Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# The New Zealand common dolphin (Delphinus sp.)

- Identity, ecology and conservation

## Karen A. STOCKIN

Massey University
Auckland, New Zealand

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Zoology



Massey University, 2008

## In loving memory of

#### Innis Jeanette Stockin

1946 - 2007

This thesis is dedicated to a remarkable lady I am so very proud to call my mom. Without her belief, her support, her dedication and love, none of this would have been possible. I owe all I am and everything I have achieved, to her. She remains my guiding light, my determination, my inspiration.

"The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeing new landscapes but in having new eyes"

PROUST

She gave me new eyes, she instilled strength and conviction so I could strive for all that I believe in - we did this together. To her, I shall remain indebted for eternity.

#### Frontispiece

#### SAINT DELPHINUS

Bishop of Bordeaux

(+403)

Little is known of the origins of Saint Delphinus; it is after his elevation to the episcopate that he became famous among the bishops of his time as a vigilant protector of the truth. We have written evidence, however, that his piety and learning made him so celebrated that the saintliest bishops of the church were honored to be his friends and to correspond with him.

He was present at the Council of Saragossa in 380, at which the Priscillian heretics were condemned. Later he assembled a council in Bordeaux, his episcopal city, which the heretics had entered and where they were working havoc; this assembly condemned once again the same propagators of error. The bishop's force and preaching so reduced their influence that they abandoned the region entirely and fled to Italy.

Saint Delphinus baptized Saint Paulinus, later Bishop of Nola, in 388, and inspired in him the desire to live a life of perfection. He, in several letters, speaks of Saint Delphinus as his father and his master. Saint Delphinus died on the 24<sup>th</sup> of December, at the beginning of the fifth century.

Source: Les Petits Bollandistes: Vies des Saints, by Msgr. Paul Guérin (Bloud et Barral: Paris, 1882), Vol. 14.

#### **Abstract**

Common dolphins (genus *Delphinus*) are poorly understood within New Zealand waters. Prior to this study, most information relating to the taxonomy, population structure, diet and pollutant loads of this genus relied upon untested assumptions. Furthermore, factors affecting the occurrence, demographics and habitat use of common dolphins in the Hauraki Gulf remained unknown. This lack of empirical data has resulted in the inadequate recognition and management of New Zealand *Delphinus*. Inappropriately classified by the New Zealand Threat Classification System, the anthropogenic impacts that affect this genus have clearly been overlooked. The present study examines behaviour of common dolphins in the Hauraki Gulf and details analyses undertaken on tissue samples collected from around New Zealand. Results detailed here challenge many of the untested assumptions about this genus within New Zealand waters.

The taxonomy of New Zealand common dolphins was assessed using 92 samples analysed for 577 base pairs (bps) of the mtDNA control region (D-loop). New Zealand samples were compared with 177 published sequences from eight other populations from around the world. New Zealand *Delphinus* exhibited a high genetic variability, sharing haplotypes with both short- (*D. delphis*) and long-beaked (*D. capensis*) populations. Indeed, the New Zealand population showed significant genetic differentiation when compared with most other populations world-wide. Furthermore, intrapopulation analyses revealed significant genetic differentiation between Hauraki Gulf individuals and other common dolphins sampled within New Zealand waters. Results suggest habitat choice and site fidelity may play a role in shaping the fragmented population structure of New Zealand *Delphinus*.

Data relating to the occurrence and demographics of common dolphins in the Hauraki Gulf region were collected during boat-based surveys between February 2002 and January 2005. In total, 719 independent encounters, involving one to > 300 common dolphins were recorded. Dolphin presence was significantly affected by month, latitude and depth. Group size varied significantly by month, season, depth, sea surface temperature (SST) and latitude, and was highly skewed towards smaller groups comprising fewer than 50 animals. Calves were observed throughout the year but were

most prevalent in the austral summer months of December and January. Group composition was significantly affected by month, season, depth and SST. The year-round occurrence and social organisation of *Delphinus* in Hauraki Gulf waters suggest this region is an important nursery and potential calving area.

