BLAINVILLE'S BEAKED WHALE (*Mesoplodon densirostris*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

-Three species of *Mesoplodon* are known to occur in the Gulf of Mexico, based on stranding or sighting data (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Würsig *et al.* 2000). These are Blainville's beaked whale (*M. densirostris*), Gervais' beaked whale (*M. europaeus*) and Sowerby's beaked whale (*M. bidens*). Sowerby's beaked whale in the Gulf of Mexico is considered extralimital because there is only 1 known stranding of this species (Bonde and O'Shea 1989) and because it normally occurs in northern temperate waters of the North Atlantic (Mead 1989). Identification of *Mesoplodon* to species in the Gulf of Mexico is very difficult, and in many cases, *Mesoplodon* and Cuvier's beaked whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) cannot be distinguished; therefore, sightings of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) are identified as *Mesoplodon* sp., Cuvier's beaked whale, or unidentified Ziphiidae.

Blainville's beaked whales appear to be widely but sparsely distributed in temperate and tropical waters of the world's oceans (Leatherwood *et al.* 1976; Leatherwood and Reeves 1983). Strandings have occurred along the northwestern Atlantic coast from Florida to Nova Scotia (Schmidly 1981), and there have been 4 documented strandings and 2 sightings of this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Würsig *et al.* 2000). Beaked whales were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico from 1992 to 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). Beaked whale sightings made during spring and summer vessel surveys have been widely distributed in waters >500 m deep (Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006; Figure 1).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The total number of Blainville's beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. The best available abundance estimate is for *Mesoplodon* spp., and is a combined estimate for Blainville's beaked whale and Gervais' beaked whale. The estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. in oceanic waters, using data pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys, is 57 (CV=1.40) (Mullin 2007; Table 1).



Figure 1. *Distribution of beaked whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100m and 1,000m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). -Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline.

Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of undifferentiated beaked whales (*Mesoplodon* spp. and unidentified Ziphiidae) for all surveys combined was 117 (CV=0.38) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Hansen *et al.* (1995) did not estimate the abundance of *Mesoplodon* spp.

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 106 (CV=0.41) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1). This was a combined estimate for Gervais' beaked whale and Blainville's beaked whale. The estimate for the same time period for unidentified Ziphiidae was 146 (CV=0.46) which may also include an unknown number of Cuvier's beaked whales.

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 57 (CV=1.40) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for these species in the northern Gulf of Mexico. This is a combined estimate for Blainville's beaked whale and Gervais' beaked whale. The estimate for the same time period for unidentified Ziphiidae was 337 (CV=0.40), which may also include an unknown number of Cuvier's beaked whales.

Table 1. Summary of recent abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico *Mesoplodon* spp., which is a combined estimate for Blainville's beaked whale and Gervais' beaked whale. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	106	0.41
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	57	1.40

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. is 57 (CV=1.40). The minimum population estimate for *Mesoplodon* spp. in the northern Gulf of Mexico is 24.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species due to uncertainty in species identification at sea. The pooled abundance estimate for *Mesoplodon* spp. for 2003-2004 of 57 (CV=1.40) and that for 1996-2001 of 106 (CV=0.41) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of *Mesoplodon* abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size for *Mesoplodon* spp. is 24. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico *Mesoplodon* spp. is 0.2. It is not possible to determine the PBR for only Blainville's beaked whales.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a beaked whale during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2007 there was 1 unidentified beaked whale released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to Blainville's or other beaked whales by this fishery. However, during 2007, 1 unidentified beaked whale was observed entangled and released alive in the northern Gulf of Mexico. All gear was removed and the animal was presumed to have no serious injuries (Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Other Mortality

There were no strandings of *Mesoplodon* spp. or unidentified beaked whales during 2004-200~~6~~7. There were 2 reported stranding events of beaked whales in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-2003. Two unidentified beaked whales mass stranded in Florida in December 1999, and 1 unidentified *Mesoplodon* stranded in Florida in January 2003. ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

In 1992, with the enactment of the Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Act, the Working Group on Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Events was created to determine when an unusual mortality event (UME) is occurring, and then to direct responses to such events. Since 1992, 8 UMEs have been declared in the Gulf of Mexico, and 1 of these included Blainville's beaked whales. Between August 1999 and May 2000, 1~~5~~62 bottlenose dolphins died coincident with *Karenia~~.~~ brevis* blooms and fish kills in the Florida Panhandle. Additional strandings included 3 Atlantic spotted dolphins, *Stenella frontalis*, 1 Risso's dolphin, *Grampus griseus*, 2 Blainville's beaked whales, and 4 unidentified dolphins.

Several unusual mass strandings of beaked whales in North Atlantic marine environments have been associated with military naval activities. During the mid- to late 1980's multiple mass strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales (4 to about 20 per event) and small numbers of Gervais' beaked whales and Blainville's beaked whales occurred in the Canary Islands (Simmonds and Lopez-Jurado 1991). Twelve Cuvier's beaked whales that live stranded and subsequently died in the Mediterranean Sea on 12-13 May 1996 were associated with low frequency acoustic sonar tests conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Frantzis 1998). In March 2000, 14 beaked whales live stranded in the Bahamas; 6 beaked whales (5 Cuvier's and 1 Blainville's) died (Balcomb and Claridge 2001; Evans and England 2001; Cox *et al.* 2006). Four Cuvier's, 2 Blainville's and 2 unidentified beaked whales were returned to sea. The fate of the animals returned to sea is unknown. Necropsies were performed on 5 of the dead beaked whales and revealed evidence of tissue trauma associated with an acoustic or impulse injury that caused the animals to strand. Subsequently, the animals died due to extreme physiologic stress associated with the physical stranding (i.e., hyperthermia, high endogenous catecholamine release) (Evans and England 2001; Cox *et al.* 2006).

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Blainville's beaked whales or other beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The t~~Total ~~level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery~~human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is ~~un~~not known but none has been documented~~, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate~~. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

Disturbance by anthropogenic noise may prove to be an important habitat issue in some areas of this population's range, notably in areas of oil and gas activities or where shipping or naval activities are high. Limited studies are currently being conducted to address this issue and its impact, if any, on this and other marine species.

REFERENCES CITED

Balcomb, K.C.I. and D.E. Claridge 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. Bahamas J. Sci. 2: 2-12.

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.

Bonde, R.K. and T.J. O'Shea 1989. Sowerby's beaked whale (*Mesoplodon bidens*) in the Gulf of Mexico. J. Mamm. 70: 447-449.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G.D. Spain, A. Fernandez, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hilderbrand, D. Houser, T. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. MacLeod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D. Moutain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Mead and L. Benner 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 7(3): 177-187.

Evans, D.L. and G.R. England 2001. Joint interim report - Bahamas Marine Mammal Stranding - event of 15-16 March 2000. U.S. Department of Commerce; Secretary of the Navy, vi + 59 pp. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/acoustics/acoustics_reports.htm

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? Nature 392: 29.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S., D.K. Caldwell and H.E. Winn 1976. Whales, dolphins, and porpoises of the western North Atlantic. A guide to their identification. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS Circ. 396. 176 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San

Francisco. 302 pp.
Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.
Mead, J.G. 1989. Beaked whales of the genus *Mesoplodon*. Pages 349-430 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River Dolphins and toothed whales. Academic press, San Diego.
Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.
Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.
Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.
Schmidly, D.J. 1981. Marine mammals of the southeastern United States and the Gulf of Mexico. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, DC. FWS/OBS-80/41. 165 pp.
Simmonds, M.P. and L.F. Lopez-Jurado 1991. Whales and the military. Nature: 351:448.
Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.
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.
Würsig, B., T.A. Jefferson and D.J. Schmidly 2000. The marine mammals of the Gulf of Mexico. Texas A&M University Press, College Station.
Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.
Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Bay, Sound, and Estuarine Stocks

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Bottlenose dolphins are distributed throughout the bays, sounds and estuaries of the Gulf of Mexico (Mullin 1988). The identification of biologically-meaningful "stocks" of bottlenose dolphins in these waters is complicated by the high degree of behavioral variability exhibited by this species (Shane *et al.* 1986; Wells and Scott 1999; Wells 2003), and by the lack of requisite information for much of the region.

Distinct stocks are provisionally identified in each of 33 areas of contiguous, enclosed or semi-enclosed bodies of water adjacent to the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) (Table 1, based on descriptions of relatively discrete dolphin "communities" in some of these areas). A "community" includes resident dolphins that regularly share large portions of their ranges, exhibit similar distinct genetic profiles, and interact with each other to a much greater extent than with dolphins in adjacent waters. The term, as adapted from Wells *et al.*(1987), emphasizes geographic, genetic and social relationships of dolphins. Bottlenose dolphin communities do not constitute closed demographic populations, as individuals from adjacent communities are known to interbreed. Nevertheless, the geographic nature of these areas and long-term, multi-generational stability of residency patterns suggest that many of these communities exist as functioning units of their ecosystems, and under the Marine Mammal Protection Act must be maintained as such. Also, the stable patterns of residency observed within communities suggest that long periods would be required to repopulate the home range of a community were it eradicated or severely depleted. Thus, in the absence of information supporting management on a larger scale, it is appropriate to adopt a risk-averse approach and focus management efforts at the level of the community rather than at some larger demographic scale. Biological support for this risk-averse approach derives from several sources. Long-term (year-round, multi-year) residency by at least some individuals has been reported from nearly every site where photographic identification or tagging studies have been conducted in the Gulf of Mexico. In Texas, some of the dolphins in the Matagorda-Espiritu Santo Bay area (Gruber 1981; Lynn and Würsig 2002), Aransas Pass (Shane 1977; Weller 1998), San Luis Pass (Maze and Würsig 1999; Irwin and Würsig 2004), and Galveston Bay (Bräger 1993; Bräger *et al.* 1994; Fertl 1994) have been reported as long-term residents. Hubard *et al.*(2004) reported sightings of dolphins tagged 12-15 years previously in Mississippi Sound. In Florida, long-term residency has been reported from Choctawhatchee Bay (1989-1993), Tampa Bay (Wells 1986a; Wells *et al.* 1996b), Sarasota Bay (Irvine and Wells 1972; Irvine *et al.* 1981; Wells 1986a; Wells *et al.* 1987; Scott *et al.* 1990; Wells 1991; 2003), Lemon Bay (Wells *et al.* 1996a) and Charlotte Harbor/Pine Island Sound (Shane 1990; Wells *et al.* 1996a; Wells *et al.* 1997; Shane 2004). In Louisiana, Miller (2003) concluded the bottlenose dolphin population in the Barataria Basin was relatively closed. In many cases, residents emphasize use of the bay, sound or estuary waters, with limited movements through passes to the Gulf of Mexico (Shane 1977; Gruber 1981; Irvine *et al.* 1981; Shane 1990; Maze and Würsig 1999; Lynn and Würsig 2002; Fazioli *et al.* 2006) 1977, 1990; Gruber 1981; Irvine *et al.* 1981; Maze and Würsig 1999; Lynn and Würsig 2002; Fazioli *et al.* 2006). These habitat use patterns are reflected in the ecology of the dolphins in some areas; for example, residents of Sarasota Bay, Florida, lacked squid in their diet, unlike non-resident dolphins stranded on nearby Gulf beaches (Barros and Wells 1998).

Genetic data also support the concept of relatively discrete bay, sound and estuary stocks. Analyses of mitochondrial DNA haplotype distributions indicate the existence of clinal variations along the Gulf of Mexico coastline (Duffield and Wells 2002). Differences in reproductive seasonality from site to site also suggest genetic-based distinctions between communities (Urian *et al.* 1996). Mitochondrial DNA analyses suggest finer-scale structural levels as well. For example, Matagorda Bay, Texas, dolphins appear to be a localized population, and differences in haplotype frequencies distinguish between adjacent communities in Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay and Charlotte Harbor/Pine Island Sound, along the central west coast of Florida (Duffield and Wells 1991; 2002). Examination of protein electrophoretic data resulted in similar conclusions for the Florida dolphins (Duffield and Wells 1986). Additionally, Sellas *et al.* (2005) examined population subdivision among Sarasota Bay, Tampa Bay, Charlotte Harbor, Matagorda Bay, and the coastal Gulf of Mexico (1-12 km offshore) from just outside Tampa Bay to the south end of Lemon Bay, and found evidence of significant population structure among all areas on the basis of both mitochondrial DNA control region sequence data and 9 nuclear microsatellite loci. The Sellas *et al.* (2005) findings support the separate identification of bay, sound and estuarine communities from those occurring in adjacent Gulf coastal waters.

The long-term structure and stability of at least some of these communities is exemplified by the residents of Sarasota Bay, Florida. This community has been observed since 1970 (Irvine and Wells 1972; Scott *et al.* 1990; Wells 1991). At least 5 generations of identifiable residents currently inhabit the region, including one-third of those first identified in 1970. Maximum immigration and emigration rates of about 2-3% have been estimated (Wells and Scott 1990).

Genetic exchange occurs between resident communities; hence the application of the demographically and behaviorally-based term "community" rather than "population" (Wells 1986a; Sellas *et al.* 2005). Some of the calves in

Sarasota Bay apparently have been sired by non-residents (Duffield and Wells 2002). A variety of potential exchange mechanisms occur in the Gulf. Small numbers of inshore dolphins traveling between regions have been reported, with patterns ranging from traveling through adjacent communities (Wells 1986b; Wells *et al.* 1996a; Wells *et al.* 1996b) to movements over distances of several hundred km in Texas waters (Gruber 1981; Lynn and Würsig 2002). In many areas year-round residents co-occur with non-resident dolphins, providing potential opportunities for genetic exchange. About 17% of group sightings involving resident Sarasota Bay dolphins include at least 1 non-resident as well (Wells *et al.* 1987). Similar mixing of inshore residents and non-residents is seen off San Luis Pass, Texas (Maze and Würsig 1999), and Pine Island Sound, Florida (Shane 2004). Non-residents exhibit a variety of patterns, ranging from apparent nomadism recorded as transience in a given area, to apparent seasonal or non-seasonal migrations. Passes, especially the mouths of the larger estuaries, serve as mixing areas. For example, several communities mix at the mouth of Tampa Bay, Florida (Wells 1986a), and most of the dolphins identified in the mouths of Galveston Bay and Aransas Pass, Texas, were considered transients (Henningsen 1991; Bräger 1993; Weller 1998).

Seasonal movements of dolphins into and out of some of the bays, sounds and estuaries provide additional opportunities for genetic exchange with residents, and complicate the identification of stocks in coastal and inshore waters. In small bay systems such as Sarasota Bay, Florida, and San Luis Pass, Texas, residents move into Gulf coastal waters in fall/winter, and return inshore in spring/summer (Irvine *et al.* 1981; Maze and Würsig 1999). In larger bay systems, seasonal changes in abundance suggest possible migrations, with increases in more northerly bay systems in summer, and in more southerly systems in winter. Fall/winter increases in abundance have been noted for Tampa Bay (Scott *et al.* 1989) and Charlotte Harbor/Pine Island Sound (Thompson 1981; Scott *et al.* 1989), and are thought to occur in Matagorda Bay (Gruber 1981; Lynn and Würsig 2002) and Aransas Pass (Shane 1977; Weller 1998). Spring/summer increases in abundance occur in Mississippi Sound (Hubard *et al.* 2004) and are thought to occur in Galveston Bay (Henningsen 1991; Bräger 1993; Fertl 1994).

Spring and fall increases in abundance have been reported for St. Joseph Bay, Florida, where recent mark-recapture photo-identification surveys and 2 NOAA-sponsored health assessments were conducted during 2005-2006. Mark-recapture abundance estimates were highest in spring and fall and lowest in summer and winter (Table 1; Balmer *et al.* in press). Individuals with low site-fidelity indices were sighted more often in spring and fall, whereas individuals sighted during summer and winter displayed higher site-fidelity indices. In conjunction with health assessments, 23 dolphins were radio tagged during April 2005 and July 2006. Dolphins tagged in spring 2005 displayed variable utilization areas and variable site fidelity patterns. In contrast, during summer 2006 the majority of radio tagged individuals displayed similar utilization areas and moderate to high site-fidelity patterns. The results of the studies suggest that during summer and winter St. Joseph Bay hosts dolphins that spend most of their time within this region, and these may represent a resident community. In spring and fall, St. Joseph Bay is visited by dolphins that range outside of this area (Balmer *et al.* in press).

Much uncertainty remains regarding the structure of bottlenose dolphin stocks in many of the Gulf of Mexico bays, sounds and estuaries. Given the apparent co-occurrence of resident and non-resident dolphins in these areas, and the demonstrated variations in abundance, it appears that consideration should be given to the existence of a complex of stocks, and to the roles of bays, sounds and estuaries for stocks emphasizing Gulf of Mexico coastal waters. A starting point for management strategy should be the protection of the long-term resident communities, with their multi-generational geographic, genetic, demographic and social stability. These localized units would be at greatest risk from geographically-localized impacts. Complete characterization of many of these basic units would benefit from additional photo-identification, telemetry and genetic research (Wells 1994).

The current provisional stocks follow the designations in Table 1, with a few revisions. Available information suggests that Block B35, Little Sarasota Bay, can be subsumed under Sarasota Bay, and B36, Caloosahatchee River, can be considered a part of Pine Island Sound. As more information becomes available, additional combination or division may be warranted. For example, a number of geographically and socially distinct subgroupings of dolphins in regions such as Tampa Bay, Charlotte Harbor, Pine Island Sound, Aransas Pass and Matagorda Bay have been identified, but the importance of these distinctions to stock designations remain undetermined (Shane 1977; Gruber 1981; Wells *et al.* 1996a; Wells *et al.* 1996b; Wells *et al.* 1997; Lynn and Würsig 2002; Urian 2002).

Understanding the full complement of the stock complex using the bay, sound and estuarine waters of the Gulf of Mexico will require much additional information. The development of biologically-based criteria to better define and manage stocks in this region should integrate multiple approaches, including studies of ranging patterns, genetics, morphology, social patterns, distribution, life history, stomach contents, isozyme analyses and contaminant concentrations. Spatially-explicit population modeling could aid in evaluating the implications of community-based stock definition. As these studies provide new information on what constitutes a bottlenose dolphin "biological stock," current provisional definitions will likely need to be revised. As stocks are more clearly identified, it will be possible to conduct abundance estimates using standardized methodology across sites (thereby avoiding some of the previous problems of mixing results of aerial and boat-based surveys), identify fisheries and other human impacts relative to specific stocks and perform individual stock assessments. As recommended by the Atlantic Scientific Review Group (November 1998, Portland, Maine), an expert panel reviewed the stock structure for bottlenose dolphins in the Gulf of Mexico during a workshop in March 2000 (Hubard and Swartz 2002). The panel sought to describe the scope of risks faced by bottlenose dolphins in the

Gulf of Mexico, and outline an approach by which the stock structure could most efficiently be investigated and integrated with data from previous and ongoing studies. The panel agreed that it was appropriate to use the precautionary approach and retain the stocks currently named until further studies are conducted, and made a variety of recommendations for future research (Hubard and Swartz 2002). As a result of this, efforts are being made to conduct research in new locations, such as the central Gulf, in addition to the ongoing studies in Texas and Florida.

Table 1. Most recent bottlenose dolphin abundance (N_{BEST}), coefficient of variation (CV) and minimum population estimate (N_{MIN}) in ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico bays, sounds and estuaries. Because they are based on data collected more than 8 years ago, most estimates are considered unknown or undetermined for management purposes. Blocks refer to 33 aerial survey blocks illustrated in Figure 1. PBR - Potential Biological Removal; UNK ~~-~~- unknown; UND - undetermined.

Blocks	Gulf of Mexico Estuary	N_{BEST}	CV	N_{MIN}	PBR	Year	Reference
B51	Laguna Madre	80	1.57	UNK	UN~~K~~D	1992	A
B52	Nueces Bay, Corpus Christi Bay	58	0.61	UNK	UND~~K~~	1992	A
B50	Compano Bay, Aransas Bay, San Antonio Bay, Redfish Bay, Espiritu Santo Bay	55	0.82	UNK	UND~~K~~	1992	A
B54	Matagorda Bay, Tres Palacios Bay, Lavaca Bay	61	0.45	UNK	UND~~K~~	1992	A
B55	West Bay	32	0.15	~~28~~UNK	~~0.3~~UND	2000	E
B56	Galveston Bay, East Bay, Trinity Bay	152	0.43	UNK	UND~~K~~	1992	A
B57	Sabine Lake	0[a]	-		UND~~K~~	1992	A
B58	Calcasieu Lake	0[a]	-		UND~~K~~	1992	A
B59	Vermillion Bay, West Cote Blanche Bay, Atchafalaya Bay	0[a]	-		UND~~K~~	1992	A
B60	Terrebonne Bay, Timbalier Bay	100	0.53	UNK	UND~~K~~	1993	A
B61	Barataria Bay	138	0.08	129	1.3	2001	D
B30	Mississippi River Delta	0[a]	-		UND~~K~~	1993	A
B02-05, 29,31	Bay Boudreau, Mississippi Sound	1,401	0.13	UNK	UND~~K~~	1993	A
B06	Mobile Bay, Bonsecour Bay	122	0.34	UNK	UND~~K~~	1993	A
B07	Perdido Bay	0[a]	-		UND~~K~~	1993	A
B08	Pensacola Bay, East Bay	33	0.80	UNK	UND~~K~~	1993	A
B09	Choctawhatchee Bay	242	0.31	UNK	UND~~K~~	1993	A
B10	St. Andrew Bay	124	0.57	UNK	UND~~K~~	1993	A
B11	St. Joseph Bay	81	0.14	72	0.7	2005-06	F
B12-13	St. Vincent Sound, Apalachicola Bay, St. George~~s~~ Sound	~~387~~537	0.~~34~~09	~~UNK~~498	~~UNK~~5.0	2008~~1993~~	~~A~~G
B14-15	Apalachee Bay	491	0.39	UNK	UND~~K~~	1993	A
B16	Waccasassa Bay, Withlacoochee Bay, Crystal Bay	100	0.85	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A
B17	St. Joseph Sound, Clearwater Harbor	37	1.06	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A



B32-34	Tampa Bay	559	0.24	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A
B20	Sarasota Bay	97	na[c]	UNK	UND~~K~~	1992	B
B35	Little Sarasota Bay	2[b]	0.24	UNK	UND~~K~~	1985	C
B21	Lemon Bay	0[a]	-		UND~~K~~	1994	A
B22-23	Pine Sound, Charlotte Harbor, Gasparilla Sound	209	0.38	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A
B36	Caloosahatchee River	0[a,b]	-		UND~~K~~	1985	C
B24	Estero Bay	104	0.67	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A
B25	Chokoloskee Bay, Ten Thousand Islands, Gullivan Bay	208	0.46	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A
B27	Whitewater Bay	242	0.37	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A
B28	Florida Keys (Bahia Honda to Key West)	29	1.00	UNK	UND~~K~~	1994	A

References: A- (Blaylock and Hoggard 1994); B- (Wells 1992); C- (Scott *et al.* 1989); D- (Miller 2003); E- (Irwin and Würsig 2004); F- (Balmer *et al.* in press); G - (Tyson 2008)

Notes:

[a] During earlier surveys (Scott *et al.* 1989), the range of seasonal abundances was as follows: B57, 0-2 (CV= 0.38); B58, 0-6 (0.34); B59, 0-0; B30, 0-182(0.14); B07, 0-0; B21, 0-15(0.43); and B36, 0-0.

[b] Block not surveyed during surveys reported in Blaylock and Hoggard (1994).

[c] No CV because NBEST was a direct count of known individuals.

Figure 1. *~~U.S.A~~ Northern Gulf of Mexico bays and sounds. Each of the alpha-numerically designated blocks corresponds to 1 of the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center logistical aerial survey areas listed in Table 1. The bottlenose dolphins inhabiting each bay and sound are considered to comprise a unique stock for purposes of this assessment.*

POPULATION SIZE

Population size estimates for most of the stocks are greater than 8 years old and therefore the current population size for each stock is considered unknown (Wade and Angliss 1997). Recent mark-recapture population size estimates are available for West Bay, Texas, Barataria Bay, Louisiana, and St. Joseph Bay, Florida (Table 1). Previous population size (Table 1) was estimated from preliminary analyses of line-transect data collected during aerial surveys conducted in September-October 1992 in Texas and Louisiana; in September-October 1993 in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama and the Florida Panhandle (Blaylock and Hoggard 1994); and in September-November 1994 along the west coast of Florida (NMFS unpublished data). Standard line-transect perpendicular sighting distance analytical methods (Buckland *et al.* 1993) and the computer program DISTANCE (Laake *et al.* 1993) were used. Stock size in Sarasota Bay, Florida, was obtained through direct count of known individuals (Wells 1992). Analyses are currently underway that should provide updated abundance estimates for Sarasota Bay, Lemon Bay, Gasparilla Sound, Charlotte Harbor, and Pine Island Sound during 2008 (~~R.S.~~ Wells, pers. comm.).

Minimum Population Estimate

The population size for all but 3 stocks is currently unknown and the minimum population estimates are given for those 3 stocks in Table 1. The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normally distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distribution as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The minimum population estimate was calculated for each block from the estimated population size and its associated coefficient of variation. Where the population size resulted from a direct count of known individuals, the minimum population size was identical to the estimated population size.

