and the vast majority of them were of the coastal morphotype; however, one offshore morphotype group was sampled during November just south of Cape Lookout only 7.3 km from shore. Coastal morphotype samples were also collected farther away from shore at 33 m depth and 39 km from shore. The logistic regression model for this region indicated a decline in the probability of a coastal morphotype group with increasing distance from shore; however, the model predictions were highly uncertain due to limited sample sizes and spatial overlap between the two morphotypes. Samples collected in Georgia waters also indicated significant overlap between the two morphotypes with a declining probability of the coastal morphotype with increasing depth. A coastal morphotype sample was collected 112 km from shore at a depth of 38 m. An offshore sample was collected in 22 m depth at 40 km from shore. As with the North Carolina model, the Georgia logistic regression predictions are uncertain due to limited sample size and high overlap between the two morphotypes (Garrison et al. 2003).

In summary, the primary habitat of the coastal morphotype of bottlenose dolphin extends from Florida to New
Distinction Between Coastal and Estuarine Bottlenose Dolphins

In addition to inhabiting coastal nearshore waters, the coastal morphotype of bottlenose dolphin also inhabits inshore estuarine waters along the U.S. east coast and Gulf of Mexico (Wells et al. 1987; Wells et al. 1996; Scott et al. 1990; Weller 1998; Zolman 2002; Speakman et al. 2006; Stolen et al. 2007; Balmer et al. 2008; Mazzoil et al. 2008). There are multiple lines of evidence supporting demographic separation between bottlenose dolphins residing within estuaries along the Atlantic coast. For example, long-term photo-identification (photo-ID) studies in waters around Charleston, South Carolina, have identified communities of resident dolphins that are seen within relatively restricted home ranges year-round (Zolman 2002; Speakman et al. 2006). In Biscayne Bay, Florida, there is a similar community of bottlenose dolphins with evidence of year-round residents that are genetically distinct from animals residing in a nearby estuary in Florida Bay (Litz et al. 2012). The Indian River Lagoon system in central Florida also has a long-term photo-ID study, and this study identified year-round resident dolphins repeatedly observed across multiple years (Stolen et al. 2007; Mazzoil et al. 2008). A few published studies demonstrate that these resident animals are genetically distinct from animals in nearby coastal waters; a study conducted near Jacksonville, Florida, demonstrated significant genetic differences between animals in coastal and estuarine waters (Caldwell 2001; Rosel et al. 2009) and animals resident in the Charleston Estuarine System show significant genetic differentiation from animals biopsied in coastal waters of southern Georgia (Rosel et al. 2009).

Despite evidence for genetic differentiation between estuarine and coastal populations, the degree of spatial overlap between these populations remains unclear. Photo-ID studies within estuaries demonstrate seasonal immigration and emigration and the presence of transient animals (e.g., Speakman et al. 2006). In addition, the degree of movement of resident estuarine animals into coastal waters on seasonal or shorter time scales is poorly understood. However, for the purposes of stock definition, bottlenose dolphins inhabiting primarily estuarine habitats are considered distinct from those inhabiting coastal habitats.

Definition of the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock

Bottlenose dolphins occur along the North Carolina coast and as far north as Long Island, New York, during summer months (CETAP 1982; Kenney 1990; Garrison et al. 2003). During winter months, bottlenose dolphins are rarely observed in coastal waters north of the North Carolina/Virginia border, and their northern distribution appears to be limited by water temperatures < 9.5°C (Garrison et al. 2003). Seasonal variation in the densities of animals observed off Virginia Beach, Virginia, also indicates the seasonal migration of dolphins northward during summer months and then south during winter (Barco and Swingle 1996).

Initially, a single stock of coastal morphotype bottlenose dolphins was thought to migrate seasonally between New Jersey (summer months) and central Florida based on seasonal patterns of strandings during a large scale mortality event occurring during 1987-1988 (Scott et al. 1988). However, re-analysis of stranding data (McLellan et al. 2003) and extensive analysis of genetic (Rosel et al. 2009), photo-ID (Zolman 2002), and satellite telemetry (Hohn and Hansen, NMFS unpublished data) data demonstrate a complex mosaic of coastal bottlenose dolphin stocks. Integrated analysis of these multiple lines of evidence suggests that there are 5 coastal stocks of bottlenose dolphins: Northern Migratory and Southern Migratory Coastal Stocks, a South Carolina/Georgia Coastal Stock, a Northern Florida Coastal Stock and a Central Florida Coastal Stock.