The effects of diel, season, depth, sea surface temperature, and group size and composition on dolphin behaviour were investigated using activity budgets. Foraging and social were the most and least frequently observed behaviours, respectively. A correlation between group size and behaviour was evident, although behaviour did not vary with the composition of dolphin groups. Resting, milling and socialising animals were more frequently observed in smaller groups. Foraging behaviour was prevalent in both small and large groups, suggesting foraging plasticity exists within this population. Behaviour differed between single- and multi-species groups, with foraging more frequent in mixed-species aggregations, indicating the primary mechanism for association is likely prey-related.

Stomach contents analysed for forty-two stranded and eleven commercially by-caught individuals collected from around North Island, New Zealand between 1997 and 2006, revealed arrow squid (*Nototodarus* spp.), jack mackerel (*Trachurus* spp.) and anchovy (*Engraulis australis*) as the most prevalent prey. Stranded individuals and dolphins by-caught within neritic waters fed on both neritic and oceanic prey. Moreover, a mixed prey composition was evident in the diet of common dolphins by-caught in oceanic waters, suggesting inshore/offshore movements of New Zealand *Delphinus* on a diel basis. Additionally, prey differences were also evident in the stomach contents of common dolphins sampled from within the Hauraki Gulf.

Trace elements, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and organochlorine (OC) pesticide levels were determined in five stranded and fourteen by-caught *Delphinus* sampled from around New Zealand between 1999 and 2005. Generally, levels of trace elements were low. However, concentrations of OC pesticides were similar in range to those previously reported for Hector's (*Cephalorhyncus hectori*) and common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). Organochlorine pesticides dieldrin, hexachlorobenzene (HCB), *o,p*'-DDT and *p,p*'-DDE were present at the highest concentrations.

Markov chain models were used to assess the impact of tourism activities on *Delphinus* within the Hauraki Gulf. Foraging and resting bouts were significantly disrupted by boat interactions. Both the duration of bouts and the time spent in these two behavioural states decreased during boat interactions. Additionally, foraging dolphins took significantly longer to return to their initial behavioural state in the presence of a tour boat. Impacts identified are similar to those previously reported for the common bottlenose dolphin, a coastal species typically considered to be more susceptible to cumulative anthropogenic impacts.

Data presented here reveal the nature and apparent susceptibility of New Zealand common dolphins to human-induced impacts, namely fisheries by-catch, pollution and tourism. This in conjunction with taxonomic uncertainty, lack of abundance estimates and the year-round use of inshore waters for feeding, clearly warrants immediate attention from managers. Furthermore, the current threat classification of New Zealand *Delphinus* should be reconsidered in light of population uncertainties, and in view of the susceptibly to human-induced impacts revealed by the present study.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This study, and the subsequent New Zealand Common Dolphin Project (NZCDP) have arisen from the goodwill of many individuals, companies and organisations. Such generosity and support has spanned more than six years and began with the sponsorship of an outboard engine from GulfLand Marine / Mercury Marine Ltd. Without this early support, the NZCDP could not have been established. Ever since those early days, I always maintained that the acknowledgements section of my PhD thesis would constitute a chapter in its own right — and indeed it does. I make no apology for the hearty serving of appreciation that follows, for I am truly indebted to a great many people and organisations, without whom this research would not have been possible.

Firstly, I wish to thank my chief supervisor, Mark Orams. I am not sure if he realised just what he was taking on when you agreed to supervise me but I will always be indebted to him and his unwavering trust in my capability. As a mentor, he has advised on various manners, some more academic than others. However, it has been his willingness to let me learn from personal experience that has allowed my personal and academic growth as a researcher. I also wish to acknowledge my co-supervisors, Padraig Duignan, Dianne Brunton and Wendi Roe for their advice and support throughout the doctorate. Particular thanks are extended to Padraig for teaching me the basics of dolphin pathology and to Dianne Brunton for stepping in as first supervisor during my final months of writing. In addition to my committee, I am indebted to the numerous surrogate supervisors who contributed their expertise and time. I am especially grateful to Robin Law, David Lusseau, Sinead Murphy, Ada Natoli, Graham Pierce and Ingrid Visser for their guidance and support. Special thanks are also extended to Giovanni Bearzi, Maddalena Bearzi, Dagmar Fertl, Tom Jefferson and my examiners Bill Perrin, Liz Slooten and Isabel Castro.