Current Population Trend

The data are insufficient to determine population trends for all of the Gulf of Mexico bay, sound and estuary bottlenose dolphin communities. ~~Eleven~~Eleven anomalous mortality events have occurred among portions of these dolphin communities between 1990 and 200~~7~~8; however, it is not possible to accurately partition the mortalities between bay and coastal stocks, thus the impact of these mortality events on communities is not known.

For Barataria Bay, Louisiana, Miller (2003) estimated a population size ranging from 138 to 238 bottlenose dolphins (95% CI = 128-297) using mark-recapture techniques with data collected from June 1999 to May 2002. The previous estimate for Barataria Bay from 1994, 219 dolphins, falls at the high end of this range. Irwin and Würsig (2004) estimated annual population sizes ranging from 28 to 38 dolphins during 1997-2001 for the San Luis Pass/Chocolate Bay portion of West Bay, Texas, where the previous estimate from 1992 was 29 dolphins.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are not known for the dolphin communities that comprise these stocks. While productivity rates may be estimated for individual females within communities, such estimates are confounded at the stock level due to the influx of dolphins from adjacent areas which balance losses, and the unexplained loss of some individuals which offset births and recruitment (Wells 1998). Continued monitoring and expanded survey coverage will be required to address and develop estimates of productivity for these dolphin communities. 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 un~~known~~determined for most stocks because the population size estimate is more than 8 years old. PBR is the product of minimum population size, one-half the maximum productivity rate and a "recovery" factor (Wade and Angliss 1997). The "recovery" ~~–~~factor, which accounts for endangered, depleted, and threatened stocks, or stocks of unknown status relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP), is assumed to be 0.5 because these stocks are of unknown status. PBR for those stocks with population size estimates less than 8 years old is given in Table 1.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Some of the bay, sound and estuarine communities were the focus of a live-capture fishery for bottlenose dolphins which supplied dolphins to the U.S. Navy and to oceanaria for research and public display for more than 2 decades ending in 1989 (NMFS unpublished data). During the period 1972-89, 490 bottlenose dolphins, an average of 29 dolphins annually, were removed from a few locations in the Gulf of Mexico, including the Florida Keys, Charlotte Harbor, Tampa Bay, and elsewhere. Mississippi Sound sustained the highest level of removals with 202 dolphins taken from this stock during this period, representing 41% of the total and an annual average of 12 dolphins (compared to a previous PBR of 13). The annual average number of removals never exceeded previous PBR levels, but it may be biologically significant that 73% of the dolphins removed during 1982-88 were females. The impact of those removals on the stocks is unknown.

One research-related mortality occurred during November 2002 in Sarasota Bay, Florida. The animal was a 35-year-old male, and it died in a health assessment research project. The histopathology report stated that drowning was the cause of death. However, the necropsy revealed that the animal was in poor condition as follows: anemic, thin (ribs evident, blubber thin and grossly lacking lipid), no food in the stomach and little evidence of recent feeding in the digestive tract, vertebral fractures with muscle atrophy, with additional conditions present. This has been the only such loss during capture/release research conducted over a 3~~6~~8-year period on Florida's central west coast. Another research-related mortality occurred during July 2006 in St. Joseph Bay, near Panama City, Florida, during a NMFS health assessment research project to investigate a series of Unusual Mortality Events in the region. The animal became entangled deep in the capture net and was found dead during extrication of other animals from the net. The cause of death was determined to be asphyxiation.

As part of its annual coastal dredging program, the Army Corps of Engineers conducts sea turtle relocation trawling during hopper dredging as a protective measure for marine turtles. Five incidents have been documented in the Gulf of Mexico involving bottlenose dolphins and relocation trawling activities. Four of the incidents were mortalities, and 1 occurred during each of the following years: 2003, 2005, 2006 and 2007. An additional incident occurred during 2006 in which the dolphin became free during net retrieval and was observed swimming away normally.

Four mortalities resulted from gillnet entanglements in research gear off Texas and Louisiana during 2003, 2004, 2006 and 2007. Three of the mortalities were a result of fisheries sampling and research by Texas Parks and Wildlife, and 1 mortality (2006) occurred during a gulf sturgeon research project for the Army Corps of Engineers in Louisiana.

Two bottlenose dolphin mortalities were observed in the shrimp trawl fishery. A mortality occurred in 2007 off the coast of Louisiana in the vicinity of Atchafalaya Bay, and 1 mortality occurred in 2003 off the coast of Alabama near Mobile Bay. Each of these animals could have belonged to either a coastal stock or to a bay, sound and estuarine stock.

Fishery Information

The commercial fisheries which potentially could interact with these stocks in the Gulf of Mexico are the shrimp trawl, blue crab trap/pot, stone crab trap/pot, menhaden purse seine and gillnet fisheries (Appendix I). Historically, there have been very low numbers of incidental mortality or injury in the stocks associated with the shrimp trawl fishery. -A voluntary observer program for the shrimp trawl fishery began in 1992 and became mandatory in 2007. Two bottlenose dolphin mortalities were observed during 2003 and 2007 which could have belonged to either a coastal or a bay, sound and estuarine stock. During 1992-2007 the observer program recorded an additional 6 unidentified dolphins caught in a lazy line or turtle excluder device, and 1 or more of these animals may have belonged to a bay, sound and estuarine stock; however, given the water depths at which the takes occurred, it is more likely the unidentified dolphins belonged to a bottlenose dolphin coastal stock, the bottlenose dolphin continental shelf stock, or possibly to the Atlantic spotted dolphin (*Stenella frontalis*) stock. In 2 of the 6 cases, an observer report indicated the animal may have already been decomposed, but this could not be confirmed in the absence of a necropsy. Bottlenose dolphins have been reported stranded with polypropylene rope around their flukes (NMFS 1991; McFee and W. Brooks 1998; NMFS unpublished data), indicating the possibility of entanglement with crab pot lines. In 2002 there was a calf stranded near Clearwater, Florida, with crab trap line wrapped around its rostrum, through its mouth and looped around its tail. There was an additional unconfirmed report to the stranding network in 2002 of a dolphin entangled in a stone crab trap with the buoy still attached. The animal was reportedly cut loose from the trap and slowly swam off with line and buoy still wrapped around it (NMFS unpublished data). The blue crab fishery has not been monitored by observers and there are no estimates of bottlenose dolphin mortality or serious injury for this fishery. There ~~is~~are no recent observer program data for the Gulf of Mexico menhaden purse seine fishery but incidental mortality of bottlenose dolphins has been reported for this fishery (Reynolds 1985). -Through the Marine Mammal Authorization Program, there have been 11 self-reported incidental takes (all mortalities) of bottlenose dolphins in northern Gulf of Mexico coastal and estuarine waters by the menhaden purse seine fishery: 2 takes of single bottlenose dolphins were reported in Louisiana waters during 2005 (1 of the animals may have been dead prior to capture); 1 take of a single bottlenose dolphin was reported in Louisiana waters during 2004; 2 takes of single unidentified dolphins were reported during 2002 (1 in Mississippi and 1 in Louisiana waters); 1 take of a single bottlenose dolphin was reported in Louisiana waters during 2001; and 3 takes were reported in 2000, 2 of which were for single dolphins (1 bottlenose, 1 unidentifed) in Louisiana waters and the third was for 3 bottlenose dolphins in a single purse seine in Mississippi waters. The menhaden purse seine fishery was observed to take 9 bottlenose dolphins (3 fatally) between 1992 and 1995 (NMFS unpublished data). During that period, there were 1,366 sets observed out of 26,097 total sets, which if extrapolated for all years suggests that as many as 172 bottlenose dolphins could have been taken in this fishery with up to 57 animals killed. Without an observer program it is not possible to obtain statistically reliable information for this fishery on the number of sets annually, the incidental take and mortality rates, and the communities from which bottlenose dolphins are being taken. No marine mammal mortalities associated with gillnet fisheries have been reported, but stranding data suggest that gillnet and marine mammal interaction does occur, causing mortality and serious injury. Four research-related gillnet mortalities occurred between 2003 and 2007 in Texas and Louisiana. In 1995, a Florida state constitutional amendment banned gillnets and large nets from bay, sounds, estuaries and other inshore waters.

The problem of dolphin depredation of fishing gear is increasing in Gulf of Mexico coastal and estuarine waters. There have been 3 recent cases of fishermen illegally "taking" dolphins due to dolphin depredation of recreational and commercial fishing gear. In 2006 a charter boat fishing captain was charged under the MMPA for shooting at a dolphin that was swimming around his catch in the Gulf of Mexico, off Panama City, Florida. In 2007 a second charter fishing boat captain was fined under the MMPA for shooting at a bottlenose dolphin that was attempting to remove a fish from his line in the Gulf of Mexico, off Orange Beach, Alabama. A commercial fishermen was indicted in November 2008 for throwing pipe bombs at dolphins off Panama City, Florida.

Table 2. Bottlenose dolphin strandings by state (west Florida to Texas) in the northern Gulf of Mexico from 2003 to 2007, as well as number of strandings for which evidence of human interaction was detected and number of strandings for which it could not be determined (CBD) if there was evidence of human interaction. Data are from the NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database (accessed 16 September 2008). Please note human interaction does not necessarily mean the interaction caused the animal's death.

STATE		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Florida							
	Total Stranded	**63**	**165**	**136**	**166[c]**	**61**	**591**
	Human Interaction						
	--Fishery Interaction	5	4	2	11	4	26
	--Other	2	0	2	9	3	16
	No Human Interaction	18	45	34	33	15	145
	CBD	38	116	98	113	39	404
Alabama							
	Total Stranded	**7**	**17**	**18**	**20**	**5**	**67**
	Human Interaction						
	--Fishery Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0
	--Other	1	0	0	1	0	2
	No Human Interaction	1	0	1	2	0	4
	CBD	5	17	17	17	5	61
Mississippi							
	Total Stranded	**35**	**27**	**11**	**8**	**8**	**89**
	Human Interaction						
	--Fishery Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0
	--Other	0	1	0	0	0	1
	No Human Interaction	4	5	2	2	0	13
	CBD	31	21	9	6	8	75
Louisiana							
	Total Stranded	**33 [a]**	**26**	**21**	**13**	**12**	**105**
	Human Interaction						
	--Fishery Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0
	--Other	0	2	0	0	1	3
	No Human Interaction	2	0	6	3	0	11
	CBD	31	24	15	10	11	91
Texas							
	Total Stranded	**154 [b]**	**110**	**96**	**96**	**122**	**578**
	Human Interaction						
	--Fishery Interaction	2	2	2	3	0	9
	--Other	7	9	1	3	5	25
	No Human Interaction	35	20	29	18	30	132

	CBD	110	79	64	72	87	412
TOTAL							
	Total Stranded	**292**	**345**	**282**	**303**	**208**	**1430**
	Human Interaction						
	--Fishery Interaction	7	6	4	14	4	35
	--Other	10	12	3	13	9	47
	No Human Interaction	60	70	72	58	45	305
	CBD	215	257	203	218	150	1043

[a] Louisiana mass stranding of 3 animals in July 2003
[b] Texas mass stranding of 5 animals in March 2003
[c] Florida mass strandings (2 animals in July 2006, 3 animals in November 2006)

Other Mortality

A total of 1,4~~91~~32 bottlenose dolphins were found stranded in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico from 200~~2~~3 through 200~~6~~7 (Table 2~~) (~~; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008~~NMFS unpublished data~~). ~~Of these,~~ Evidence of ~~93 showed evidence of~~ human interactions ~~as the cause of death~~ (e.g., gear entanglement, mutilation, gunshot wounds) was detected for 84 of these dolphins. Bottlenose dolphins are known to become entangled in, or ingest recreational and commercial fishing gear (Wells and Scott 1994; Gorzelany 1998; Wells *et al.* 1998; Wells *et al.* 2008), and some are struck by vessels (Wells and Scott 1997; Wells *et al.* 2008).

There are a number of difficulties associated with the interpretation of stranding data. It is possible that some or all of the stranded dolphins may have been from a nearby coastal stock; however, the proportion of stranded dolphins belonging to another stock cannot be determined because of the difficulty of determining from where the stranded carcasses originated. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the dolphins which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interaction, and the condition of the carcass if badly decomposed can inhibit the interpretation of cause of death.

Since 1990, there have been 1~~1~~1 bottlenose dolphin die-offs in the northern Gulf of Mexico. From January through May 1990, a total of 367 bottlenose dolphins stranded in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Overall this represented a two-fold increase in the prior maximum recorded strandings for the same period, but in some locations (i.e., Alabama) strandings were 10 times the average number. The cause of the 1990 mortality event could not be determined (Hansen 1992). An unusual mortal~~tir~~ity event was declared for Sarasota Bay, Florida, in 1991, but the cause was not determined. In March and April 1992, 111 bottlenose dolphins stranded in Texas; about 9 times the average number. The cause of this event was not determined, but carbamates were a suspected cause. ~~Seven of 34 live-captured bottlenose dolphins (20%) in 1992 from Matagorda Bay, Texas, tested positive for previous exposure to cetacean morbillivirus, and it is possible that other estuarine resident stocks have been exposed to the morbillivirus (Duignan et al. 1996).~~

In 1992, with the enactment of the Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Act, the Working Group on Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Events was created to determine when an unusual mortality event (UME) is occurring, and then to direct responses to such events. Since 1992, ~~8~~8 bottlenose dolphin UMEs have been declared in the Gulf of Mexico. 1) In 1993-1994 an UME of bottlenose dolphins likely caused by morbillivirus started in the Florida Panhandle and spread west with most of the mortalities occurring in Texas (Lipscomb 1993; Lipscomb *et al.* 1994). From February through April 1994, 220 bottlenose dolphins were found dead on Texas beaches, of which 67 occurred in a single 10-day period. 2) In 1996 an UME was declared for bottlenose dolphins in Mississippi when 27 bottlenose dolphins stranded during November and December. The cause was not determined, but a *Karenia brevis* (red tide) bloom was suspected to be responsible. 3) Between August 1999 and May 2000, 1~~5~~62 bottlenose dolphins died coincident with *K. brevis* blooms and fish kills in the Florida Panhandle (additional strandings included 3 Atlantic spotted dolphins, *Stenella frontalis*, 1 Risso's dolphin, *Grampus griseus*, 2 Blainville's beaked whales, *Mesop~~o~~lodon densirostris*, and 4 unidentified dolphins). 4) In March and April 2004, in another Florida Panhandle UME possibly related to *K. brevis* blooms, 107 bottlenose dolphins stranded dead (NMFS 2004). Although there was no indication of a *K. brevis* bloom at the time, high levels of brevetoxin were found in the stomach contents of the stranded dolphins (Flewelling *et al.* 2005). 5) ~~From February through April 2004, 220 bottlenose dolphins were found dead on Texas beaches, of which 67 occurred in a single 10-day~~

~~period. 6)~~ In 2005, a particularly destructive red tide (*K. brevis*) bloom occurred off of central west Florida. Manatee, sea turtle, bird and fish mortalities were reported in the area in early 2005 and a manatee UME had been declared. Dolphin mortalities began to rise above the historical averages by late July 2005, continued to increase through October 2005, and were then declared to be part of a multi-species UME. The multi-species UME extended into 2006, and ended in December 2006. A total of 190 dolphins were involved, primarily bottlenose dolphins (plus strandings of 1 Atlantic spotted dolphin, *S. frontalis*, and a few unidentified dolphins). The ~~investigation into this event is still ongoing, however, the~~ evidence ~~is highly~~ suggest~~ive~~s ~~of a relationship between~~ the effects of a red tide bloom ~~and the dolphin deaths~~contributed to the cause of this event. ~~7~~6) A separate UME was declared in the Florida Panhandle after elevated numbers of dolphin strandings occurred in association with a *K. brevis* bloom in September 2005. Dolphin strandings remained elevated through the spring of 2006 and brevetoxin was again detected in the tissues of some of the stranded dolphins. Between September 2005 and ~~September~~April 2006 when the event was officially declared over, a total of 9~~4~~3 bottlenose dolphin strandings occurred (plus strandings of 1 striped dolphin, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, and 4 unidentified dolphins). ~~8~~7) During February and March of 2007 an event was declared for northeast Texas and western Louisiana involving 66 bottlenose dolphins. Decomposition prevented conclusive analyses on most carcasses. 8) During February and March of 2008 an additional event was declared in Texas involving 113 bottlenose dolphin strandings. The investigation into this event is ongoing.

Feeding or provisioning, and swimming with wild bottlenose dolphins have been documented in Florida, particularly near Panama City Beach in the Panhandle. Feeding wild dolphins is defined under the MMPA as a form of 'take' because it can alter their natural behavior and increase their risk of injury or death. Nevertheless, Samuels and Bejder (2004) observed a high rate of uncontrolled provisioning near Panama City Beach in 1998, and Cunningham-Smith *et al.* (2006) have observed provisioning south of Sarasota Bay continuing since 1990. The effects of swim-with activities on dolphins and their legality under the MMPA are less clear and are currently under review. Near Panama City Beach, Samuels and Bejder (2004) concluded that dolphins were amenable to swimmers due to provisioning. There are emerging questions regarding potential linkages between provisioning and depredation of recreational fishing gear and associated entanglement and ingestion of gear, which is increasing through much of Florida. During 2006, an estimated 2% of the long-term resident dolphins of Sarasota Bay died from ingestion of recreational fishing gear (~~R.S.~~ Wells, pers. comm.).

As noted previously, bottlenose dolphins are known to be struck by vessels (Wells and Scott 1997). During 2003-2007, 12 stranded bottlenose dolphins (of 1432 total strandings) showed signs of a boat collision (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data). In some instances, the propeller scars were well-healed and were not suspected as a cause of stranding or death, and it is possible some of the instances were post-mortem collisions. In addition to vessel collisions, the presence of vessels may also impact bottlenose dolphin behavior in bays, sounds and estuaries. Miller *et al.* (2008) investigated the immediate responses of bottlenose dolphins to "high-speed personal watercraft" (i.e., boats) in Mississippi Sound. They found an immediate impact on dolphin behavior demonstrated by an increase in traveling behavior and dive duration, and a decrease in feeding behavior for non-traveling groups. The findings suggested dolphins attempted to avoid high-speed personal watercraft. It is unclear whether short-term effects will result in long-term consequences like reduced health and viability of Mississippi Sound dolphins. Further studies are needed to determine the impacts on this stock as well as other stocks throughout the Gulf of Mexico.

The nearshore habitat occupied by many of these stocks is adjacent to areas of high human population, and in some bays, such as Mobile Bay in Alabama and Galveston Bay in Texas, is highly industrialized. The area surrounding Galveston Bay, for example, has a coastal population of over 3 million people. More than 50% of all chemical products manufactured in the U.S. are produced there and 17% of the oil produced in the Gulf of Mexico is refined there (Henningsen and Würsig 1991). Many of the enclosed bays in Texas are surrounded by agricultural lands which receive periodic pesticide applications.

Concentrations of chlorinated hydrocarbons and metals were examined in conjunction with an anomalous mortality event of bottlenose dolphins in Texas bays in 1990 and found to be relatively low in most; however, some had concentrations at levels of possible toxicological concern (Varanasi *et al.* 1992). No studies to date have determined the amount, if any, of indirect human-induced mortality resulting from pollution or habitat degradation.

Analyses of organochlorine concentrations in the tissues of bottlenose dolphins in Sarasota Bay, Florida, have found that the concentrations found in male dolphins exceeded toxic threshold values that may result in adverse effects on health or reproductive rates (Schwacke *et al.* 2002). 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, the exposure to environmental pollutants and subsequent effects on population health is an area of concern and active research.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of these stocks relative to OSP is unknown and this species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. The occurrence of 11 anomalous mortality events among bottlenose dolphins along the

~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico coast since 1990 (NMFS unpublished data) is cause for concern; however, the effects of the mortality events on stock abundance have not yet been determined.

The relatively high number of bottlenose dolphin deaths which occurred during the mortality events since 1990 suggests that some of these stocks may be stressed. Human-caused mortality and serious injury for each of these stocks is not known, but considering the evidence from stranding data (Table 2), the total ~~human-caused~~fishery-related mortality and serious injury exceeds 10% of the total known PBR or previous PBR, and, therefore, it is probably not insignificant and approaching the zero mortality and serious injury rate. Because most of the stock sizes are currently unknown, but likely~~these stocks are~~ small and relatively few mortalities and serious injuries would exceed PBR, NMFS considers that each of these stocks is 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 in press. Seasonal abundance and distribution patterns of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) near St. Joseph Bay, Florida, USA. J. Cetacean Res. Manage.

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.

Barros, N.B. and R.S. Wells 1998. Prey and feeding patterns of resident bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Sarasota Bay, Florida. J. Mamm. 79(3): 1045-1059.

Blaylock, R.A. and W. Hoggard 1994. Preliminary estimates of bottlenose dolphin abundance in southern U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico continental shelf waters. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-356. 10 pp.

Bräger, S. 1993. Diurnal and seasonal behavior patterns of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). Mar. Mamm. Sci. 9: 434-440.

Bräger, S., B. Würsig, A. Acevedo and T. Henningsen 1994. Association patterns of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Galveston Bay, Texas. J. Mamm. 75(2): 431-437.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Andersen, K.P. Burnham and J.L. Laake 1993. Distance sampling: Estimating abundance of biological populations. Chapman and Hall, New York. 446 pp.

Cunningham-Smith, P., D.E. Colbert, R.S. Wells and T. Speakman 2006. Evaluation of human interactions with a wild bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) near Sarasota Bay, Florida, and efforts to curtail the interactions. Aquatic Mammals 32(3): 346-356.

Duffield, D.A. and R.S. Wells 1986. Population structure of bottlenose dolphins: Genetic studies of bottlenose dolphins along the central west coast of Florida. Contract Report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Center 16 pp.

Duffield, D.A. and R.S. Wells 1991. The combined application of chromosome, protein and molecular data for the investigation of social unit structure and dynamics in *Tursiops truncatus*. Pages 155-169 *in*: A. R. Hoelzel, (ed.) Genetic Ecology of Whales and Dolphins. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. Special Issue 13.

Duffield, D.A. and R.S. Wells 2002. The molecular profile of a resident community of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*. Pages 3-11 *in*: C. J. Pfeiffer, (ed.) Cell and Molecular Biology of Marine Mammals. Krieger Publishing, Melbourne, FL.

Fazioli, K.L., S. Hofmann and R.S. Wells 2006. Use of Gulf of Mexico coastal waters by distinct assemblages of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). Aquatic Mammals 32(2): 212-222.

Fertl, D.C. 1994. Occurrence patterns and behavior of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Galveston ship channel. Texas J. Sci. 46: 299-317.

Flewelling, L.J., J.P. Naar, J. P. Abbott, D.G. Baden, N.B. Barros, G.D. Bossart, M.D. Bottein, D.G. Hammond, E.M. Haubold, C.A. Heil, M.S. Henry, H.M. Jacocks, T.A. Leighfield, R.H. Pierce, T.D. Pitchford, S.A. Rommel, P.S. Scott, K.A. Steidinger, E.W. Truby, F.M.V. Dolah and J.H. Landsberg 2005. Red tides and marine mammal mortalities: Unexpected brevetoxin vectors may account for deaths long after or remote from an algal bloom. Nature 435: 755-756.

Gorzelany, J.F. 1998. Unusual deaths of two free-ranging Atlantic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) related to ingestion of recreational fishing gear. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 14(3): 614-617.

Gruber, J.A. 1981. Ecology of the Atlantic bottlenosed dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Pass Cavallo area of Matagorda Bay, Texas. Masters thesis. Texas A&M University, College Station. 182 pp.