Among the coastal stocks, the migratory movements and spatial distribution of the Northern Migratory Stock are the best understood based on aerial survey data, tag-telemetry studies, photo-ID data and genetic studies.

Four dolphins tagged during 2003 and 2004 off the coast of New Jersey in late summer moved south to North Carolina and inhabited waters near and just south of Cape Hatteras during winter months. These animals then moved north to New Jersey again during the following summer (Hohn and Hansen, NMFS unpublished data). Similarly, a dolphin tagged in 1998 off Virginia Beach, Virginia, during the fall occupied the area between Cape Hatteras and Cape Lookout during winter months (NMFS 2001). There is no evidence suggesting that this animal moved farther south than Cape Lookout during winter months (NMFS 2001). In addition, there are no matches in long term photo-ID studies between sites in New Jersey and those south of Cape Hatteras (Urian et al. 1999; NMFS 2001).

Genetic analyses using mitochondrial and nuclear microsatellite data also indicated significant differentiation between bottlenose dolphins occupying coastal waters from the North Carolina/Virginia border to New Jersey during summer months and those in southern North Carolina and further south (Charleston, South Carolina, coastal Georgia and Jacksonville, Florida). One exception was the comparison using the microsatellite data of animals from Virginia and north to those in southern North Carolina (NMFS 2001; Rosel et al. 2009). This finding is thought to
be a result of some degree of seasonal spatial overlap between the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock and other stocks occupying coastal waters of North Carolina (Rosel et al. 2009) because some of the samples were collected in southern North Carolina during the winter when multiple stocks are thought to be present.

Toth et al. (2012) suggested the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock may be further partitioned in waters off of New Jersey. They identified two clusters of sightings that differed in presence of *Xenobalanus*, avoidance behavior and "base coloration". One cluster inhabited waters 0-1.9 km from shore while the other cluster inhabited waters 1.9-6 km from shore. Additional studies are needed to determine whether this apparent partitioning has a genetic basis.

Spatial and temporal overlap of the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock with other stocks is likely. During summer months, overlap with the Southern Migratory Stock in coastal waters of northern North Carolina and Virginia is possible, but the degree of overlap is unknown. During winter months, the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock moves southward to waters from Cape Lookout, North Carolina, to north of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, based upon tag-telemetry studies. The stock overlaps spatially with the NNCES Stock during this period. These complex seasonal spatial movements and the overlap of coastal and estuarine stocks in the waters of North Carolina greatly limit the ability to fully assess the mortality of each of these stocks.

In summary, spatial distribution data, tag-telemetry studies, photo-ID studies and genetic studies demonstrate the existence of a distinct Northern Migratory Stock of coastal bottlenose dolphins. During summer months (July-August), this stock occupies coastal waters from the shoreline to approximately the 25-m isobath between the Chesapeake Bay mouth and Long Island, New York (Figure 1). During winter months (January-March), the stock occupies coastal waters from Cape Lookout, North Carolina, to the North Carolina/Virginia border.

**Figure 1.** The summer (July-August) distribution of bottlenose dolphin stocks occupying coastal waters from North Carolina to New Jersey. Locations are shown from aerial surveys. Sightings assigned to the Northern Migratory stock are shown with filled symbols.
The best available estimate for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock of bottlenose dolphins in the western North Atlantic is 11,548 (CV=0.36; Table 1). This estimate is from aerial surveys conducted during the summers of 2010 and 2011 covering waters from Florida to New Jersey.

