Revised 12/30/2015

HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena*): Gulf of Alaska Stock

NOTE – December 2015: In areas outside of Alaska, studies of harbor porpoise distribution have indicated that stock structure is likely more finely-scaled than is reflected in the Alaska Stock Assessment Reports. At this time, no data are available to define stock structure for harbor porpoise on a finer scale in Alaska. However, based on comparisons with other regions, it is likely that several regional and sub-regional populations exist. Should new information on harbor porpoise stocks become available, the harbor porpoise Stock Assessment Reports will be updated.

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

In the eastern North Pacific Ocean, the harbor porpoise ranges from Point Barrow and offshore areas of the Chukchi Sea, along the Alaska coast, and down the west coast of North America to Point Conception, California (Gaskin 1984, Christman and Aerts 2015). Harbor porpoise primarily frequent the coastal waters of the Gulf of Alaska and Southeast Alaska (Dahlheim et al. 2000, 2009), typically occurring in waters less than 100 m deep (Hobbs and Waite 2010). The average density of harbor porpoise in Alaska appears to be less than that reported off the west coast of the continental U.S., although areas of high densities do occur in Glacier Bay and the adjacent waters of Icy Strait, Yakutat Bay, the Copper River Delta, Sitkalidak Strait (Dahlheim et al. 2000, Hobbs and Waite 2010), and lower Cook Inlet (Shelden et al. 2014).



Figure 1. Approximate distribution of harbor porpoise in Alaska waters (dark shaded area).

Stock discreteness in the eastern North Pacific was analyzed using mitochondrial DNA from samples collected along the west coast (Rosel 1992), including one sample from Alaska. Two distinct mitochondrial DNA groupings or clades were found. One clade is present in California, Washington, British Columbia, and the single sample from Alaska (no samples were available from Oregon), while the other is found only in California and Washington. Although these two clades are not geographically distinct by latitude, the results may indicate a low mixing rate for harbor porpoise along the west coast of North America. Investigation of pollutant loads in harbor porpoise ranging from California to the Canadian border also suggests restricted harbor porpoise movements (Calambokidis and Barlow 1991); these results are reinforced by a similar study in the northwest Atlantic (Westgate and Tolley 1999). Further genetic testing of the same samples mentioned above, along with a few additional samples including eight more from Alaska, found significant genetic differences for three of the six pair-wise comparisons between the four areas investigated: California, Washington, British Columbia, and Alaska (Rosel et al. 1995). Those results demonstrate that harbor porpoise along the west coast of North America are not panmictic and that movement is sufficiently restricted to result in genetic differences. This is consistent with low movement suggested by genetic analysis of harbor porpoise specimens from the North Atlantic (Rosel et al. 1999). Numerous stocks have been delineated with clinal differences over areas as small as the waters surrounding the British Isles (Walton 1997). In a molecular genetic analysis of small-scale population structure of eastern North Pacific harbor porpoise, Chivers et al. (2002) included 30 samples from Alaska, 16 of which were from Copper River Delta, 5 from Barrow, 5 from Southeast Alaska, and 1 sample each from St. Paul, Adak, Kodiak, and Kenai. Unfortunately, no conclusions could be drawn about the genetic structure of harbor porpoise within Alaska because of the insufficient number of samples from each region. Accordingly, harbor porpoise stock structure in Alaska is unknown at this time.

Although it is difficult to determine the true stock structure of harbor porpoise populations in the northeast Pacific, from a management standpoint it would be prudent to assume that regional populations exist and that they

should be managed independently (Rosel et al. 1995, Taylor et al. 1996). The Alaska Scientific Review Group concurred that available data were insufficient to justify recognizing three biological stocks of harbor porpoise in Alaska instead of only one; however, it did not recommend against the establishment of three management units in Alaska (DeMaster 1996, 1997). Accordingly, from the above information, three harbor porpoise stocks in Alaska were identified, recognizing that the boundaries of these three stocks were inferred primarily based upon geography or perceived areas of low porpoise density: 1) the Southeast Alaska stock - occurring from the northern border of British Columbia to Cape Suckling, Alaska, 2) the Gulf of Alaska stock - occurring from Cape Suckling to Unimak Pass, and 3) the Bering Sea stock - occurring throughout the Aleutian Islands and all waters north of Unimak Pass (Fig. 1). To date, there have been no analyses to assess the validity of these stock designations.