Hansen, L.J., (ed.) 1992. Report on investigation of 1990 Gulf of Mexico bottlenose dolphin strandings. NOAA-NMFS-SEFSC Contribution MIA-92/93-21.(Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center,

75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149).
Henningsen, T. 1991. Zur Verbreitung und Ökologie des Großen Tümmlers (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Galveston, Texas. thesis. Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel, Germany. 80 pp.
Henningsen, T. and B. Würsig 1991. Bottle-nosed dolphins in Galveston Bay, Texas: Numbers and activities. European research on cetaceans - 5. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Conference of the European Cetacean Society, Sandefjord, Norway, Cambridge, UK, 21-23 February, 1991. 36-38 pp.
Hubard, C.W., K. Maze-Foley, K.D. Mullin and W.W. Schroeder 2004. Seasonal abundance and site fidelity of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Mississippi Sound. Aquatic Mammals 30: 299-310.
Hubard, C.W. and S.L. Swartz 2002. Gulf of Mexico bottlenose dolphin stock identification workshop: 14-15 March 2000, Sarasota, Florida. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-473. 50 pp.
Irvine, A.B., M.D. Scott, R.S. Wells and J.H. Kaufmann 1981. Movements and activities of the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*, near Sarasota, Florida. Fish. Bull. 79: 671-688.
Irvine, B. and R.S. Wells 1972. Results of attempts to tag Atlantic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). Cetology 13(1-5).
Irwin, L.J. and B. Würsig 2004. A small resident community of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in Texas: Monitoring recommendations. Gulf of Mexico Science 22(1): 13-21.
Laake, J.L., S.T. Buckland, D.R. Anderson and K.P. Burnham 1993. DISTANCE user's guide, V2.0. Colorado Cooperative Fish & Wildlife Research Unit, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, CO, 72 pp.
Lipscomb, T.P. 1993. Some answers to questions about morbillivirus. Pages 4-5 *in*: R. A. Blaylock, B. Mase and D. K. Odell, (eds.) Strandings. SEFSC Miami Laboratory, Miami, Florida. Vol. 2, No. 3.
Lipscomb, T.P., S. Kennedy, D. Moffet and B.K. Ford 1994. Morbilliviral disease in an Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) from the Gulf of Mexico. Journal of Wildlife Disease 30(4): 572-576.
Lynn, S.K. and B. Würsig 2002. Summer movement patterns of bottlenose dolphins in a Texas bay. Gulf of Mexico Science 20(1): 25-37.
Maze, K.S. and B. Würsig 1999. Bottlenose dolphins of San Luis Pass, Texas: Occurrence patterns, site fidelity, and habitat use. Aquatic Mammals 25: 91-103.
McFee, W.E. and J. W. Brooks 1998. Fact finding meeting of marine mammal entanglement in the crab pot fishery: a summary. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Unpublished Report.
Miller, C. 2003. Abundance trends and environmental habitat usage patterns of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in lower Barataria and Caminada Bays, Louisiana. Ph.D. thesis. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge. 125 pp.
Miller, L.J., M. Solangi and S.A. Kuczaj, II 2008. Immediate response of Atlantic bottlenose dolphins to high-speed personal watercraft in the Mississippi Sound. J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U. K. 88(6): 1139-1143.
Mullin, K.D. 1988. Comparative seasonal abundance and ecology of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in three habitats of the north-central Gulf of Mexico. Ph. D. thesis. Mississippi State University, Starkville. 135 pp.
NMFS 1991. Proposed regime to govern the interactions between marine mammals and commercial fishing operations after October 1, 1993. Draft Environmental Impact Statement, June 1991. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.
NMFS 2004. Interim report on the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) unusual mortality event along the Panhandle of Florida, March-April 2004. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149, 35 pp.
Reynolds, J.E., III 1985. Evaluation of the nature and magnitude of interactions between bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and fisheries and other human activities in coastal areas of the southeastern United States. National Technical Information Service PB86-162203, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA 22161.
Samuels, A. and L. Bejder 2004. Chronic interactions between humans and free-ranging bottlenose dolphins near Panama City Beach, Florida, USA. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 6: 69-77.
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, L.J. Hansen and R.E. Owen 1989. Estimates of bottlenose dolphin abundance in the Gulf of Mexico from regional aerial surveys. CRD 88/89-07. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.
Scott, M.D., R.S. Wells and A.B. Irvine 1990. A long-term study of bottlenose dolphins on the west coast of Florida. Pages 235-244 *in*: S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves, (eds.) The bottlenose dolphin. Academic Press, San

Diego, CA.
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.
Shane, S.H. 1977. The population biology of the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*, in the Aransas Pass area of Texas. Masters thesis. Texas A&M University, College Station. 238 pp.
Shane, S.H. 1990. Behavior and ecology of the bottlenose dolphin at Sanibel Island, Florida. Pages 245-265 *in*: S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves, (eds.) The bottlenose dolphin. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
Shane, S.H. 2004. Residence patterns, group characteristics, and association patterns of bottlenose dolphins near Sanibel Island, Florida. Gulf of Mexico Science 22(1): 1-12.
Shane, S.H., R.S. Wells and B. Würsig 1986. Ecology, behavior, and social organization of the bottlenose dolphin: A review. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 2(1): 34-63.
Thompson, N.B. 1981. Estimates of abundance of *Tursiops truncatus* in Charlotte Harbor, Florida. NOAA/NMFS/SEFSC/Miami Laboratory, Fishery Data Analysis Technical Report. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.
Tyson, R.B. 2008. Abundance of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Big Bend of Florida, St. Vincent Sound to Alligator Harbor. M. Sc. thesis. Florida State University, Tallahassee. 65 + ix pp.
Urian, K.W. 2002. Community structure of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Tampa Bay, Florida, USA. M.Sc. thesis. University of North Carolina, Wilmington. 26 pp.
Urian, K.W., D.A. Duffield, A.J. Read, R.S. Wells and D.D. Shell 1996. Seasonality of reproduction in bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*. J. Mamm. 77: 394-403.
Varanasi, U., K.L. Tilbury, D.W. Brown, M.M. Krahn, C.A. Wigren, R.C. Clark and S.L. Chan 1992. Chemical contaminants in bottlenose dolphins stranded along the Gulf of Mexico during 1990. Pages 56-86 *in*: L. J. Hansen, (ed.) Report on investigation of 1990 Gulf of Mexico bottlenose dolphin strandings. Southeast Fisheries Science Center Contribution MIA-92/93-21.
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.
Weller, D.W. 1998. Global and regional variation in the biology and behavior of bottlenose dolphins. Ph. D. thesis. Texas A&M University, College Station. 142 pp.
Wells, R.S. 1986a. Population structure of bottlenose dolphins: Behavioral studies along the central west coast of Florida. Contract report to NMFS, SEFSC. Contract No. 45-WCNF-5-00366. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149 58 pp.
Wells, R.S. 1986b. Structural aspects of dolphin societies. Ph. D. thesis. University of California, Santa Cruz. 234 pp.
Wells, R.S. 1991. The role of long-term study in understanding the social structure of a bottlenose dolphin community. Pages 199-225 *in*: K. Pryor and K. S. Norris, (eds.) Dolphin societies: Discoveries and puzzles. University of California Press, Berkeley.
Wells, R.S. 1992. The marine mammals of Sarasota Bay. Pages 9.1-9.23 Sarasota Bay: Framework for action. Sarasota Bay National Estuary Program, Sarasota, FL.
Wells, R.S. 1994. Determination of bottlenose dolphin stock discreteness: Application of a combined behavioral and genetic approach. K. R. Wang, P. M. Payne and V.G. Thayer (compilers). Coastal stock(s) of Atlantic bottlenose dolphin: Status review and management. Proceedings and recommendations from a workshop held in Beaufort, NC, 13-14 September 1993. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-4. 16-20 pp.
Wells, R.S. 1998. Progress report: Sarasota long-term bottlenose dolphin research. Unpublished contract report to the U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL 5 pp.
Wells, R.S. 2003. Dolphin social complexity: Lessons from long-term study and life history. Pages 32-56 *in*: F. B. M. de Waal and P. L. Tyack, (eds.) Animal social complexity: Intelligence, culture, and individualized societies. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
Wells, R.S., J.B. Allen, S. Hoffman, K. Bassos-Hull, D.A. Fauquier, N.B. Barros, R.E. DeLynn, G. Sutton, V. Socha and M.D. Scott 2008. Consequences of injuries on survival and reproduction of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) along the west coast of Florida. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 24: 774-794.
Wells, R.S., M.K. Bassos, K.W. Urian, W.J. Carr and M.D. Scott 1996a. Low-level monitoring of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in Charlotte Harbor, Florida: 1990-1994. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-384. 36 pp.
Wells, R.S., M.K. Bassos, K.W. Urian, S.H. Shane, E.C.G. Owen, C.F. Weiss, W.J. Carr and M.D. Scott 1997. Low-level monitoring of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in Pine Island Sound, Florida: 1996. Contract report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Center Contribution No. 40-

WCNF601958. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.
Wells, R.S., S. Hofmann and T.L. Moors 1998. Entanglement and mortality of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in recreational fishing gear in Florida. Fish. Bull. 96(3): 647-650.
Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1990. Estimating bottlenose dolphin population parameters from individual identification and capture-release techniques. Pages 407-415 *in*: P. S. Hammond, S. A. Mizroch and G. P. Donovan, (eds.) Individual recognition of cetaceans: Use of photo-identification and other techniques to estimate population parameters. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. Special Issue 12.
Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1994. Incidence of gear entanglement for resident inshore bottlenose dolphins near Sarasota, Florida. Pages 629 *in*: W. F. Perrin, G. P. Donovan and J. Barlow, (eds.) Gillnets and cetaceans. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Special Issue 15.
Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1997. Seasonal incidence of boat strikes on bottlenose dolphins near Sarasota, Florida. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 13(3): 475-480.
Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1999. Bottlenose dolphins. Pages 137-182 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals. Vol. 6: The second book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.
Wells, R.S., M.D. Scott and A.B. Irvine 1987. The social structure of free ranging bottlenose dolphins. Pages 247-305 *in*: H. Genoways, (ed.) Current Mammalogy, Vol. 1. Plenum Press, New York.
Wells, R.S., V. Tornero, A. Borrell, A. Aguilar, T.K. Rowles, H.L. Rhinehart, S. Hofmann, W.M. Jarman, A.A. Hohn and J.C. Sweeney 2005. Integrating life history and reproductive success data to examine potential relationships with organochlorine compounds for bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Sarasota Bay, Florida. Science of the Total Environment 349: 106-119.
Wells, R.S., K.W. Urian, A.J. Read, M.K. Bassos, W.J. Carr and M.D. Scott 1996b. Low-level monitoring of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus,* in Tampa Bay, Florida: 1988-1993. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-385. 25 pp.

BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Coastal Stocks

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Bottlenose dolphins inhabit coastal waters throughout the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) (Mullin *et al.* 1990). Northern Gulf of Mexico coastal waters have been divided for management purposes into 3 bottlenose dolphin stocks: eastern, northern and western. As a working hypothesis, it is assumed that the dolphins occupying habitats with dissimilar climactic, coastal and oceanographic characteristics might be restricted in their movements between habitats, and thus constitute separate stocks. Coastal waters are defined as those from shore, barrier islands or presumed bay boundaries to the 20-m isobath (Figure 1). The eastern coastal bottlenose dolphin stock area extends from 84^{o} W longitude to Key West, Florida; the northern coastal bottlenose dolphin stock area from 84^{o} W longitude to the Mississippi River Delta; and the western coastal bottlenose dolphin stock area from the Mississippi River Delta to the Texas-Mexico border. The eastern coastal stock area is temperate to subtropical in climate, is bordered by a mixture of coastal marshes, sand beaches, marsh and mangrove islands, and has an intermediate level of freshwater input. The northern coastal stock area is characterized by a temperate climate, barrier islands, sand beaches, coastal marshes and marsh islands, and has a relatively high level of fresh water input. The western coastal stock area is characterized by an arid to temperate climate, sand beaches in southern Texas, extensive coastal marshes in northern Texas and Louisiana, and low to high levels of fresh-water input.



Figure 1. *Locations of bottlenose dolphin groups sighted in coastal waters during aerial surveys in 1992-1994. The 20 and 200-m isobaths are shown.*

Portions of the coastal stocks may co-occur with the northern Gulf of Mexico continental shelf stock and bay, sound and estuary stocks, and the western coastal stock is trans-boundary with Mexico. The seaward boundary for coastal stocks, the 20-m isobath, generally corresponds to survey strata (Scott *et al.* 1990; Blaylock and Hoggard 1994; Fulling *et al.* 2003), and thus represents a management boundary rather than an ecological boundary. Both "coastal/nearshore" and "offshore" ecotypes of bottlenose dolphins (Hersh and Duffield 1990) occur in the Gulf of Mexico (LeDuc and Curry 1998), and both could potentially occur in coastal waters. The offshore and coastal ecotypes are genetically distinct using both mitochondrial and nuclear markers (Hoelzel *et al.* 1998). In the northwestern Atlantic Ocean, Torres *et al.* (2003) found a statistically significant break in the distribution of the ecotypes at 34 km from shore. The offshore ecotype was found exclusively seaward of 34 km and in waters deeper than 34 m. Within 7.5 km of shore, all animals were of the coastal ecotype. The distance of the 20-m isobath ranges from 4 to 90 km from shore in the northern Gulf. Because the continental shelf is much wider in the Gulf, results from the Atlantic may not apply.

Research on coastal stocks is limited. (Sellas *et al.* 2005) examined population subdivision among Sarasota Bay, Tampa Bay, Charlotte Harbor, Matagorda Bay~~,~~ and the coastal Gulf of Mexico (1-12 km offshore) from just outside Tampa Bay to the south end of Lemon Bay, and found evidence of significant population structure among all areas on the basis of both mitochondrial DNA control region sequence data and 9 nuclear microsatellite loci. The Sellas *et al.* (2005) findings support the separate identification of bay, sound and estuarine stocks from those occurring in adjacent Gulf coastal waters. Fazioli *et al.* (2006) conducted photo-identification surveys of coastal waters off Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay, and Charlotte Harbor/Pine Island Sound over 14 months. They found coastal waters were inhabited by both 'inshore' and 'Gulf' dolphins but that the two types used coastal waters differently. Dolphins from the inshore communities were observed occasionally in Gulf near-shore waters adjacent to their inshore range, whereas ‘Gulf’ dolphins were found primarily in open Gulf of Mexico waters with some displaying seasonal variations in their use of the study area. The ‘Gulf’ dolphins did not show a preference for waters near passes as was seen for ‘inshore’ dolphins, but moved throughout the study area and made greater use of waters offshore of waters used by ‘inshore’ dolphins. During winter months abundance of ‘Gulf’ groups decreased while abundance for ‘inshore’ groups increased. Seasonal movements of identified individuals and abundance indices suggest that part of the ‘Gulf” dolphin community moves out of the study area during winter, but their destination is unknown.

Off Galveston, Texas, Beier (2001) reported an open population of individual dolphins in coastal waters, but several individual dolphins had been sighted previously by other researchers over a 10-year period. Some coastal animals may move relatively long distances alongshore. Two bottlenose dolphins previously seen in the South Padre Island area in Texas were seen in Matagorda Bay, 285 km north, in May 1992 and May 1993 (Lynn and Würsig 2002).

POPULATION SIZE

Population size has not been estimated for the 3 coastal stocks for more than 8 years and therefore the current population size is unknown for each (Wade and Angliss 1997). Previous estimates of abundance were derived using distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 1993) and the computer program DISTANCE (Laake *et al.* 1993) with sighting data collected during aerial line-transect surveys conducted during autumn from 1992-1994 (Blaylock and Hoggard 1994; NMFS unpublished data). Systematic sampling transects, placed randomly with respect to the bottlenose dolphin distribution, extended orthogonally from shore out to approximately 9 km past the 18-m isobath. Approximately 5% of the total survey area was visually searched. Previous bottlenose dolphin abundance estimates for each stock based on the 1991-1994 surveys are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Previous bottlenose dolphin abundance (N_{BEST}), coefficient of variation (CV), and minimum population estimate (N_{MIN}) for northern Gulf of Mexico coastal bottlenose dolphin stocks. Because they are based on data collected more than 8 years ago, all estimates are currently considered unknown or undetermined. PBR - Potential Biological Removal,; UNK -- unknown; UND - undetermined.

Gulf of Mexico Stock Area	N_{BEST}	CV	N_{MIN}	PBR	Year
Eastern	9,912	0.12	UNK	UNDK	1994
Northern	4,191	0.21	UNK	UNDK	1993
Western	3,499	0.21	UNK	UNDK	1992

Minimum Population Estimate

The current minimum population size for each stock is unknown. The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normally distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distribution as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997).

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine population trends for these stocks.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are not known for these stocks. 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 currently unknowndetermined for each stock. PBR is the product of minimum population size, one-half the maximum productivity rate and a “recovery” factor (Wade and Angliss 1997). The “recovery” factor, which accounts for endangered, depleted and threatened stocks, or stocks of unknown status relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP), is assumed to be 0.5 because the stocks are of unknown status.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There were 3 interactions with the shark bottom longline fishery, including ~~one~~1 mortality, during 1994-2003, and none during 2004-2007 (Burgess and Morgan 2003a; b; Hale and Carlson 2007; Hale *et al.* 2007; Richards 2007).

As part of its annual coastal dredging program, the Army Corps of Engineers conducts sea turtle relocation trawling during hopper dredging as a protective measure for marine turtles. Five incidents have been documented in the Gulf of Mexico involving bottlenose dolphins and relocation trawling activities. Four of the incidents were mortalities, and 1 occurred during each of the following years: 2003, 2005, 2006, and 2007. An additional incident occurred during 2006 in which the dolphin became free during net retrieval and was observed swimming away normally.

Four mortalities resulted from gillnet entanglements in research gear off Texas and Louisiana during 2003, 2004, 2006 and 2007. Three of the mortalities were a result of fisheries sampling and research by Texas Parks and Wildlife, and 1 mortality (2006) occurred during a gulf sturgeon research project for the Army Corps of Engineers in Louisiana.

Two bottlenose dolphin mortalities were observed in the shrimp trawl fishery. A mortality occurred in 2007 off the coast of Louisiana in the vicinity of Atchafalaya Bay, and 1 mortality occurred in 2003 off the coast of Alabama near Mobile Bay. Each of these animals could have belonged to either a coastal stock or to a bay, sound and estuarine stock.

Table 2. Bottlenose dolphin strandings by state (west Florida to Texas) in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico ~~(West Florida to Texas)~~ from 200~~2~~3 to 200~~6~~7, as well as number of strandings for which evidence of human interaction was detected and number of strandings for which it could not be determined (CBD) if there was evidence of human interaction. Data are from the NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database (accessed 16 September 2008)~~Southeast Marine Mammal Stranding Database (SESUS)~~. ~~Percent of animals with indications of human interactions were calculated based on animals which were determined as "yes" or "no" for human interactions. Animals that were "CBD" (could not be determined) were excluded from % with human interactions calculations.~~ Please note human interaction does not necessarily mean the interaction caused the animal's death.

STATE		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Florida							
	~~No.~~Total Stranded	**63~~64~~[a]**	**16~~2~~5**	**13~~5~~6**	**166[ec]**	**61**	**591**
	~~No.~~ Human Interaction~~s~~	~~7~~	~~4~~	~~4~~	~~18~~		
	--Fishery Interaction	5	4	2	11	4	26
	--Other	2	0	2	9	3	16
	No Human Interaction	18	45	34	33	15	145
	~~No.~~ CBD	38~~4~~	~~63~~116	~~84~~98	11~~2~~3	39	404
	~~% With Human Interactions~~	~~23%~~	~~4%~~	~~8%~~	~~33%~~		
Alabama							
	~~No.~~Total Stranded	**7**	**1~~8~~7**	**1~~9~~8**	**20**	**5**	**67**
	~~No.~~ Human Interaction~~s~~	~~1~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~1~~		
	--Fishery Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0
	--Other	1	0	0	1	0	2
	No Human Interaction	1	0	1	2	0	4
	~~No.~~ CBD	~~4~~5	1~~8~~7	1~~5~~7	17	5	61
	~~% With Human Interactions~~	~~33%~~	~~CBD~~	~~0%~~	~~33%~~		
Mississippi							

	No.Total Stranded	**375** [b]	**27**	**11**	**8**	**8**	**89**
	No. Human Interactions	0	1	0	0		
	--Fishery Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0
	--Other	0	1	0	0	0	1
	No Human Interaction	4	5	2	2	0	13
	No. CBD	2931	1321	69	6	8	75
	% With Human Interactions	0%	7%	0%	0%		
Louisiana							
	No.Total Stranded	**33** [ca]	**26**	**221**	**13**	**12**	**105**
	No. Human Interactions	0	2	1	1		
	--Fishery Interaction	0	0	0	0	0	0
	--Other	0	2	0	0	1	3
	No Human Interaction	2	0	6	3	0	11
	No. CBD	2931	24	15	810	11	91
	% With Human Interactions	0%	100%	14%	20%		
Texas							
	No.Total Stranded	**1544** [db]	**110**	**96**	**926**	**122**	**578**
	No. Human Interactions	10	12	3	7		
	--Fishery Interaction	2	2	2	3	0	9
	--Other	7	9	1	3	5	25
	No Human Interaction	35	20	29	18	30	132
	No. CBD	1010	4179	1764	472	87	412
	% With Human Interactions	19%	17%	4%	14%		
TOTAL							
	No.Total Stranded	**2952**	**3435**	**2832**	**299303**	**208**	**1430**
	No. Human Interactions	18	19	8	27		
	--Fishery Interaction	7	6	4	14	4	35
	--Other	10	12	3	13	9	47
	No Human Interaction	60	70	72	58	45	305
	No. CBD	197215	159257	137203	2185	150	1043
	% With Human Interactions	18%	10%	5%	24%		

a Florida mass stranding of 2 animals in May 2003

b Mississippi mass stranding of 2 animals in April 2003

ca Louisiana mass stranding of 3 animals in July 2003

bd Texas mass stranding of 5 animals in March 2003

ce Florida mass strandings (2 animals in July 2006, 3 animals in November 2006)

Fisheries Information

The commercial fisheries which potentially could interact with coastal stocks in the northern Gulf of Mexico are the shrimp trawl, blue crab trap/pot, stone crab trap/pot, menhaden purse seine, gillnet, and shark bottom longline fisheries (Appendix III). Historically, there have been very low numbers of incidental mortality or injury in the stocks associated with the shrimp trawl fishery. A voluntary observer program for the shrimp trawl fishery began in 1992 and became mandatory in 2007. Two bottlenose dolphin mortalities were observed during 2003 and 2007 which could have belonged to either a coastal or a bay, sound and estuarine stock. During 1992-2007 the observer program recorded an additional 6 unidentified dolphins caught in a lazy line or turtle excluder device, and 1 or more of these animals may have belonged to a coastal stock. In 2 of the 6 cases, an observer report indicated the animal may have already been decomposed, but this could not be confirmed in the absence of a necropsy. Bottlenose dolphins have been reported stranded with polypropylene rope around their flukes (NMFS 1991; NMFS unpublished data; McFee and Brooks 1998), indicating the possibility of entanglement with crab pot lines. In 2002 there was a calf stranded near Clearwater, Florida, with crab trap line wrapped around its rostrum, through its mouth and looped around its tail. There was an additional unconfirmed report to the stranding network in 2002 of a dolphin entangled in a stone crab trap with the buoy still attached. The animal was reportedly cut loose from the trap and slowly swam off with line and buoy still wrapped around it (NMFS unpublished data). The blue crab fishery has not been monitored by observers and there are no estimates of bottlenose dolphin mortality or serious injury for this fishery. There are no recent observer program data for the Gulf of Mexico menhaden purse seine fishery but incidental mortality of bottlenose dolphins has been reported for this fishery (Reynolds 1985). Through the Marine Mammal Authorization Program, there have been 11 self-reported incidental takes (all mortalities) of bottlenose dolphins in northern Gulf of Mexico coastal and estuarine waters by the menhaden purse seine fishery: 2 takes of single bottlenose dolphins were reported in Louisiana waters during 2005 (1 of the animals may have been dead prior to capture); 1 take of a single bottlenose dolphin was reported in Louisiana waters during 2004; 2 takes of single unidentified dolphins were reported during 2002 (1 in Mississippi and 1 in Louisiana waters); 1 take of a single bottlenose dolphin was reported in Louisiana waters during 2001; and 3 takes were reported in 2000, 2 of which were for single dolphins (1 bottlenose, 1 unidentifed) in Louisiana waters and the third was for 3 bottlenose dolphins in a single purse seine in Mississippi waters. The menhaden purse seine fishery was observed to take 9 bottlenose dolphins (3 fatally) between 1992 and 1995 (NMFS unpublished data). During that period, there were 1,366 sets observed out of 26,097 total sets, which if extrapolated for all years suggests that as many as 172 bottlenose dolphins could have been taken in this fishery with up to 57 animals killed. Without an observer program it is not possible to obtain statistically reliable information for this fishery on the number of sets annually, the incidental take and mortality rates, and the communities from which bottlenose dolphins are being taken. No marine mammal mortalities associated with gillnet fisheries have been reported, but stranding data suggest that gillnet and marine mammal interaction does occur, causing mortality and serious injury. Four research-related gillnet mortalities occurred between 2003 and 2007 in Texas and Louisiana. The shark bottom longline fishery has been observed since 1994, and 3 interactions with bottlenose dolphins have been recorded. The incidents include 1 mortality (2003) and 2 hooked animals that escaped at the vessels (1999, 2002; Burgess and Morgan 2003a; b; Hale and Carlson 2007; Hale *et al.* 2007; Richards 2007). Based on the water depths of the interactions (~12-60 m), they likely involved animals from the eastern coastal and continental shelf stocks. For the shark bottom longline fishery in the Gulf of Mexico, Richards (2007) estimated bottlenose dolphin mortalities of 58 (CV=0.99), 0 and 0 for 2003, 2004 and 2005, respectively.

The problem of dolphin depredation of fishing gear is increasing in the Gulf of Mexico. There have been 3 recent cases of fishermen illegally "taking" dolphins due to dolphin depredation of recreational and commercial fishing gear. In 2006 a charter boat fishing captain was charged under the MMPA for shooting at a dolphin that was swimming around his catch in the Gulf of Mexico, off Panama City, Florida. In 2007~~,~~ a second charter fishing boat captain was fined under the MMPA for shooting at a bottlenose dolphin that was attempting to remove a fish from his line in the Gulf of Mexico, off Orange Beach, Alabama. A commercial fishermen was indicted in November 2008 for throwing pipe bombs at dolphins off Panama City, Florida. ~~The problem of dolphin depredation of recreational and commercial fishing gear is increasing in the Gulf of Mexico.~~

Other Mortality

A total of 1,4~~91~~32 bottlenose dolphins were found stranded in the northern Gulf of Mexico from 200~~2~~3 through 200~~6~~7 (Table 2; ~~) (NMFS unpublished data~~NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). ~~Of these,~~Evidence of ~~93 showed evidence of~~ human interactions ~~as the cause of death~~ (e.g., gear entanglement, mutilation, gunshot wounds) was detected for 84 of these dolphins. Bottlenose dolphins are known to become entangled in, or ingest recreational and commercial fishing gear (Wells and Scott 1994; Gorzelany 1998; Wells *et al.* 1998; Wells *et al.* 2008), and some are struck by vessels (Wells and Scott 1997; Wells *et al.* 2008).

