GRAY WHALE (*Eschrichtius robustus*): Eastern North Pacific Stock

**STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE**

Once common throughout the Northern Hemisphere, the gray whale became extinct in the Atlantic by the early 1700s (Fraser 1970; Mead and Mitchell 1984), though one anomalous sighting occurred in the Mediterranean Sea in 2010 (Scheinin *et al.* 2011). Gray whales are now only found in the North Pacific. Genetic comparisons indicate there are distinct “Eastern North Pacific” (ENP) and “Western North Pacific” (WNP) population stocks, with differentiation in both mtDNA haplotype and microsatellite allele frequencies (LeDuc *et al.* 2002; Lang *et al.* 2011a, Weller *et al.* 2013).

During summer and fall, most whales in the ENP population feed in the Chukchi, Beaufort and northwestern Bering Seas (Fig. 1). An exception to this is the relatively small number of whales (approximately 200) that summer and feed along the Pacific coast between Kodiak Island, Alaska and northern California (Darling 1984, Gosho *et al.* 2011, Calambokidis *et al.* 2012), also known as the “Pacific Coast Feeding Group” (PCFG). Three primary wintering lagoons in the ENP are utilized, and some females are known to make repeated returns to specific lagoons (Jones 1990). Genetic substructure on the wintering grounds is indicated by significant differences in mtDNA haplotype frequencies between females (mothers with calves) using two of the primary calving lagoons and females sampled in other areas (Goerlitz *et al.* 2003). Other research identified a small but significant departure from panmixia between two of the lagoons using nuclear data, although no significant differences were identified using mtDNA (Alter *et al.* 2009).

New information from tagging, photo-identification and genetic studies show that some whales identified in the WNP off Russia have been observed in the ENP, including such areas as coastal waters of Canada, the U.S. and Mexico (Lang 2010; Mate *et al.* 2011; Weller *et al.* 2012; Urbán *et al.* 2013). In combination, these studies have recorded a total of 27 gray whales observed in both the WNP and ENP. Despite this overlap, significant mtDNA and nDNA differences are found between whales in the WNP and those summering in the ENP (Lang *et al.* 2011a). Although it is clear that some whales feeding in the WNP during the summer/fall migrate to the west coast of North America during the winter/spring, past and present observations of gray whales in the WNP off Japan, Korea and China during the winter/spring suggest that not all gray whales in the WNP share a common wintering ground (Weller and Brownell 2012).

In 2010, the IWC Standing Working Group on Aboriginal Whaling Management Procedure noted that different names had been used to refer to gray whales feeding along the Pacific coast, and agreed to designate animals that spend the summer and autumn feeding in coastal waters of the Pacific coast of North America from California to southeast Alaska as the “Pacific Coast Feeding Group” or PCFG (IWC 2012). This definition was further refined for purposes of abundance estimation, limiting the geographic range to the area from northern California to northern British Columbia (from 41°N to 52°N), limiting the temporal range to the period from June 1 to November 30, and counting only those whales seen in more than one year within this geographic and temporal range (IWC 2012). The IWC adopted this definition in 2011, but noted that “not all whales seen within the PCFG area at this time will be PCFG whales and some PCFG whales will be found outside of the PCFG area at various times during the year.” (IWC 2012).

Photo-identification studies between northern California and northern British Columbia provide data on the abundance and population structure of PCFG whales (Calambokidis *et al.* 2012). Gray whales using the Pacific Northwest during summer and autumn include two components: 1) whales that frequently return to the area, display a high degree of intra-seasonal “fidelity” and account for a majority of the sightings between 1 June and 30
November. Despite movement and interchange among sub-regions of the study area, some whales are more likely to return to the same sub-region where they were observed in previous years. 2) “visitors” from the northbound migration that are sighted only in one year, tend to be seen for shorter time periods in that year, and are encountered in more limited areas. Photo-identification (Gosho et al. 2011; Calambokidis et al. 2012) and satellite tagging (Mate et al. 2010, Ford et al. 2012) studies have documented some PCFG whales off Kodiak Island, the Gulf of Alaska and Barrow, Alaska, well to the north of the pre-defined 41°N to 52°N boundaries used in some PCFG-related analyses (e.g. abundance estimation).