I wish to acknowledge colleagues at Massey University (past and present) whom have supported this research in numerous ways over the years. Particular thanks are expressed to Robert Anderson, Grant Guilford, Judith Kinnear, David Lambert, John Monin, Brian Springett and Russ Tillman, all of whom have invested in the NZCDP and my research. I am indebted to Denise Brunskill, Margaret Gilbert, Kathy Hamilton, Ravi Hettiarachchi, Pauline Larsen, Karen Lowe, Irene Manley, Pam Mayall, Kathy McLennan, Sri Nagappan, Gerhard Saayman,

Heather Scott, Kathryn Teale and Lynne Tunna for technical and administrative support. Additional thanks are extended to Kiri Manuera and the New Zealand Vice Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC).

The NZCDP has required the support of various individuals and organisations involved in the retrieval and/or sampling of carcasses. Particular thanks are extended to Anton van Helden (Te Papa) and the numerous Department of Conservation and Ministry of Fisheries personnel who facilitated necropsies and sampling. In alphabetical order: Joe Altham, Lester Bridson, Phil Brown, Selena Brown, Bill Cash, Rob Chappell, Julie Denton, Denis Fairfax, Richard Gill, Richard Gillies, Roy Grose, Judith Holland, Halema Jamieson, Helen Jonas, Bryce Lummis, Helen McConnell, Vivienne McGlynn, Karl McLeod, Karen Montford, Greg Napp, Don Neale, Mike Ogle, Jamie Quirk, Steph Rowe, Kirsty Russell, Joanna Sim, Steve Smith, Paul van Klink, Bryan Williams, David Wilson and Thelma Wilson. Additional thanks are extended to Dan Breen, Clinton Duffy, Malcolm Francis, Beau Fraser, Kala Sivaguru for their advice and support.

Laboratory analyses undertaken in this study could not have occurred without the logistical and financial support of the Institutes of Natural Resources (INR), Veterinary, Animal and Biomedical Sciences (IVABS) and Molecular Biosciences (IMBS). Particular thanks are extended to Robert Anderson, Padraig Duignan, Brett Gartrell, Grant Guilford, Mike Hogan, Gareth Jones, Judith Kinnear, David Lambert, Wendi Roe and Russ Tillman. Again, the faith and investment shown in me and the NZCDP has been second to none.

This research would not have been possible without the additional support of Dolphin Explorer, particularly Keith Algie, Mark Drascovitch, William Goodfellow, Jo Keane, Andy Light, Daniel and Pia Mares, Aline Schaffer, Kim Sutherland and Andy Wiseman. Numerous research assistants volunteered their time both at sea and in the laboratory in during this study. In alphabetical order: Karen Anderson, Monika Bando, Matt Birdsall, Julie Black, Angus Bloomfield, Nicola Brabyn, Claire Brignall, Marjolaine Caillat, Gemma Cave, Nicola Clark, Peter Collings, Teresa Colombini, Mike Corbett, Claire Daniel, Rebekah Davis, Isabel De Beus, Ciaran Edwards, Jacqui Guerts, Claire Hall, Dave Harper, Suzanne Haughey, Sarah Healy, Jackie Jirgala, Kate Lomas, Hamish Low, Sara Mann, Brooke Martin, Fiona McNie, Cullen Mead, Maguelone Menard, Monika Merriman, Laureline

Meynier, Jenny Mitcham, Craig Mumme, Rebecca Murphy, Lindsay Price, Susie Rutherford, Sofia Salvador, Federico Sapriza, Birte Schaper, Wendy Schrader, Anne Schroer, Kathleen Steele, Troy Stephenson, Kim Sutherland, Laura Torre, Sarah Wells and Nicky Wiseman. Congratulations to those who went on to pursue their own postgraduate studies in marine mammal research. I am pleased, indeed proud to think that the NZCDP served as a learning platform for so many other research projects.