There are a number of difficulties associated with the interpretation of stranding data. It is possible that some or all of the stranded dolphins may have been from a nearby bay, sound and estuary stock; however, the proportion of stranded dolphins belonging to another stock cannot be determined because of the difficulty of determining from where the stranded carcass originated. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of human-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the dolphins which die or are seriously injured due to human interactions wash ashore, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of fishery-interaction or other human interactions. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of human interaction, and the condition of the carcass if badly decomposed can inhibit the interpretation of cause of death.

Since 1990, there have been 1~~1~~1 bottlenose dolphin die-offs in the northern Gulf of Mexico. From January through May 1990, a total of 367 bottlenose dolphins stranded in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Overall this represented a two-fold increase in the prior maximum recorded strandings for the same period, but in some locations (i.e., Alabama) strandings were 10 times the average number. The cause of the 1990 mortality event could not be determined (Hansen 1992). An unusual mortal~~tir~~ity event was declared for Sarasota Bay, Florida, in 1991, but the cause was not determined. In March and April 1992, 111 bottlenose dolphins stranded in Texas~~;~~, about 9 times the average number. The cause of this event was not determined, but carbamates were a suspected cause. ~~Seven of 34 live-captured bottlenose dolphins (20%) in 1992 from Matagorda Bay, Texas, tested positive for previous exposure to cetacean morbillivirus and it is possible that other stocks have been exposed to the morbillivirus (Duignan *et al.* 1996).~~

In 1992, with the enactment of the Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Act, the Working Group on Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Events was created to determine when an unusual mortality event (UME) is occurring, and then to direct responses to such events. Since 1992, ~~8~~8 bottlenose dolphin UMEs have been declared in the Gulf of Mexico. 1) In 1993-1994 a UME of bottlenose dolphins caused by morbillivirus started in the Florida Panhandle and spread west with most of the mortalities occurring in Texas (Lipscomb 1993; Lipscomb *et al.* 1994). From February through April 1994, 220 bottlenose dolphins were found dead on Texas beaches, of which 67 occurred in a single 10-day period. 2) In 1996 a UME was declared for bottlenose dolphins in Mississippi when 27 bottlenose dolphins stranded during November and December. The cause was not determined, but a *Karenia brevis* (red tide) bloom was suspected to be responsible. 3) Between August 1999 and May 2000, 1~~5~~62 bottlenose dolphins died coincident with *K. brevis* blooms and fish kills in the Florida Panhandle (additional strandings included 3 Atlantic spotted dolphins, *Stenella frontalis*, 1 Risso's dolphin, *Grampus griseus*, 2 Blainville's beaked whales, *Mesop~~o~~lodon densirostris*, and 4 unidentified dolphins). 4) In March and April 2004, in another Florida Panhandle UME possibly related to *K. brevis* blooms, 107 bottlenose dolphins stranded dead (NMFS 2004). Although there was no indication of a *K. brevis* bloom at the time, high levels of brevetoxin were found in the stomach contents of the stranded dolphins (Flewelling *et al.* 2005). 5) ~~From February through April 2004, 220 bottlenose dolphins were found dead on Texas beaches, of which 67 occurred in a single 10-day period. 6)~~ In 2005, a particularly destructive red tide (*K. brevis*) bloom occurred off of central west Florida. Manatee, sea turtle, bird and fish mortalities were reported in the area in early 2005 and a manatee UME had been declared. Dolphin mortalities began to rise above the historical averages by late July 2005, continued to increase through October 2005, and were then declared to be part of a multi-species UME. The multi-species UME extended into 2006, and ended in December 2006. A total of 190 dolphins were involved, primarily bottlenose dolphins (plus strandings of 1 Atlantic spotted dolphin, *S. frontalis*, and a few unidentified dolphins). ~~The investigation into this event is still ongoing, however, t~~The evidence ~~is highly~~ suggest~~ive~~s ~~of a relationship between~~ the effects of a ~~-~~red tide bloom contributed to the cause of this event~~and the dolphin deaths~~. ~~7~~6) A separate UME was declared in the Florida Panhandle after elevated numbers of dolphin strandings occurred in association with a *K. brevis* bloom in September 2005. Dolphin strandings remained elevated through the spring of 2006 and brevetoxin was again detected in the tissues of some of the stranded dolphins. Between September 2005 and ~~September~~April 2006 when the event was officially declared over, a total of 9~~4~~3 bottlenose dolphin strandings occurred (plus 1 stranding of a striped dolphin, *Stenella coeruleoalba*, and 4 unidentified dolphins). ~~8~~7) During February and March of 2007 an event was declared for northeast Texas and western Louisiana involving 66 bottlenose dolphins. Decomposition prevented conclusive analyses on most carcasses. 8) During February and March of 2008 an additional event was declared in Texas involving 113 bottlenose dolphin strandings. The investigation into this event is ongoing.

Feeding or provisioning, and swimming with wild bottlenose dolphins have been documented in Florida, particularly near Panama City Beach in the Panhandle, and near Sarasota Bay (Cunningham-Smith *et al.* 2006). Feeding wild dolphins is defined under the MMPA as a form of 'take' because it can alter their natural behavior and increase their risk of injury or death. Nevertheless, Samuels and Bejder (2004) observed a high rate of uncontrolled provisioning near Panama City beach in 1998. The effects of swim-with activities on dolphins and their legality under the MMPA are less clear and are currently under review. Near Panama City Beach, Samuels and Bejder (2004) concluded that dolphins were amenable to swimmers due to provisioning.

The nearshore habitat occupied by these 3 stocks is adjacent to areas of high human population and in some areas, such as Tampa Bay, Florida; Galveston, Texas; and Mobile, Alabama, is highly industrialized. Concentrations of anthropogenic chemicals such PCB's and DDT and its metabolites vary from site to site, and can reach levels of concern for bottlenose dolphin health and reproduction in the southeastern U.S. (Schwacke *et al.* 2002). PCB concentrations in 3 stranded dolphins sampled from the eastern coastal stock area ranged from 16-46μg/g wet weight. Two stranded dolphins from the northern coastal stock area had the highest levels of DDT derivatives of any of the bottlenose dolphin liver samples analyzed in conjunction with a 1990 mortality investigation conducted by NMFS (Varanasi *et al.* 1992). The significance of these findings is unclear, but there is some evidence that increased exposure to anthropogenic compounds may reduce immune function in bottlenose dolphins (Lahvis *et al.* 1995), or impact reproduction through increased first-born calf mortality (Wells *et al.* 2005). Concentrations of chlorinated hydrocarbons and metals were relatively low in most of the bottlenose dolphins examined in conjunction with an anomalous mortality event in Texas bays in 1990; however, some had concentrations at levels of possible toxicological concern (Varanasi *et al.* 1992). Agricultural runoff following periods of high rainfall in 1992 was implicated in a high level of bottlenose dolphin mortalities in Matagorda Bay, which is adjacent to the western coastal stock area (NMFS unpublished data).

The Mississippi River, which drains about two-thirds of the continental U.S., flows into the north-central Gulf of Mexico and deposits its nutrient load which is linked to the formation of one of the world's largest areas of seasonal hypoxia (Rabalais *et al.* 1999). This area is located in Louisiana coastal waters west of the Mississippi River delta. How it affects bottlenose dolphins is not known.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of each stock relative to OSP is not known and population trends cannot be determined due to insufficient data. This species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. There are insufficient data to determine population trends for each of these stocks. ~~The t~~Total ~~known~~ human-~~related~~caused mortality and serious injury for each stock~~ cannot be assessed relative to PBR because the PBR is unknown for each stock, and therefore cannot be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ is not known and there is insufficient information available to determine whether the total fishery-related mortality and serious injury for each stock is insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. Because for each stock the stock size is currently unknown and PBR undetermined, and because there are documented cases of human-related mortality from a number of sources, each stock is a strategic stock. Additionally,~~Each is a strategic stock because the known level of human-related mortality or serious injury relative to PBR is unknown. Also,~~ there is no systematic monitoring of all fisheries that may take these stocks. ~~Insufficient information is available to determine whether the total fishery mortality and serious injury for coastal bottlenose dolphin stocks is insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ The potential impact, if any, of coastal pollution may be an issue for this species in portions of its habitat, though little is known on this to date.

REFERENCES CITED

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.

Beier, A.G. 2001. Occurrence, distribution, and movement patterns of outer coastline bottlenose dolphins off Galveston, Texas. MA thesis. Texas A&M University. 97 pp.

Blaylock, R.A. and W. Hoggard 1994. Preliminary estimates of bottlenose dolphin abundance in southern U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico continental shelf waters. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-356. 10 pp.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Andersen, K.P. Burnham and J.L. Laake 1993. Distance sampling: Estimating abundance of biological populations. Chapman and Hall, New York. 446 pp.

Burgess, G. and A. Morgan 2003a. Commercial shark fishery observer program. Renewal of an observer program to monitor the directed commercial shark fishery in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic: 1999 fishing season. U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Highly Migratory Species Management Division Award NA97FF004. Final Report.

Burgess, G. and A. Morgan 2003b. Commercial shark fishery observer program. Renewal of an observer program to monitor the directed commercial shark fishery in the Gulf of Mexico and the south Atlantic: 2002(2) and 2003(1) fishing seasons. U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Highly Migratory Species Management Division Award NA16FM0598. Final Report.

Cunningham-Smith, P., D.E. Colbert, R.S. Wells and T. Speakman 2006. Evaluation of human interactions with a wild bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) near Sarasota Bay, Florida, and efforts to curtail the interactions. Aquatic Mammals 32(3): 346-356.

Fazioli, K.L., S. Hofmann and R.S. Wells 2006. Use of Gulf of Mexico coastal waters by distinct assemblages of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). Aquatic Mammals 32(2): 212-222.

Flewelling, L.J., J.P. Naar, J. P. Abbott, D.G. Baden, N.B. Barros, G.D. Bossart, M.D. Bottein, D.G. Hammond, E.M. Haubold, C.A. Heil, M.S. Henry, H.M. Jacocks, T.A. Leighfield, R.H. Pierce, T.D. Pitchford, S.A.

Rommel, P.S. Scott, K.A. Steidinger, E.W. Truby, F.M.V. Dolah and J.H. Landsberg 2005. Red tides and marine mammal mortalities: Unexpected brevetoxin vectors may account for deaths long after or remote from an algal bloom. Nature 435: 755-756.

Fulling, G.L., K.D. Mullin and C.W. Hubard 2003. Abundance and distribution of cetaceans in outer continental shelf waters of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 101: 923-932.

Gorzelany, J.F. 1998. Unusual deaths of two free-ranging Atlantic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) related to ingestion of recreational fishing gear. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 14(3): 614-617.

Hale, L.F. and J.K. Carlson 2007. Characterization of the shark bottom longline fishery: 2005-2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-554. 28 pp.

Hale, L.F., L.D. Hollensead and J.K. Carlson 2007. Characterization of the shark bottom longline fishery: 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-564. 25 pp.

Hansen, L.J., (ed.) 1992. Report on investigation of 1990 Gulf of Mexico bottlenose dolphin strandings. NOAA-NMFS-SEFSC Contribution MIA-92/93-21.(Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149).

Hersh, S.L. and D.A. Duffield 1990. Distinction between Northwest Atlantic offshore and coastal bottlenose dolphins based on hemoglobin profile and morphometry. Pages 129-139 *in*: S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves, (eds.) The bottlenose dolphin. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Hoelzel, A.R., C.W. Potter and P.B. Best 1998. Genetic differentiation between parapatric 'nearshore' and 'offshore' populations of bottlenose dolphins. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B: Biol. Sci. 265: 1177-1183.

Laake, J.L., S.T. Buckland, D.R. Anderson and K.P. Burnham 1993. DISTANCE user's guide, V2.0. Colorado Cooperative Fish & Wildlife Research Unit, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, CO, 72 pp.

Lahvis, G.P., R.S. Wells, D.W. Kuehl, J.L. Stewart, H.L. Rhinehart and C.S. Via 1995. Decreased lymphocyte responses in free-ranging bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) are associated with increased concentrations of PCB's and DDT in peripheral blood. Environmental Health Perspectives 103: 67-72.

LeDuc, R.G. and B.E. Curry 1998. Mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis indicates need for revision of the genus *Tursiops*. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 47: 393.

Lipscomb, T.P. 1993. Some answers to questions about morbillivirus. Pages 4-5 *in*: R. A. Blaylock, B. Mase and D. K. Odell, (eds.) Strandings. SEFSC Miami Laboratory, Miami, Florida. Vol. 2, No. 3.

Lipscomb, T.P., S. Kennedy, D. Moffet and B.K. Ford 1994. Morbilliviral disease in an Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) from the Gulf of Mexico. Journal of Wildlife Disease 30(4): 572-576.

Lynn, S.K. and B. Würsig 2002. Summer movement patterns of bottlenose dolphins in a Texas bay. Gulf of Mexico Science 20(1): 25-37.

McFee, W.E. and W. Brooks, Jr., 1998. Fact finding meeting of marine mammal entanglement in the crab pot fishery: a summary. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Unpublished Report.

Mullin, K.D., R.R. Lohoefener, W. Hoggard, C.L. Roden and C.M. Rogers 1990. Abundance of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in the coastal Gulf of Mexico. Northeast Gulf Sci. 11(2): 113-122.

NMFS 1991. Proposed regime to govern the interactions between marine mammals and commercial fishing operations after October 1, 1993. Draft Environmental Impact Statement, June 1991. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.

NMFS 2004. Interim report on the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) unusual mortality event along the Panhandle of Florida, March-April 2004. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149, 35 pp.

Rabalais, N.N., R.E. Turner and W.J. Wiseman, Jr. 1999. Hypoxia in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Linkage with the Mississippi River. Pages 297-322 *in*: H. Kumpf, K. Steidinger and K. Sherman, (eds.) The Gulf of Mexico large marine ecosystem. Blackwell Science, Oxford, UK.

Reynolds, J.E., III 1985. Evaluation of the nature and magnitude of interactions between bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and fisheries and other human activities in coastal areas of the southeastern United States. National Technical Information Service PB86-162203, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA 22161.

Richards, P.M. 2007. Estimated takes of protected species in the commercial directed shark bottom longline fishery 2003, 2004, and 2005. NMFS SEFSC Contribution PRD-06/07-08, June 2007, 21 pp.

Samuels, A. and L. Bejder 2004. Chronic interactions between humans and free-ranging bottlenose dolphins near Panama City Beach, Florida, USA. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 6: 69-77.

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, M.D., R.S. Wells and A.B. Irvine 1990. A long-term study of bottlenose dolphins on the west coast of Florida. Pages 235-244 *in*: S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves, (eds.) The bottlenose dolphin. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

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.

Torres, L.G., P.E. Rosel, C. D'Agrosa and A.J. Read 2003. Improving management of overlapping bottlenose dolphin ecotypes through spatial analysis and genetics. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 19(3): 502-514.

Varanasi, U., K.L. Tilbury, D.W. Brown, M.M. Krahn, C.A. Wigren, R.C. Clark and S.L. Chan 1992. Chemical contaminants in bottlenose dolphins stranded along the Gulf of Mexico during 1990. Pages 56-86 *in*: L. J. Hansen, (ed.) Report on investigation of 1990 Gulf of Mexico bottlenose dolphin strandings. Southeast Fisheries Science Center Contribution MIA-92/93-21.

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.

Wells, R.S., J.B. Allen, S. Hoffman, K. Bassos-Hull, D.A. Fauquier, N.B. Barros, R.E. DeLynn, G. Sutton, V. Socha and M.D. Scott 2008. Consequences of injuries on survival and reproduction of common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) along the west coast of Florida. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 24: 774-794.

Wells, R.S., S. Hofmann and T.L. Moors 1998. Entanglement and mortality of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in recreational fishing gear in Florida. Fish. Bull. 96(3): 647-650.

Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1994. Incidence of gear entanglement for resident inshore bottlenose dolphins near Sarasota, Florida. Pages 629 *in*: W. F. Perrin, G. P. Donovan and J. Barlow, (eds.) Gillnets and cetaceans. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Special Issue 15.

Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1997. Seasonal incidence of boat strikes on bottlenose dolphins near Sarasota, Florida. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 13(3): 475-480.

Wells, R.S., V. Tornero, A. Borrell, A. Aguilar, T.K. Rowles, H.L. Rhinehart, S. Hofmann, W.M. Jarman, A.A. Hohn and J.C. Sweeney 2005. Integrating life history and reproductive success data to examine potential relationships with organochlorine compounds for bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Sarasota Bay, Florida. Science of the Total Environment 349: 106-119.

~~November 20068~~March 2009

BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Oceanic Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Thirty-eight stocks have been provisionally identified for northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) bottlenose dolphins (Waring *et al.* 2001). Northern Gulf of Mexico inshore habitat has been separated into 33 bay, sound and estuarine stocks. Three northern Gulf of Mexico coastal stocks include nearshore waters from the shore to the 20 m isobath. The northern Gulf of Mexico continental shelf stock encompasses waters from 20 to 200 m deep. The northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic stock encompasses the waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ; Figure 1).

Both "coastal/nearshore" and "offshore" ecotypes of bottlenose dolphins (Hersh and Duffield 1990) occur in the Gulf of Mexico (LeDuc and Curry 1998) but the distribution of each is not known. The offshore and nearshore ecotypes are genetically distinct using both mitochondrial and nuclear markers (Hoelzel *et al.* 1998). In the northwestern Atlantic Ocean, Torres *et al.* (2003) found a statistically significant break in the distribution of the ecotypes at 34 km from shore. The offshore ecotype was found exclusively seaward of 34km and in waters deeper than 34 m. The continental shelf is much wider in the Gulf of Mexico and these results may not apply. Ongoing research is aimed at defining these boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico.

Based on research currently being conducted on bottlenose dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, as well as the western North Atlantic Ocean, the structure of these stocks is uncertain, but appears to be complex. The multi-disciplinary research programs conducted over the last 37 years (e.g., Wells 1994) are beginning to shed light on stock structures of bottlenose dolphins, though additional analyses are needed before stock structures can be elaborated on in the northern Gulf of Mexico. As research is completed, it may be necessary to revise stocks of bottlenose dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

The northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic stock of bottlenose dolphins is provisionally being considered separate from the Atlantic Ocean stocks of bottlenose dolphins for management purposes. One line of evidence to support this decision comes from (Baron *et al.* 2008), who found that Gulf of Mexico bottlenose dolphin whistles (collected from oceanic waters) were significantly different from those in the western North Atlantic Ocean (collected from continental shelf and oceanic waters) in duration, number of inflection points and number of steps.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for the northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic stock of bottlenose dolphins is 3,708 (CV=0.42) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ.



Figure 1. *Distribution of bottlenose dolphin sightings from SEFSC shipboard surveys during spring 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. Surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Tracklines, which were perpendicular to the bathymetry, covered the waters from 200m to the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for bottlenose dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 2,239 –(CV=0.41) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of -the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for bottlenose dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 3,708 (CV=0.42) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for the northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic stock of bottlenose dolphins. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	2,239	0.41
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	3,708	0.42

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for bottlenose dolphins is 3,708 (CV=0.42) taken from Mullin and Fulling (2004). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic stock is 2,641 bottlenose dolphins.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003 to 2004 of 3,708 (CV=0.42) and that for 1996-2001 of 2,239 (CV=0.41) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the imprecision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of bottlenose dolphin abundance and stock structure. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, the maximum 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 level (PBR) is the product of 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 is 2,641. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the Gulf of Mexico oceanic bottlenose dolphin is 26.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Annual human-caused mortality and serious injury is unknown for this stock.

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of bottlenose dolphins in the Gulf of Mexico is unknown; however, interactions between bottlenose dolphins and fisheries have been observed in the Gulf of Mexico. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to bottlenose dolphins ~~in the Gulf of Mexico~~by this fishery in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2007, 1 bottlenose dolphin was observed entangled and released alive in the northern Gulf of Mexico. All gear was removed and the animal was presumed to have no serious injuries (Fairfield and Garrison 2008). This animal could have belonged to the continental shelf or oceanic stock. ~~However, f~~Fishery interactions have previously been reported to occur between bottlenose dolphins and the longline swordfish/tuna fishery in the northern Gulf of Mexico (SEFSC unpublished logbook data), with annual fishery-related mortality and serious injury to bottlenose dolphins estimated to be 2.8 per year (CV=0.74) during 1992-1993. This could include bottlenose dolphins from the continental shelf and oceanic stocks. One animal was hooked in the mouth and released by the pelagic longline fishery in 1998 (Yeung 1999). There have been no reports of incidental mortality or injury associated with the shrimp trawl fishery in this area. A trawl fishery for butterfish was monitored by NMFS observers for a short period in the 1980's with no records of incidental take of marine mammals (Burn and Scott 1988; NMFS unpublished data), although an experimental set by NMFS resulted in the death of 2 bottlenose dolphins (Burn and Scott 1988). There are no other data available with regard to this fishery.

Other Mortality

A total of 1,4~~91~~32 bottlenose dolphins were found stranded in the northern Gulf of Mexico from 200~~2~~3 through 200~~6~~7 (~~NMFS unpublished data~~NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Of these, ~~93~~84 showed evidence of human interactions as the cause of death (e.g., gear entanglement, mutilation, gunshot wounds). ~~Bottlenose dolphins are known to become entangled in, or ingest recreational and commercial fishing gear (Wells and Scott 1994; Wells *et al.* 1998; Gorzelany 1998), and some are struck by vessels (Wells and Scott 1997).~~ The vast majority of stranded bottlenose dolphins are assumed to belong to one of the coastal stocks or to bay, sound and estuarine stocks. Nevertheless, it is possible that some of the stranded bottlenose dolphins belonged to the continental shelf or oceanic stocks and that they were among those strandings with evidence of human interactions. (Strandings do occur for other cetacean species whose primary range in the Gulf of Mexico is outer continental shelf or oceanic waters.)

The use of explosives to remove oil rigs in portions of the continental shelf in the western Gulf of Mexico has the potential to cause serious injury or mortality to marine mammals. These activities have been closely monitored by NMFS observers since 1987 (Gitschlag and Herczeg 1994). There have been no reports of either serious injury or mortality to bottlenose dolphins in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico (NMFS unpublished data).

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of bottlenose dolphins, relative to OSP, in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic waters is unknown. The species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. ~~The t~~Total ~~level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery~~human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not ~~un~~known.~~,~~ 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 ~~but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate~~. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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.

Baron, S.C., A. Martinez, L.P. Garrison and E.O. Keith 2008. Differences in acoustic signals from Delphinids in the western North Atlantic and northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 24(1): 42-56.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Burn, D. and G.P. Scott 1988. Synopsis of available information on marine mammal-fisheries interactions in the southeastern United States: Preliminary report. Contribution ML-CRG-87/88-26, National Marine Fisheries Service, Miami, FL 37 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Gitschlag, G.R. and B.A. Herczeg 1994. Sea turtle observations at explosive removals of energy structures. Mar. Fish. Rev. 56(2): 1-8.

Hersh, S.L. and D.A. Duffield 1990. Distinction between Northwest Atlantic offshore and coastal bottlenose dolphins based on hemoglobin profile and morphometry. Pages 129-139 *in*: S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves, (eds.) The bottlenose dolphin. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Hoelzel, A.R., C.W. Potter and P.B. Best 1998. Genetic differentiation between parapatric 'nearshore' and 'offshore' populations of bottlenose dolphins. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B: Biol. Sci. 265: 1177-1183.

LeDuc, R.G. and B.E. Curry 1998. Mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis indicates need for revision of the genus *Tursiops*. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 47: 393.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

Torres, L.G., P.E. Rosel, C. D'Agrosa and A.J. Read 2003. Improving management of overlapping bottlenose dolphin ecotypes through spatial analysis and genetics. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 19(3): 502-514.

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., J.M. Quintal and S.L. Swartz, eds. 2001. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments - 2001. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NE-168. vii +151 p. + 2 app. pp.

Wells, R.S. 1994. Determination of bottlenose dolphin stock discreteness: Application of a combined behavioral and genetic approach. K. R. Wang, P. M. Payne and V.G. Thayer (compilers). Coastal stock(s) of Atlantic bottlenose dolphin: Status review and management. Proceedings and recommendations from a workshop held in Beaufort, NC, 13-14 September 1993. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-4. 16-20 pp.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

~~November 2007~~~~8~~March 2009

BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Continental Shelf Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) continental shelf bottlenose dolphin stock inhabits waters from 20 to 200 m deep in the northern Gulf from the U.S.-Mexican border to the Florida Keys (Figure 1). Both "coastal" and "offshore" ecotypes of bottlenose dolphins ~~(Hersh and Duffield 1990)~~ occur in the Gulf of Mexico (Hersh and Duffield 1990; LeDuc and Curry 1998). The continental shelf stock probably consists of a mixture of both the coastal and offshore ecotypes. The offshore and ~~nearshore~~coastal ecotypes are genetically distinct using both mitochondrial and nuclear markers (Hoelzel *et al.* 1998). In the northwestern Atlantic, Torres *et al.* (2003) found a statistically significant break in the distribution of the ecotypes at 34 km from shore. The offshore ecotype was found exclusively seaward of 34 km and in waters deeper than 34 m. Within 7.5 km of shore, all animals were of the coastal ecotype. The continental shelf is much wider in the Gulf of Mexico so these results may not apply. The continental shelf stock range may extend into Mexican and Cuban territorial waters; however, there are no available estimates of either abundance or mortality from those countries. A stranded dolphin from the Florida Panhandle, genetically intermediate between coastal and offshore forms, was rehabilitated and released over the shelf off western Florida, and traveled into the Atlantic Ocean (Wells *et al.* 1999).

