BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus truncatus*): Western North Atlantic South Carolina/Georgia Coastal Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

**Geographic Range and Coastal Morphotype Habitat**

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

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

To address the question of distribution of coastal and offshore morphotypes in waters south of Cape Hatteras, tissue samples were collected during large vessel surveys during the summers of 1998 and 1999, during systematic biopsy sampling efforts in nearshore waters from New Jersey to central Florida conducted in the summers of 2001 and 2002, and during winter biopsy collection efforts in 2002 and 2003, in nearshore continental shelf waters of North Carolina and Georgia. Additional biopsy samples were collected in deeper continental shelf waters south of Cape Hatteras during winter 2002. Genetic analyses using mitochondrial DNA sequences of these biopsies identified individual animals to the coastal or offshore morphotype. Using the genetic results from all surveys combined, a logistic regression was used to model the probability that a particular bottlenose dolphin group was of the coastal morphotype as a function of environmental variables including depth, sea surface temperature and distance from shore. These models were used to partition the bottlenose dolphin groups observed during aerial surveys between the two morphotypes (Garrison et al. 2003).

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

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

In summary, the primary habitat of the coastal morphotype of bottlenose dolphin extends from Florida to New Jersey during summer months and in waters less than 20 m deep, including estuarine and inshore waters. South of Cape Lookout, the coastal morphotype occurs in lower densities over the continental shelf (waters between 20 m and 100 m depth) and overlaps spatially with the offshore morphotype.

**Distinction between Coastal and Estuarine Bottlenose Dolphins**

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

A few published studies demonstrate that these resident animals are genetically distinct from animals in nearby coastal waters. A study conducted near Jacksonville, Florida, demonstrated significant genetic differences between animals in nearshore coastal waters and estuarine waters (Caldwell 2001; Rosel et al. 2009) and animals resident in the Charleston estuarine system show significant genetic differentiation from animals biopsied in coastal waters of southern Georgia (Rosel et al. 2009). In addition, stable isotope ratios of \(^{18}O\) relative to \(^{16}O\) (referred to as depleted oxygen) in animals sampled along the Outer Banks of North Carolina between Cape Hatteras and Bogue Inlet during February and March were very low (Cortese 2000). One explanation for this depleted oxygen signature is that a resident group of dolphins in Pamlico Sound moves into nearby nearshore areas in the winter.

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

**Definition of the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal Stock**

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

The spatial extent of these stocks, their potential seasonal movements, and their relationships with estuarine stocks are poorly understood. Migratory movement and spatial distribution of the Northern Migratory stock is best understood based on tag-telemetry, photo-ID and aerial survey data. This stock migrates seasonally between coastal waters of central North Carolina and New Jersey. It is not thought to overlap with the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock in any season. The Southern Migratory stock is defined primarily on satellite tag telemetry studies and is thought to migrate south from waters of southern Virginia and north central North Carolina in the summer to waters south of Cape Fear and as far south as coastal Florida during winter months.

During summer months when the Southern Migratory stock is found in waters north of Cape Fear, North Carolina, bottlenose dolphins are still seen in coastal waters of South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, indicating the presence of additional stocks of coastal animals. Speakman et al. (2006) using photo-ID studies documented dolphins in coastal waters off Charleston, South Carolina, that are not known resident members of the estuarine...
stock. Genetic analyses of samples from northern Florida, Georgia and central South Carolina (primarily the estuaries around Charleston), using both mitochondrial DNA and nuclear microsatellite markers, indicate significant genetic differences between these areas (NMFS 2001; Rosel et al. 2009). This stock assessment report addresses the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock, which is present in coastal Atlantic waters from the North Carolina/South Carolina border south to the Georgia/Florida border (Figure 1). There is no obvious boundary defining the offshore extent of this stock. The combined genetic and logistic regression analysis (Garrison 2007) indicated that in waters less than 10 m depth, 70% of the bottlenose dolphins were of the coastal morphotype. Between 10 and 20 m depth, the percentage of animals of the coastal morphotype dropped precipitously and at depths >40 m nearly all (>90%) animals were of the offshore morphotype. However, in winter months, the Southern Migratory stock (also of the coastal morphotype) moves into this region in waters 10-30 m depth complicating the ability to define ocean-side boundaries for the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock.