POPULATION SIZE

In June and July of 1998, an aerial survey covered the waters of the western Gulf of Alaska from Cape Suckling to Sutwik Island, offshore to the 1,000 fathom depth contour. Two types of corrections were needed for these aerial surveys: one for observer perception bias and one to correct for porpoise availability/visibility at the surface. The 1998 survey resulted in an abundance estimate for the Gulf of Alaska harbor porpoise stock of 10,489 (CV = 0.115) animals (Hobbs and Waite 2010), which includes a correction factor (1.372; CV = 0.066) for perception bias to correct for animals that were present but not counted because they were not detected by observers. Laake et al. (1997) estimated the availability bias for aerial surveys of harbor porpoise in Puget Sound to be 2.96 (CV = 0.180); the use of this correction factor is preferred to other published correction factors (e.g., Barlow et al. 1988, Calambokidis et al. 1993) because it is an empirical estimate of availability bias. The estimated corrected abundance estimate from the 1998 survey is 31,046 (10,489 × 2.96 = 31,046; CV = 0.214) (Hobbs and Waite 2010).

This latest estimate of abundance (31,046) is considerably higher than the estimate reported in the 1999 stock assessment (8,271; CV = 0.309), which was based on surveys in 1991-1993. This disparity largely stems from changes in the area covered by the two surveys and differences in harbor porpoise density encountered in areas added to, or dropped from, the 1998 survey relative to the 1991-1993 surveys. The survey area in 1998 (119,183 km^2) was greater than the area covered in the combined portions of the 1991, 1992, and 1993 surveys (106,600 km^2). The 1998 survey included selected bays, channels, and inlets in Prince William Sound, the outer Kenai Peninsula, the south side of the Alaska Peninsula, and the Kodiak Archipelago, whereas, the earlier survey included only open water areas. Several of the bays and inlets covered by the 1998 survey had higher harbor porpoise densities than observed in the open waters. In addition, the 1998 estimate provided by Hobbs and Waite (2010) empirically estimates the perception bias and uses this in addition to the correction factor for availability bias. Finally, the 1998 estimate extrapolates available densities to estimate the number of porpoise which would likely be found in unsurveyed inlets within the study area. For these reasons, the 1998 survey result is probably more representative of the size of the Gulf of Alaska harbor porpoise stock.

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate (N_{MIN}) for this stock is calculated using Equation 1 from the potential biological removal (PBR) guidelines (Wade and Angliss 1997): $N_{MIN} = N/\exp(0.842\times[\ln(1+[CV(N)]^2)]^{½})$. Using the population estimate (N) of 31,046 and its associated CV of 0.214, N_{MIN} for the Gulf of Alaska stock of harbor porpoise is 25,987 (Hobbs and Waite 2010). However, because the survey data are now more than 8 years old, N_{MIN} is considered unknown.

Current Population Trend

At present, there is no reliable information on trends in abundance for the Gulf of Alaska stock of harbor porpoise since survey methods and results are not comparable.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

A reliable estimate of the maximum net productivity rate (R_{MAX}) is not currently available for the Gulf of Alaska stock of harbor porpoise. Hence, until additional data become available, it is recommended that the cetacean maximum theoretical net productivity rate of 4% be employed (Wade and Angliss 1997).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Under the 1994 reauthorized Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), the PBR is defined as the product of the minimum population estimate, one-half the maximum theoretical net productivity rate, and a recovery factor: $PBR = N_{MIN} \times 0.5R_{MAX} \times F_R$. The recovery factor ($F_R$) for this stock is 0.5, the value for cetacean stocks with unknown population status (Wade and Angliss 1997). However, the 2005 revisions to the SAR guidelines (Wade

and Angliss 1997) state that abundance estimates older than 8 years should not be used to calculate PBR due to a decline in confidence in the reliability of an aged abundance estimate. Therefore, the PBR for this stock is considered undetermined (NMFS 2005).

