BLUE WHALE (*Balaenoptera musculus musculus*): Eastern North Pacific Stock

**STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE**

North Pacific blue whales were once thought to belong to as many as five separate populations (Reeves *et al.* 1998), but acoustic evidence suggests only two populations, in the eastern and western north Pacific, respectively (Stafford *et al.* 2001, Stafford 2003, McDonald *et al.* 2006, Monnahan *et al.* 2014). North Pacific blue whales produce two distinct acoustic calls, referred to as “northwestern” and “northeastern” types, and it has been proposed that these represent distinct populations with some degree of geographic overlap (Stafford *et al.* 2001, Stafford 2003, Monnahan *et al.* 2014). The northeastern call predominates in the Gulf of Alaska, the U.S. West Coast, and the eastern tropical Pacific, while the northwestern call predominates from south of the Aleutian Islands to the Kamchatka Peninsula in Russia, though both call types have been recorded concurrently in the Gulf of Alaska (Stafford *et al.* 2001, Stafford 2003). Both call types occur in lower latitudes in the central North Pacific, but differ in their seasonal patterns (Stafford *et al.* 2001). Blue whales satellite-tagged off California in late summer have been found to travel to the eastern tropical Pacific and the Costa Rica Dome area in winter (Mate *et al.* 1999, Bailey *et al.* 2009). Photographs of blue whales in California have also been matched to individuals photographed off the Queen Charlotte Islands in northern British Columbia and to one individual photographed in the northern Gulf of Alaska (Calambokidis *et al.* 2009a). Gilpatrick and Perryman (2008) showed that blue whales from California to Central America (the Eastern North Pacific stock) are on average, two meters shorter than blue whales measured from historic whaling records in the central and western north Pacific.

For the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) stock assessment reports, the Eastern North Pacific Stock of blue whales includes animals found in the eastern North Pacific from the northern Gulf of Alaska to the eastern tropical Pacific. This definition is consistent with both the distribution of the northeastern call type, photogrammetric length determinations and with the known range of photographically identified individuals. Based on locations where the northeastern call type has been recorded, some individuals in this stock may range as far west as Wake Island and as far south as the Equator (Stafford *et al.* 1999, 2001). The U.S. West Coast is certainly one of the most important feeding areas in summer and fall (Figure 1), but, increasingly, blue whales from this stock have been found feeding to the north and south of this area during summer and fall. Nine ‘biologically important areas’ (BIAs) for blue whale feeding are identified off the California coast by Calambokidis *et al.* (2015), including six in southern California and three in central California. Most of this stock is believed to migrate south to spend the winter and spring in high productivity areas off Baja California, in the Gulf of California, and on the Costa Rica Dome. Given that these migratory destinations are areas of high productivity and given the observations of feeding in these areas, blue whales can be assumed to feed year round. Some individuals from this stock may be present year-round on the Costa Rica Dome (Reilly and Thayer 1990). However, it is also possible that some Southern Hemisphere blue whales might occur...
north of the equator during the austral winter. One other stock of North Pacific blue whales (the Central North Pacific stock) is recognized in the Pacific Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) Stock Assessment Reports.

**POPULATION SIZE**

The size of the feeding stock of blue whales off the U.S. West Coast has been estimated recently by both line-transect and mark-recapture methods. Line-transect abundance estimates from summer/autumn research vessel surveys in the California Current ranged between approximately 400 and 800 animals from 2001 to 2008 (Barlow and Forney 2007, Barlow 2010). These estimates are considerably lower than previous line-transect estimates of approximately 1,900 animals obtained between 1991 and 1996 (Barlow 2010) (Figure 2). The lower abundance estimates appear to be related to a northward shift in the distribution of blue whales out of the study area (as far north as the Gulf of Alaska) and not a population decline (Barlow and Forney 2007, Calambokidis et al. 2009a). Mark-recapture estimates are often negatively biased by individual heterogeneity in sighting probabilities (Hammond 1986); however, Calambokidis et al. (2010) minimize such effects by selecting one sample that was taken randomly with respect to distance from the coast. Because some fraction of the population is always outside the survey area, the line-transect and mark recapture estimation methods provide different measures of abundance for this stock. Line transect estimates reflect the average density and abundance of blue whales in the study area during summer and autumn surveys, while mark recapture estimates provide an estimate of total population size. New photographic mark-recapture estimates of abundance for the period 2005 to 2011 presented by Calambokidis and Barlow (2013) range from approximately 1,000 to 2,300 animals, with the most consistent estimates represented by a 4-yr sampling period Chao model that incorporates individual capture heterogeneity over time. The Chao model consistently yielded estimates of approximately 1,500 whales (Figure 2). The best estimate of blue whale abundance is taken from the Chao model results of Calambokidis and Barlow (2013) for the period 2008 to 2011, or 1,647 (CV=0.07) whales.

**Minimum Population Estimate**

The minimum population estimate for blue whales is taken as the lower 20th percentile of the log-normal distribution of abundance estimated from the mark-recapture estimate, or approximately 1,551.