Frasier et al. (2011) found significant differences in mtDNA haplotype distributions between PCFG and ENP gray whale sequences, in addition to differences in long-term effective population size, and concluded that the PCFG qualifies as a separate management unit under the criteria of Moritz (1994) and Palsbøll et al. (2007). The authors noted that PCFG whales probably mate with the rest of the ENP population and that their findings were the result of maternally-directed site fidelity of whales to different feeding grounds.

Lang et al. (2011b) assessed stock structure of ENP whales from different feeding grounds using both mtDNA and eight microsatellite markers. Significant mtDNA differentiation was found when samples from individuals (n=71) sighted over two or more years within the seasonal range of the PCFG were compared to samples from whales feeding north of the Aleutians (n=103), and when PCFG samples were compared to samples collected off Chukotka, Russia (n=71). No significant differences were found when these same comparisons were made using microsatellite data. The authors concluded that (1) the significant differences in mtDNA haplotype frequencies between the PCFG and whales sampled in northern areas indicates that the utilization of some feeding areas is being influenced by internal recruitment (e.g., matrilineal fidelity), and (2) the lack of significance in nuclear comparisons suggests that individuals from different feeding grounds may interbreed. The level of mtDNA differentiation identified, while statistically significant, was low, and the mtDNA haplotype diversity found within the PCFG was similar to that found in the northern strata. Lang et al. (2011b) suggested this could indicate recent colonization of the PCFG but could also be consistent with external recruitment into the PCFG. An additional comparison of whales sampled off Vancouver Island, British Columbia (representing the PCFG) and whales sampled at the calving lagoon at San Ignacio also found no significant differences in microsatellite allele frequencies, providing further support for interbreeding between the PCFG and the rest of the ENP stock (D’Intino et al. 2012). Lang and Martien (2012) investigated how much immigration into the PCFG could occur using simulations and produced results consistent with the empirical (mtDNA) analyses of Lang et al. (2011b). Results indicated that immigration of >1 and <10 animals per year into the PCFG was plausible, and that annual immigration of 4 animals/year produced results that were most consistent with those of the empirical study.

While the PCFG is recognized as a distinct feeding aggregation (Calambokidis et al. 2012, Mate et al. 2010, Frasier et al. 2011, Lang et al. 2011b, IWC 2012), the status of the PCFG as a population stock remains unresolved (Weller et al. 2013). A NMFS gray whale stock identification workshop held in 2012 included a review of available photo-identification, genetic, and satellite tag data. The report of the workshop states “there remains a substantial level of uncertainty in the strength of the lines of evidence supporting demographic independence of the PCFG.” (Weller et al. 2013). The NMFS task force, charged with evaluating stock status of the PCFG, noted that “both the photo-identification and genetics data indicate that the levels of internal versus external recruitment are comparable, but these are not quantified well enough to determine if the population dynamics of the PCFG are more a consequence of births and deaths within the group (internal dynamics) rather than related to immigration and/or emigration (external dynamics).” Further, given the lack of significant differences found in nuclear DNA markers between PCFG whales and other ENP whales, the task force found no evidence to suggest that PCFG whales breed exclusively or primarily with each other, but interbreed with ENP whales, including potentially other PCFG whales. Future research efforts to better identify recruitment levels into the PCFG will be necessary to further assess the stock status of PCFG whales (Weller et al. 2013). In contrast, the task force noted that WNP gray whales should be recognized as a population stock under the MMPA, and NMFS intends on preparing a separate report for WNP gray whales in 2014. Because the PCFG appears to be a distinct feeding aggregation and may warrant consideration as a distinct stock in the future, separate PBRs are calculated for the PCFG within this report. Calculation of a PBR for this feeding aggregation allows NMFS to assess whether levels of human-caused mortality are likely to cause local depletion within this population.
**POPULATION SIZE**

Systematic counts of gray whales migrating south along the central California coast have been conducted by shore-based observers at Granite Canyon most years since 1967 (Fig. 2). The most recent southbound counts were made during the 2007/2008, 2009/2010, and 2010/2011 surveys, from which abundance estimates are not yet available.