Earlier abundance estimates

Earlier abundance estimates for the Northern Migratory Coastal stock were derived from aerial surveys conducted during the summer of 2002. Survey tracklines were set perpendicular to the shoreline and included coastal waters to depths of 40 m. These surveys employed two observer teams operating independently on the same aircraft to estimate visibility bias. 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. Observed bottlenose dolphin groups from these were partitioned between the coastal and offshore morphotypes based upon analysis of available biopsy samples (Garrison et al. 2003). For the region north of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina, there was complete separation between the coastal and offshore morphotypes, with only coastal animals occupying waters < 20 m deep. Therefore, all animals observed in the 0-20 m depth stratum during surveys of this region were assigned to the coastal morphotype (Garrison et al. 2003).

Summer surveys are best for estimating the abundance for both the Northern and Southern Migratory Coastal Stocks since they overlap least with other stocks during summer months. An analysis of summer survey data from 1995, 2002 and 2004 demonstrated strong inter-annual variation in the spatial distribution of presumed Southern Migratory and Northern Migratory Coastal Stock animals. Two groups of dolphins in each survey year were identified using a multivariate cluster analysis of sightings based on water temperature, depth and latitude. One group ranged from Cape Lookout, North Carolina, to just north of the Chesapeake Bay mouth, and one ranged farther north along the eastern shore of Virginia to New Jersey. The southern group (i.e., the Southern Migratory Coastal Stock) was found in water temperatures between 26.5 and 28.0°C, and the northern group (i.e., the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock) occurred in cooler waters between 24.5 and 26.0°C. The spatial distribution of these groups was strongly correlated with water temperatures and varied between years. During the summer of 2004, water temperatures were significantly cooler than those during 2002, and animals from both groups were distributed farther south and overlapped spatially. Very few bottlenose dolphins were observed in waters north of Virginia during the summer 2004 survey. Therefore, it was not possible to develop an estimate of abundance for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock from the summer 2004 survey and so the best abundance estimate for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock came from the summer 2002 survey when there was little overlap and an apparent separation from the Southern Migratory Coastal Stock at approximately 37.5°N latitude. The resulting abundance estimate for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock was 9,604 (CV=0.36).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

The Southeast Fisheries Science Center conducted aerial surveys of continental shelf waters along the U.S. East Coast from southeastern Florida to Cape May, New Jersey, during the summers of 2010 and 2011. The surveys were conducted along tracklines oriented perpendicular to the shoreline that were latitudinally spaced 20 km apart and covered waters from the shoreline to the continental shelf break. The summer 2010 survey was conducted during 24 July–14 August 2010, and 7,944 km of on-effort tracklines completed. A total of 127 bottlenose dolphin groups were observed including 1,541 animals. During the 2011 summer survey, 8,665 km of trackline were completed between Cape May, New Jersey and Ft. Pierce, Florida. The survey was conducted during 6 July - 29 July 2011. The 2011 survey also included more closely spaced “fine-scale” tracklines in waters offshore of New Jersey and Virginia within areas being evaluated for the placement of offshore energy installations. A total of 112 bottlenose dolphin groups were sighted including 1,339 animals.

Both the summer 2010 and 2011 surveys were conducted using a two-team approach to develop estimates of visibility bias using the independent observer approach with Distance analysis (Laake and Borchers 2004). However, the detection functions from both surveys indicated a decreased probability of detection near the trackline, which limited the effectiveness of the method for correcting for visibility bias due to a relatively small number of sightings made by both teams near the trackline. Abundance estimates were therefore derived by combining the sightings from both teams during a survey and “left-truncating” the data by analyzing only sightings occurring greater than 100 m from the trackline during the 2010 survey and 50 m during the 2011 survey (see Buckland et al. 2001 for left-truncation methodology). Detection functions were fit to these left-truncated data accounting for the effects of survey conditions (e.g., sea state, glare, water color) on the detection probabilities. A bootstrap resampling approach was used to estimate the variance of the estimates. The resulting abundance estimates assume that
detection probability at the truncation distance is equal to 1. While the estimates could not be explicitly corrected for this assumption, analyses of the summer 2010 data suggest that this bias is likely small.