A project of this magnitude could not have been established without the financial support and sponsorship of many commercial companies, Significant sponsors of the organisations and non-profit groups. NZCDP include: Ampro, AssureQuality (formerly AgriQuality Ltd.), Bolle, Brin Wilson Boat Builders Ltd., Broadway Radiology, Dell Computers, Department of Conservation, Dolphin Explorer, Gulf Harbour Marina, Gulf Harbour Sails and Covers Ltd., GulfLand Marine, Fujifilm, Mercury Marine Power, Oceanbridge Shipping Ltd., One World America Cup challenge (2003), Peninsula Engineering, SeaQuip Marine Engineers, Stripe Co., T.A. Macalister Ltd., and Viko. Non-profits and NGOs who supported this project include: Biscay Dolphin Research Programme, Cetacean Conservation International, Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society, Royal Society of New Zealand, Whale and Dolphin Adoption Project and the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society (U.K.). Additional financial support was granted by the Allan Wilson Centre (AWC), Auckland Coastquard, INR, Massey University and Rodney District Council.

Heartfelt thanks are expressed to my extended family, all of whom have supported me during the most testing times. I am truly grateful to Mark for allowing me to be apart of Team Orams. I am blessed to have John, Lynette, Graham, Beryl, Renee, Daniel and Brianna as my kiwi family. A special thanks to Vicky and Garth Binedell, Lisa Brown, Liz Burgess, Trevor Dwerryhouse, Faye Gordon, Sue Green, Dee Pigneguy and Sam Spratt, for treating me as though I were family. I would not have been able to complete this PhD if it were not for the support of so many special friends and colleagues. In alphabetical order: Deb Benham, Jo Berghan, Vicky Binedell, Mike Bossley, Liz Burgess, Sarah Canning, Gabriel Machovsky Capuska, Deanna Clement, Debbie Dixon, Sam DuFresne, Debbie Fyfe, Melanie Green, Jen Learmonth, David Lusseau, Colin Macleod, Emmanuelle Martinez, Monika Merriman, Fabiana Mourao, Sinead Murphy, Ada Natoli, Dirk Neumann, Carlos Olavarria, Marc

Oremus, Gabriela de Tezanos Pinto, Stephanie Plon, Will Rayment, Silvia Scali, Aline Schaffer, Laura Torre, Monique van Rensburg, Ingrid Visser, Trudi Webster, Caroline Weir, Sarah Wells, and Nicky Wiseman. Additional thanks are extended to all fellow lab mates at the Coastal - Marine and Ecology and Conservation Research Groups, especially Marleen Baling, Manuela Barry, Anna Gsell, Weihong Ji, Jo Peace, Mark Seabrook-Davidson, Monique van Rensburg and Birgit Ziesemann. Your emails of support during those traumatic months in the U.K. were of great support and comfort to both mom and I - sincere thanks for being there during our hour of need.

I am eternally grateful for the love and support of my family, Eric and Ian Stockin, and of my partner, Mike Corbett (Corby). They have all travelled a long and somewhat arduous journey with me. Corby, your patience and understanding throughout this entire process has enabled this PhD to reach fruition. Your contribution is unsurpassed – at strandings, at sea, in the lab – you have assisted every step of the way. To overcome a distaste of blood and rotting flesh is remarkable. To give up most weekends and evenings in the pursuit of my vision is ultimately selfless. Thank you for supporting me throughout all that has presented itself during these PhD years. You have been my saviour, and for that I love you.

My final thanks rest with mom - It has been her courage, spirit and resolve that has resulted in the completion of this doctorate. She taught me strength and instilled belief and conviction like no other. She remains my inspiration, my drive, my focus. To mom I owe most thanks, to her I owe everything.