**POPULATION SIZE**

Aerial surveys to estimate the abundance of coastal bottlenose dolphins in the Atlantic were conducted during winter (January-February) and summer (July-August) of 2002. Survey tracklines were set perpendicular to the shoreline and included coastal waters to depths of 40 m. The surveys employed a stratified design so that most effort was expended in waters shallower than 20 m deep where a high proportion of observed bottlenose dolphins were expected to be of the coastal morphotype. Survey effort was also stratified to optimize coverage in seasonal management units. The surveys employed two observer teams operating independently on the same aircraft to estimate visibility bias.

The winter 2002 survey included the region from the Georgia/Florida state line to the southern edge of Delaware Bay. A total of 6,411 km of trackline was completed during the survey, and 185 bottlenose dolphin groups were sighted including 2,114 individual animals. No bottlenose dolphins were sighted north of Chesapeake Bay where water temperatures were <9.5ºC. During the summer survey, 6,734 km of trackline were completed between Sandy Hook, New Jersey, and Ft. Pierce, Florida. All tracklines in the 0-20 m stratum were completed throughout the survey range while offshore lines were completed only as far south as the Georgia/Florida state line. A total of 185 bottlenose dolphin groups were sighted during summer including 2,544 individual animals.

In summer 2004, an additional aerial survey between central Florida and New Jersey was conducted. As with the 2002 surveys, effort was stratified into 0-20 m and 20-40 m strata with the majority of effort in the shallow depth stratum. The survey was conducted between 16 July and 31 August and covered 7,189 km of trackline. There were 140 sightings of bottlenose dolphins including 3,093 individual animals. A winter survey was conducted between 30 January and 9 March 2005 covering waters from the mouth of Chesapeake Bay through central Florida. The survey covered 5,457 km of trackline and observed 135 bottlenose dolphin groups accounting for 957 individual animals.

Abundance estimates for bottlenose dolphins in each stock were calculated using line transect methods and distance analysis (Buckland et al. 2001). The 2002 surveys included two teams of observers to derive a correction.
for visibility bias. The independent and joint estimates from the two survey teams were used to quantify the probability that animals available to the survey on the trackline were missed by the observer teams, or perception bias, using the direct-duplicate estimator (Palka 1995). The resulting estimate of the probability of seeing animals on the trackline was applied to abundance estimates for the summer 2004 and winter 2005 surveys. Observed bottlenose dolphin groups were also partitioned between the coastal and offshore morphotypes based upon analysis of available biopsy samples (Garrison et al. 2003).

There is apparent inter-annual variation in the abundance estimates and observed spatial distribution of bottlenose dolphins in this region that may indicate movements of animals in response to environmental variability. However, at this time there is no tag-telemetry or genetic evidence supporting the presence of additional migratory stocks along the southern portion of the survey range.

For the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock, the mean of the summer 2002 and 2004 abundance estimates provided the best estimate of abundance. During winter months, this stock overlaps spatially with the Southern Migratory stock and hence winter survey data are inappropriate for estimating abundance of the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock. The abundance estimate for this stock from the summer 2002 survey was 8,518 (CV=0.37) and that from summer 2004 was 7,379 (CV=0.29). The best abundance estimate is the inverse-variance weighted average of these two surveys and is 7,738 (CV=0.23).

**Minimum Population Estimate**

The minimum population size (Nmin) for the stock was calculated as the lower bound of the 60% confidence interval for a log-normally distributed mean (Wade and Angliss 1997). The best estimate for the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock is 7,738 (CV=0.23). The resulting minimum population estimate is 6,399.