The abundance estimates for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock were based upon tracklines and sightings occurring north of 37.5°N latitude and in waters from the shoreline to the 20-m isobath. Prior analyses suggested that this latitudinal boundary separates the Northern and Southern Migratory Coastal Stocks. The abundance estimate derived from the summer 2010 survey was 12,602 (CV=0.76), and the estimate from the summer 2011 survey was 11,044 (CV=0.36). The best estimate is a weighted average of these two with higher weighting given to the more precise estimate from 2011. The resulting best estimate is 11,548 (CV=0.36).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>N_{best}</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July-August 2002</td>
<td>Virginia to New Jersey</td>
<td>9,604</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-August 2010</td>
<td>Virginia to New Jersey</td>
<td>11,548</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum Population Estimate
The minimum population size (N_{min}) was calculated as the lower bound of the 60% confidence interval for a lognormally distributed mean (Wade and Angliss 1997). The best estimate for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock of bottlenose dolphins is 11,548 (CV=0.36). The resulting minimum population estimate is 8,620.

Current Population Trend
There are limited data available to assess population trends for this stock. The estimates from the 2002 and 2010/2011 surveys are not significantly different from each other; however, it should be noted that the relatively large CVs limit the power to detect significant differences. The statistical power to detect a trend in abundance for this species is poor due to the relatively imprecise estimates and long survey interval. For example, the power to detect a precipitous decline (i.e., 50% decrease in 15 years) in abundance with estimates of low precision (e.g., CV > 0.30) remains below 80% (alpha = 0.30) unless surveys are conducted on an annual basis (Taylor et al. 2007).

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES
Current and maximum net productivity rates are not known for the Northern Migratory Coastal 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 Northern Migratory Coastal Stock of bottlenose dolphins is 8,620. 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 depleted. PBR for this stock of bottlenose dolphins is 86.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY
The total estimated average annual fishery mortality of the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock ranges between a minimum of 3.8 and a maximum of 5.8 animals per year. This range reflects the uncertainty in assigning observed or reported mortalities to a particular stock.
NMFS updated its serious injury designation and reporting process, which uses guidance from previous serious injury workshops, expert opinion, and analysis of historic injury cases to develop new criteria for distinguishing serious from non-serious injury (Angliss and DeMaster 1998; Andersen et al. 2008; NOAA 2012). NMFS defines serious injury as an “injury that is more likely than not to result in mortality”. Injury determinations for stock assessments revised in 2013 or later incorporate the new serious injury guidelines, based on the most recent 5-year period for which data are available.

Fishery Information
This stock has the potential to interact with the following Category I and II fisheries: (1) mid-Atlantic gillnet; (2) Virginia pound net; (3) mid-Atlantic menhaden; (4) Atlantic blue crab trap/pot, and (5) mid-Atlantic beach/haul seine. There is also the potential for this stock to interact with the Category III Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean commercial passenger fishing vessel fishery. The primary known source of fishery mortality is the mid-Atlantic coastal gillnet fishery, which has the potential to affect the Northern Migratory Coastal, Southern Migratory Coastal, NNCES and Southern North Carolina Estuarine System (SNCES) Stocks of bottlenose dolphin. At certain times of year, it is not possible to definitively assign mortalities observed in that fishery to a specific stock because of the overlap amongst the 4 stocks around North Carolina. Additional fishery interactions have been reported in Virginia pound nets, beach-based gillnet gear, blue crab or other pot gear, and Atlantic Ocean commercial passenger fishing vessel (hook and line) gear. However, these additional fisheries have limited or no systematic federal observer coverage, which prevents the estimation of total takes. Therefore, the total average annual mortality estimate is a lower bound of the actual annual human-caused mortality for each stock. Detailed fishery information is presented in Appendix III.

Earlier Interactions
The Atlantic menhaden purse seine fishery historically reported an annual incidental take of 1 to 5 bottlenose dolphins (NMFS 1991, pp. 5-73). This information has not been updated for some time. There has been very limited observer coverage since 2008, but no takes have been observed (see Appendix III).