The bottlenose dolphins inhabiting waters <20 m deep in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf are believed to constitute 36 inshore or coastal stocks. An oceanic stock is provisionally defined for bottlenose dolphins inhabiting waters >200 m. Both inshore and coastal stocks and the oceanic stock are separate from the continental shelf stock, but the continental shelf stock may overlap with coastal stocks and the oceanic stock in some areas and may be genetically indistinguishable from some of those stocks. However, studies have shown significant genetic differentiation between inshore stocks and coastal/continental shelf stocks along the central west coast of Florida (Sellas *et al.* 2005).



Figure 1. *Distribution of bottlenose dolphin sightings from SEFSC fall vessel surveys during 1998-2001. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Based on research currently being conducted on bottlenose dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, as well as the western North Atlantic Ocean, the structure of these stocks is uncertain, but appears to be complex. The multi-disciplinary research programs conducted over the last 3~~7~~8 years (e.g., Wells 1994) have begun to shed light on the structure of some of the stocks of bottlenose dolphins, though additional analyses are needed before stock structures can be elaborated on in the northern Gulf of Mexico. As research is completed, it may be necessary to revise stocks of bottlenose dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

POPULATION SIZE

The current population size for the bottlenose dolphin continental shelf stock in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown because the survey data from the continental shelf are more than 8 years old (Wade and Angliss 1997).

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.*

2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. Data were collected from 1998 to 2001 during fall plankton surveys conducted from NOAA ships *Oregon II* (1998, 1999) and *Gordon Gunter* (2000, 2001). Tracklines, which were perpendicular to the bathymetry, covered shelf waters from the 20-m to the 200-m isobaths (Figure 1; Table 1; Fulling *et al.* 2003). Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate for both areas.

~~As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates using data older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations.~~

~~Therefore, t~~The previous~~most recent~~best abundance estimate of bottlenose dolphins was based on data pooled from 2000 through 2001 for continental shelf vessel surveys and was 17,777 (CV=0.32) (see Fulling *et al.* 2003). As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates using data older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. ~~This estimate is also considered the best because these surveys have the most complete coverage of the species' habitat.~~ Because data from the continental shelf are more than 8 years old, the current best population estimate is unknown.

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is unknown. -The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for bottlenose dolphins is ~~17,777 (CV=0.32)~~ unknown. The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is ~~13,667 bottlenose dolphins~~ unknown.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate from the 2000-2001 ship survey of 17,777 (CV=0.32) and the previous abundance from a 1992-1994 aerial survey of 50,247 (CV=0.18) (Blaylock and Hoggard 1994) are significantly different (P<0.05). However, there are a number of reasons the 2 estimates are different other than from a change in abundance. Blaylock and Hoggard (1994) estimated from aerial surveys that about 31% of the bottlenose dolphins in shelf waters west of Mobile Bay were in a rather small area from the Mississippi River Delta west to about 90.5ºW. Vessel survey effort in this area was small and resulted in only 1 sighting of bottlenose dolphins. Therefore, vessel-based estimates may have underestimated the abundance of bottlenose dolphins in the western shelf. Aerial abundances were based on survey lines that extended from 9.3 km past the 18 m (10 fm) curve to 9.3 km past 183 m (100 fm) curve, so the area surveyed was somewhat different than from the study area (20-200 m) for vessel surveys. Also, Atlantic spotted dolphins are very common in shelf waters and are similar in length and shape to bottlenose dolphins. Atlantic spotted dolphins are born without spots and become progressively more spotted with age, but young animals look very similar to bottlenose dolphins. Therefore, depending on the composition of the group, from a distance Atlantic spotted are not always easily distinguished from bottlenose dolphins, so it is possible that some groups were misidentified during aerial surveys leading to bias in the relative abundance of each species.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is un~~known~~determined. PBR is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a "recovery" factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is ~~13,667~~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 the stock is of unknown status. ~~PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico continental shelf bottlenose dolphin is 136.~~

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of bottlenose dolphins in the pelagic longline fishery during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield

Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2007 there was 1 bottlenose dolphin released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Fairfield and Garrison 2008). –There were 3 interactions with the shark bottom longline fishery, including one mortality, during 1994-2003, and none during 2004-2007 (Burgess (Burgess and Morgan 2003a; b; Hale and Carlson 2007; Hale *et al.* 2007; Richards 2007).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of bottlenose dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown; however, interactions between bottlenose dolphins and fisheries have been observed in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Fishery interactions have been reported to occur between bottlenose dolphins and the pelagic longline -fishery in the Gulf of Mexico (SEFSC unpublished logbook data),. and During 2007, 1 bottlenose dolphin was observed entangled and released alive by the pelagic longline fishery in the northern Gulf of Mexico. All gear was removed and the animal was presumed to have no serious injuries (Fairfield and Garrison 2008). This animal could have belonged to the continental shelf or oceanic stock. aAnnual fishery-related mortality and serious injury to bottlenose dolphins from the pelagic longline fishery was estimated to be 2.8 per year (CV=0.74) during 1992-1993. This could include bottlenose dolphins from the oceanic stock. The shark bottom longline fishery has been observed since 1994, and 3 interactions with bottlenose dolphins have been recorded in the northern Gulf of Mexico. The incidents include 1 mortality (2003) and 2 hooked animals that escaped at the vessels (1999, 2002;Burgess and Morgan 2003a; b; Hale and Carlson 2007; Hale *et al.* 2007; Richards 2007). Based on the water depths of the interactions (~12-60 m), they likely involved animals from the eastern coastal and continental shelf stocks. For the shark bottom longline fishery in the northern Gulf of Mexico, Richards (2007) estimated bottlenose dolphin mortalities of 58 (CV=0.99), 0 and 0 for 2003, 2004 and 2005, respectively. A voluntary observer program for the shrimp trawl fishery began in 1992 and became mandatory in 2007. Two bottlenose dolphin mortalities were observed during 2003 and 2007 which could have belonged to either a coastal or a bay, sound and estuarine stock. During 1992-2007 the shrimp trawl fishery observer program recorded an additional 6 unidentified dolphins caught in a lazy line or turtle excluder device, and 1 or more of these animals may have belonged to the continental shelf stock of bottlenose dolphins. In 2 of the 6 cases, an observer report indicated the animal may have already been decomposed, but this could not be confirmed in the absence of a necropsy. There have been no reports of incidental mortality or injury associated with the shrimp trawl fishery in this area. A trawl fishery for butterfish was monitored by NMFS observers for a short period in the 1980's with no records of incidental take of marine mammals (Burn and Scott 1988; NMFS unpublished data), although an experimental set by NMFS resulted in the death of 2 bottlenose dolphins (Burn and Scott 1988). There are no other data available.

Other Mortality

A total of 1,49132 bottlenose dolphins were found stranded in the northern Gulf of Mexico from 20023 through 20067 (NMFS unpublished dataNOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Of these, 9384 showed evidence of human interactions as the cause of death (e.g., gear entanglement, mutilation, gunshot wounds). Bottlenose dolphins are known to become entangled in, or ingest recreational and commercial fishing gear (Wells and Scott 1994; 1997; Gorzelany 1998; Wells *et al.* 1998), and some are struck by vessels (Wells and Scott 1997). The vast majority of stranded bottlenose dolphins are assumed to belong to one of the coastal or bay, sound and estuarine stocks. Nevertheless, it is possible that some of the stranded bottlenose dolphins belonged to the continental shelf or oceanic stocks and that they were among those strandings with evidence of human interactions. (Strandings do occur for other cetacean species whose primary range in the Gulf of Mexico is outer continental shelf or oceanic waters.)

The use of explosives to remove oil rigs in portions of the continental shelf in the western Gulf of Mexico has the potential to cause serious injury or mortality to marine mammals. These activities have been closely monitored by NMFS observers since 1987 (Gitschlag and Herczeg 1994). There have been no reports of either serious injury or mortality to bottlenose dolphins (NMFS unpublished data).

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of bottlenose dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is not a strategic stock because average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR. Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. Despite an undetermined PBR and unknown population size, this is not a strategic stock because previous estimates of population size have been large compared to the number of cases of documented human-related mortality and serious injury.

REFERENCES CITED

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.

Blaylock, R.A. and W. Hoggard 1994. Preliminary estimates of bottlenose dolphin abundance in southern U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico continental shelf waters. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-356. 10 pp.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Burgess, G. and A. Morgan 2003a. Commercial shark fishery observer program. Renewal of an observer program to monitor the directed commercial shark fishery in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic: 1999 fishing season. U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Highly Migratory Species Management Division Award NA97FF004. Final Report.

Burgess, G. and A. Morgan 2003b. Commercial shark fishery observer program. Renewal of an observer program to monitor the directed commercial shark fishery in the Gulf of Mexico and the south Atlantic: 2002(2) and 2003(1) fishing seasons. U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service, Highly Migratory Species Management Division Award NA16FM0598. Final Report.

Burn, D. and G.P. Scott 1988. Synopsis of available information on marine mammal-fisheries interactions in the southeastern United States: Preliminary report. Contribution ML-CRG-87/88-26, National Marine Fisheries Service, Miami, FL 37 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Fulling, G.L., K.D. Mullin and C.W. Hubard 2003. Abundance and distribution of cetaceans in outer continental shelf waters of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 101: 923-932.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Gitschlag, G.R. and B.A. Herczeg 1994. Sea turtle observations at explosive removals of energy structures. Mar. Fish. Rev. 56(2): 1-8.

Gorzelany, J.F. 1998. Unusual deaths of two free-ranging Atlantic bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) related to ingestion of recreational fishing gear. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 14(3): 614-617.

Hale, L.F. and J.K. Carlson 2007. Characterization of the shark bottom longline fishery: 2005-2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-554. 28 pp.

Hale, L.F., L.D. Hollensead and J.K. Carlson 2007. Characterization of the shark bottom longline fishery: 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-564. 25 pp.

Hersh, S.L. and D.A. Duffield 1990. Distinction between Northwest Atlantic offshore and coastal bottlenose dolphins based on hemoglobin profile and morphometry. Pages 129-139 *in*: S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves, (eds.) The bottlenose dolphin. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Hoelzel, A.R., C.W. Potter and P.B. Best 1998. Genetic differentiation between parapatric 'nearshore' and 'offshore' populations of bottlenose dolphins. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. B: Biol. Sci. 265: 1177-1183.

LeDuc, R.G. and B.E. Curry 1998. Mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis indicates need for revision of the genus *Tursiops*. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 47: 393.

Richards, P.M. 2007. Estimated takes of protected species in the commercial directed shark bottom longline fishery 2003, 2004, and 2005. NMFS SEFSC Contribution PRD-06/07-08, June 2007, 21 pp.

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.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

Torres, L.G., P.E. Rosel, C. D'Agrosa and A.J. Read 2003. Improving management of overlapping bottlenose dolphin ecotypes through spatial analysis and genetics. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 19(3): 502-514.

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.

Wells, R.S. 1994. Determination of bottlenose dolphin stock discreteness: Application of a combined behavioral and genetic approach. K. R. Wang, P. M. Payne and V.G. Thayer (compilers). Coastal stock(s) of Atlantic bottlenose dolphin: Status review and management. Proceedings and recommendations from a workshop held in Beaufort, NC, 13-14 September 1993. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-4. 16-20 pp.

Wells, R.S., S. Hofmann and T.L. Moors 1998. Entanglement and mortality of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, in recreational fishing gear in Florida. Fish. Bull. 96(3): 647-650.

Wells, R.S., C.A. Manire, H.L. Rhinehart, D. Smith, A.J. Westgate, F.I. Townsend, T. Rowles, A.A. Hohn and L.J. Hansen 1999. Ranging patterns of rehabilitated rough-toothed dolphins, *Steno bredanensis*, released in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. 13th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 28 Nov - 3 Dec, 1999, Maui, HI.

Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1994. Incidence of gear entanglement for resident inshore bottlenose dolphins near Sarasota, Florida. Pages 629 *in*: W. F. Perrin, G. P. Donovan and J. Barlow, (eds.) Gillnets and cetaceans. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Special Issue 15.

Wells, R.S. and M.D. Scott 1997. Seasonal incidence of boat strikes on bottlenose dolphins near Sarasota, Florida. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 13(3): 475-480.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

BRYDE'S WHALE (*Balaenoptera edeni*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Bryde's whales are distributed worldwide in tropical and sub-tropical waters. In the western Atlantic Ocean, Bryde's whales are reported from off the southeastern United States and the southern West Indies to Cabo Frio, Brazil (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983). Most of the sighting records of Bryde's whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) are from NMFS abundance surveys that were conducted during the spring (Figure 1; Hansen *et al.* 1995; Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). However, there are stranding records from throughout the year (Würsig *et al.* 2000).

It has been postulated that the Bryde's whales found in the northern Gulf of Mexico may represent a resident stock (Schmidly 1981; Leatherwood and Reeves 1983), but there is no information on stock differentiation. The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico Bryde's whales is 15 (CV=1.98) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of Bryde's whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data.

From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of Bryde's whales for all surveys combined from 1991 through 1994 was 35 (CV=1.10) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1).

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for Bryde's whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 40 (CV=0.61) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA

Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for Bryde's whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 15 (CV=1.98) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico Bryde's whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	35	1.10
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	40	0.61
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	15	1.98

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for Bryde's whales is 15 (CV=1.98). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 5 Bryde's whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 15 (1.98) and that for 1996-2001 of 40 (CV=0.61) are not significantly different (P>0.05) from each other but due to the imprecision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. The abundance estimate for 1991-1994 was 35 (CV=1.09). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of Bryde's whale abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 5. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico Bryde's whale is 0.1.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of Bryde's whales during 1998-20067 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of Bryde's whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to Bryde's whales by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There were no reported strandings of Bryde's whales in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-2005 and during 2007. One Bryde's whale –calf live-stranded in Sandestin, Florida, during November 2006. No evidence of human interaction was detected for this stranded animal (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Bryde's whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Schmidly, D.J. 1981. Marine mammals of the southeastern United States and the Gulf of Mexico. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, DC. FWS/OBS-80/41. 165 pp.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Würsig, B., T.A. Jefferson and D.J. Schmidly 2000. The marine mammals of the Gulf of Mexico. Texas A&M University Press, College Station.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

CLYMENE DOLPHIN (*Stenella clymene*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The Clymene dolphin is endemic to tropical and sub-tropical waters of the Atlantic (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Perrin and Mead 1994). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur primarily over the deeper waters off the continental shelf and primarily west of the Mississippi River (Mullin *et al.* 1994; Figure 1; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Clymene dolphins were seen in the winter, spring and summer during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1992 to 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico Clymene dolphins is 6,575 (CV=0.36) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of Clymene dolphin sightings from SEFSC shipboard spring surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. ~~Exclusive Economic Zone (~~EEZ~~)~~ (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of Clymene dolphins for all surveys combined was 5,571 (CV=0.37) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1).

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for Clymene dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 17,355 (CV=0.65) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA

Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for Clymene dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 6,575 (CV=0.36) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico Clymene dolphins. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	5,571	0.37
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	17,355	0.65
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	6,575	0.36

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for Clymene dolphins is 6,575 (CV=0.36). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 4,901 Clymene dolphins.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 6,575 (CV=0.36) and that for 1996-2001 of 17,355 (CV=0.65) are significantly different (P<0.05). However, the 2003-2004 estimate is similar to that for 1991-1994 of 5,571 (CV=0.37). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of Clymene dolphin abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 4,901. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico Clymene dolphin is 49.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of Clymene dolphins during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of Clymene dolphins in the northern Gulf of

Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to Clymene dolphins by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There were 3 reported stranding events of Clymene dolphins in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). One animal stranded in Florida in July 2002, 2 animals mass stranded in Louisiana in September 2003, and 1 animal stranded in Texas in April 2004. ~~There were n~~No ~~indications~~evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Clymene dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The t~~Total ~~level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery~~human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is ~~un~~not known~~,~~ but none has been documented. The total level of fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is not a strategic stock because average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K., W. Hoggard, C. Roden, R. Lohoefener, C. Rogers and B. Taggart 1994. Cetaceans on the upper continental slope in the north-central Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 92: 773-786.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys.

Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Perrin, W.F. and J.G. Mead 1994. Clymene dolphin *Stenella clymene* (Gray, 1846). Pages 161-171 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

November 20068March 2009

CUVIER'S BEAKED WHALE (*Ziphius cavirostris*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Cuvier's beaked whales are distributed throughout the world's oceans except for the polar regions (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Heyning 1989). Strandings have occurred in all months along the east coast of the U.S. (Schmidly 1981) and throughout the year in the Gulf of Mexico (Würsig *et al.* 2000). Beaked whales were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). Some of the aerial survey sightings may have included Cuvier's beaked whale, but identification of beaked whale species from aerial surveys is problematic. Beaked whale sightings made during spring and summer vessel surveys have been widely distributed in waters >500 m deep (Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006; Figure 1).

Strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales along the west coast of North America, based on skull characteristics, are thought to represent members of a panmictic population (Mitchell 1968), but there is no information on stock differentiation in the Gulf of Mexico and nearby waters. In the absence of adequate information on stock structure, a species' range within an ocean should be divided into defensible management units, and such management units include distinct oceanographic regions (Wade and Angliss 1997). The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for Cuvier's beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is 65 (CV=0.67) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). However, this abundance estimate is negatively biased because only sightings of beaked whales which could be positively identified to species were used. The estimate for the same time period for unidentified Ziphiidae is 337 (CV=0.40), which may also include an unknown number of *Mesoplodon* spp.



Figure 1. *Distribution of beaked whale sightings from SEFSC shipboard spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of Cuvier's beaked whales for all surveys combined was 30 (CV=0.50) (Table 1).

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for Cuvier's beaked whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 95 (CV=0.47) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1). The estimated abundance of Cuvier's beaked whales was negatively biased because only sightings of beaked whales which could be positively identified to species were used. The estimate for the same time period for unidentified Ziphiidae was 146 (CV=0.46), which may also include an unknown number of *Mesoplodon* spp.

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for Cuvier's beaked whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 65 (CV=0.67) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico. The estimate for the same time period for unidentified Ziphiidae was 337 (CV=0.40), which may also include an unknown number of *Mesoplodon* spp.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico Cuvier's beaked whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	30	0.50
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	95	0.47
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	65	0.67

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for Cuvier's beaked whales is 65 (CV=0.67). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 39 Cuvier's beaked whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 65 (CV=0.67) and that for 1996-2001 of 95 (CV=0.47) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of Cuvier's beaked whale abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size for the Cuvier's beaked whale is 39. The maximum productivity rate is 0.04, the default value for cetaceans. The recovery factor for this stock is 0.5 because the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico Cuvier's beaked whale is 0.4.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a Cuvier's beaked whale during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2007 there was 1 unidentified beaked whale released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of Cuvier's beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to Cuvier's beaked whales by this fishery. However, during 2007, 1 unidentified beaked whale was observed entangled and released alive in the northern Gulf of Mexico. All gear was removed and the animal was presumed to have no serious injuries (Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Other Mortality

Cuvier's beaked whales were taken occasionally in a small, directed fishery for cetaceans that operated out of the Lesser Antilles (Caldwell and Caldwell 1971). There was ~~one~~1 reported stranding of Cuvier's beaked whale in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). One Cuvier's beaked whale stranded in Texas in October 2004. ~~There was n~~No ~~indication~~evidence of human interaction was detected~~s~~ for this stranded animal. Two unidentified beaked whales mass stranded in Florida in December 1999. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

Several unusual mass strandings of beaked whales in North Atlantic marine environments have been associated with military naval activities. During the mid- to late 1980's multiple mass strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales (4 to about 20 per event) and small numbers of Gervais' beaked whales and Blainville's beaked whales occurred in the Canary Islands (Simmonds and Lopez-Jurado (1991). Twelve Cuvier's beaked whales that live stranded and subsequently died in the Mediterranean Sea on 12-13 May 1996 were associated with low frequency acoustic sonar tests conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Frantzis 1998). In March 2000, 14 beaked whales live stranded in the Bahamas; 6 beaked whales (5 Cuvier's and 1 Blainville's) died (Balcomb and Claridge 2001; Evans and England 2001; Cox *et al.* 2006). Four Cuvier's, 2 Blainville's, and 2 unidentified beaked whales were returned to sea. The fate of the animals returned to sea is unknown. Necropsies were performed on 5 of the dead beaked whales and revealed evidence of tissue trauma associated with an acoustic or impulse injury that caused the animals to strand. Subsequently, the animals died due to extreme physiologic stress associated with the physical stranding (i.e., hyperthermia, high endogenous catecholamine release) (Evans and England 2001; Cox *et al.* 2006).

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Cuvier's beaked whales and other beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The t~~Total ~~level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery~~human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is ~~un~~not known~~,~~ but none has been documented~~assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate~~. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

Disturbance by anthropogenic noise may prove to be an important habitat issue in some areas of this population's range, notably in areas of oil and gas activities or where shipping or naval activities are high. Limited studies are currently being conducted to address this issue and its impact, if any, on this and other marine species.

REFERENCES CITED

Balcomb, K.C.I. and D.E. Claridge 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. Bahamas J. Sci. 2: 2-12.

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Caldwell, D.K. and M.C. Caldwell 1971. Beaked whales, *Ziphius cavirostris*, in the Bahamas. Quart. Jour. Florida Acad. Sci. 34(157-160).

Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G.D. Spain, A. Fernandez, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hilderbrand, D. Houser, T. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. MacLeod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D. Moutain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Mead and L. Benner 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 7(3): 177-187.

Evans, D.L. and G.R. England 2001. Joint interim report - Bahamas Marine Mammal Stranding - event of 15-16 March 2000. U.S. Department of Commerce; Secretary of the Navy, vi + 59 pp. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/acoustics/acoustics_reports.htm

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? Nature 392: 29.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Heyning, J.E. 1989. Cuvier's beaked whale, *Ziphius cavirostris* G. Cuvier, 1823. Pages 289-308 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of Marine Mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and larger toothed whales. Academic Press, London.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mitchell, E. 1968. Northeast Pacific stranding distribution and seasonality of Cuvier's beaked whale, *Ziphius cavirostris*. Can. J. Zool. 46: 265-279.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Schmidly, D.J. 1981. Marine mammals of the southeastern United States and the Gulf of Mexico. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, DC. FWS/OBS-80/41. 165 pp.

Simmonds, M.P. and L.F. Lopez-Jurado 1991. Whales and the military. Nature: 351:448.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Würsig, B., T.A. Jefferson and D.J. Schmidly 2000. The marine mammals of the Gulf of Mexico. Texas A&M University Press, College Station.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

DWARF SPERM WHALE (*Kogia sima*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The dwarf sperm whale appears to be distributed worldwide in temperate to tropical waters (Caldwell and Caldwell 1989). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur primarily in oceanic waters (Figure 1; Mullin *et al.* 1991; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Dwarf sperm whales and pygmy sperm whales (*Kogia breviceps*) are difficult to differentiate at sea, and sightings of either species are usually categorized as *Kogia* spp. Sightings of this category were documented in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico from 1992 to 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). The difficulty in sighting dwarf and pygmy sperm whales may be exacerbated by their avoidance reaction towards ships, and change in behavior towards approaching survey aircraft (Würsig *et al.* 1998).

In a study using hematological and stable-isotope data, Barros *et al.* (1998) speculated that dwarf sperm whales may have a more pelagic distribution than pygmy sperm whales and/or dive deeper during feeding bouts. Diagnostic morphological characters have also been useful in distinguishing the 2 *Kogia* species (Barros and Duffield 2003), thus enabling researchers to use stranding data in distributional and ecological studies. Specifically, the distance from the snout to the center of the blowhole in proportion to the animal's total length, as well as the height of the dorsal fin, in proportion to the animal's total length, can be used to differentiate between the 2 *Kogia* species when such measurements are obtainable (Barros and Duffield 2003).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 453 (CV=0.35) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of dwarf and pygmy sperm whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200 m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. ~~Exclusive Economic Zone (~~EEZ~~)~~ (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of dwarf and pygmy sperm whales for all surveys combined was 547 (CV =0.28) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 742 (CV=0.29) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1) . A separate estimate of abundance for dwarf sperm whales could not be estimated due to uncertainty of species identification at sea.

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 453 (CV=0.35) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for these species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of combined abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico dwarf and pygmy sperm whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	547	0.28
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	742	0.29
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	453	0.35

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 453 (CV=0.35). It is not possible to determine the minimum population estimate for only dwarf sperm whales. The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 340 dwarf and pygmy sperm whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species due to uncertainty in species identification at sea. The pooled abundance estimate for *Kogia* spp. for 2003-2004 of 453 (CV=0.35) and that for 1996-2001 of 742 (CV=0.29) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. The abundance estimate for *Kogia* spp. for 1991-1994 was 547 (CV=0.28). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of *Kogia* abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 340. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is 3.4. It is not possible to determine the PBR for only dwarf sperm whales.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of dwarf or pygmy sperm whales during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of dwarf sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to dwarf sperm whales by this fishery.