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Fisheries Information

Detailed information on U.S. commercial fisheries in Alaska waters (including observer programs, observer coverage, and observed incidental takes of marine mammals) is presented in Appendices 3-6 of the Alaska Stock Assessment Reports.

Prior to 2003, three different federally-managed commercial fisheries operating within the range of the Gulf of Alaska stock of harbor porpoise were monitored by NMFS observers for incidental take: the Gulf of Alaska groundfish trawl, longline, and pot fisheries. As of 2003, changes in fishery definitions in the MMPA List of Fisheries resulted in separating these 3 Gulf of Alaska (GOA) fisheries into 10 fisheries (69 FR 70094, 2 December 2004). This change does not represent a change in fishing effort but provides managers with better information on the component of each fishery that is responsible for the incidental serious injury or mortality of marine mammal stocks in Alaska. No incidental mortality or serious injury of harbor porpoise was observed in these fisheries. Observers also monitored the State of Alaska-managed Prince William Sound salmon drift gillnet fishery in 1990 and 1991, recording 1 mortality in 1990 and 3 in 1991, which extrapolated to 8 (95% CI: 1-23) and 32 (95% CI: 3-103) for the entire fishery, resulting in a mean annual mortality and serious injury rate of 20 (CV = 0.60) animals when averaged over 1990 and 1991 (Wynne et al. 1991, 1992) (Table 1). The Prince William Sound salmon drift gillnet fishery has not been observed since 1991 and no additional data are available for that fishery.

In 1999 and 2000, observers were placed on the state-managed Cook Inlet salmon set and drift gillnet vessels. One harbor porpoise mortality was observed in 2000 in the Cook Inlet salmon drift gillnet fishery (Manly 2006). This single mortality extrapolates to an estimated mortality and serious injury rate of 31 for that year and an average of 16 per year when averaged over the 2 years of observer data (Table 1).

In 2002 and 2005, observers were placed on state-managed Kodiak Island set gillnet vessels. Two harbor porpoise mortalities were observed in this fishery in both 2002 and 2005 (Manly 2007), which extrapolates to an estimated mean annual mortality and serious injury rate of 36 harbor porpoise (Table 1).

Table 1. Summary of incidental mortality and serious injury of the Gulf of Alaska stock of harbor porpoise due to state-managed fisheries from 1990 through 2005 and calculation of the mean annual mortality and serious injury rate (Wynne et al. 1991, 1992; Manly 2006, 2007). Methods for calculating percent observer coverage are described in Appendix 6 of the Alaska Stock Assessment Reports.

Fishery name	Years	Data type	Percent observer coverage	Observed mortality	Estimated mortality	Mean estimated annual mortality
Prince William Sound salmon drift gillnet	1990 1991	obs data	4 5	1 3	8 32	20 (CV = 0.60)
Cook Inlet salmon drift gillnet	1999 2000	obs data	1.6 3.6	0 1	0 31	16 (CV = 1.0)
Cook Inlet salmon set gillnet	1999 2000	obs data	0.16-1.1 2.7	0 0	0 0	0
Kodiak Island set gillnet	2002 2005	obs data	6.0 4.9	2 2	32 39	36 (CV = 0.68)
Minimum total estimated annual mortality						72 (CV = 0.44)

Strandings of marine mammals with fishing gear attached or with injuries caused by interactions with fishing gear are another source of mortality data. Between 2009 and 2013, one Gulf of Alaska harbor porpoise mortality, due to entanglement in a commercial salmon drift gillnet near Kenai, Alaska, in 2013, was reported to the NMFS Alaska Region stranding database (Helker et al. 2015). However, this event is accounted for in the extrapolated estimate (derived from Alaska Marine Mammal Observer Program (AMMOP) observer data) of annual mortality and serious injury occurring in the commercial Cook Inlet salmon drift gillnet fishery (Table 1).

