December 2005

HUMPBACK WHALE (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): Gulf of Maine Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

In the western North Atlantic, humpback whales feed during spring, summer and fall over a range which encompasses the eastern coast of the United States (including the Gulf of Maine), the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland/Labrador, and western Greenland (Katona and Beard 1990). Other North Atlantic feeding grounds occur off Iceland and northern Norway, including off Bear Island and Jan Mayen (Christensen *et al.* 1992; Palsbøll *et al.* 1997). These six regions represent relatively discrete subpopulations, fidelity to which is determined matrilineally (Clapham and Mayo 1987). Genetic analysis of mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) has indicated that this fidelity has persisted over an evolutionary timescale in at least the Icelandic and Norwegian feeding grounds (Palsbøll *et al.* 1995; Larsen *et al.* 1996).

Previously, the North Atlantic humpback whale population was treated as a single stock for management purposes (Waring *et al.* 1999). Indeed, earlier genetic analyses (Palsbøll *et al.* 1995), based upon relatively small sample sizes, had failed to discriminate among the four western North Atlantic feeding areas. However, genetic analyses often reflect a timescale of thousands of years, well beyond those commonly used by managers. Accordingly, the decision was recently made to reclassify the Gulf of Maine as a separate feeding stock; this was based upon the strong fidelity by individual whales to this region, and the attendant assumption that, were this subpopulation wiped out, repopulation by immigration from adjacent areas would not occur on any reasonable management timescale. This reclassification has subsequently been supported by new genetic analysis based upon a much larger collection of samples than those utilized by Palsbøll *et al.* (1995). These analyses have found significant differences in mtDNA haplotype frequencies of the four western feeding areas, including the Gulf of Maine (Palsbøll *et al.* 2001). During the recent Comprehensive Assessment of North Atlantic humpback whales, the International Whaling Commission acknowledged the evidence for treating the Gulf of Maine as a separate stock for the purpose of management (IWC 2002).

During the summers of 1998 and 1999, the Northeast Fisheries Science Center conducted surveys for humpback whales on the Scotian Shelf. The objective of these surveys was to establish the occurrence and population identity of the animals found in this region, which lies between the well-studied populations of the Gulf of Maine and Newfoundland. Photographs from both surveys have now been compared to both the overall North Atlantic Humpback Whale Catalogue and a large regional catalogue from the Gulf of Maine (maintained by the College of the Atlantic and the Center for Coastal Studies, respectively); this work is summarized in Clapham *et al.* (2003). The match rate between the Scotian Shelf and the Gulf of Maine was 27% (14 of 52 Scotian Shelf individuals from both years). Comparable rates of exchange were obtained from the southern (26%, n=10 of 36 whales) and northern (27%, *n*=4 of 15 whales) ends of the Scotian Shelf, despite the additional distance of nearly 100 nautical miles (one whale was observed in both areas). In contrast, all (36 of 36) humpback whales identified by the same NMFS surveys elsewhere in the Gulf of Maine (including Georges Bank, southwestern Nova Scotia and the Bay of Fundy) had been previously observed in the Gulf of Maine region. The sighting histories of the 14 Scotian Shelf whales matched to the Gulf of Maine suggested that many of them were transient through the latter area. There were no matches between the Scotian Shelf and any North Atlantic feeding ground, except the Gulf of Maine; however, instructive comparisons are compromised by the often low sampling effort in other regions in recent years. Overall, while it is not possible to define the Gulf of Maine population by drawing a strict geographical boundary, it appears that the effective range of many members of this stock does not extend onto the Scotian Shelf. Further work on the Scotian Shelf was conducted in August 2002 and August 2003; this sampling extended further north and east as far as the Laurentian Channel, and the results are expected to further clarify the issue of stock identity from this region. The very low match rate between the two sampled years (only one animal was resighted in the region in both 1998 and 1999) suggests that the Scotian Shelf is host to a larger population of humpback whales than was previously thought. However, preliminary analysis of photographs collected in 2002 and 2003 revealed a number of inter-annual matches; it is not yet clear whether a suitably precise abundance estimate can be calculated from these data.

In winter, whales from all feeding areas (including the Gulf of Maine) mate and calve primarily in the West Indies, where spatial and genetic mixing among subpopulations occurs (Clapham *et al.* 1993; Katona and Beard 1990; Palsbøll *et al.* 1997; Stevick *et al.* 1998). A few whales of unknown northern origin migrate to the Cape Verde Islands (Reiner *et al.*, 1996). In the West Indies, the majority of whales are found in the waters of the Dominican Republic, notably on Silver Bank, on Navidad Bank, and in Samana Bay (Balcomb and Nichols 1982; Whitehead and Moore 1982; Mattila *et al.* 1989, 1994). Humpback whales are also found at much lower densities throughout the remainder of the Antillean arc, from Puerto Rico to the coast of Venezuela (Winn *et al.* 1975; Levenson and Leapley 1978; Price 1985; Mattila and Clapham 1989).