**Current Population Trend**

Mark-recapture estimates provide the best indicator of population trends for this stock, because of recent northward shifts in blue whale distribution that negatively bias line-transect estimates. Based on mark-recapture estimates shown in Figure 2, there is no evidence of a population size increase in this blue whale population since the early 1990s. While the Petersen mark-recapture estimates show an apparent increase in blue whale abundance since 1996, the estimation errors associated with these estimates are also much higher than for the Chao estimates (Figure 2). Monnahan et al. (2015) used a population dynamics model to estimate that the eastern Pacific blue whale population was at 97% of carrying capacity in 2013 and suggest that density dependence and not impacts from ship strikes, explains the observed lack of a population size increase since the early 1990s. The authors estimate that the eastern North Pacific population likely did not drop below 460 whales during the last century, despite being targeted by commercial whaling.

**CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES**

Based on mark-recapture estimates from the US West Coast and Baja California, Mexico, Calambokidis et al. (2009b) estimate a rate of increase just under 3% per year, but it is not known if that corresponds to the maximum growth rate of this stock.

**POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL**

The potential biological removal (PBR) level for this stock is calculated as the minimum population size (1,551) times one half the default maximum net growth rate for cetaceans (1/2 of 4%) times a recovery factor of 0.3 (for an endangered species which has a minimum abundance greater than 1,500 and a CV_{min}<0.5), resulting in a PBR of 9.3. Because whales in this stock spends approximately three quarters of their time outside the U.S. EEZ, the PBR allocation for U.S. waters is one-quarter of this total, or 2.3 whales per year.
Figure 2. Estimates of blue whale abundance from line-transect and photographic mark-recapture surveys, 1991 to 2011 (Barlow and Forney 2007, Barlow 2010, Calambokidis and Barlow 2013). Vertical bars indicate ±2 standard errors of each abundance estimate.

HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Fisheries Information
A seriously-injured blue whale was sighted entangled in unidentified pot/trap gear offshore of southern California in 2015, the first documented blue whale entanglement in a commercial fishery in this region (Carretta et al. 2017a). There have been no observed entanglements of blue whales in the California swordfish drift gillnet fishery during a 26-year observer program that includes 8,711 observed fishing sets from 1990-2015 (Julian and Beeson 1998, Carretta et al. 2004, Carretta et al. 2017b). Some gillnet mortality of large whales may go unobserved because whales swim away with a portion of the net; however, fishermen report that large rorquals usually swim through nets without entangling and with very little damage to the nets. Gillnets have been documented to entangle marine mammals off Baja California (Sosa-Nishizaki et al. 1993), but no recent bycatch data from Mexico are available.

Table 1. Summary of available information on the incidental mortality and injury of blue whales (Eastern North Pacific stock) for commercial fisheries that might take this species (Carretta et al. 2017a, 2017b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishery Name</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Percent Observer Coverage</th>
<th>Observed Mortality (and serious injury)</th>
<th>Estimated mortality and/or serious injury (CV in parentheses)</th>
<th>Mean Annual Takes (CV in parentheses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified pot/trap fishery</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>opportunistic reports</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0 (1)</td>
<td>1 (n/a)</td>
<td>≥ 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA/OR thresher shark/swordfish drift gillnet fishery</td>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>observer</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Takes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (n/a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ship Strikes
No ship strikes of blue whales were recorded in the most recent 5-year period, 2011-2015, but there was one ship strike serious injury of an unidentified large whale during this same period (Carretta et al. 2017a).
were implicated in the deaths of four blue whales and the serious injury of a fifth whale between 2009 and 2013 (Carretta et al. 2015). Five deaths occurred in 2007, the highest number recorded for any year. The remaining four ship strike deaths occurred in 2009 (2) and 2010 (2). No methods have been developed to prorate the number of unidentified whale ship strike cases to species, because identified cases are likely biased towards species that are large, easy to identify, and more likely to be detected, such as blue and fin whales. Most observed blue whale ship strikes have been in the southern California Bight, where large container ship ports overlap with seasonal blue whale distribution (Berman-Kowalewski et al. 2010). Several blue whales have been photographed in California with large gashes in their dorsal surface that appear to be from ship strikes. Including ship strike records identified to species and prorated serious injuries, blue whale mortality and injuries attributed to ship strikes in California waters was zero during 2011-2015 (Carretta et al. 2017a). NOAA previously implemented a mitigation plan that includes NOAA weather radio and U.S. Coast Guard advisory broadcasts to mariners entering the Santa Barbara Channel to be observant for whales, along with recommendations that mariners transit the channel at 10 knots or less. The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary also developed a blue whale/ship strike response plan, which involved weekly overflights to record whale locations. Documented ship strike deaths and serious injuries are derived from actual counts of whale carcasses and should be considered minimum values. Where evaluated, estimates of detection rates of cetacean carcasses are consistently quite low across different regions and species (<1% to 17%), highlighting that observed numbers are unrepresentative of true impacts (Kraus et al. 2005, Perrin et al. 2011, Williams et al. 2011, Prado et al. 2013). Due to this negative bias, Redfern et al. (2013) stress that the number of observed ship strike deaths of blue whales in the California Current likely exceeds PBR. Ship strike mortality was recently estimated for blue whales in the California Current (Rockwood et al. 2017), using an encounter theory model (Martin et al. 2015) that combined species distribution models of whale density (Becker et al. 2016), vessel traffic characteristics (size + speed + spatial use), along with whale movement patterns obtained from satellite-tagged whales in the region to estimate encounters that would result in mortality. The results of this study were published while this report was being prepared and the results will be fully incorporated into the draft 2018 stock assessment report for this species.