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 in North Carolina and Virginia. Because the Northern Migratory, Southern Migratory, NNCES and SNCES 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).
Table 1. Summary of the 2002-2008 incidental mortality of bottlenose dolphins (Tursiops truncatus truncatus) in the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock in the commercial mid-Atlantic 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, VMRC landings and NCDMF dealer data. Values in parentheses indicated the CV of the estimate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Observer Coverage</th>
<th>Min Annual Ratio</th>
<th>Min Pooled Ratio</th>
<th>Min GLM</th>
<th>Max Annual Ratio</th>
<th>Max Pooled Ratio</th>
<th>Max GLM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-BDTRP</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan-Apr 2006</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Avg. pre-BDTRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum: 4.78 (CV=0.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum: 6.38 (CV=0.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-BDTRP</td>
<td>May-Dec 2006</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Avg. post-BDTRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum: 5.27 (CV=0.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum: 6.02 (CV=0.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the period of 2002-2008, there were no observed mortalities in the mid-Atlantic gillnet fishery that could potentially be assigned to the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock. Hence, both the annual and pooled ratio estimators of bycatch rate were equal to zero in both the pre-BDTRP and post-BDTRP periods. Since the GLM approach includes information from prior to 2002, positive bycatch rates for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock were estimated (Table 1). 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 of the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock are presented for comparison to PBR (Table 1).

Based upon these analyses, the minimum mortality estimate for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock for the pre-BDTRP period was 4.78 (CV=0.17) animals per year, and that for the post-BDTRP period was 5.27 (CV=0.19) animals per year. The maximum estimates were 6.38 (CV=0.15) for the pre-BDTRP period and 6.02 (CV=0.19) for the post-BDTRP period (Table 1).

During the last five years (2007-2011), no bottlenose dolphin takes were observed by the Northeast Fishery Observer Program (NEFOP) attributable to the mid-Atlantic gillnet fishery. NEFOP observer coverage (measured in
trips) for this fishery from 2007-2011 was less than 1% in internal waters (bays, sounds, estuaries), 2.74% in state waters (0-3 miles) and 6.30% in federal waters (3-200 miles). These low levels of coverage are likely insufficient to detect bycatch of bottlenose dolphins in the mid-Atlantic commercial gillnet fishery. Due to a lack of observed takes, no new estimates of mortality in this fishery could not be generated, as indicated by the “no estimate” in Table 2 for years 2009-2011. However, serious injury and mortality from this fishery are still occurring based on other documented interactions (see Table 2). Specifically, in 2009, there was 1 observed take by the Southeast Fishery Observer Program in small-mesh gillnet gear off North Carolina targeting Spanish mackerel. This animal likely belonged to either the Northern or Southern Migratory Coastal Stock. Stranding data also documented 2 dolphin mortalities recovered with gillnet gear attached that likely belonged to the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock: (1) in 2008 in Virginia, a dead dolphin was recovered entangled in a gillnet; (2) in 2010 in Delaware, a dead dolphin was recovered with its flukes entangled in monkfish gillnet gear. These 2 mortalities were included in the stranding database and the stranding totals presented in Table 3. The documented interactions in commercial gear represent a minimum known count of interactions with this fishery in the last 5 years, absent sufficient observer coverage to generate mortality estimates (see Table 2).

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

Two coastal bottlenose dolphin takes were observed in beach-anchored gillnets: 1 in May 1998 and 1 in December 2000. The May 1998 take occurred while using a small mesh net targeting weakfish, and the December 2000 take occurred during a striped bass fishery. Both of these takes occurred 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 and has been monitored by the observer program. Data from the Southeast Region Stranding Network from 2002-2008 include 1 confirmed report of a bottlenose dolphin mortality in beach-based gillnet gear for striped bass during January 2008 off the coast of northern North Carolina. A second 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 Coastal Stock. In 2007, one dolphin was killed in a multifilament beach seine during a state fishery research project that may belong to either the Northern Migratory or Southern Migratory Coastal Stock. Finally, in 2008, through the Marine Mammal Authorization Program, there was one self-reported bottlenose dolphin mortality in a beach seine/beach-anchored gillnet in North Carolina that likely belonged to the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock.

**Crab Pots and Other Pots**

During 2007-2011, there was 1 report of a bottlenose dolphin from the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock disentangled and released alive from trap/pot gear. The disentanglement and release occurred off New Jersey in 2007. 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, based on stranding data, 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).