Other Mortality

~~There were no documented strandings of dwarf sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1999-2006 which were classified as likely caused by fishery interactions.~~ At least 1~~2~~7 dwarf sperm whale strandings were documented in the northern Gulf of Mexico from 1999 through 200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008; Table ~~1~~2 displays 200~~2~~3-200~~6~~7 data~~; 9 showed no signs of human interaction and 3 were designated "could not be determined"~~). No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. An additional 9 *Kogia* spp. stranded during 1999-200~~6~~7 (2 in Texas in 2000, 1 in Texas in 2001, 2 in Texas in 2002, 1 in Mississippi in 2003, 1 in Florida in 2003, 1 in Florida in 2004, and ~~2~~1 in Florida in 2006). Evidence of human interactions was detected for 1 of these stranded animals. ~~-~~Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

Table ~~1~~2. Dwarf sperm whale (*Kogia sima*) strandings along the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico coast, 200~~2~~3-200~~6~~7.

STATE	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	1[a]	1[c~~b~~]	1	~~1~~2[d,~~e~~e]	2	7
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0[~~a~~b]	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	2	0	0	2[f]	4
TOTAL	1	3	1	~~1~~2	4	11

[a] 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded
[~~a~~b] 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded
[~~b~~c] 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded
[~~c~~d] ~~2~~1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded
[e] Previously reported incorrectly as 1 stranded animal
[f] Mass stranding of 2 animals in August 2007

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of dwarf sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The t~~Total ~~level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery~~human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is ~~un~~not known~~,~~. 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. Despite an unknown PBR for this species, this is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed combined PBR for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales. but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is not a strategic stock because average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR. However, the continuing inability to distinguish between species of *Kogia* raises concerns about the possibility of mortalities of one1 stock or the other exceeding PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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.

Barros, N.B. and D.A. Duffield 2003. Unraveling the mysteries of pygmy and dwarf sperm whales. Strandings Newsletter of the Southeast U.S. Marine Mammal Stranding Network. December 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-521. 11 pp.

Barros, N.B., D.A. Duffield, P.H. Ostrom, D.K. Odell and V.R. Cornish 1998. Nearshore vs. offshore ecotype differentiation of *Kogia breviceps* and *K. sima* based on hemoglobin, morphometric and dietary analyses. Abstracts. World Marine Mammal Science Conference, Monaco, 20-24 January.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Caldwell, D.K. and M.C. Caldwell 1989. Pygmy sperm whale *Kogia breviceps* (de Blainville, 1838): Dwarf sperm whale *Kogia sima* Owen, 1866. Pages 235-260 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K., W. Hoggard, C. Roden, R. Lohoefener, C. Rogers and B. Taggart 1991. Cetaceans on the upper continental slope in the north-central Gulf of Mexico. OCS Study/MMS 91-0027. U.S. Dep. Interior, Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Regional Office, New Orleans, LA 108 pp.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Würsig, B., S.K. Lynn, T.A. Jefferson and K.D. Mullin 1998. Behavior of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. Aquatic Mammals 24: 41-50.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

~~November 2006~~8March 2009

FALSE KILLER WHALE (*Pseudorca crassidens*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The false killer whale is distributed worldwide throughout warm temperate and tropical oceans (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983). Sightings of this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur in oceanic waters, primarily in the eastern Gulf (Figure 1; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). False killer whales were seen only in the spring and summer during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000) and in the spring during vessel surveys (Mullin and Fulling 2004).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered 1 stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico false killer whales is 777 (CV=0.56) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of false killer whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. ~~Exclusive Economic Zone (~~EEZ~~)~~ (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of false killer whales for all surveys combined was 381 (CV=0.62) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1).

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for false killer whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 1,038 (CV=0.71) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates

prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for false killer whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 777 (CV=0.56) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico false killer whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	381	0.62
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	1,038	0.71
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	777	0.56

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for false killer whales is 777 (CV=0.56). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 501 false killer whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 777 (CV=0.56) and that for 1996-2001 of 1,038 (CV=0.71) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of false killer whale abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 501. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico false killer whale is 5.0.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There hass been 1no reported fishing-related mortality of a false killer whale during 1998-20067, which was a stranding in 1999 classified as likely caused by fishery interactions or other human-related causes due to mutilation of limbs (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of false killer whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the U.S.northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to false killer whales by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There was 1 reported stranding of a false killer whale in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). This animal, which stranded in Alabama in 1999, was classified as likely caused by fishery interactions or other human-related causes. The fins and flukes of the animal had been amputated. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of false killer whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

FRASER'S DOLPHIN (*Lagenodelphis hosei*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Fraser's dolphin is distributed worldwide in tropical waters (Perrin *et al.* 1994). Sightings in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur in oceanic waters (>200m) (Figure 1; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Fraser's dolphins have been observed in the northern Gulf of Mexico during all seasons (Leatherwood *et al.* 1993; Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered 1 stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico Fraser's dolphins is unknown (Mullin 2007; Table 1). No sightings of groups of Fraser's dolphins were made during summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. Nevertheless, a small number of Fraser's dolphins probably continually inhabit the northern Gulf of Mexico. Historically, sightings have been consistently made every 3-4 years since the early 1990's but have not occurred or have been rare during any given survey.



Figure 1. *Distribution of Fraser's dolphin sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of Fraser's dolphins for all surveys combined was 127 (CV= 0.90) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for Fraser's dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, is 726 (CV=0.70) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates

prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for Fraser's dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 0 (Mullin 2007). Because sightings of groups of Fraser's dolphins have historically been uncommon to rare, it is probable that Fraser's dolphins were in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 2003 and 2004 but were not encountered. Therefore, the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown (Table 1).

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico Fraser's dolphins. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	127	0.90
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	726	0.70
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	0	-

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for Fraser's dolphins is unknown. The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico for -Fraser's dolphins is unknown.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The best available abundance estimate is unknown. The pooled abundance estimate for 1996-2001 of 726 (CV=0.70) and that for 1991-1994 of 127 (CV=0.89) were not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low.

The large relative changes in the total abundances of Fraser's dolphin are probably due to a number of factors. Fraser's dolphin is most certainly a resident species in the Gulf of Mexico but probably occurs in low numbers and the survey effort is not sufficient to estimate the abundance of uncommon or rare species with precision. Also, ~~T~~these temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of Fraser's dolphin abundance. Fraser's dolphin, like all the other oceanic cetacean species in the Gulf, is a mobile predator and this stock is most likely a transboundary stock. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico Fraser's dolphin is un~~known~~determined.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a Fraser's dolphin during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999;

2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of Fraser's dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to Fraser's dolphins by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There was 1 reported stranding event of Fraser's dolphins in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Ten animals mass stranded in Florida during April 2003. ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Fraser's dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. 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. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Despite an un~~known~~determined PBR, this is not a strategic stock because there is no documented human-related mortality and serious injury.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S., T.A. Jefferson, J.C. Norris, W.E. Stevens, L.J. Hansen and K.D. Mullin 1993. Occurrence and sounds of Fraser's dolphin in the Gulf of Mexico. Texas J. Sci. 45(4): 349-354.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Perrin, W.F., S. Leatherwood and A. Collet 1994. Fraser's dolphin *Lagenodelphis hosei* (Fraser 1956). Pages 225-240 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

November 20068March 2009

GERVAIS' BEAKED WHALE (*Mesoplodon europaeus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Three species of *Mesoplodon* are known to occur in the Gulf of Mexico, based on stranding or sighting data (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Würsig *et al.* 2000). These are Blainville's beaked whale (*M. densirostris*), Gervais' beaked whale (*M. europaeus*) and Sowerby's beaked whale (*M. bidens*). Sowerby's beaked whale in the Gulf of Mexico is considered extralimital because there is only 1 known stranding of this species (Bonde and O'Shea 1989) and because it normally occurs in northern temperate waters of the North Atlantic (Mead 1989). Identification of *Mesoplodon* to species in the Gulf of Mexico is very difficult, and in many cases, *Mesoplodon* and Cuvier's beaked whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*) cannot be distinguished; therefore, sightings of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) are identified as *Mesoplodon* sp., Cuvier's beaked whale, or unidentified Ziphiidae.

Gervais' beaked whales appear to be widely but sparsely distributed in temperate and tropical waters of the world's oceans (Leatherwood *et al.* 1976; Leatherwood and Reeves 1983). Strandings have occurred along the northwestern Atlantic coast from Florida to Nova Scotia (Schmidly 1981), and there have been 16 documented strandings in the Gulf of Mexico (Würsig *et al.* 2000). Beaked whales were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) from 1992 to 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). Beaked whale sightings made during spring and summer vessel surveys have been widely distributed in waters >500 m deep (Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006; Figure 1).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The total number of Gervais' beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. The best available abundance estimate is for *Mesoplodon* spp., and is a combined estimate for Gervais' beaked whale and Blainville's beaked whale. The estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. in oceanic waters, using data pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys, is 57 (CV=1.40) (Mullin 2007; Table 1).



Figure 1. *Distribution of beaked whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of undifferentiated beaked whales (*Ziphius* and *Mesoplodon* spp.) for all surveys combined was 117 (CV=0.38) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 106 (CV=0.41) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1). This was a combined estimate for Blainville's beaked whale and Gervais' beaked whale. The estimate for the same time period for unidentified Ziphiidae was 146 (CV=0.46), which may also include an unknown number of Cuvier's beaked whales.

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extend of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 57 (CV=1.40) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for these species in the northern Gulf of Mexico. This is a combined estimate for Blainville's beaked whale and Gervais' beaked whale. The estimate for the same time period for unidentified Ziphiidae was 337 (CV=0.40), which may also include an unknown number of Cuvier's beaked whales.

Table 1. Summary of recent abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico *Mesoplodon* spp., which is a combined estimate for Gervais' beaked whale and Blainville's beaked whale. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	106	0.41
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	57	1.40

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for *Mesoplodon* spp. is 57 (CV = 1.40). The minimum population estimate for *Mesoplodon* spp. in the northern Gulf of Mexico is 24.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species due to uncertainty in species identification at sea. The pooled abundance estimate for *Mesoplodon* spp. for 2003-2004 of 57 (CV=1.40) and that for 1996-2001 of 106 (CV=0.41) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of *Mesoplodon* abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). -The minimum population size for *Mesoplodon* spp. is 24. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico *Mesoplodon* spp. is 0.2. It is not possible to determine the PBR for only Gervais' beaked whales.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a beaked whale during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2007 there was 1 unidentified beaked whale released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to Gervais' or other beaked whales by this fishery. However, during 2007, 1 unidentified beaked whale was observed entangled and released alive in the northern Gulf of Mexico. All gear was removed and the animal was presumed to have no serious injuries (Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Other Mortality

There were no strandings of *Mesoplodon* spp. or unidentified beaked whales during 2004-200~~6~~7. There were 2 reported stranding events of beaked whales in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-2003. Two unidentified beaked whales mass stranded in Florida in December 1999, and 1 unidentified *Mesoplodon* stranded in Florida in January 2003. ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

Several unusual mass strandings of beaked whales in North Atlantic marine environments have been associated with military naval activities. During the mid- to late 1980's multiple mass strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales (4 to about 20 per event) and small numbers of Gervais' beaked whales and Blainville's beaked whales occurred in the Canary Islands (Simmonds and Lopez-Jurado 1991). Twelve Cuvier's beaked whales that live stranded and subsequently died in the Mediterranean Sea on 12-13 May 1996 were associated with low frequency acoustic sonar tests conducted by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Frantzis 1998). In March 2000, 14 beaked whales live stranded in the Bahamas; 6 beaked whales (5 Cuvier's and 1 Blainville's) died (Balcomb and Claridge 2001; Evans and England 2001; Cox *et al.* 2006). Four Cuvier's, 2 Blainville's, and 2 unidentified beaked whales were returned to sea. The fate of the animals returned to sea is unknown. Necropsies were performed on 5 of the dead beaked whales and revealed evidence of tissue trauma associated with an acoustic or impulse injury that caused the animals to strand. Subsequently, the animals died due to extreme physiologic stress associated with the physical stranding (i.e., hyperthermia, high endogenous catecholamine release) (Evans and England 2001; Cox *et al.* 2006).

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Gervais' beaked whales or other beaked whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. 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. –This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

Disturbance by anthropogenic noise may prove to be an important habitat issue in some areas of this population's range, notably in areas of oil and gas activities or where shipping or naval activities are high. Limited studies are currently being conducted to address this issue and its impact, if any, on this and other marine species.

REFERENCES CITED

Balcomb, K.C.I. and D.E. Claridge 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. Bahamas J. Sci. 2: 2-12.

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.

Bonde, R.K. and T.J. O'Shea 1989. Sowerby's beaked whale (*Mesoplodon bidens*) in the Gulf of Mexico. J. Mamm. 70: 447-449.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G.D. Spain, A. Fernandez, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hilderbrand, D. Houser, T. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. MacLeod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D. Moutain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Mead and L. Benner 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 7(3): 177-187.

Evans, D.L. and G.R. England 2001. Joint interim report - Bahamas Marine Mammal Stranding - event of 15-16 March 2000. U.S. Department of Commerce; Secretary of the Navy, vi + 59 pp. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/acoustics/acoustics_reports.htm

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? Nature 392: 29.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S., D.K. Caldwell and H.E. Winn 1976. Whales, dolphins, and porpoises of the western North Atlantic. A guide to their identification. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS Circ. 396. 176 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mead, J.G. 1989. Beaked whales of the genus *Mesoplodon*. Pages 349-430 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River Dolphins and toothed whales. Academic press, San Diego.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Schmidly, D.J. 1981. Marine mammals of the southeastern United States and the Gulf of Mexico. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, DC. FWS/OBS-80/41. 165 pp.

Simmonds, M.P. and L.F. Lopez-Jurado 1991. Whales and the military. Nature: 351:448.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Würsig, B., T.A. Jefferson and D.J. Schmidly 2000. The marine mammals of the Gulf of Mexico. Texas A&M University Press, College Station.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

KILLER WHALE (*Orcinus orca*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The killer whale is distributed worldwide from tropical to polar regions (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) during 1951-1995 occurred primarily in oceanic waters ranging from 256 to 2,652 m (averaging 1,242 m) in the north-central Gulf of Mexico (O'Sullivan and Mullin 1997). More recent sightings from NMFS vessel surveys have also occurred in oceanic waters of the north-central Gulf (Figure 1). Despite extensive shelf surveys (O'Sullivan and Mullin 1997), no killer whales have been reported on the Gulf of Mexico shelf waters other than those reported in 1921, 1985 and 1987 by Katona *et al.* (1988). Killer whales were seen only in the summer during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000), were reported from May through June during vessel surveys (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006) and recorded in May, August, September and November by earlier opportunistic ship-based sources (O'Sullivan and Mullin 1997).

Different stocks were identified in the northeastern Pacific based on morphological, behavioral and genetic characteristics (Bigg *et al.* 1990; Hoelzel 1991). There is no information on stock differentiation for the Atlantic Ocean population, although an analysis of vocalizations of killer whales from Iceland and Norway indicated that whales from these areas may represent different stocks (Moore *et al.* 1988). Thirty-two individuals have been photographically identified to date in the northern Gulf of Mexico, with 6 individuals having been sighted over a 5 year period, and 1 whale resighted over 10 years. Three animals have been sighted over a range of more than 1,100km (O'Sullivan and Mullin 1997). The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.



Figure 1. *Distribution of killer whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico killer whales is 49 (CV=0.77) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200 m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during summer in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of killer whales for all surveys combined was 277 (CV=0.42) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for killer whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 133 (CV=0.49) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for killer whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 49 (CV=0.77) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico killer whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	277	0.42
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	133	0.49
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	49	0.77

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for killer whales is 49 (CV=0.77). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 28 killer whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 49 (CV=0.77) and that for 1996-2001 of 133 (CV=0.49) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. The abundance estimate for 1991-1994 was 277 (CV=0.42). The large relative changes in the total abundances of killer whales are probably due to a number of factors. The killer whale is most certainly a resident species in the Gulf of Mexico but probably occurs in low numbers and the survey effort is not sufficient to estimate the abundance of uncommon or rare species with precision. Also, these temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of killer whale abundance. The killer whale, like all the other oceanic cetacean species in the Gulf, is a mobile predator and this stock is most likely a transboundary stock. ~~These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of killer whale abundance.~~ The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). –The minimum population size is 28. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico killer whale is 0.3.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a killer whale during 1998-20067 (Yeung (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of killer whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to killer whales by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There were no reported strandings of killer whales in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-20067 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of killer whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but the rarity of mortality reports for this species suggests that this level is insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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.

Bigg, M.A., P.F. Olesiuk, G.M. Ellis, J.K.B. Ford and K.C. Balcomb 1990. Social organization and genealogy of resident killer whales (Orcinus orca) in the coastal waters of British Columbia and Washington State. Pages 383-405 *in*: P. S. Hammond, S. A. Mizroch and G. P. Donovan, (eds.) Individual recognition of cetaceans: Use of photoidentification and other techniques to estimate population parameters. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge. Special Issue 12.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet

during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Hoelzel, A.R. 1991. Analysis of regional mitochondrial DNA variation in the killer whale; Implications for conservation. Pages 225-233 *in*: A. R. Hoelzel, (ed.) Genetic ecology of whales and dolphins. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge. Special Issue 13.

Katona, S.K.J.A.B., P.E. Girton and F. Wenzel 1988. Killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) from the Bay of Fundy to the equator, including the Gulf of Mexico. Rit Fiskideild 11: 205-224.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Moore, S.E., J.K. Francine, A.E. Bowles and K.B. Ford 1988. Analysis of calls of killer whales, *Orcinus orca*, from Iceland and Norway. Rit. Fiskideild 11: 225-250.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

O'Sullivan, S. and K.D. Mullin 1997. Killer whales (Orcinus orca) in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 13(1): 141-147.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

MELON-HEADED WHALE (*Peponocephala electra*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The melon-headed whale is distributed worldwide in tropical to sub-tropical waters (Jefferson *et al.* 1994). Sightings in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) have generally occurred in ~~oceanic waters~~water depths >800m and west of Mobile Bay, Alabama (Figure 1; Mullin *et al.* 1994; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Sightings of melon-headed whales were documented in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered 1 stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico melon-headed whales is 2,283 (CV=0.76) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of melon-headed whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100m and 1,000m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. ~~Exclusive Economic Zone (~~EEZ~~)~~ (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of melon-headed whales for all surveys combined was 3,965 (CV=0.39) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for melon-headed whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 3,451 (CV=0.55) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates

prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for melon-headed whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 2,283 (CV=0.76) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico melon-headed whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	3,965	0.39
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	3,451	0.55
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	2,283	0.76

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for melon-headed whales is 2,283 (CV=0.76). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 1,293 melon-headed whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003 to 2004 of 2,283 (CV=0.76) and that for 1996-2001 of 3,451 (CV=0.55) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These estimates are generally similar to that for 1991-1994 of 3,965 (CV=0.39). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of melon-headed whale abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 1,293. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico melon-headed whale is 13.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a melon-headed whale during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of melon-headed whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. There has historically been some take of this species in small cetacean fisheries in the Caribbean (Caldwell *et al.* 1976). Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~ northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to melon-headed whales by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There were ~~8~~10 reported strandings of melon-headed whales in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008; Table ~~1~~2 displays 200~~2~~3-200~~6~~7 data). ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

Table ~~1~~2. Melon-headed whale (*Peponocephala electra*) strandings along the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico coast, 200~~2~~3-200~~6~~7.

STATE	2003[a]	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	2	0	0	0	0	2
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	1	1	0	1	2	5~~3~~
TOTAL	3	1	0	1	2	~~5~~7

[a] Strandings from 2003 were previously reported incorrectly~~ in previous reports~~. Previous reports listed 2 strandings in Alabama and 2 in Texas, for a total of 4 strandings in 2003.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of melon-headed whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Caldwell, D.K., M.C. Caldwell and R.V. Walker 1976. First records for Fraser's dolphin (*Lagenodelphis hosei*) in the Atlantic and the melon-headed whale (*Peponocephala electra*) in the western Atlantic. Cetology 25: 1-4.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet

during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Jefferson, T.A., S. Leatherwood and M.A. Weber 1994. Marine mammals of the world. FAO, Rome. 320 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K., W. Hoggard, C. Roden, R. Lohoefener, C. Rogers and B. Taggart 1994. Cetaceans on the upper continental slope in the north-central Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 92: 773-786.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

~~November 20068~~March 2009

PANTROPICAL SPOTTED DOLPHIN (*Stenella attenuata*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

There are two species of spotted dolphin in the Atlantic Ocean, the Atlantic spotted dolphin (*Stenella frontalis*) and the pantropical spotted dolphin (*S. attenuata*) (Perrin *et al.* 1987). The Atlantic spotted dolphin occurs in two forms which may be distinct sub-species (Perrin *et al.* 1987; Perrin *et al.* 1994; Rice 1998): the large, heavily spotted form which inhabits the continental shelf and is usually found inside or near the 200-m isobath; and the smaller, less spotted island and offshore form which occurs in the Atlantic Ocean but is not known to occur in the Gulf of Mexico (Fulling *et al.* 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2004). Where they co-occur, the offshore form of the Atlantic spotted dolphin and the pantropical spotted dolphin can be difficult to differentiate at sea.

The pantropical spotted dolphin is distributed worldwide in tropical and some sub-tropical oceans (Perrin *et al.* 1987; Perrin and Hohn 1994). Sightings of this species occur in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) (Figure 1: Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Pantropical spotted dolphins were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

Some of the Pacific Ocean populations have been divided into different geographic stocks based on morphological characteristics (Perrin *et al.* 1987; Perrin and Hohn 1994). The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico pantropical spotted dolphins is 34,067 (CV=0.18) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of pantropical spotted dolphin sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. ~~Exclusive Economic Zone (~~EEZ~~)~~ (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of pantropical spotted dolphins for all surveys combined was 31,320 (CV=0.20) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1).

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for pantropical spotted dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 91,321 (CV=0.16) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter*(Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for pantropical spotted dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 34,067 (CV=0.18) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico pantropical spotted dolphins. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	31,320	0.20
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	91,321	0.16
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	34,067	0.18

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for pantropical spotted dolphins is 34,067 (CV=0.18). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 29,311 pantropical spotted dolphins.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 34,067 (CV=0.18) and that for 1996-2001 of 91,321 (CV=0.16) are significantly different ($P<0.05$). However, the 2003-2004 estimate is similar to that for 1991-1994 of 31,320 (CV=0.20). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of pantropical spotted dolphin abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate, and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 29,311. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico pantropical spotted dolphin is 293.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a pantropical spotted dolphins during 1998-20067

(Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of pantropical spotted dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to pantropical spotted dolphins by this fishery during 1998-200~~5~~7.

Other Mortality

S~~even~~ix pantropical spotted dolphins stranded in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~5 (1 in Alabama during 2005~~,~~; ~~4~~3 in Florida during 2003 and 2004~~,~~; 2 in Texas during 1999 and 2001). ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. No strandings occurred during 2006-2007 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of pantropical spotted dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. The total level of ~~U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused~~fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is not a strategic stock because average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Fulling, G.L., K.D. Mullin and C.W. Hubard 2003. Abundance and distribution of cetaceans in outer continental shelf waters of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 101: 923-932.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2003. Abundance of cetaceans in the southern U.S. North Atlantic Ocean during summer 1998. Fish. Bull. 101: 603-613.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Perrin, W.F., D.K. Caldwell and M.C. Caldwell 1994. Atlantic spotted dolphin. Pages 173-190 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Volume 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego.

Perrin, W.F. and A.A. Hohn 1994. Pantropical spotted dolphin *Stenella attenuata* (Meyen, 1833). Pages 129-159 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London.

Perrin, W.F., E.D. Mitchell, J.G. Mead, D.K. Caldwell, M.C. Caldwell, P.J.H. van Bree and W.H. Dawbin 1987. Revision of the spotted dolphins, *Stenella spp*. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 3(2): 99-170.

Rice, D.W. 1998. Marine mammals of the world, systematics and distribution. The Society for Marine Mammalogy, Lawrence, KS. 231 pp.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

November 20068March 2009

PYGMY KILLER WHALE (*Feresa attenuata*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The pygmy killer whale is distributed worldwide in tropical and subtropical waters (Ross and Leatherwood 1994). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur in oceanic waters (Figure 1; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Sightings of pygmy killer whales were documented in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico pygmy killer whales is 323 (CV=0.60) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of pygmy killer whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of pygmy killer whales for all surveys combined was 518 (CV=0.81) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). —Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for pygmy killer whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 408 (CV=0.60) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are

deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for pygmy killer whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 323 (CV=0.60) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for pygmy killer whales is 323 (CV=0.60). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 203 pygmy killer whales.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico pygmy killer whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	518	0.81
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	408	0.60
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	323	0.60

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 323 (CV=0.60) and that for 1996-2001 of 408 (CV=0.60) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These estimates are generally similar to that for 1991-1994 of 518 (CV=0.81). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of pygmy killer whale abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). –The minimum population size is 203. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico pygmy killer whale is 2.0.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a pygmy killer whale during 1998-20067 (Yeung (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of pygmy killer whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. There has historically been some take of this species in small cetacean fisheries in the Caribbean (Caldwell and Caldwell 1971). Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to pygmy killer whales by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There were 2 reported strandings of a pygmy killer whale in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). One pygmy killer whale stranded in Florida in 2001, and 1 stranded in Texas in 2004. ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of pygmy killer whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES

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. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-6, 73 pp.