It is apparent that not all whales migrate to the West Indies every winter, and that significant numbers of animals are found in mid- and high-latitude regions at this time (Clapham *et al.* 1993; Swingle *et al.* 1993). An increased number of sightings of humpback whales in the vicinity of the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays occurred in 1992 (Swingle *et al.* 1993). Wiley *et al.* (1995) reported 38 humpback whale strandings which occurred during 1985-1992 in the U.S. Mid-

Atlantic and southeastern states. Humpback whale strandings increased, particularly along the Virginia and North Carolina coasts, and most stranded animals were sexually immature; in addition, the small size of many of these whales strongly suggested that they had only recently separated from their mothers. Wiley *et al.* (1995) concluded that these areas are becoming an increasingly important habitat for juvenile humpback whales and that anthropogenic factors may negatively impact whales in this area. There have also been a number of wintertime humpback sightings in coastal waters of the southeastern U.S. (NMFS unpublished data; New England Aquarium unpublished data; Florida DEP unpublished data). Whether the increased sightings represent a distributional change, or are simply due to an increase in sighting effort and/or whale abundance, is presently unknown.

A key question with regard to humpback whales off the southeastern and Mid-Atlantic states is their population identity. This topic was recently investigated using fluke photographs of living and dead whales observed in the region (Barco *et al.* 2002). In this study, photographs of 40 whales (live or dead) were of sufficient quality to be compared to catalogues from the Gulf of Maine (the closest feeding ground) and other areas in the North Atlantic. Of 21 live whales, 9 (42.9%) matched to the Gulf of Maine, 4 (19.0%) to Newfoundland and 1 (4.8%) to the Gulf of St Lawrence. Of 19 dead humpbacks, 6 (31.6%) were known Gulf of Maine whales. Although the population composition of the Mid-Atlantic is apparently dominated by Gulf of Maine whales, lack of recent photographic effort in Newfoundland makes it likely that the observed match rates under-represent the true presence of Canadian whales in the region. Barco *et al.* (2002) suggested that the Mid-Atlantic region primarily represents a supplemental winter feeding ground that is used by humpbacks for more than one purpose.

Feeding is the principal activity of humpback whales in New England waters, and their distribution in this region has been largely correlated to prey species and abundance, although behavior and bottom topography are factors in foraging strategy (Payne *et al.* 1986, 1990). Humpback whales are frequently piscivorus when in these waters, feeding on herring (*Clupea harengus*), sand lance (*Ammodytes* spp.), and other small fishes. In the northern Gulf of Maine, euphausiids are also frequently taken (Paquet *et al.* 1997). Commercial depletion of herring and mackerel led to an increase in sand lance in the southwestern Gulf of Maine in the mid 1970's with a concurrent decrease in humpback whale abundance in the northern Gulf of Maine. Humpback whales were densest over the sandy shoals in the southwestern Gulf of Maine favored by the sand lance during much of the late 1970's and early 1980's, and humpback distribution appeared to have shifted to this area (Payne *et al.* 1986). An apparent reversal began in the mid 1980's, and herring and mackerel increased as sand lance again decreased (Fogarty *et al.* 1991). Humpback whale abundance in the northern Gulf of Maine increased dramatically during 1992-1993, along with a major influx of herring (P. Stevick, pers. comm.). Humpback whales were few in nearshore Massachusetts waters in the 1992-1993 summer seasons. They were more abundant in the offshore waters of Cultivator Shoal and the Northeast Peak on Georges Bank, and on Jeffreys Ledge; these latter areas are more traditional locations of herring occurrence. In 1996 and 1997, sand lance, and thus humpback whales, were once again abundant in the Stellwagen Bank area. However, unlike previous cycles, where an increase in sand lance corresponded to a decrease in herring, herring remained relatively abundant in the northern Gulf of Maine, and humpbacks correspondingly continued to occupy this portion of the habitat, where they also fed on euphausiids (unpublished data, Center for Coastal Studies and College of the Atlantic).

In early 1992, a major research initiative known as the Years of the North Atlantic Humpback (YONAH) (Smith *et al.* 1999) was initiated. This project was a large-scale, intensive study of humpback whales throughout almost their entire North Atlantic range, from the West Indies to the Arctic. During two primary years of field work, photographs for individual identification and biopsy samples for genetic analysis were collected from summer feeding areas and from the breeding grounds in the West Indies. Additional samples were collected from certain areas in other years. Results pertaining to the estimation of abundance and to genetic population structure are summarized below.