The most recent estimate of abundance from the 2006/2007 southbound survey is 19,126 (CV=7.1%) whales (Laake et al. 2012).

Photographic mark-recapture abundance estimates for PCFG gray whales between 1998 and 2010, including estimates for a number of smaller geographic areas within the IWC-defined PCFG region (41°N to 52°N), are reported in Calambokidis et al. (2012). The 2010 abundance estimate for the defined range of the PCFG between 41°N to 52°N is 188 (CV=0.10).

Eastern North Pacific gray whales experienced an unusual mortality event (UME) in 1999 and 2000, when large numbers of emaciated animals stranded along the west coast of North America (Moore et al., 2001; Gulland et al., 2005). Over 60% of the dead whales were adults, compared with previous years when calf strandings were more common. Several factors following this UME suggest that the high mortality rate observed was a short-term, acute event and not a chronic situation or trend: 1) in 2001 and 2002, strandings decreased to levels below UME levels (Gulland et al., 2005); 2) average calf production returned to levels seen before 1999; and 3) in 2001, living whales no longer appeared emaciated. Oceanographic factors that limited food availability for gray whales were identified as likely causes of the UME (LeBouef et al. 2000, Moore et al. 2001, Minobe 2002, Gulland et al. 2005), with resulting declines in survival rates of adults during this period (Punt and Wade 2012). The population has recovered to levels seen prior to the UME of 1999-2000 (Figure 2).

Gray whale calves have been counted from Piedras Blancas, a shore site in central California, in 1980-81 (Poole 1984a) and each year from 1994 to 2012 (Perryman et al. 2002, Perryman and Weller 2012). In 1980 and 1981, calves comprised 4.7% to 5.2% of the population (Poole 1984b). Estimates of northbound calves from 2001 to 2012 ranged between 254 in 2010 and 1,528 in 2004, with high interannual variability (Perryman and Weller 2012). Calf production indices, as calculated by dividing northbound calf estimates by estimates of population abundance (Laake et al. 2012), ranged between 1.3 - 8.8% (mean=4.2%) during 1994-2012. Annual indices of calf production include impacts of early postnatal mortality but may overestimate recruitment because they exclude possibly significant levels of killer whale predation on gray whale calves north of the survey site (Barrett-Lennard et al. 2011). The relatively low reproductive output reported is consistent with little or no population growth over the time period (Laake et al. 2012; Punt and Wade 2012).

**Minimum Population Estimate**

The minimum population estimate (N_{MIN}) for the ENP stock is calculated from Equation 1 from the PBR Guidelines (Wade and Angliss 1997): \[N_{MIN} = N \exp(0.842 \cdot \ln(1 + CV(N)^2)^{1/2})\]. Using the 2006/07 abundance estimate of 19,126 and its associated CV of 0.071, N_{MIN} for this stock is 18,017.

The minimum population estimate for PCFG gray whales is calculated as the lower 20th percentile of the log-normal distribution of the 2010 mark-recapture estimate given above, or 173 animals.
Current Population Trend

The population size of the ENP gray whale stock has increased over several decades despite an UME in 1999 and 2000. The estimated annual rate of increase, based on the abundance time series from Laake et al. (2012) is 3.2% with a standard error of 0.5% (Punt and Wade 2012).