Buckland, S. T., D. R. Anderson, 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~~,~~. 432 pp.

Caldwell, D. K. and M. C. Caldwell. 1971. The pygmy killer whale, *Feresa attenuata*, in the western Atlantic, with a summary of world records. J. Mamm. 52:206-209.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L. P. Garrison. 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539, 52 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L. P. Garrison. 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560, 54 pp.

Fairfield, C. P. and L. P. Garrison. 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572, 62 pp.

Garrison, L. P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515, 52 pp.

Garrison, L. P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531, 57 pp.

Garrison, L. P. and P. M. Richards. 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527, 57 pp.

Hansen, L. J., K. D. Mullin and C. L. Roden. 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami Laboratory, Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25, 9 pp. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.

Hansen, L. J., K. D. Mullin, T. A. Jefferson and G. P. Scott. 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. pp. 55-132. *In:* R.W. Davis and G.S. Fargion (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96- 0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.

Maze-Foley, K. and K. D. Mullin. 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K. D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. 26 pp.

Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568.

Mullin, K. D. and G. L. Fulling. 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K. D. and W. Hoggard. 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. pp. 111-172. *In:* R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 2000-003. U.S. Department of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.

Ross, G. J. B. and S. Leatherwood. 1994. Pygmy killer whale *Feresa attenuata* (Gray, 1874). pp. 387-404. *In:* S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: –The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London,. 416 pp.

Thomas, L., J. L. Laake, J. F. Derry, S. T. Buckland, D. L. Borchers, D. R. Anderson, K. P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S. L. Hedley, F. F. C. Marques, J. H. Pollard and R. M. Fewster. 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

Wade, P. R. and R. P. Angliss. 1997. Guidelines for assessing marine mammal stocks: Report of the GAMMS Workshop April 3-5, 1996, Seattle, WA. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech Memo. NMFS-OPR-12, 93 pp.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430, 26 pp. ~~Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.~~

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-467, 43 pp. ~~Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Dr., Miami, FL 33149.~~

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Caldwell, D.K. and M.C. Caldwell 1971. Beaked whales, *Ziphius cavirostris*, in the Bahamas. Quart. Jour. Florida Acad. Sci. 34(157-160).

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm.

Sci. 20(4): 787-807.
Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.
Ross, G.J.B. and S. Leatherwood 1994. Pygmy killer whale *Feresa attenuata* (Gray, 1874). Pages 387-404 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London.
Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.
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.
Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.
Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

PYGMY SPERM WHALE (*Kogia breviceps*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The pygmy sperm whale appears to be distributed worldwide in temperate to tropical waters (Caldwell and Caldwell 1989; Bloodworth and Odell 2008). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur primarily in oceanic waters (Figure 1; Mullin *et al.* 1991; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Pygmy sperm whales and dwarf sperm whales (*Kogia sima*) are difficult to differentiate at sea, and sightings of either species are often categorized as *Kogia* sp. Sightings of this category were documented in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico from 1992 to 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). The difficulty in sighting pygmy and dwarf sperm whales may be exacerbated by their avoidance reaction towards ships, and change in behavior towards approaching survey aircraft (Würsig *et al.* 1998)).

In a study using hematological and stable-isotope data, Barros *et al.* (1998) speculated that dwarf sperm whales may have a more pelagic distribution than pygmy sperm whales, and/or dive deeper during feeding bouts. Diagnostic morphological characters have also been useful in distinguishing the 2 *Kogia* species (Barros and Duffield 2003), thus enabling researchers to use stranding data in distributional and ecological studies. Specifically, the distance from the snout to the center of the blowhole in proportion to the animal's total length, as well as the height of the dorsal fin, in proportion to the animal's total length, can be used to differentiate between the 2 *Kogia* species when such measurements are obtainable (Barros and Duffield 2003).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico pygmy and dwarf sperm whales is 453 (CV=0.35) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of pygmy and dwarf sperm whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of pygmy and dwarf sperm whales for all surveys combined was 547 (CV=0.28) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1).

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for pygmy and dwarf sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 742 (CV=0.29) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1). A separate estimate of abundance for pygmy sperm whales could not be estimated due to uncertainty of species identification at sea.

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of -the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for pygmy and dwarf sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 453 (CV=0.35) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for these species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of combined abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico pygmy and dwarf sperm whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	547	0.28
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	742	0.29
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	453	0.35

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for pygmy and dwarf sperm whales is 453 (CV=0.35). It is not possible to determine the minimum population estimate for only pygmy sperm whales. The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 340 pygmy and dwarf sperm whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species due to uncertainty in species identification at sea. The pooled abundance estimate for *Kogia* spp. for 2003-2004 of 453 (CV=0.35) and that for 1996-2001 of 742 (CV=0.29) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. The abundance estimate for *Kogia* spp. for 1991-1994 was 547 (CV=0.28). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of *Kogia* abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size for pygmy and dwarf sperm whales is 340. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico pygmy and dwarf sperm whales is 3.4. It is not possible to determine the PBR for only pygmy sperm whales.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of dwarf or pygmy sperm whales during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of dwarf sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to dwarf sperm whales by this fishery.

Other Mortality

At least 1~~7~~8 pygmy sperm whale strandings were documented in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008; Table ~~1~~2 displays 200~~2~~3-200~~6~~7 data~~; 15 showed no signs of human interaction and 2 were designated "could not be determined"~~). Two animals mass stranded in Florida during January 2001. No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. An additional 9 *Kogia* spp. stranded during 1999-200~~6~~7 (2 in Texas in 2000, 1 in Texas in 2001, 2 in Texas in 2002, 1 in Mississippi in 2003, 1 in Florida in 2003, 1 in Florida in 2004, and ~~2~~1 in Florida in 2006). Evidence of human interactions was detected for 1 of these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

Table ~~1~~2. Pygmy sperm whale (*Kogia breviceps*) strandings along the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico coast, 200~~2~~3- 200~~6~~7.

STATE	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0~~0~~
Florida	3[a]	1[c~~b~~]	0	1[d~~c~~]	1	6~~7~~
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0~~0~~
Mississippi	0[b~~a~~]	0	0	0	0	0~~0~~
Texas	1	0	2	1	0	4~~6~~
TOTAL	4	1	2	2	1	10~~13~~

[a] 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded
[b~~a~~] 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded
[c~~b~~] 1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded
[d~~c~~] ~~2~~1 additional *Kogia* sp. stranded

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of pygmy sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is not a strategic stock because average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. Despite an unknown PBR for this species, this is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed combined PBR for dwarf and pygmy sperm whales.

However, the continuing inability to distinguish between species of *Kogia* raises concerns about the possibility of mortalities of ~~one~~1 stock or the other exceeding PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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.

Barros, N.B. and D.A. Duffield 2003. Unraveling the mysteries of pygmy and dwarf sperm whales. Strandings Newsletter of the Southeast U.S. Marine Mammal Stranding Network. December 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-521. 11 pp.

Barros, N.B., D.A. Duffield, P.H. Ostrom, D.K. Odell and V.R. Cornish 1998. Nearshore vs. offshore ecotype differentiation of *Kogia breviceps* and *K. sima* based on hemoglobin, morphometric and dietary analyses. Abstracts. World Marine Mammal Science Conference, Monaco, 20-24 January.

Bloodworth, B.E. and D.K. Odell 2008. *Kogia breviceps* (Cetacea: Kogiidae). Mammalian Species 819: 1-12.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Caldwell, D.K. and M.C. Caldwell 1989. Pygmy sperm whale *Kogia breviceps* (de Blainville, 1838): Dwarf sperm whale *Kogia sima* Owen, 1866. Pages 235-260 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K., W. Hoggard, C. Roden, R. Lohoefener, C. Rogers and B. Taggart 1991. Cetaceans on the upper continental slope in the north-central Gulf of Mexico. OCS Study/MMS 91-0027. U.S. Dep. Interior, Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Regional Office, New Orleans, LA 108 pp.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.
Würsig, B., S.K. Lynn, T.A. Jefferson and K.D. Mullin 1998. Behavior of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. Aquatic Mammals 24: 41-50.
Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.
Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

November 20068March 2009

RISSO'S DOLPHIN (*Grampus griseus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Risso's dolphin is distributed worldwide in tropical to warm temperate waters (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983). Risso's dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur throughout oceanic waters but are concentrated in continental slope waters (Figure 1; Baumgartner 1997; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Risso's dolphins were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently little information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). In 2006, a Risso's dolphin that stranded on the Florida Gulf Coast was rehabilitated, satellite tagged and released into the Gulf southwest of Tampa Bay. Over a 23-day period the Risso's dolphin moved from the Gulf release site, into the Atlantic Ocean, and north to just off of Delaware (Wells *et al.* In press). During September 2007 – January 2008, tracking of an adult female Risso's dolphin that had been rehabilitated and released by Mote Marine Laboratory after stranding on the southwest coast of Florida documented movements throughout the northern Gulf of Mexico. The dolphin, released with its young calf, traveled as far as Bahia de Campeche, Mexico, and waters off Texas and Louisiana before returning to the shelf edge southwest of its stranding site off Florida (Wells *et al.* 2008). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico Risso's dolphins is 1,589 (CV=0.27) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of Risso's dolphin sightings from SEFSC vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of Risso's dolphins for all surveys combined was 2,749 (CV=0.27) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for Risso's dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 2,169 (CV=0.32) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for Risso's dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 1,589 (CV=0.27) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico Risso's dolphins. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	2,749	0.27
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	2,169	0.32
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	1,589	0.27

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for Risso's dolphins is 1,589 (CV=0.27). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 1,271 Risso's dolphins.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 1,589 (CV=0.27) and that for 1996-2001 of 1,777 (CV=0.34) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is relatively low. These estimates are generally similar to that for 1991-1994 of 2,749 (CV=0.27). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of Risso's dolphin abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 1,271. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico Risso's dolphin is 13.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a Risso's dolphin during 1998-20067 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2005 there was one1 Risso's dolphin released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of Risso's dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. This species has been taken in the U.S. pelagic longline fishery in the northern Gulf of Mexico and in the U.S. Atlantic (Lee *et al.* 1994). Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the U.S.northern Gulf of Mexico (see Appendix III for a description of the large pelagics longline fishery). There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to Risso's dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico by this fishery during 1998-20067 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2005, 1 Risso's dolphin was observed entangled and released alive in the northern Gulf of Mexico. The animal was not hooked, but was tangled with mainline and leader around its flukes. All gear was removed and the animal dove immediately. It is presumed to have not been seriously injured (Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006). One Risso's dolphin was observed taken and released alive during 1992; the extent of injury to the animal was unknown (SEFSC, unpublished data). One lethal take of a Risso's dolphin by the fishery was observed in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1993 (SEFSC, unpublished data). Estimated average annual fishery-related mortality and serious injury attributable to the pelagic longline fishery in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1992-1993 was 19 Risso's dolphins (CV=0.20).

Other Mortality

There were 916 reported strandings of Risso's dolphin in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-20067 (613 in Florida, 3 in Texas; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008; see Table 2 for 2003-2007 data). This includes one1 mass stranding of 5 animals in Florida during July 2005 (1 was rehabilitated and released by Mote Marine Laboratory), and 1 mass stranding of 4 animals in Florida during May 2007 (2 were rehabilitated and released by Mote Marine Laboratory). There was nNo evidence of human interactions was detected for any of the stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

In 1992, with the enactment of the Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Act, the Working Group on Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Events was created to determine when an unusual mortality event (UME) is occurring, and then to direct responses to such events. Since 1992, 8 UMEs have been declared in the Gulf of Mexico, and 1 of these included a Risso's dolphin. Between August 1999 and May 2000, 1562 bottlenose dolphins died coincident with *K.arenia brevis* blooms and fish kills in the Florida Panhandle. Additional strandings included 3 Atlantic spotted dolphins, *Stenella frontalis*, 1 Risso's dolphin, 2 Blainville's beaked whales, *Mesopolodon densirostris*, and 4 unidentified dolphins.

Table 2. Risso's dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) strandings along the northern Gulf of Mexico coast, 2003-2007.

STATE	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**TOTAL**
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	0	1	5[a]	0	6[b]	12
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	1	1	0	0	2
TOTAL	0	2	6	0	6	14

[a] Florida mass stranding of 5 animals in July 2005

[b] Includes Florida mass stranding of 4 animals in May 2007

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Risso's dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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.

Baumgartner, M.F. 1997. The distribution of Risso's dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) with respect to physiography in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 13: 614-638.

Buckland, S.T., D.R. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Lee, D.W., C.J. Brown, A.J. Catalano, J.R. Grubich, T.W. Greig, R.J. Miller and M.T. Judge 1994. SEFSC pelagic longline observer program data summary for 1992-1993. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-347. 19 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Wells, R.S., G.A. Early, J.G. Gannon, R.G. Lingenfelser and P. Sweeney In press. Tagging and tracking of rough-toothed dolphins (*Steno bredanensis*) from the March 2005 mass stranding in the Florida Keys. S. F. S. C. Available from NMFS, 75 Virginia Beach Road, Miami, FL 33149. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-XXX, XX

Wells, R.S., C.A. Manire, L. Byrd, D.R. Smith, J.G. Gannon, D. Fauquier and K.D. Mullin 2008. Movements and dive patterns of a rehabilitated Risso's dolphin, *Grampus griseus*, in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 25(2): 420-429.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

ROUGH-TOOTHED DOLPHIN (*Steno bredanensis*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The rough-toothed dolphin is distributed worldwide in tropical to warm temperate waters (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Miyazaki and Perrin 1994). Rough-toothed dolphins occur in both oceanic and continental shelf waters in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) (Figure 1; Fulling *et al.* 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Rough-toothed dolphins were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). Four dolphins from a mass stranding of 62 animals in the Florida Panhandle in December 1997 were rehabilitated and released in 1998, and satellite-linked transmitters tracked for 4 ~~-~~to 112 days. A report after 5 months ~~,~~indicated that the animals returned to, and remained in, Gulf waters averaging about 195 m deep offshore of the original stranding site (Wells *et al.* 1999).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered 1 stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The current population size for the rough-toothed dolphin in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown because the survey data from the continental shelf that covers a significant portion of this stock's range are more than 8 years old (Wade and Angliss 1997).

~~The best available abundance estimate for the rough-toothed dolphin in the northern Gulf of Mexico is the combined estimate of abundance for both the outer continental shelf and oceanic waters which is 2,653 (CV=0.42) (Table 1).~~



Figure 1. *Distribution of rough-toothed dolphin sightings from SEFSC spring and fall vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and ~~the offshore~~the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of rough-toothed dolphins for all surveys combined was 852 (CV= 0.31) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). This was probably an underestimate and should be considered a partial stock estimate because the continental shelf area was not entirely covered.

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico from 200 m to the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ. Estimates for all oceanic strata were summed, as survey effort was not uniformly distributed, to calculate a total estimate for the entire northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic waters (Mullin and Fulling 2004). Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate for both continental shelf and oceanic waters. The estimate of abundance for rough-toothed dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 through 2001, was 985 (CV=0.44) (Mullin and Fulling 2004). Data were collected from 1998 to 2001 during fall plankton surveys. Tracklines, which were perpendicular to the bathymetry, covered shelf waters from 20 to 200m deep in the fall of 1998 through 2001 (Figure 1; Table 1; see Fulling *et al.* 2003). As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates using data older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. ~~Therefore, t~~The ~~most recent~~ estimated abundance of rough-toothed dolphins was based on data pooled from 2000 through 2001, for the outer continental shelf shipboard surveys and was 1,145 (CV=0.83) (see Fulling *et al.* 2003).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter*. The estimate of abundance for rough-toothed dolphins in oceanic waters from 2003 and 2004~~,~~ was 1,508 (CV=0.39) (Mullin 2007)~~,~~.

Because most of the data for oceanic estimates prior to 2003 were older than the 8-year limit and due to the different oceanic sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable for oceanic waters. The ~~best~~~~most recent available~~previous abundance estimate for the rough-toothed dolphin in the northern Gulf of Mexico ~~i~~was the combined estimate of abundance for both the outer continental shelf (fall surveys, 2000-2001) and oceanic waters (spring and summer surveys, 2003-2004), which ~~i~~was 2,653 (CV=0.42)~~.~~ –. Because data from the continental shelf portion of this estimate are more than 8 years old, the current best population estimate is unknown.

Table 1. Most recent abundance estimates (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV) of rough-toothed dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico outer continental shelf (OCS) (waters 20-200m deep) during fall 2000-2001 and oceanic waters (200m to the offshore extent of the EEZ) during spring/summer 2003-2004.

Month/Year	**Area**	**N_{best}**	**CV**
Fall 2000-2001	Outer Continental Shelf	1,145	0.83
Spring/Summer 2003 -2004	Oceanic	1,508	0.39
Spring/Summer & Fall	**OCS & Oceanic**	**2,653**	**0.42**

Minimum Population Estimate

~~The~~ The current minimum population estimate is unknown. –The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). ~~The best estimate of abundance for rough-toothed dolphins is 2,653 (CV=0.42). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 1,890 rough-toothed dolphins.~~

Current Population Trend

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

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is un~~known~~determined. PBR is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a “recovery” factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362;Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 1,890unknown. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico rough-toothed dolphin is 18.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality or serious injury of rough-toothed dolphins during 1992-20067 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of rough-toothed dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the U.S.northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to rough-toothed dolphins by this fishery in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1992-20067 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Other Mortality

There were 4950 stranded rough-toothed dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1999-20067, including a mass stranding of 19 animals in February 2001, a mass stranding of 12 animals in September 2004, and a mass stranding of 11 animals in March 2005 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008; Table 2 displays 20023-20067 data). There was nNo evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

Table 2. Rough-toothed dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*) strandings along the U.S.northern Gulf of Mexico coast, 20023-20067.

STATE	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	TOTAL
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	1	12[a]	11[ba]	1	1	26
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	1	1	1	0	3
TOTAL	1	13	12	2	1	29

[a] Florida mass stranding of 112 animals in MarchSeptember 20054
[b] Florida mass stranding of 11 animals in March 2005

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of rough-toothed dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is not a strategic stock because average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known but none has been documented. 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. Despite an undetermined PBR, this is not a strategic stock because there is no documented human-related mortality and serious injury.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Fulling, G.L., K.D. Mullin and C.W. Hubard 2003. Abundance and distribution of cetaceans in outer continental shelf waters of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 101: 923-932.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Miyazaki, N. and W.F. Perrin 1994. Rough-toothed dolphin *Steno bredanensis* (Lesson, 1828). Pages 1-21 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. J. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of Marine Mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Wells, R.S., C.A. Manire, H.L. Rhinehart, D. Smith, A.J. Westgate, F.I. Townsend, T. Rowles, A.A. Hohn and L.J. Hansen 1999. Ranging patterns of rehabilitated rough-toothed dolphins, *Steno bredanensis*, released in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. 13th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 28 Nov - 3 Dec, 1999, Maui, HI.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

SHORT-FINNED PILOT WHALE (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The short-finned pilot whale is distributed worldwide in tropical to temperate waters (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur primarily on the continental slope west of 89˚W (Figure 1; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Short-finned pilot whales were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico short-finned pilot whales is 716 (CV=0.34) (Mullin (Mullin 2007; Table 1) 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of short-finned pilot whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of short-finned pilot whales for all surveys combined was 353 (CV=0.89) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1).

Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for short-finned pilot whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 2,388 (CV=0.48) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are

deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most ~~of the~~of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for short-finned ~~-~~pilot whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 716 (CV=0.34) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico short-finned pilot whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	353	0.89
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	2,388	0.48
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	716	0.34

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for short-finned pilot whales is 716 (CV=0.34). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 542 short-finned pilot whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 716 (CV=0.34) and that for 1996-2001 of 2,388 (CV=0.48) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the imprecision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. The abundance estimate for 1991-1994 was 353 (CV=0.52). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of short-finned pilot whale abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 542. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico short-finned pilot whale is 5.4.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a short-finned pilot whale~~s~~ during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). However, during 2006 there was ~~one~~1 short-finned pilot whale released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of short-finned pilot whales in the northern Gulf of

Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no recent reports of mortality or serious injury to short-finned pilot whales by this fishery. During 2006, ~~one~~1 short-finned pilot whale was observed entangled and released alive with no serious injury. The animal was not hooked, but was lassoed around its body in front of the flippers (not through the mouth). It was disentangled and was observed swimming away quickly (Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007). There was 1 logbook report of a fishery-related injury of a pilot whale in the northern Gulf of Mexico in 1991.

Other Mortality

There have been 2 reported mass strandings of short-finned pilot whales in the Gulf of Mexico since 1999. Both mass strandings occurred in Florida. Two animals mass stranded in May 1999, and 9 animals in October 2001. ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. There were no other documented strandings of short-finned pilot whales in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-2005 or during 2007. One short-finned pilot whale stranded during 2006 in Florida; no evidence of human interactions was detected for this animal (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008)~~ did not show signs of human interaction~~. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of short-finned pilot whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9

pp.
Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.
Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.
Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.
Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.
Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.
Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.
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.
Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.
Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

SPERM WHALE (*Physeter macrocephalus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Sperm whales are found throughout the world's oceans in deep waters to the edge of the ice at both poles (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Rice 1989; Whitehead 2002). Sperm whales were commercially hunted in the Gulf of Mexico by American whalers from sailing vessels until the early 1900s (Townsend 1935). In the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) systematic aerial and ship surveys indicate that sperm whales inhabit continental slope and oceanic~~only~~ waters ~~greater than 200m deep~~ where they are widely distributed (Figure 1; Fulling *et al.* 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Mullin *et al.* 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006; Mullin 2007). Seasonal aerial surveys confirm that sperm whales are present in the northern Gulf of Mexico in all seasons (Mullin *et al.* 1994; Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). The information for southern Gulf of Mexico waters is more limited, but there are sighting and stranding records from each season with sightings widely distributed in continental slope waters of the western Bay of Campeche (Ortega-Ortiz 2002).



Figure 1. *Distribution of sperm whale sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100m and 1,000m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Sperm whales throughout the world exhibit a geographic social structure where females and juveniles of both sexes occur in mixed groups and inhabit tropical and subtropical waters. Males, as they mature, initially form bachelor groups but eventually become more socially isolated and more wide-ranging, inhabiting temperate and polar waters as well (Whitehead 2003). While this pattern also applies to the Gulf of Mexico, results of multi-disciplinary research conducted in the Gulf since 2000 confirms speculation by Schmidly (1981) and indicates clearly that Gulf of Mexico sperm whales constitute a stock that is distinct from other Atlantic Ocean stocks(s) (Mullin *et al.* 2003; Jaquet 2006; Jochens *et al.* 2008). The following summarizes the most significant stock structure-related findings from Jochens *et al*. (2008). Measurements of the total length of Gulf of Mexico sperm whales indicate that they are 1.5-2.0m smaller on average compared to whales measured in other areas. Female/~~juvenile~~immature group size in the Gulf (9-11 whales) is about one-~~half~~third that found elsewhere. Tracks from 39 whales satellite tagged in the northern Gulf were monitored for up to 607 days. No discernable seasonal migrations were made, but Gulf-wide movements primarily along the northern Gulf slope did occur. The~~se~~ tracks showed that whales exhibit~~ed~~ a range of movement patterns within the Gulf, including movement into the southern Gulf in a few cases, but that only 1 whale (a male) left the Gulf of Mexico. This animal moved into the North Atlantic and then back into the Gulf after about 2 months. Additionally, no matches were found when ~~1~~285 individual whales photo-identified from the Gulf and about 2500 from the North Atlantic and Mediterranean were compared. An analysis of matrilineally inherited mtDNA~~ revealed that of the 5 haplotypes found in Gulf whales, 2 are known to occur only in the Gulf of Mexico and 65% of the whales were of these haplotypes~~ revealed a significant genetic differentiation between animals from the northern Gulf of Mexico compared to those from the North Atlantic Ocean, North Sea and Mediterranean Sea. Analysis of biparentally inherited nuclear DNA showed no significant difference between whales sampled in the Gulf and those from the other areas of the North Atlantic, indicating that mature males move in and out of the Gulf. Sperm whales make vocalizations used in a social context called "codas" that have distinct patterns that are apparently culturally transmitted, and based on degree of social affiliation, mixed groups of sperm whales worldwide can be placed in recognizable acoustic clans. Recordings from mixed groups in the Gulf of Mexico compared to those from other areas of the Atlantic indicated that Gulf sperm whales constitute a distinct acoustic clan that is rarely encountered outside of the Gulf. It is assumed from this that groups from other clans enter the northern Gulf only infrequently.

Disturbance by anthropogenic noise may prove to be an important habitat issue in some areas of this population's range, notably in areas of oil and gas activities and/or where shipping activity is high. Results from very limited studies of sperm whale responses to seismic exploration indicate that sperm whales do not exhibit horizontal avoidance of seismic survey activities. . , but results were not definitive for studies of fine-scale behavioral responses (Jochens *et al*. 2006). The potential impact, if any, of coastal pollution may be an issue for this species in portions of its habitat, though little is known on this to date.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico sperm whales is 1,665 (CV=0.20) (Mullin 2007: Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of sperm whales for all surveys combined was 530 (CV=0.31) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). —Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, is 1,349 (CV=0.23) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for sperm whales in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 1,665 (CV=0.20) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico sperm whales. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	530	0.31
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	1,349	0.23
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	1,665	0.20

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for sperm whales is 1,665 (CV=0.20). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 1,409 sperm whales.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 1,665 (CV=0.20) and that for 1996-2001 of 1,349 (CV=0.29) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is relatively low. These estimates are 2-3 times larger than that for 1991-1994 of 530 (CV=0.31). The 2003-2004 estimates were based on less negatively biased estimates of sperm whale group size and may account for part of the difference. Nevertheless, these temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of sperm whale abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 1,409. 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 0.1 because the sperm whale is an endangered species. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico sperm whale is 2.8.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of a sperm whale during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to sperm whales by this fishery.