You raised me up so I could walk on mountains,
You raised me up to walk on stormy seas,
I am strong when I am on your shoulders,
You raised me up, to more than I could be.



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication	i
Abstract	ii
Frontispiece	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	x
List of Tables	xv
List of Figures	xvii
Chapter One	1
General Introduction	
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Taxonomy	3
1.3 Morphology	4
1.4 Range and distribution	6
1.5 Abundance	9
1.6 Life history	10
1.6.1 Growth and sexual maturity	11
1.6.2 Gestation, parturition and lactation	12
1.7 Behavioural ecology	14
1.7.1 Social ecology	14
1.7.2 Foraging behaviour	15
1.8 Diet	16
1.9 Anthropogenic impacts	17
1.9.1 Fisheries interactions	18
1.9.2 Pollution	19
1.9.3 Tourism	20
1.9.4 Vessel disturbance	21
1.10 Conservation status	22
1.11 Thesis outline	23
1.12 Thesis structure	23

Chapter Two	27
Genetic identity and population structure of the	
New Zealand common dolphin	
2.1 Abstract	28
2.2 Introduction	29
2.3 Materials and methods	30
2.3.1 Sample collection and DNA extraction	30
2.3.2 Sample classifications	31
2.3.3 Sex determination	33
2.3.4 Mitochondrial DNA amplification	34
2.3.5 Mitochondrial DNA data analysis	34
2.4 Results	35
2.4.1 Sex determination	35
2.4.2 Mitochondrial genetic variation of the	36
New Zealand population	
2.4.3 Inter-population analysis	36
2.4.4 Intra-population analysis	37
2.5 Discussion	44
2.5.1 Taxonomy and population identity of the	44
New Zealand common dolphin	4.6
2.5.2 Population structure within New Zealand waters	46
2.5.3 Management implications	47
2.6 Conclusions	48
Chapter Three	50
Occurrence and demographics of common dolphins	
in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand	51
3.1 Abstract	-
3.2 Introduction	51
3.3 Materials and methods	52
3.3.1 Study site	52
3.3.2 Data collection	53
3.3.3 Data analysis	55
3.3.4 Variables describing dolphin presence, relative	56
abundance and group characteristics	56
3.3.5 Spatial and temporal trends 3.3.6 Environmental variables	56
3.4 Results	58
3.4.1 Survey effort	58
3.4.2 Dolphin presence in relation to abiotic factors	58
3.4.3 Group size in relation to abiotic factors	59

3.4.4 Group composition in relation to abiotic factors	69
3.4.5 Associated species	69
3.5 Discussion	70
3.5.1 Prey availability, oceanographic factors and	, 0
climate	72
3.5.2 Predation	73
3.5.3 Competition and co operation	73
3.5.4 Reproduction	74
3.5.5 Management implications	75
3.6 Conclusions	76
Chapter Four	77
Behaviour of common dolphins in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
4.1 Abstract	78
4.2 Introduction	78
4.3 Materials and methods	80
4.3.1 Study site	80
4.3.2 Data collection	80
4.3.3 Data analysis	83
4.4 Results	86
4.4.1 Field effort	86
4.4.2 Activity budget	86
4.4.3 Temporal variance	87
4.4.4 Environmental variance	87
4.4.5 Effect of group dynamics on behaviour	93
4.4.6 Effect of associated species on behaviour	93
4.5 Discussion	94
4.5.1 Foraging	94
4.5.2 Travelling	97
4.5.3 Resting	97
4.5.4 Milling	98
4.5.5 Socialising	99
4.5.6 Multi-species groups	99
4.5.7 Study limitations	101
4.5.8 Management implications	102
4.6 Conclusions	103
Chapter Five	104
A first examination of the diet of New Zealand	
common dolphins using stomach contents	
5.1 Abstract	105
5.2 Introduction	105

107
107
108
109
109
109
111
113
113
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
122
124
124
125
127
127
129
129
129
130
130
132
132
134
137
137
138
13
140
140