POPULATION SIZE

The overall North Atlantic population (including the Gulf of Maine) was estimated from genetic tagging data collected by the YONAH project in the breeding range at 4,894 males (95% CI=3,374-7,123) and 2,804 females (95% CI=1,776-4,463) (Palsbøll *et al.* 1997). Since the sex ratio in this population is known to be even (Palsbøll *et al.* 1997), the excess of males is presumed to be a result of sampling bias, lower rates of migration among females or sex-specific habitat partitioning in the West Indies; whatever the reason, the combined total is an underestimate of overall population size in this ocean. Photographic mark-recapture analyses from the YONAH project gave an ocean-basin-wide estimate of 11,570 for 1992/1993 (CV=0.068, Stevick *et al.* 2003), and an additional genotype-based analysis yielded a similar but less precise estimate of 10,400 (95% CI=8,000 to 13,600) (Smith *et al.* 1999). The estimate of 11,570 (CV=0.068) is regarded as the best available estimate for the North Atlantic, although because YONAH sampling was not spatially representative in the feeding grounds, this figure is negatively biased. In the northeastern North Atlantic, Øien (2001) estimated from sighting survey data that there were 889 (CV=0.32) humpback whales in the Barents and Norwegian Seas region.

Estimating abundance for the Gulf of Maine stock has proved problematic. Three approaches have been investigated: mark-recapture estimates, minimum population size, and line-transect estimates. Most of the mark-recapture estimates were affected by heterogeneity of sampling, which was heavily focused on the southwestern Gulf of Maine. However, an

estimate of 652 (CV=0.29) derived from the more extensive and representative YONAH sampling in 1992 and 1993 was probably less subject to this bias.

The second approach uses photo-identification data to establish the minimum number of humpback whales known to be alive in a particular year, 1997. By determining the number of identified individuals seen either in that year, or in both a previous and subsequent year, it is possible to determine that at least 497 humpbacks were alive in 1997. This figure is also likely to be negatively biased, again because of heterogeneity of sampling. A similar calculation for 1992 (which would correspond to the YONAH estimate for the Gulf of Maine) yields a figure of 501 whales.

In the third approach, data were used from a 28 July to 31 August 1999 line-transect sighting survey conducted by a ship and airplane covering waters from Georges Bank to the mouth of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Total track line length was 8,212km. However, in light of the information on stock identity of Scotian Shelf humpback whales noted above, only the portions of the survey covering the Gulf of Maine were used; surveys blocks along the eastern coast of Nova Scotia were excluded. Shipboard data were analyzed using the modified direct duplicate method (Palka 1995) that accounts for school size bias and *g(0)*, the probability of detecting a group on the track line. Aerial data were not corrected for *g(0)* (Palka 2000). These surveys yielded an estimate of 816 humpbacks (CV=0.45). However, given that the rate of exchange between the Gulf of Maine and both the Scotian Shelf and Mid-Atlantic region is not zero, this estimate is likely to be somewhat conservative. Accordingly, inclusion of data from 25% of the Scotian Shelf survey area (to reflect the match rate of 25% between the Scotian Shelf and the Gulf of Maine) gives an estimate of 902 whales (CV=0.41). Since the mark-recapture figures for abundance and minimum population size given above falls above the lower bound of the CV of the line transect estimate, and given the known exchange between the Gulf of Maine and the Scotian Shelf, we have chosen to use the latter as the best estimate of abundance for Gulf of Maine humpback whales.

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normally distributed best abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distribution as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for Gulf of Maine humpback whales is 902 (CV=0.41). The minimum population estimate for this stock is 647.

Table 1. Summary of abundance estimates for Gulf of Maine humpback whales. CCS = Center for Coastal Studies. COA = College of the Atlantic.