A commercial fishery for sperm whales operated in the Gulf of Mexico in deep waters between the Mississippi River delta and DeSoto Canyon during the late 1700's to the early 1900's (Mullin *et al.* 1991), but the exact number of whales taken is not known (Townsend 1935; Lowery 1974). Townsend (1935) reported many records of sperm whales from April through July in the north-central Gulf (Petersen and Hoggard 1996).

Other Mortality

Two sperm whales strandings were documented during 2007 (1 in Florida, 1 in Texas). No sperm whale strandings were documented during 2004-2006. A total of 9 sperm whale strandings were documented in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1999-2003 (Table ~~1~~12; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

Seismic vessel operations in the Gulf of Mexico (commercial and academic) now operate with marine mammal observers as part of required mitigation measures. There have been no reported seismic-related or industry ship-related mortalities or injuries to sperm whales. However, disturbance by anthropogenic noise may prove to be an important habitat issue in some areas of this population's range, notably in areas of oil and gas activities and/or where shipping activity is high. Results from very limited studies of northern Gulf of Mexico sperm whale responses to seismic exploration indicate that sperm whales do not appear to exhibit horizontal avoidance of seismic survey activities. Data did suggest that there may be some decrease in foraging effort during exposure to full-array airgun firing, at least for some individuals. Further study is needed as samples sizes are insufficient at this time (Jochens *et al.* 2008).

The potential impact, if any, of coastal pollution may be an issue for this species in portions of its habitat, though little is known on this to date.

Table ~~1~~2. Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) strandings along the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico coast, 1999-2003. No sperm whale strandings were documented during 2004-2006.

STATE	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	TOTAL
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Florida	1	2	1	1	1	6
Louisiana	1	0	0	0	1	2
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	1	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	2	3	1	1	2	9

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, relative to OSP, is unknown. This species is listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. This is a strategic stock because the sperm whale is listed as an endangered species under the ESA.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield , C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fulling, G.L., K.D. Mullin and C.W. Hubard 2003. Abundance and distribution of cetaceans in outer continental shelf waters of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 101: 923-932.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Jaquet, N. 2006. A simple photogrammetric technique to measure sperm whales at sea. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 22(4): 862-879.

Jochens, A., D. Biggs, K. Benoit-Bird, D. Engelhaupt, J. Gordon, C. Hu, N. Jaquet, M. Johnson, R. Leben, B. Mate, P. Miller, J. Ortega-Ortiz, A. Thode, P. Tyack and B. Würsig 2008. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico: Synthesis report. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. OCS Study MMS 2008-006. 341 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Lowery, G.H., Jr. 1974. The mammals of Louisiana and its adjacent waters. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge. 565 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K., W. Hoggard, C. Roden, R. Lohoefener, C. Rogers and B. Taggart 1991. Cetaceans on the upper continental slope in the north-central Gulf of Mexico. OCS Study/MMS 91-0027. U.S. Dep. Interior, Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Regional Office, New Orleans, LA 108 pp.

Mullin, K., W. Hoggard, C. Roden, R. Lohoefener, C. Rogers and B. Taggart 1994. Cetaceans on the upper continental slope in the north-central Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 92: 773-786.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D., D. Engelhaupt, C.E. Cates and N.B. Barros 2003. Sperm whale research in the Gulf of Mexico. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/55/O15. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Mullin, K.D., W. Hoggard and L.J. Hansen 2004. Abundance and seasonal occurrence of cetaceans in outer continental shelf and slope waters of the north-central and northwestern Gulf of Mexico. Gulf of Mexico Science 2004(1): 62-73.

Ortega-Ortiz, J.G. 2002. Multiscale analysis of cetacean distribution in the Gulf of Mexico. Ph.D. thesis. Texas A&M University. 170 pp.

Petersen, J.C. and W. Hoggard 1996. First sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) record in Mississippi. Gulf Research Reports 9(3): 215-217.

Rice, D.W. 1989. Sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus* Linnaeus, 1758. Pages 177-233 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, London.

Schmidly, D.J. 1981. Marine mammals of the southeastern United States and the Gulf of Mexico. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, DC. FWS/OBS-80/41. 165 pp.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

Townsend, C.H. 1935. The distribution of certain whales as shown by logbook records of American whale ships. Zoologica 19: 1-50.

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.

Whitehead, H. 2002. Estimates of the current global population size and historical trajectory for sperm whales. Mar.

Ecol. Prog. Ser. 242: 295-304.
Whitehead, H. 2003. Sperm whales: Social evolution in the ocean. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL. 431 pp.
Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.
Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

SPINNER DOLPHIN (*Stenella longirostris*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The spinner dolphin is distributed worldwide in tropical to temperate oceanic waters (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Perrin and J. W. Gilpatrick 1994). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur in oceanic waters and generally east of the Mississippi River (Figure 1; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Spinner dolphins were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico spinner dolphins is 1,989 (CV=0.48) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).



Figure 1. *Distribution of spinner dolphin sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of spinner dolphins for all surveys combined was 6,316 (CV=0.43) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for spinner dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 11,971 (CV=0.71) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are

deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for spinner dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 1,989 (CV=0.48) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico spinner dolphins. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	6,316	0.43
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	11,971	0.71
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	1,989	0.48

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for spinner dolphins is 1,989 (CV=0.48). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 1,356 spinner dolphins.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 1,989 (CV=0.48) and that for 1996-2001 of 11,971 (CV=0.71) are significantly different (P<0.05). The 1991-1994 estimate of 6,316 (CV=0.43) was intermediate to these two estimates. These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of spinner dolphin abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 1,356. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico spinner dolphin is 14.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of spinner dolphins during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of spinner dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to spinner dolphins by this fishery.

Other Mortality

There were 6 reported strandings of spinner dolphins in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (2 in Alabama during 2003, 1 in Florida during 2002, and ~~4~~3 in Texas during 2003 and 2004; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). ~~There was e~~Evidence of human interaction was detected for 1 animal that stranded during 2003 in Texas. This animal had monofilament line around its tail stock but not into the skin, and abrasions around its flukes as though the animal had been towed. In addition, possible propeller marks were noted. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of spinner dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568,

26 pp.
Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.
Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.
Perrin, W.F. and J. J. W. Gilpatrick 1994. Spinner dolphin *Stenella longirostris* (Gray, 1828). Pages 99-128 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London.
Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.
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.
Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.
Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

~~November 20068~~March 2009

ATLANTIC SPOTTED DOLPHIN (*Stenella frontalis*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

There are ~~two~~2 species of spotted dolphin in the Atlantic Ocean, the Atlantic spotted dolphin (*Stenella frontalis*) and the pantropical spotted dolphin (*S. attenuata*) (Perrin *et al.* 1987). The Atlantic spotted dolphin occurs in ~~two~~2 forms which may be distinct sub-species (Perrin *et al.* 1987; Perrin *et al.* 1994; Rice 1998): the large, heavily spotted form which inhabits the continental shelf and is usually found inside or near the 200-m isobath; and the smaller, less spotted island and offshore form which occurs in the Atlantic Ocean but is not known to occur in the Gulf of Mexico (Fulling *et al.* 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2004). Where they co-occur, the offshore form of the Atlantic spotted dolphin and the pantropical spotted dolphin can be difficult to differentiate at sea.

The Atlantic spotted dolphin is endemic to the Atlantic Ocean in temperate to tropical waters (Perrin *et al.* 1987; Perrin *et al.* 1994). In the Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic spotted dolphins occur primarily from continental shelf waters 10-200 m deep to slope waters <500 m deep (Figure 1; Fulling *et al.* 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Atlantic spotted dolphins were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) from 1992 to 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000). It has been suggested that this species may move inshore seasonally during spring, but data supporting this hypothesis are limited (Caldwell and Caldwell 1966; Fritts *et al.* 1983).

The Gulf of Mexico population is being considered a separate stock for management purposes. In a recent study, Adams and Rosel (2005) presented strong genetic support for differentiation between Gulf of Mexico and western North Atlantic management stocks using both mitochondrial and nuclear markers. However, this study did not test for further population subdivision within the Gulf of Mexico.

POPULATION SIZE

~~The best available abundance estimate~~The current population size for the Atlantic spotted dolphin in the northern Gulf of Mexico is ~~the combined estimate of abundance for both the outer continental shelf and oceanic waters, which is 37,611 (CV=0.28) (Table 1).~~ unknown because the survey data from the continental shelf that covers the majority of this stock's range are more than 8 years old (Wade and Angliss 1997).



Figure 1. *Distribution of Atlantic spotted dolphin sightings from SEFSC spring and fall vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of Atlantic spotted dolphins for all surveys combined was 3,213 (CV=0.44) (Hansen *et al.* 1995). This is an underestimate because the continental shelf was not entirely covered during these surveys.

Data were collected from 1996 to 2001 during spring and fall plankton surveys conducted from NOAA ships *Oregon II* (1996, 1997, 1999, 2000) and *Gordon Gunter* (1998, 2000, 2001). Tracklines, which were perpendicular to the bathymetry, covered shelf waters from the 20-m to the 200-m isobaths in the fall of 1998 through 2001. As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates using data older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. The ~~most recent estimate is the combined~~ estimated abundance of Atlantic spotted dolphins, pooled from 2000 through 2001, for the fall outer continental shelf shipboard surveys was 37,611 (CV=0.28) (Figure 1; Table 1; see Fulling *et al.* 2003). Spring surveys were conducted from April to May 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico from 200m to the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ. Estimates for all oceanic strata were summed, as survey effort was not uniformly distributed, to calculate a total estimate for the entire northern Gulf of Mexico oceanic waters (Mullin and Fulling 2004). Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate for both areas. The estimate of abundance for Atlantic spotted dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 through 2001, was 175 (CV=0.84) (Mullin and Fulling 2004).

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extend of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007). The estimate of abundance for Atlantic spotted dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 0 (Mullin 2007). Because most of the data for oceanic estimates prior to 2003 were older than the 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable for oceanic waters.

The ~~best most recent available~~previous abundance estimate for the Atlantic spotted dolphin in the northern Gulf of Mexico ~~is~~was the combined estimate of abundance for both the outer continental shelf (fall surveys, 2000-2001) and oceanic waters (spring and summer surveys, 2003-2004), which ~~is~~ was 37,611 (CV=0.28) (Table 1). Because data from the continental shelf portion of this estimate are more than 8 years old, the current best population estimate is unknown. ~~This estimate is considered the best because these surveys have the most complete coverage of the species' habitat.~~

Table 1. Most recent ~~A~~abundance estimates (N_{best}) and ~~C~~coefficient of ~~V~~variation (CV) of Atlantic spotted dolphins in the northern ~~U.S.~~ Gulf of Mexico outer continental shelf (OCS) (waters 20-200 m deep) during fall 2000-2001 and oceanic waters (200 m to the offshore extent of the EEZ) during spring/summer 2003-2004.

Month/Year	**Area**	N_{best}	**CV**
Fall 2000-2001	Outer Continental Shelf	37,611	0.28
Spring/Summer 2003-2004	Oceanic	0	-
Fall & Spring/Summer	**OCS & Oceanic**	**37,611**	**0.28**

Minimum Population Estimate

The current minimum population estimate is unknown. The minimum population estimate~~s~~ is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). ~~The best estimate of abundance for Atlantic spotted dolphins is 37,611 (CV=0.28). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 29,844 Atlantic spotted dolphins.~~

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trend~~s~~ for this species.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is currently undetermined~~known.~~. PBR is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a "recovery" factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). ~~The minimum population size is 29,844.~~ 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 the stock is of unknown status.

~~PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico Atlantic spotted dolphin is 298.~~

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of an Atlantic spotted dolphin during 1998-200~~6~~7 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008). One mortality occurred during 2006 off Ft. Myers, Florida, when a dolphin was captured during sea turtle relocation trawling activities. As part of its annual coastal dredging program, the Army Corps of Engineers conducts sea turtle relocation trawling during hopper dredging as a protective measure for marine turtles.

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of Atlantic spotted dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown; however, interactions between spotted dolphins and fisheries have been observed in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were 2 observed incidental takes and releases of spotted dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 1994, but no recent reported takes of Atlantic spotted dolphins by this fishery ~~in the Gulf of Mexico~~. Either spotted dolphin species may have been involved in the observed fishery-related mortality and serious injury incidents, but because of the uncertainty in species identification by fishery observers, they cannot currently be separated. Estimated average annual fishing-related mortality and serious injury of spotted dolphins attributable to this fishery during 1991-1993 was 1.5 annually (CV=0.33). A voluntary observer program for the shrimp trawl fishery began in 1992 and became mandatory in 2007. During 1992-2007 the shrimp trawl fishery observer program recorded 6 unidentified dolphins caught in a lazy line or turtle excluder device, and 1 or more of these animals may have been an Atlantic spotted dolphin. In 2 of the 6 cases, an observer report indicated the animal may have already been decomposed, but this could not be confirmed in the absence of a necropsy.

Other Mortality

A total of ~~17~~25 Atlantic spotted dolphins stranded in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-200~~6~~7 (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008; Table 2 displays 200~~2~~3-200~~6~~7 data). ~~There were indications~~Evidence of human interactions was detected for 2 animals that stranded in Alabama during 2004, both of which were classified as likely caused by fishery interactions. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

In 1992, with the enactment of the Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Act, the Working Group on Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Events was created to determine when an unusual mortality event (UME) is occurring, and then to direct responses to such events. Since 1992, 8 UMEs have been declared in the Gulf of Mexico, and 2 of these included Atlantic spotted dolphins. Between August 1999 and May 2000, 1~~5~~62 bottlenose dolphins died coincident with *K.~~.~~arenia brevis* blooms and fish kills in the Florida Panhandle. Additional strandings included 3 Atlantic spotted dolphins, 1 Risso's dolphin, *Grampus griseus*, 2 Blainville's beaked whales, *Mesop~~o~~lodon densirostris*, and 4 unidentified dolphins. In 2005, a particularly destructive red tide (*K. brevis*) bloom occurred off of central west Florida. Manatee, sea turtle, bird and fish mortalities were reported in the area in early 2005 and a manatee UME had been declared. Bottlenose dolphin mortalities began to rise above the historical averages by late July 2005, continued to increase through October 2005, and were then declared to be part of a multi-species UME. The multi-species UME extended into 2006, and ended in December 2006. A total of 190 dolphins were involved, primarily bottlenose dolphins plus strandings of 1 Atlantic spotted dolphin and a few unidentified dolphins. The ~~investigation into this event is still ongoing, however, the~~ evidence ~~is highly~~ sugges~~tive~~ts the effects of a ~~relationship between the~~ red tide bloom ~~and the dolphin deaths~~contributed to the cause of this event.

Table 2. Atlantic spotted dolphin (*Stenella frontalis*) strandings along the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico coast, 200~~2~~3-200~~6~~7.

STATE	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**TOTAL**
Alabama	1	4	0	0	1	~~5~~6
Florida	1	4	2	0	7	~~7~~14
Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0
Texas	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2	8	2	0	8	~~12~~20

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of Atlantic spotted dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is not a strategic stock because average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. Despite an undetermined PBR and unknown population size, this is not a strategic stock because previous estimates of population size have been large compared to the number of cases of documented human-related mortality and serious injury.

REFERENCES CITED

Adams, L. and P.E. Rosel 2005. Population differentiation of the Atlantic spotted dolphin *Stenella frontalis* in the Western North Atlantic, including the Gulf of Mexico. Marine Biology 148: 671-681.

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Caldwell, D.K. and M.C. Caldwell 1966. Observations on the distribution, coloration, behavior and audible sound production of the spotted dolphin, *Stenella plagiodon* (Cope). Los Angeles County Museum Contribution to Science 104: 1-28.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Fritts, T.H., A.B. Irvine, R.D. Jennings, L.A. Collum, W. Hoffman and M.A. McGehee 1983. Turtles, birds, and mammals in the northern Gulf of Mexico and nearby Atlantic waters. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Biological Services, Washington, D.C. FWS/OBS-82/65. 455 pp.

Fulling, G.L., K.D. Mullin and C.W. Hubard 2003. Abundance and distribution of cetaceans in outer continental shelf waters of the U.S. Gulf of Mexico. Fish. Bull. 101: 923-932.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet

during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.
Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.
Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .
Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.
Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.
Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.
Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2003. Abundance of cetaceans in the southern U.S. North Atlantic Ocean during summer 1998. Fish. Bull. 101: 603-613.
Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.
Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.
Perrin, W.F., D.K. Caldwell and M.C. Caldwell 1994. Atlantic spotted dolphin. Pages 173-190 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Volume 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego.
Perrin, W.F., E.D. Mitchell, J.G. Mead, D.K. Caldwell, M.C. Caldwell, P.J.H. van Bree and W.H. Dawbin 1987. Revision of the spotted dolphins, *Stenella spp*. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 3(2): 99-170.
Rice, D.W. 1998. Marine mammals of the world, systematics and distribution. The Society for Marine Mammalogy, Lawrence, KS. 231 pp.
Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.
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.
Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.
Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.

~~November 20068~~March 2009

STRIPED DOLPHIN (*Stenella coeruleoalba*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

The striped dolphin is distributed worldwide in tropical to temperate oceanic waters (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Perrin *et al.* 1994). Sightings of these animals in the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) occur in oceanic waters (Figure 1; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006). Striped dolphins were seen in all seasons during GulfCet aerial surveys of the northern Gulf of Mexico between 1992 and 1998 (Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

The Gulf of Mexico population is provisionally being considered a separate stock for management purposes, although there is currently no information to differentiate this stock from the Atlantic Ocean stock(s). Additional morphological, genetic and/or behavioral data are needed to provide further information on stock delineation.

POPULATION SIZE

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico striped dolphins is 3,325 (CV=0.48) (Mullin 2007; Table 1). This estimate is pooled from summer 2003 and spring 2004 oceanic surveys covering waters from the 200m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Earlier abundance estimates

Estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland *et al.* 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas *et al.* 1998) to sighting data. From 1991 through 1994, line-transect vessel surveys were conducted in conjunction with bluefin tuna ichthyoplankton surveys during spring in the northern Gulf of Mexico from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. ~~Exclusive Economic Zone (~~EEZ~~)~~ (Hansen *et al.* 1995). Annual cetacean surveys were conducted along a fixed plankton sampling trackline. Survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of striped dolphins for all surveys combined was 4,858 (CV=0.44) (Hansen *et al.* 1995; Table 1). Similar surveys were conducted during spring from 1996 to 2001 (excluding 1998) in oceanic waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, survey effort was pooled across all years to develop an average abundance estimate. The estimate of abundance for striped dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 1996 to 2001, was 6,505 ~~–~~(CV=0.43) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).



Figure 1. *Distribution of striped dolphin sightings from SEFSC spring vessel surveys during 1996-2001 and from summer 2003 and spring 2004 surveys. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100-m and 1,000-m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.*

Recent surveys and abundance estimates

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, line-transect surveys dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans were conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. During each year, a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start were surveyed from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ using NOAA Ship *Gordon Gunter* (Mullin 2007).

As recommended in the GAMMS Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than 8 years are deemed unreliable, and therefore should not be used for PBR determinations. Because most ~~of the~~of the data for estimates prior to 2003 were older than this 8-year limit and due to the different sampling strategies, estimates from the 2003 and 2004 surveys were considered most reliable. The estimate of abundance for striped dolphins in oceanic waters, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 3,325 (CV=0.48) (Mullin 2007; Table 1), which is the best available abundance estimate for this species in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for northern Gulf of Mexico striped dolphins. Month, year and area covered during each abundance survey, and resulting abundance estimate (N_{best}) and coefficient of variation (CV).

Month/Year	Area	N_{best}	CV
Apr-Jun 1991-1994	Oceanic waters	4,858	0.44
Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)	Oceanic waters	6,505	0.43
Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004	Oceanic waters	3,325	0.48

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for striped dolphins is 3,325 (CV=0.48). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 2,266 striped dolphins.

Current Population Trend

There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. The pooled abundance estimate for 2003-2004 of 3,325 (CV=0.48) and that for 1996-2001 of 6,505 (CV=0.43) are not significantly different (P>0.05), but due to the precision of the estimates, the power to detect a difference is low. These estimates are similar to that for 1991-1994 of 4,858 (CV=0.44). These temporal abundance estimates are difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of striped dolphin abundance. The Gulf of Mexico is composed of waters belonging to the U.S., Mexico and Cuba. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. EEZ. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, 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 history (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential biological removal level (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 2,266. 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 the stock is of unknown status. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico striped dolphin is 23.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality of striped dolphins during 1998-20067 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008).

Fisheries Information

The level of past or current, direct, human-caused mortality of striped dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico is unknown. Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the ~~U.S.~~northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to striped dolphins by this fishery.

Other Mortality

During 2007, 1 striped dolphin stranded in Louisiana, and during 2006, 1 striped dolphin stranded alive in Florida with evidence of human interaction from a boat collision. There were 2 reported strandings of a striped dolphin in the Gulf of Mexico during 1999-2005. ~~There was n~~No evidence of human interactions was detected for these stranded animals (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 September 2008). ~~During 2006, 1 striped dolphin stranded alive in Florida with evidence of human interaction from a boat collision. The animal had propeller marks on its peduncle and near its left eye.~~ Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in fishery interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

In 1992, with the enactment of the Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Act, the Working Group on Marine Mammal Unusual Mortality Events was created to determine when an unusual mortality event (UME) is occurring, and then to direct responses to such events. Since 1992, 8 UMEs have been declared in the Gulf of Mexico, and 1 of these included a striped dolphin. An UME was declared in the Florida Panhandle after elevated numbers of dolphin strandings occurred in association with a *K~~.~~arenia brevis* bloom in September 2005. Dolphin strandings remained elevated through the spring of 2006 and brevetoxin was again detected in the tissues of some of the stranded dolphins. Between September 2005 and ~~September~~April 2006 when the event was officially declared over, a total of 9~~4~~3 bottlenose dolphin, *Tursiops truncatus*, strandings occurred plus strandings of 1 striped dolphin and 4 unidentified dolphins.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of striped dolphins in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 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 the population trends for this species. ~~The total level of U.S. Gulf of Mexico fishery-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is unknown, but assumed to be less than 10% of the calculated PBR and can be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.~~ Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. 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. This is not a strategic stock because it is assumed that the average annual human-related mortality and serious injury does not exceed PBR.

REFERENCES CITED

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. Anderson, 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. 432 pp.

Fairfield-Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2007. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-560. 54 pp.

Fairfield, C.P. and L.P. Garrison 2008. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and sea turtles in the US Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2007. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-572. 62 pp.

Fairfield Walsh, C. and L.P. Garrison 2006. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2005. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-539. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2003. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2001-2002. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-515. 52 pp.

Garrison, L.P. 2005. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2004. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-531. 57 pp.

Garrison, L.P. and P.M. Richards 2004. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals and turtles in the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet during 2003. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-527. 57 pp.

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, T.A. Jefferson and G.P. Scott 1996. Visual surveys aboard ships and aircraft. Pages 55-132 *in*: R. W. Davis and G. S. Fargion, (eds.) Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico: Final report. Volume II: Technical report. OCS Study MMS 96-0027. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. .

Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin and C.L. Roden 1995. Estimates of cetacean abundance in the northern Gulf of Mexico from vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. Contribution No. MIA-94/95-25. 9 pp.

Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco. 302 pp.

Maze-Foley, K. and K.D. Mullin 2006. Cetaceans of the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico: Distributions, group sizes and interspecific associations. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 8(2): 203-213.

Mullin, K.D. 2007. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic Gulf of Mexico based on 2003-2004 ship surveys. Available from: NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, P.O. Drawer 1207, Pascagoula, MS 39568, 26 pp.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling 2004. Abundance of cetaceans in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 20(4): 787-807.

Mullin, K.D. and W. Hoggard 2000. Visual surveys of cetaceans and sea turtles from aircraft and ships. Pages 111-172 *in*: R. W. Davis, W. E. Evans and B. Würsig, (eds.) Cetaceans, sea turtles and seabirds in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Distribution, abundance and habitat associations. Volume II: Technical report. Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans. OCS Study MMS 96-0027.

Perrin, W.F., D.K. Caldwell and M.C. Caldwell 1994. Atlantic spotted dolphin. Pages 173-190 *in*: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, (eds.) Handbook of marine mammals, Volume 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego.

Thomas, L., J.L. Laake, J.F. Derry, S.T. Buckland, D.L. Borchers, D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, S. Strindberg, S.L. Hedley, F.F.C. Marques, J.H. Pollard and R.M. Fewster 1998. Distance 3.5. Research Unit for Wildlife Population Assessment, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews, UK.

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.

Yeung, C. 1999. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-430. 26 pp.

Yeung, C. 2001. Estimates of marine mammal and marine turtle bycatch by the U.S. Atlantic pelagic longline fleet in 1999-2000. NOAA Tech. Memo., NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL. NMFS-SEFSC-467. 43 pp.