7.3 Materials and methods	142
7.3.1 Study site	142
7.3.2 Data collection	143
7.3.3 Markov chains	145
7.4 Results	148
7.4.1 Field effort	148
7.4.2 Effects of tour boat interactions	149
7.5 Discussion	153
7.5.1 Tourism growth and sustainability	153
7.5.2 Management implications	155
7.5.3 Study limitations	156
7.6 Conclusion	157
Chapter Eight	158
Conclusions: The status and management of	
New Zealand common dolphins	
8.1 Introduction	159
8.2 General findings	160
8.3 Conservation and management	162
8.3.1 Classification	162
8.3.2 Management	165
8.4 Threats and impacts	166
8.4.1 Identified threats	166
8.4.2 Fisheries by-catch	167
8.4.3 Pollution	168
8.4.4 Tourism	168
8.5 Future research	169
8.5.1 Evaluation of skull morphometric data	169
8.5.2 Use of molecular markers to further examine taxonomy and population structure	170
8.5.3 Examination of reproductive biology	170
8.5.4 Investigation of dietary differences	171
8.5.5 Assessment of abundance and site fidelity	171
in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand	
8.6 Conclusion	172
Literature Cited	173
Appendices	208

## List of Tables

## Chapter Two

2.1	List of the common dolphin samples (Delphinus spp.)	33
0 0	analysed with corresponding acronym and sample size	2.5
2.2	Sex determination for unique individual common dolphins	35
	(Delphinus spp.) determined from skin samples collected in New Zealand waters between 1997 and 2005	
2.3	Gene diversity, nucleotide diversity, Tajima's D and Fu's	38
	$F_s$ values reported for each population of <i>Delphinus</i> spp.	
2.4		40
	(Delphinus spp.) populations using mtDNA.	
2.5	Genetic differentiation among pairwise populations	42
	within New Zealand waters using mtDNA data	
Chant	cer Three	
Chapt	er miree	
3.1	Monthly summary of surveys and search effort (hr)	60
	by platform in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002	
	and January 2005	
3.2	Monthly analysis of common dolphin (Delphinus sp.)	61
	sightings in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002	
	and January 2005	
3.3		61
	sightings in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002	
	and January 2005	
3.4	Seasonal analysis of water depths (m) of common dolphins	62
	(Delphinus sp.) sightings in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between	
	February 2002 and January 2005	
Chapt	cer Four	
4 1	Definitions of behavioural states recorded for common	85
1.1	dolphins (Delphinus sp.) in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
	between February 2002 and January 2005	
4.2	Depth of water (m) by season for each behavioural state	90
	recorded for common dolphin (Delphinus sp.) groups observed	
	in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002 and	
	January 2005	
4.3	SST (°C) by season for each behavioural state recorded	91
	for common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) groups observed in	
	the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002 and January 2005	

## Chapter Six

Hauraki Gulf, NZ

6.1	Specimen details for common dolphins ( <i>Delphinus</i> sp.) stranded and by-caught in New Zealand waters between	126
6.2	1999 and 2005 A summary of six trace elements determined in the liver,	131
	kidney and blubber of stranded common dolphins	
	(Delphinus sp.) sampled from the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
	during December 2004	
6.3	A summary of OC and PCB levels determined in male and	133
	female common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) stranded and	
	by-caught within New Zealand waters between 1999 and 2005	
Chap	ter Seven	
7.1	Definitions of the behavioural states of common dolphin	146
	(Delphinus sp.) groups in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
7.2	Probability of common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) being in	150
	a particular behavioural state	
7.3	Average bout length of common dolphins (Delphinus sp.)	152
	during control (research boat only) and impact	
	(presence of tour and research boats) scenarios, in the	