Month/Year	Type	N	CV	Source
1992/93	Mark-recapture estimate	652	0.29	Clapham *et al.* (2003)
1997	Minimum known to be alive	497	-	CCS + COA data
July/August 1999	Line transect, including a portion of the Scotian Shelf stratum	902	0.41	Palka 2000, Clapham *et al.* 2003

Current Population Trend

As detailed below, current data suggest that the Gulf of Maine humpback whale stock is steadily increasing in size. This is consistent with an estimated average trend of 3.1% (SE=0.005) in the North Atlantic population overall for the period 1979-1993 (Stevick *et al.* 2003), although there are no other feeding-area-specific estimates.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Barlow and Clapham (1997) applied an interbirth interval model to photographic mark-recapture data and estimated the population growth rate of the Gulf of Maine humpback whale stock at 6.5% (CV=0.012). Maximum net productivity is unknown for this population, although a theoretical maximum for any humpback population can be calculated using known values for biological parameters (Brandão *et al.* 2000; Clapham *et al.* 2001). For the Gulf of Maine, data supplied by Barlow and Clapham (1997) and Clapham *et al.* (1995) gives values of 0.96 for survival rate, 6 years as mean age at first parturition, 0.5 as the proportion of females, and 0.42 for annual pregnancy rate. From this, a maximum population growth rate of 0.072 is obtained according to the method described by Brandão *et al.* (2000). This suggests that the observed rate of 6.5% (Barlow and Clapham 1997) was close to the maximum for this stock.

Clapham *et al.* (2003) updated the Barlow and Clapham (1997) analysis using data from the period 1992 to 2000. The estimate was either 0% (for a calf survival rate of 0.51) or 4.0% (for a calf survival rate of 0.875). Although confidence limits are not available (because maturation parameters could not be estimated), both estimates of population growth rate are outside the 95% confidence intervals of the previous estimate of 6.5% for the period 1979 to 1991 (Barlow and Clapham 1997). It is unclear whether this apparent decline is an artifact resulting from a shift in distribution; indeed, such a shift occurred during exactly the period (1992-1995) in which survival rates declined. It is possible that this shift

resulted in calves born in those years imprinting on (and thus subsequently returning to) areas other than those in which intensive sampling occurs. If the decline is a real phenomenon it may be related to known high mortality among young-of-the-year whales in the waters of the U.S. Mid-Atlantic states. However, calf survival appears to have increased since 1996, presumably accompanied by an increase in population growth.

In light of the uncertainty accompanying the more recent estimate of population growth rate for the Gulf of Maine, for purposes of this assessment the maximum net productivity rate was assumed to be the default value for cetaceans of 0.04 (Barlow *et al.* 1995).

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for the North Atlantic population overall. As noted above, Stevick *et al.* (2003) calculated an average population growth rate of 3.1% (SE=0.005) for the period 1979-1993.

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is the product of minimum population size, one-half the maximum productivity rate, and a "recovery" factor (MMPA Sec. 3. 16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 647. The maximum productivity rate is the default value of 0.04. The "recovery" factor, which accounts for endangered, depleted, threatened stocks, or stocks of unknown status relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP) is assumed to be 0.10 because this stock is listed as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). PBR for the Gulf of Maine humpback whale stock is 1.3 whales.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED SERIOUS INJURY AND MORTALITY

For the period 1999 through 2003, the total estimated human-caused mortality and serious injury to the Gulf of Maine humpback whale stock is estimated as 3.8 per year (U.S. waters, 2.8; Canadian waters, 0.6; St. Vincent and the Grenadines, 0.4). This average is derived from three components: 1) incidental fishery interaction records, 2.8 (U.S. waters, 2.2; Canadian waters, 0.6); 2) records of vessel collisions, 0.6 (U.S. waters, 0.6; Canadian waters, 0), and directed takes from the Bequian harvest in St. Vincent and the Grenadines (0.4). There were additional humpback mortalities and serious injuries that occurred in the southeastern and Mid-Atlantic states that could not be confirmed as involving members of the Gulf of Maine stock. These records represent an additional minimum annual average of 1.8 human-caused mortalities and serious injuries to humpbacks over the time period, of which 1.2 per year are attributable to incidental fishery interactions and 0.6 per year are attributable to vessel collisions.

Beginning with the 2001 Stock Assessment Report, Canadian records were incorporated into the mortality and serious injury rates, to reflect the effective range of this stock as described above. In addition, records from the southeastern and Mid-Atlantic states involving individuals that could not be identified as members of the Gulf of Maine stock were tallied separately. Conversely, records involving unidentified individuals reported between New York and the Bay of Fundy were assumed to be whales from the Gulf of Maine stock. It is also important to stress that serious injury determinations are made based upon the best available information at the time of writing; these determinations may change with the availability of new information. For the purposes of this report, discussion is primarily limited to those records considered confirmed human-caused mortalities or serious injuries.