**Virginia Pound Nets**

Historical and recent stranding network data report interactions between bottlenose dolphins and pound nets in Virginia. During 2007-2011, 5 bottlenose dolphin strandings, which could have belonged to the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock, were entangled in pound net gear in Virginia (Northeast Regional Marine Mammal Stranding Network; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 9 November 2012). An additional 17 dolphins that could have belonged to the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock stranded with twisted twine markings indicative of interactions with pound net gear. These interactions occurred primarily inside estuarine waters near the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay and in summer months.

**Hook and Line Fisheries**

During 2007-2011, 3 dolphin mortalities that could have belonged to the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock were documented as interacting with hook and/or line gear. During 2007 in New Jersey, 1 dolphin was documented with ingested hook and line gear. In 2008 in Virginia, a dolphin that could have belonged to this stock, the Southern Migratory Coastal Stock or the NNCES Stock, was documented entangled in hook and line gear. In 2009 in New Jersey, 1 dolphin was documented with ingested hook and line gear. These mortalities were included in the stranding database and are included in the stranding totals presented in Table 3.
Other Mortality

There have been occasional mortalities of bottlenose dolphins during research activities including both directed live capture studies, turtle relocation trawls, and fisheries surveys. As mentioned above, 1 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 Coastal Stock or the Southern Migratory Coastal Stock. This animal was included in the stranding database (see Table 3). All mortalities from known sources including commercial fisheries and research related mortalities for the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock are summarized in Table 2.

The coastal and estuarine habitats occupied by the coastal morphotype are adjacent to areas of high human population and some are highly industrialized. The blubber of stranded dolphins examined during the 1987-1988 mortality event contained very high concentrations of organic pollutants (Kuehl et al. 1991). More recent studies have examined persistent organic pollutant concentrations in bottlenose dolphin tissues from several estuaries along the Atlantic coast and have likewise found evidence of high blubber concentrations particularly in estuaries near Charleston, South Carolina, and Beaufort, North Carolina (Hansen et al. 2004), and in portions of Biscayne Bay, Florida (Litz et al. 2007). The concentrations found in male dolphins from both of these sites exceeded toxic threshold values that may result in adverse effects on health or reproductive rates (Schwacke et al. 2002; Hansen et al. 2004). Studies of contaminant concentrations relative to life history parameters showed higher levels of mortality in first-born offspring and higher contaminant concentrations in these calves and in primiparous females (Wells et al. 2005). While there are no direct measurements of adverse effects of pollutants on estuarine dolphins and little study of contaminant loads in migrating coastal dolphins, the exposure to environmental pollutants and subsequent effects on population health is an area of concern and active research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mid-Atlantic Gillnet (stranding and observed)</th>
<th>Virginia Pound Net (stranding data)</th>
<th>Beach-based Gillnet Gear (strandings)</th>
<th>Blue Crab Pot (strandings)</th>
<th>Other Pot (strandings)</th>
<th>Hook and Line (strandings)</th>
<th>Research (incidental takes)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Min = 6.9 Max = 8.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Min = 0 Max = 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Min = 0 Max = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Min = 6.3 Max = 6.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Min = 0 Max = 1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>No estimate</td>
<td>Min = 0 Max = 1</td>
<td>Min = 0 Max = 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>No estimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>No estimate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Min = 0 Max = 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Average Mortality (2007-2011) Minimum Estimated = 3.8 Maximum Estimated ≥ 5.8
Strandings

Between 2007 and 2011, 548 bottlenose dolphins that could be assigned to the Northern Migratory Stock stranded along the Atlantic coast between North Carolina and New York (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 13 September 2012 (SER) and 9 November 2012 (NER)). It was not possible to determine whether there was evidence of human interaction (HI) for 348 of these strandings, and for 123 it was determined there was no evidence of HI. The remaining 77 showed evidence of HI, of which 61 (79%) were fisheries interactions (Table 3). It should be recognized that evidence of HI 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.