# List of Figures

Chapt	er One	
1.1	Areas of colouration shown for a common dolphin	5
	(Delphinus spp.)	
1.2	a Approximate known distribution of the short-beaked	8
	common dolphin (D. delphis)	
1.2	o Approximate known distribution of the long-beaked	8
	common dolphin (D. capensis)	
1.3	Summer distribution of common dolphins (D. delphis)	10
	in New Zealand waters	
1.4	Photograph of common dolphin (Delphinus sp.) neonate	14
	alongside its presumed mother in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
Chapt	er Two	
2.1	Location of skin samples collected from stranded	32
	and by-caught common dolphins in New Zealand waters	
	between 1999 and 2005	
2.2	Mismatch distribution for the control region (577bp)	39
	for the New Zealand common dolphin (Delphinus spp.)	
2.3		41
	control region illustrating the phylogenetic	
	relationship among 152 haplotypes	
2.4		4
	haplotypes based on 577 bp	
Chapt	er Three	
3.1	Map showing the location of the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	53
3.2	Mean water depth (m) of common dolphin (Delphinus sp.)	63
	in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002 and	
	January 2005	
3.3	Monthly SPUE for common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) in the	65
	Hauraki Gulf, NZ in relation to mean SST ( $^{\circ}$ C)	
3.4	· ·	66
	indicating 95% confidence limits) depicting the partial	
	effect of month on common dolphin (Delphinus sp.)	
	occurrence in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
3.5	· ·	67
	indicating 95% confidence limits) depicting the partial	
	effect of latitude on common dolphin (Delphinus sp.)	
	occurrence in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
3.6	The fitted 'smoother' curve (with the dotted lines indicating 95% confidence limits) depicting the partial	68

	effect of depth (m) on common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) occurrence in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
3.7	A Bryde's whale (Balaenoptera brydei) head-lunging	71
2 0	in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	7.1
3.8	An Australasian gannet (Morus serrator) on take	71
	off in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
Chapte	er Four	
4.1	Map showing the location of the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	84
4.2	Activity budget for common dolphins (Delphinus sp.)	88
	groups observed in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ 2002 and 2005 compared with the Bay of Plenty, NZ 2001	
4.3	Differences in the behaviour of common dolphin	89
	( <i>Delphinus</i> sp.) groups observed in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002 and January 2005	
4.4	Seasonal behaviour of common dolphin (Delphinus sp.)	92
	groups in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ between February 2002 and January 2005	
4.5	Common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) observed 'herding'	96
	a baitball of presumed anchovy (Engraulis australis)	
	in the Bay of Islands, NZ	
4.6	A presumed mother-calf pair of common dolphins	97
	(Delphinus sp.) observed travelling in the	
	Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
4.7	Two common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) observed in the	100
	Hauraki Gulf, NZ during assumed copulation	
4.8	Australasian gannets (Morus serrator) observed in	102
	the Hauraki Gulf, NZ during a foraging event	
Chapte	er Five	
5.1	Location of stranded and by-caught common dolphins	110
J.1	(Delphinus sp.) around North Island, NZ collected	110
	between 1997 and 2006	
5.2	Stomach contents sampled from common dolphins	112
3.2	(Delphinus sp.) in New Zealand waters between	
	1997 and 2006	
5.3	Estimated lengths (cm) of total fish and squid preyed	114
	by New Zealand common dolphins (Delphinus sp.)	
5.4	Percentage occurrence of each common dolphin	115
- <del></del>	(Delphinus sp.) prey type (oceanic, neritic, coastal	•
	and combined) according to the sample category	
	and companied, according to the bumple category	

Chapte	r Seven	
7.1	Map showing location of the Hauraki Gulf, NZ study area	143
7.2	Research vessel (Aihe) and tour boat (Dolphin Explorer)	144
	on survey in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	
7.3	Effect of boat interactions on transitions in	151
	behavioural state of common dolphins (Delphinus sp.),	
	Based on differences in transition probabilities	
7.4	Effect of boat interactions on the behavioural budget of	152
	common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) in the Hauraki Gulf, NZ	

## Chapter Eight

8.1	The	New Zea	land	threat	classifi	cation syst	em	164
8.2	The	revised	New	Zealand	threat	classificat	ion system	165