Abundance estimates of PCFG gray whales reported by Calambokidis et al. (2012) show a high rate of increase in the late 1990s and early 2000s, but have been relatively stable since 2003.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Using abundance data through 2006/07, an analysis of the ENP gray whale population led to an estimate of R_{max} of 0.062, with a 90% probability the value was between 0.032 and 0.088 (Punt and Wade 2012). This value of R_{max} is also applied to PCFG gray whales, as it is currently the best estimate of R_{max} available for gray whales in the ENP.

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

The potential biological removal (PBR) level for the ENP stock of gray whales is calculated as the minimum population size (18,017), times one-half of the maximum theoretical net population growth rate (½ x 6.2% = 3.1%), times a recovery factor of 1.0 for a stock above MNPL (Punt and Wade 2012), or 559 animals.

The potential biological removal (PBR) level for PCFG gray whales is calculated as the minimum population size (173 animals), times one half the maximum theoretical net population growth rate (½ x 6.2% = 3.1%), times a recovery factor of 0.5 (for a population of unknown status), resulting in a PBR of 2.7 animals. Use of the recovery factor of 0.5 for PCFG gray whales, rather than 1.0 used for ENP gray whales, is based on uncertainty regarding stock structure (Weller et al. 2013) and guidelines for preparing marine mammal stock assessments which state that “Recovery factors of 1.0 for stocks of unknown status should be reserved for cases where there is assurance that N_{min}, R_{max}, and the kill are unbiased and where the stock structure is unequivocal” (NMFS 2005). Given uncertainties in the levels of external versus internal recruitment of PCFG whales described above, the equivocal nature of the stock structure, and the small estimated population size of the PCFG, NMFS will continue to use the default recovery factor of 0.5 for PCFG gray whales.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

New Serious Injury Guidelines

NMFS updated its serious injury designation and reporting process, which uses guidance from previous serious injury workshops, expert opinion, and analysis of historic injury cases to develop new criteria for distinguishing serious from non-serious injury (Angliss and DeMaster 1998, Andersen et al. 2008, NOAA 2012). NMFS defines serious injury as an “injury that is more likely than not to result in mortality”. Injury determinations for stock assessments revised in 2013 or later incorporate the new serious injury guidelines, based on the most recent 5-year period for which data are available.

Fisheries Information

No gray whales were observed entangled in California gillnet fisheries between 2007 and 2011 (Carretta and Enriquez 2009a, 2009b, 2010, 2012a, 2012b), but previous mortality in the swordfish drift gillnet fishery has been observed (Carretta et al. 2004) and there have been recent sightings of free-swimming gray whales entangled in gillnets (Table 1). Alaska gillnet fisheries largely lack observer programs, including those in Bristol Bay known to interact with gray whales. Most data on human-caused mortality and serious injury of gray whales is from strandings, including at-sea reports of entangled animals alive or dead (Carretta et al. 2013). Strandings represent only a fraction of actual gray whale deaths (natural or human-caused), as reported by Punt and Wade (2012), who estimated that only 3.9% to 13.0% of gray whales that die in a given year end up stranding and being reported.