A complete estimate of the total mortality and serious injury incidental to commercial fisheries is unavailable because of the absence of observer placements in all salmon and herring fisheries. However, the minimum estimated annual mortality and serious injury rate incidental to U.S. commercial fisheries is 72 harbor porpoise (Table 1).

Alaska Native Subsistence/Harvest Information

Porpoise in the Gulf of Alaska were hunted by prehistoric societies in Kodiak, Cook Inlet, and Prince William Sound (Shelden et al. 2014). Subsistence hunters have not been reported to harvest from this stock of harbor porpoise since the early 1900s (Shelden et al. 2014).

STATUS OF STOCK

Harbor porpoise are not designated as "depleted" under the MMPA or listed as "threatened" or "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act. Because the PBR is undetermined, the annual level of U.S. commercial fishery-related mortality and serious injury that can be considered insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate is unknown. The estimated annual level of human-caused mortality and serious injury is 72 harbor porpoise. Because the most recent abundance estimate is more than 8 years old and information on incidental harbor porpoise mortality and serious injury in commercial fisheries is not complete, the Gulf of Alaska stock of harbor porpoise is classified as a strategic stock. Population trends and status of this stock relative to its Optimum Sustainable Population are currently unknown.

HABITAT CONCERNS

Harbor porpoise are mostly found in waters less than 100 m in depth and they often concentrate in nearshore areas, bays, tidal areas, and river mouths (Dahlheim et al. 2000, Hobbs and Waite 2010). As a result, harbor porpoise are vulnerable to physical modifications of nearshore habitats resulting from urban and industrial development (including waste management and nonpoint source runoff) and activities such as construction of docks and other over-water structures, filling of shallow areas, dredging, and noise (Linnenschmidt et al. 2013).

CITATIONS

Barlow, J., C. W. Oliver, T. D. Jackson, and B. L. Taylor. 1988. Harbor porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena*, abundance estimation for California, Oregon, and Washington: II. Aerial surveys. Fish. Bull., U.S. 86:433-444.

Calambokidis, J., and J. Barlow. 1991. Chlorinated hydrocarbon concentrations and their use for describing population discreteness in harbor porpoises from Washington, Oregon, and California. Pp. 101-110 *In* J. E. Reynolds III and D. K. Odell (eds.), Proceedings of the Second Marine Mammal Stranding Workshop: 3-5 December 1987, Miami, Florida. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS-98.

Calambokidis, J., J. R. Evenson, J. C. Cubbage, S. D. Osmek, D. Rugh, and J. L. Laake. 1993. Calibration of sighting rates of harbor porpoise from aerial surveys. Final Report to the National Marine Mammal Laboratory, AFSC, NMFS, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115. 55 pp.

Chivers, S. J., A. E. Dizon, P. J. Gearin, and K. M. Robertson. 2002. Small-scale population structure of eastern North Pacific harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) indicated by molecular genetic analyses. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 4(2):111-122.

Christman, C. L., and L. M. Aerts. 2015. Harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) sightings from shipboard surveys in the Chukchi Sea during summer and fall, 2008-2014. Pp. 197 *In* Book of Abstracts, 2015 Alaska Marine Science Symposium, Anchorage, Alaska, January 19-23, 2015.

Dahlheim, M., A. York, R. Towell, J. Waite, and J. Breiwick. 2000. Harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) abundance in Alaska: Bristol Bay to Southeast Alaska, 1991-1993. Mar. Mammal Sci. 16:28-45.

Dahlheim, M., P. A. White, and J. Waite. 2009. Cetaceans of Southeast Alaska: distribution and seasonal occurrence. J. Biogeogr. 36(3):410-426.

DeMaster, D. P. 1996. Minutes from the 11-13 September 1996 meeting of the Alaska Scientific Review Group. Anchorage, Alaska. 20 pp. + appendices. Available from Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115.

DeMaster, D. P. 1997. Minutes from the fifth meeting of the Alaska Scientific Review Group, 7-9 May 1997, Seattle, Washington. 21 pp. + appendices. Available from Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115.