**Current Population Trend**

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

**CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES**

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

**POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL**

Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one-half the maximum productivity rate, and a “recovery” factor (MMPA Sec. 3. 16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size of the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock of bottlenose dolphins is 6,272. The maximum productivity rate is 0.04, the default value for cetaceans. The recovery factor, which accounts for endangered, depleted, threatened stocks, or stocks of unknown status relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP), is assumed to be 0.5 because this stock is depleted. PBR for this stock of bottlenose dolphins is 64.

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

**Fishery Information**

Three Category II fisheries have the potential to interact with the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock of bottlenose dolphins – the Southeastern U.S. Atlantic shark gillnet fishery, the Southeast Atlantic gillnet fishery and the Atlantic blue crab/trap pot fishery. In addition, the Southeastern U.S. Atlantic shrimp trawl fishery (Category III) has the potential to interact with this stock. Only limited observer data are available for these and other fisheries that may interact with this stock. Therefore, the total average annual mortality estimate is a lower bound of the actual annual human-caused mortality for each stock. Detailed fishery information is presented in Appendix III.

**Southeastern U.S. Atlantic Shark Gillnet Fishery and Southeast Atlantic Gillnet Fishery**

Gillnet fisheries targeting finfish and sharks operate in southeast waters between North Carolina and southern Florida. These fisheries include a number of different fishing methods and gear types including drift nets, “strike” fishing, and anchored (“sink”) gillnets. The majority of this fishing is reported from waters of North Carolina and central Florida. A small number of trips (average 35 annually from 2004-2008) are reported within the bounds of the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock. There has been no observer coverage of sets within the stock boundaries, and therefore there have been no observed takes.
Southeastern U.S. Shrimp Trawl Fishery

In August 2002 in Beaufort County, South Carolina, a fisherman self-reported a dolphin entanglement in a commercial shrimp trawl. No other bottlenose dolphin mortality or serious injury has been reported to NMFS. There has been very little systematic observer coverage of this fishery during the last decade.

Atlantic Blue Crab/Trap Pot Fishery

The blue crab trap pot fishery only rarely fishes in coastal waters of South Carolina and Georgia during winter months. Thus coastal dolphins rarely have the opportunity to encounter trap pots. During 2004-2008, no stranded animals assigned to the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock showed evidence of entanglement in trap pot gear.

Other Mortality

There were 128 stranded bottlenose dolphins recovered between 2004 and 2008 in the waters of the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock (NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 21 September 2009 and 18 November 2009). It was not possible to determine whether or not there was evidence of human interaction for 75 of these strandings and for 48 it was determined there was no evidence of human interaction. The remaining five showed evidence of human interaction and one of those showed evidence of fishery interaction—an animal was found in 2005 with hook and line in the mouth. Two animals had lacerations, again unknown whether ante-mortem or post-mortem, and one had human debris in the forestomach. Finally, one of the six animals with human interaction determinations was caught in a research trawl in 2006, although it is unknown whether the animal was dead prior to being caught in the trawl. It is worth noting that during winter months, the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock overlaps with the Southern Migratory stock and it is currently not possible to distinguish between them. Hence during winter months, stranded dolphins could come from either of these two stocks.

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

STATUS OF STOCK

From 1995 to 2001, NMFS recognized only a single migratory stock of coastal bottlenose dolphins in the western North Atlantic, and the entire stock was listed as depleted. This stock structure was revised in 2002 to recognize both multiple stocks and seasonal management units and again in 2008 and 2010 to recognize resident estuarine stocks and migratory and resident coastal stocks. This stock retains the depleted designation as a result of its origins from the originally delineated depleted coastal migratory stock. The total U.S. fishery-related mortality and serious injury for the South Carolina/Georgia Coastal stock is unknown. There are several commercial fisheries overlapping with the stock boundaries; however, these have little to no observer coverage. Insufficient information is available to determine whether the total fishery mortality and serious injury for this stock is insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate. The species is not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, but this is a strategic stock due to the depleted listing under the MMPA.
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