A summary of human-caused mortality and serious injury resulting from unknown fishery sources (mainly pot/trap or net fisheries) is given in Table 1 for the most recent 5-year period of 2007 to 2011. Total observed human-caused fishery mortality and serious injury for ENP gray whales for the period 2007 to 2011 is 12.25 animals (4 serious injuries, 5.25 prorated serious injuries, and 3 deaths), or 2.45 whales per year (Table 1). Total observed human-caused fishery mortality and serious injury for gray whales observed in the PCFG range and season for the period 2007 to 2011 is 0.75 prorated serious injuries, or 0.15 whales per year (Table 1).
Table 1. Human-caused deaths and serious injuries (SI) of gray whales from fishery-related sources for the period 2007 to 2011 as recorded by NMFS stranding networks and observer programs. NSI denotes non-serious injury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of observation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PCFG range N 41- N 52 AND season?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Determination (SI Prorate value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug-2011</td>
<td>Petersburg, AK</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Entangled in 50 lbs. Heavy monofilament webbing, cork line, and lead line, as well as over 200 lbs. Of bull kelp attached to gear; completely disentangled; leading edge of flukes had significant cuts and abrasions; overall body condition was poor; massive infestation of whale lice and barnacles; animal very emaciated and lacked any visible signs of recent feeding; observed the day after disentanglement swimming very slowly. Apparent health decline due to constricting and weighted entanglement.</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Aug-2011</td>
<td>San Mateo, CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>One white &quot;crab pot&quot; buoy next to body by left pectoral fin; float stayed next to body and did not change position; animal remained in same position - possibly anchored; only observed for ~2 min; not resighted, no rescue, outcome unknown.</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Sep-2010</td>
<td>Central Bering Sea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Bering Sea / Aleutian Islands flatfish trawl fishery: 12 m animal caught in gear. Photos taken.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-May-2010</td>
<td>Orange County CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Free-swimming animal entangled in gillnet; animal first observed inside Dana Point Harbor on 5/11/10; animal successfully disentangled on 5/12/10 &amp; swam out of harbor; animal observed alive in surf zone for several hours on 5/14/10 off Doheny State Beach before washing up dead on beach.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-May-2010</td>
<td>Cape Foulweather OR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Entangled in 3 crab pots, whale not relocated.</td>
<td>SI (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Apr-2010</td>
<td>Seaside OR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>27-ft long gray whale stranded dead, entangled in crab pot gear</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Apr-2010</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Rope wrapped around caudal peduncle; identified as gray whale from photo. Free-swimming, diving. No rescue effort, no resightings, final status unknown</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Mar-2010</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Free-swimming entangled whale reported by member of the public; no rescue effort initiated; no resightings reported; final status unknown.</td>
<td>SI (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Jul-2009</td>
<td>Trinidad Head CA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free-swimming animal with green gillnet, rope &amp; small black floats wrapped around caudal peduncle; report received via HSU researcher on scene during research cruise; animal resighted on 3 Aug; no rescue effort initiated. Photos show rope cutting into caudal peduncle. This whale was re-sighted in 2010 and 2011, still trailing gear. In 2013, whale was resighted, had shed all gear and appeared in good health.</td>
<td>NSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Jun-2009</td>
<td>Clallam County, WA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Whale found entangled in tribal set gillnet in morning. Net had been set 8 pm previous day. Whale able to breathe, but not swim freely and was stationary in net. Right pectoral flipper and head were well-wrapped in net webbing. In response to disentanglement attempts, whale reacted violently and swam away. The net was retrieved and found to be torn in two. No confirmation on whether whale was completely free of netting.</td>
<td>SI (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Apr-2009</td>
<td>Sitka, AK</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Thick black line wrapped twice around whale’s body posterior to the eyes was cut and pulled away by private citizen. Animal swam away and dove.</td>
<td>SI (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-Mar-2009</td>
<td>Seal Beach CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Free-swimming animal with pink gillnet wrapped around head, trailing 4 feet of visible netting; report received via naturalist on local whale watch vessel; no rescue effort initiated; final status unknown</td>
<td>SI (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-Jan-2009</td>
<td>San Diego CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Free-swimming animal towing unidentified pot/trap gear; report received via USCG on scene; USCG reported gear as 4 lobster pots; final status unknown</td>
<td>SI (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Apr-2008</td>
<td>Eel River CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Observed 12 miles west of Eel River by Humboldt State University personnel. It was unknown sex with an estimated length of 20 ft and in emaciated condition. The animal was described as towing 40-50 feet of line &amp; 3 crab pot buoys from the caudal peduncle and moving very slowly. Vessel retrieved the buoys, pulled them and ~20 ft of line onto the deck and cut it loose from the whale. The whale swam away slowly with 20-30 feet of line still entangling the peduncle, outcome unknown. Identification numbers on buoy traced to crab pot fishery gear that was last fished in Bering Sea in</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subsistence/Native Harvest Information