Gaskin, D. E. 1984. The harbor porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* (L.): regional populations, status, and information on direct and indirect catches. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. 34:569-586.

Helker, V. T., B. A. Allen, and L. A. Jemison. 2015. Human-caused injury and mortality of NMFS-managed Alaska marine mammal stocks, 2009-2013. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-300, 94 p.

Hobbs, R. C., and J. M. Waite. 2010. Abundance of harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) in three Alaskan regions, corrected for observer errors due to perception bias and species misidentification, and corrected for animals submerged from view. Fish. Bull., U.S. 108(3):251-267.

Laake, J. L., J. Calambokidis, S. D. Osmek, and D. J. Rugh. 1997. Probability of detecting harbor porpoise from aerial surveys: estimating g(0). J. Wildl. Manage. 61(1):63-75.

Linnenschmidt, M., J. Teilmann, T. Akamatsu, R. Dietz, and L. A. Miller. 2013. Biosonar, dive, and foraging activity of satellite tracked harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*). Mar. Mammal Sci. 29(2):77-97.

Manly, B. F. J. 2006. Incidental catch and interactions of marine mammals and birds in the Cook Inlet salmon driftnet and setnet fisheries, 1999-2000. Final Report to NMFS Alaska Region. 98 pp. Available online: https://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sites/default/files/1999-2000cookinlet.pdf. Accessed December 2015.

Manly, B. F. J. 2007. Incidental take and interactions of marine mammals and birds in the Kodiak Island salmon set gillnet fishery, 2002 and 2005. Final Report to NMFS Alaska Region. 221 pp. Available online: https://alaskafisheries.noaa.gov/sites/default/files/kodiakreport02_05.pdf. Accessed December 2015.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2005. Revisions to guidelines for assessing marine mammal stocks. 24 pp. Available online: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/sars/gamms2005.pdf. Accessed December 2015.

Rosel, P. E. 1992. Genetic population structure and systematic relationships of some small cetaceans inferred from mitochondrial DNA sequence variation. Ph.D. Diss., University of California San Diego. 191 pp.

Rosel, P. E., A. E. Dizon, and M. G. Haygood. 1995. Variability of the mitochondrial control region in populations of the harbour porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena*, on inter-oceanic and regional scales. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 52:1210-1219.

Rosel, P. E., R. Tiedemann, and M. Walton. 1999. Genetic evidence for limited trans-Atlantic movements of the harbor porpoise *Phocoena phocoena*. Mar. Biol. 133:583-591.

Shelden, K. E. W., B. A. Agler, J. J. Brueggeman, L. A. Cornick, S. G. Speckman, and A. Prevel-Ramos. 2014. Harbor porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena vomerina*, in Cook Inlet, Alaska. Mar. Fish. Rev. 76(1-2):22-50.

Taylor, B. L., P. R. Wade, D. P. DeMaster, and J. Barlow. 1996. Models for management of marine mammals. Unpubl. doc. submitted to Int. Whal. Comm. (SC/48/SM50). 12 pp.

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

Walton, M. J. 1997. Population structure of harbour porpoises *Phocoena phocoena* in the seas around the UK and adjacent waters. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B 264:89-94.

Westgate, A. J., and K. A. Tolley. 1999. Geographical differences in organochlorine contaminants in harbour porpoises *Phocoena phocoena* from the western North Atlantic. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 177:255-268.

Wynne, K. M., D. Hicks, and N. Munro. 1991. 1990 salmon gillnet fisheries observer programs in Prince William Sound and South Unimak Alaska. Annual Report NMFS/NOAA Contract 50ABNF000036. 65 pp. Available from NMFS Alaska Region, Office of Marine Mammals, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802.

Wynne, K. M., D. Hicks, and N. Munro. 1992. 1991 marine mammal observer program for the salmon driftnet fishery of Prince William Sound Alaska. Annual Report NMFS/NOAA Contract 50ABNF000036. 53 pp. Available from NMFS Alaska Region, Office of Marine Mammals, P.O. Box 21668, Juneau, AK 99802.