The assignment of animals to a particular stock is impossible in some seasons and regions, particularly in North Carolina, Virginia and Maryland. Therefore, it is likely that the counts below include some animals from either the Southern Migratory Coastal or NNCES Stocks. Therefore, the counts below include an unknown number of animals from the Southern Migratory Coastal and NNCES Stocks, and some of the strandings below were also included in the counts for the Southern Migratory Coastal and NNCES Stocks. 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.

Table 3. Strandings of bottlenose dolphins from North Carolina to Maine during 2007-2011 that can possibly be assigned to the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock. Assignments to stock were based upon the understanding of the seasonal movements of this stock. However, in waters of North Carolina and Virginia there is likely overlap with other stocks during particular times of year. 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 13 September 2012 (SER) and 9 November 2012 (NER).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;s&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strandings for North Carolina include data for November-April north of Cape Lookout when Northern Migratory animals may be in coastal waters. The stock identity of these strandings is highly uncertain and likely also includes animals from the NNCES Stock.

Includes 3 fisheries interactions (FI) and 1 incidental take in a research beach seine.

Includes 3 FI, 1 of which was also mutilated. One FI was taken in a beach seine for striped bass.

Includes 1 FI.

Includes 4 FIs.

Includes 5 FIs and 1 mutilation.

Strandings from Virginia were assigned to stock based upon both location and time of year. Some of the strandings assigned to the Northern Migratory Stock could possibly be assigned to the Southern Migratory Coastal Stock or NNCES Stock.

Includes 5 FI, 2 of which were animals (mortalities) entangled in VA pound nets.

Includes 7 FI and 2 mutilations. One FI was an animal (mortality) entangled in hook and line gear, and 1 FI was an animal (mortality) entangled in gillnet gear.

Includes 9 FI, 2 of which were animals (mortalities) entangled in VA pound nets.

Includes 7 FIs.

Includes 6 FIs, 1 of which was also a mutilation. One FI was an animal (mortality) entangled in a VA pound net.

Includes 1 boat strike.

Includes 1 FI.

Includes 1 FI and 1 mutilation.

Includes 1 boat strike.

Includes 2 FIs and 1 boat strike. One of the FIs was an animal (mortality) entangled in monkfish gillnet.

Includes 2 boat strikes.

Includes 3 FIs, 1 of which was disentangled and released alive from trap/pot gear. One FI was an animal (mortality) that had ingested hook and line gear.

Includes 3 FIs. One FI was an animal (mortality) that had ingested hook and line gear.

Includes 1 FI.

Includes 1 FI.

Includes 1 FI and 1 mutilation.

Includes 1 boat strike.

Includes 2 FIs and 1 boat strike. One of the FIs was an animal (mortality) entangled in trap/pot gear. One FI was an animal (mortality) that had ingested hook and line gear.

Includes 3 FIs. One FI was an animal (mortality) that had ingested hook and line gear.

Includes 1 FI.

STATUS OF STOCK

Bottlenose dolphins are not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, but the Northern Migratory Coastal Stock is a strategic stock due to the depleted listing under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. From 1995 to 2001, NMFS recognized only a single stock of coastal bottlenose dolphins in the WNA, and the entire stock was listed as depleted. This stock structure was revised in 2002 to recognize both multiple stocks and seasonal management units and again in 2008 and 2009 to recognize resident estuarine stocks and migratory and resident coastal stocks. This stock retains the depleted designation as a result of its origins from the original western North Atlantic Coastal Stock. PBR for the Northern Migratory Stock is 86 and so the zero mortality rate goal, 10% of PBR, is 8.6. The documented annual average human-caused mortality for this stock for 2007 – 2011 ranges between a minimum of 3.8 and a maximum of 5.8. However, the total U.S. human-caused mortality and serious injury for the Northern Migratory Stock cannot be directly estimated because of the spatial overlap among the stocks of bottlenose dolphins that occupy waters of North Carolina and Virginia. In addition, there are several commercial fisheries operating within this stock’s boundaries, but these have little to no observer coverage and so the documented mortalities must be considered minimum estimates of total fishery-related mortality. The total fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is therefore unlikely to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR, and thus cannot be considered to be insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate. The status of this stock relative to OSP is unknown. There are insufficient data to determine population trends for this stock.
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