Subsistence hunters in Russia and the United States have traditionally harvested whales from the ENP stock in the Bering Sea, although only the Russian hunt has persisted in recent years (Huelsbeck 1988, Reeves 2002). In 2005, the Makah Indian Tribe requested authorization from NOAA/NMFS, under the MMPA and the Whaling Convention Act, to resume limited hunting of gray whales for ceremonial and subsistence purposes in the coastal portion of their usual and accustomed (U&A) fishing grounds off the coast of Washington State (NMFS 2008). The spatial overlap of the Makah U&A and the summer distribution of PCFG whales has management implications. The proposal by the Makah Tribe includes time/area restrictions designed to reduce the probability of killing a PCFG whale and to focus the hunt on whales migrating to/from feeding areas to the north. The Makah proposal also includes catch limits for PCFG whales that result in the hunt being terminated if these limits are met. Similarly, observations of gray whales moving between the WNP and ENP highlight the need to estimate the probability of a gray whale observed in the WNP being taken during a hunt by the Makah Tribe (Moore and Weller 2012). NMFS has published a notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed hunt (NMFS 2012) and the IWC has evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed hunt and other sources of human-caused mortality on PCFG whales and concluded, with certain qualifications, that the proposed hunt meets the Commission’s conservation objectives (IWC 2013). The Scientific Committee has not scheduled an implementation review of the impacts of the Makah hunt on whales using summering feeding areas in the WNP, but is continuing to investigate stock structure of north Pacific gray whales and may schedule such a review in the future (IWC 2013). In 2012, the IWC approved a 6-year quota (2013-2018) of 744 gray whales, with an annual cap of 140, for Russian and U.S. (Makah Indian Tribe) aboriginals based on the joint request and needs statements submitted by the U.S. and Russian federation. The U.S. and Russia have agreed that the quota will be shared with an average annual harvest of 120 whales by the Russian Chukotka people and 4 whales by the Makah Indian Tribe. Total takes by the Russian hunt during the past five years were: 126 in 2007, 127 in 2008, 115 in 2009, 118 in 2010, and 128 in 2011. Based on this information, the annual subsistence take averaged 123 whales during the 5-year period from 2007 to 2011.

Other Mortality

Ship strikes are a source of mortality for gray whales (Table 2). For the most recent five-year period, 2007-2011 the total serious injury and mortality of ENP gray whales attributed to ship strikes is 10.8 animals (including eight deaths, two serious injuries, and 0.8 prorated serious injuries, or 2.2 whales per year (Table 2, Carretta et al. 2013). The total ship strike serious injury and mortality of gray whales observed in the PCFG range and season during this same period is 0.52 animals, or 0.1 whales per year (Table 2). Additional mortality from ship strikes probably goes unreported because the whales either do not strand or do not have obvious signs of trauma.

In February 2010, a gray whale stranded dead near Humboldt, CA with parts of two harpoons embedded in the body. Since this whale was likely harpooned during the aboriginal hunt in Russian waters, it would have been counted as “struck and lost” in the harvest data.

One PCFG gray whale was illegally killed by hunters in Neah Bay in September 2007 (Calambokidis et al. 2009).

HABITAT CONCERNS

Evidence indicates that the Arctic climate is changing significantly, resulting in a reductions in sea ice cover (Johannessen et al. 2004, Comiso et al. 2008 ). These changes are likely to affect gray whales. For example, the summer range of gray whales has greatly expanded in the past decade (Rugh et al. 2001). Bluhm and Gradinger (2008) examined the availability of pelagic and benthic prey in the Arctic and concluded that pelagic prey is likely to increase while benthic prey is likely to decrease in response to climate change. They noted that marine mammal