Impacts of ship strikes on population recovery of the eastern North Pacific blue whale population were assessed by Monnahan et al. (2015). Their population dynamics model incorporated data on historic whaling removals, levels of ship strikes, and projected numbers of vessels using the region through 2050. The authors concluded (based on 10 ship strike deaths per year) that this stock was at 97% of carrying capacity in 2013 and that current ship strike levels do not pose a threat to the status of this stock. These authors also analyzed the status of the blue whale stock based on a ‘high case’ of annual ship strike deaths (35/yr) and concluded that under that scenario, the stock would have been at approximately 91% of carrying capacity in 2013. Caveats to the carrying capacity analysis include the assumption that the population was already at carrying capacity prior to commercial whaling of this stock in the early 20th century and that carrying capacity has not changed appreciably since that time (Monnahan et al. 2015).

Habitat Concerns

Increasing levels of anthropogenic sound in the world’s oceans has been suggested to be a habitat concern for blue whales (Reeves et al. 1998, Andrew et al. 2002). Tagged blue whales exposed to simulated mid-frequency sonar and pseudo-random noise demonstrated a variety of behavioral responses, including no change in behavior, termination of deep dives, directed travel away from sound sources, and cessation of feeding (Goldbogen et al. 2013). Behavioral responses were highly dependent upon the type of sound source and the behavioral state of the animal at the time of exposure. Deep-feeding and non-feeding whales reacted more strongly to experimental sound sources than surface-feeding whales that typically showed no change in behavior. The authors stated that behavioral responses to such sounds are influenced by a complex interaction of behavioral state, environmental context, and prior exposure of individuals to such sound sources. One concern expressed by the authors is if blue whales did not habituate to such sounds near feeding areas that “repeated exposures could negatively impact individual feeding performance, body condition and ultimately fitness and potentially population health.” Currently, no evidence indicates that such reduced population health exists, but such evidence would be difficult to differentiate from natural sources of reduced fitness or mortality in the population. Nine blue whale feeding areas identified off the California coast by Calambokidis et al. (2015) represent a diversity of nearshore and offshore habitats that overlap with a variety of anthropogenic activities, including shipping, oil and gas extraction, and military activities.

STATUS OF STOCK

The reported take of North Pacific blue whales by commercial whalers totaled 9,500 between 1910 and 1965 (Ohsumi and Wada 1972). Approximately 3,000 of these were taken from the west coast of North America from Baja California, Mexico to British Columbia, Canada (Tonnessen and Johnsen 1982; Rice 1992; Clapham et al. 1997; Rice 1974). Recently, Monnahan et al. (2014) estimated that 3,411 blue whales (95% range 2,593–4,114) were removed
from the eastern North Pacific populations between 1905 and 1971. Blue whales in the North Pacific were given protected status by the IWC in 1966, but Doroshenko (2000) reported that a small number of blue whales were taken illegally by Soviet whalers after that date. As a result of commercial whaling, blue whales were listed as "endangered" under the Endangered Species Conservation Act of 1969. This protection was transferred to the Endangered Species Act in 1973. Despite a current analysis suggesting that the Eastern North Pacific population is at 97% of carrying capacity (Monnahan et al. 2015), blue whales are listed as “endangered”, and consequently the Eastern North Pacific stock is automatically considered a "depleted" and "strategic" stock under the MMPA. Conclusions about the population’s current status relative to carrying capacity depend upon assumptions that the population was already at carrying capacity before commercial whaling impacted the population in the early 1900s, and that carrying capacity has remained relatively constant since that time (Monnahan et al. 2015). If carrying capacity has changed significantly in the last century, conclusions regarding the status of this population would necessarily change (Monnahan et al. 2015). The observed annual incidental mortality and injury rate (0/year) from ship strikes from 2011-2015 is less than the calculated PBR (2.3) for this stock, but this rate does not include unidentified large whales struck by vessels, some of which may have been blue whales, nor does it include undetected and unreported ship strikes of blue whales. While Redfern et al. (2013) noted that the number of blue whales struck by ships in the California Current likely exceeds the PBR for this stock, Monnahan et al. (2015) proposed that observed ship strike levels do not pose a threat to the status of this stock. The current annual level of serious injury and mortality due to commercial fisheries (≥0.2) for this stock is less than 10% of the stock’s PBR, and thus, is approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate.
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