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-Jul-2007</td>
<td>Seattle WA</td>
<td>No1</td>
<td>Some gear was removed from the animal, swam away with gear still attached, tribal fishing nets, animal was not sighted again to remove more gear.</td>
<td>SI (0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-Apr-2007</td>
<td>Newport OR</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Entangled in crab gear. skipper of nearby vessel removed 8 pots before he had to return to port due to darkness whale still had 8 buoys and several wraps of line around mid-section, left pectoral flipper, and through mouth</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1For purposes of calculating annual human-caused mortality, this whale is counted as an ENP whale and not part of the PCFG. This determination is based on observations that PCFG whales are not known to enter Puget Sound and current estimates of PCFG population size exclude whales seen in this area (J. Calambokidis, Cascadia Research, personal communication).
species that exhibit trophic plasticity (such as gray whales which feed on both benthic and pelagic prey) will adapt better than trophic specialists.

Global climate change is also likely to increase human activity in the Arctic as sea ice decreases, including oil and gas exploration and shipping (Hovelsrud et al. 2008). Such activity will increase the chance of oil spills and ship strikes in this region. Gray whales have demonstrated avoidance behavior to anthropogenic sounds associated with oil and gas exploration (Malme et al. 1983, 1984) and low-frequency active sonar during acoustic playback experiments (Buck and Tyack 2000, Tyack 2009).

Table 2. Summary of gray whale serious injuries (SI) and deaths attributed to vessel strikes for the five-year period 2007-2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of observation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PCFG range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Determination (SI prorate value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-Jun-2011</td>
<td>San Mateo CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Massive hemorrhage into the thorax, blood clots around lungs. Lesions indicate massive trauma. Due to carcass position, the skeleton could not be completely examined (lying on back, top of skull in sand).</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Apr-2011</td>
<td>San Francisco CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Crushed mandible.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Feb-2011</td>
<td>Los Angeles CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Private recreational vessel collided with free-swimming animal; animal breached just prior to contact, bouncing off side of vessel; dove immediately following contact &amp; was not resighted; no blood observed in water; final status unknown; skin sample collected from vessel and genetically identified as a female gray whale. Vessel size assumed less than 65 ft and speed unknown.</td>
<td>SI (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-Jan-2011</td>
<td>San Diego CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pleasure sailboat collided with free-swimming animal; animal dove immediately following contact &amp; was not resighted; no blood observed in water; final status unknown. Vessel size assumed less than 65 ft. And speed unknown.</td>
<td>SI (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Mar-2010</td>
<td>Santa Barbara CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>21 meter sailboat underway at 13 kts collided with free-swimming animal; whale breached shortly after collision; no blood observed in water; minor damage to lower portion of boat's keel; final status unknown; DNA analysis of skin sample confirmed species.</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Feb-2010</td>
<td>San Diego CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Free-swimming animal with propeller-like wounds to dorsum.</td>
<td>SI (0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-Sep-2009</td>
<td>Quileute River WA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>USCG vessel reported to be traveling at 10 knots when they hit the gray whale at noon on 9/9/2009. The animal was hit with the prop and was reported alive after being hit, blood observed in water.</td>
<td>SI (0.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-May-2009</td>
<td>Los Angeles CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Catalina island transport vessel collided with free-swimming calf accompanied by adult animal; calf was submerged at time of collision; pieces of flesh &amp; body observed in water; calf never surfaced; presumed mortality.</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-Apr-2009</td>
<td>Whidbey Is. WA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Large amount of blood in body cavity, bruising in some areas of blubber layer and in some internal organs. Findings suggestive of blunt force trauma likely caused by collision with a large ship.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Apr-2009</td>
<td>Sunset Beach CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Dead stranding; 3 deep propeller-like cuts on right side, just anterior of genital opening; carcass towed out to sea.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Apr-2009</td>
<td>Ilwaco WA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Necropsied, broken bones in skull; extensive hemorrhage head and thorax; sub-adult male.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Mar-2008</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Carcass brought into port on bow of cruise ship; collision occurred between ports of San Diego and Cabo San Lucas between 5:00 p.m. On 2/28 &amp; 7:20 a.m. On 3/1.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-Feb-2008</td>
<td>Orange County CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Carcass; propeller-like wounds to left dorsum from mid-body to caudal peduncle; deep external bruising on right side of head; field necropsy revealed multiple cranial fractures</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jun-2007</td>
<td>Marin, CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Carcass; 4 propeller-like wounds to body.</td>
<td>Dead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ocean acidification could reduce the abundance of shell-forming organisms (Fabry et al. 2008, Hall-Spencer et al. 2008), many of which are important in the gray whales’ diet (Nerini 1984, Moore and Huntington 2008).

STATUS OF STOCK

In 1994, the ENP stock of gray whales was removed from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife (the List), as it was no longer considered endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA)(NMFS
Punt and Wade (2012) estimated the ENP population was at 85% of carrying capacity (K) and at 129% of the maximum net productivity level (MNPL), with a probability of 0.884 that the population is above MNPL and therefore within the range of its optimum sustainable population (OSP).

Even though the stock is within OSP, abundance will fluctuate as the population adjusts to natural and human-caused factors affecting carrying capacity of the environment (Punt and Wade 2012). It is expected that a population close to or at carrying capacity will be more susceptible to environmental fluctuations (Moore et al. 2001). The correlation between gray whale calf production and environmental conditions in the Bering Sea (Perryman et al. 2002; Perryman and Weller 2012) may reflect this. Overall, the population nearly doubled in size over the first 20 years of monitoring and has fluctuated for the last 30 years around its average carrying capacity. This is consistent with a population approaching K.

Alter et al. (2007) used estimates of genetic diversity to infer that North Pacific gray whales may have numbered ~96,000 animals in both the western and eastern populations 1,100-1,600 years ago. The authors recommend that because the current estimate of the eastern stock of gray whales is at most 28-56% of this historic abundance, the stock should be designated as “depleted” under the MMPA. NMFS does not accept the recommendation made by Alter et al. (2007) for the following reasons. First, their analysis examines the historic population of the entire Pacific population of gray whales, while MMPA management occurs at the level of a stock, which in this case is the ENP stock. Second, NMFS relies on current carrying capacity in making MMPA determinations. Ecosystems change over time and with those changes, the carrying capacity of the ecosystem also changes. NMFS interprets carrying capacity to mean “current” carrying capacity in part because it is not reasonable to expect ecosystems to remain static over thousands of years. Thus, an estimate of stock abundance 1,100-1,600 years ago is not relevant to MMPA decision-making, even if such an estimate were available.

Based on 2007-2011 data, the estimated annual level of human-caused mortality and serious injury for ENP gray whales includes Russian harvest (123), mortality from commercial fisheries (2.45), and ship strikes (2.2), totals 127 whales per year, which does not exceed the PBR (558). The IWC completed an implementation review for ENP gray whales (including the PCFG) in 2012 (IWC 2013) and concluded that harvest levels (including the proposed Makah hunt) and other human caused mortality are sustainable, given the current population abundance (Laake et al. 2012, Punt and Wade 2012). Therefore, the ENP stock of gray whales is not classified as a strategic stock.

PCFG gray whales do not currently have a formal status under the MMPA, though the population size appears to have been stable since 2003, based on photo-ID studies (Calambokidis et al. 2012, IWC 2012). Total annual human-caused mortality and serious injury of PCFG gray whales during the period 2007 to 2011 from commercial fisheries (0.15/yr), ship strikes (0.1/yr), and illegal hunts (0.2/yr), totals 0.45 whales annually. This does not exceed the PBR level of 2.7 whales for this population. Levels of human-caused mortality and serious injury resulting from commercial fisheries and ship strikes for both ENP and PCFG whales represent minimum estimates as recorded by stranding networks or at-sea sightings.
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