To better assess human impacts (both vessel collision and gear entanglement), and considering the number of decomposed and incompletely or unexamined animals in the records, there needs to be greater emphasis on the timely recovery of carcasses and complete necropsies. The literature and review of records described here suggest that there are significant human impacts beyond those recorded in the fishery observer data. For example, a study of entanglement-related scarring on the caudal peduncle of 134 individual humpback whales in the Gulf of Maine suggested that between 48% and 65% had experienced entanglements (Robbins and Mattila 2001). Decomposed and/or unexamined animals (e.g., carcasses reported but not retrieved or necropsied) represent 'lost data', some of which may relate to human impacts.

'Serious injury' was defined in 50 CFR part 229.2 as an injury that was likely to lead to mortality. We therefore limited the serious injury designation to only those reports that had substantiated evidence that the injury, whether from entanglement or vessel collision, was likely to lead to the whale's death. Determinations of serious injury were made on a case by case basis following recommendations from the workshop conducted in 1997 on differentiating serious and non-serious injuries (Angliss and DeMaster 1998). Injuries that impeded the whale's locomotion or feeding were not considered serious injuries unless they were likely to be fatal in the foreseeable future. There was no forecasting of how the entanglement or injury may increase the whale's susceptibility to further injury, namely from additional entanglements or vessel collisions. For these reasons, the human impacts listed in this report are a minimum estimate.

Background

As with right whales, human impacts (vessel collisions and entanglements) are factors which may be slowing recovery of the humpback whale population. There is an average of 4 to 6 entanglements of humpback whales a year in waters of the southern Gulf of Maine and additional reports of vessel-collision scars (unpublished data, Center for Coastal Studies). Of 20 dead humpback whales (principally in the Mid-Atlantic, where decomposition did not preclude examination for human impacts), Wiley *et al.* (1995) reported that 6 (30%) had major injuries possibly attributable to ship strikes, and 5 (25%) had injuries consistent with possible entanglement in fishing gear. One whale displayed scars that

may have been caused by both ship strike and entanglement. Thus, 60% of the whale carcasses which were suitable for examination showed signs that anthropogenic factors may have contributed to, or been responsible for, their death. Wiley *et al.* (1995) further reported that all stranded animals were sexually immature, suggesting a winter or migratory segregation and/or that juvenile animals are more susceptible to human impacts.

An updated analysis of humpback whale mortalities from the Mid-Atlantic states region has recently been produced by Barco *et al.* (2002). Between 1990 and 2000, there were 52 known humpback whale mortalities in the waters of the U.S. Mid-Atlantic states. Length data from 48 of these whales (18 females, 22 males and 8 of unknown sex) suggested that 39 (81.2%) were first-year animals, 7 (14.6%) were immature and 2 (4.2%) were adults. However, sighting histories of 5 of the dead whales indicate that some were small for their age, and histories of live whales further indicate that the population contains a greater percentage of mature animals than is suggested by the stranded sample.

In their study of entanglement rates estimated from caudal peduncle scars, Robbins and Mattila (2001) found that males were more likely to be entangled than females. The scarring data also suggested that yearlings were more likely than other age classes to be involved in entanglements. Finally, female humpbacks showing evidence of prior entanglements produced significantly fewer calves, suggesting that entanglement may significantly impact reproductive success.

Humpback whale entanglements also occur in relatively high numbers in Canadian waters. Reports of collisions with fixed fishing gear set for groundfish around Newfoundland averaged 365 annually from 1979 to 1987 (range 174-813). An average of 50 humpback whale entanglements (range 26-66) was reported annually between 1979 and 1988, and 12 of 66 humpback whales that were entangled in 1988 died (Lien *et al.* 1988). Volgenau *et al.* (1995) also summarized existing data and concluded that in Newfoundland and Labrador, cod traps caused the most entanglements and entanglement mortalities (21%) of humpbacks between 1979 and 1992. They also reported that gillnets are the gear that has been the primary cause of entanglements and entanglement mortalities (20%) of humpbacks in the Gulf of Maine between 1975 and 1990.

Disturbance by whale watching may prove to be an important habitat issue in some areas of this population's range, notably the coastal waters of New England where the density of whale watching traffic is seasonally high. No studies have been conducted to address this question, and its impact (if any) on habitat occupancy and reproductive success is unknown.

Fishery-Related Serious Injuries and Mortalities

A description of Fisheries is provided in Appendix III. Two mortalities were observed in the pelagic drift gillnet fishery since 1989. In winter 1993, a juvenile humpback was observed entangled and dead in a pelagic drift gillnet along the 200m isobath northeast of Cape Hatteras; in early summer 1995, a humpback was entangled and dead in a pelagic drift gillnet on southwestern Georges Bank.

Additional reports of mortality and serious injury relevant to comparison to PBR, as well as description of total human impacts, are contained in records maintained by NMFS. A number of these records (11 entanglements involving lobster pot/trap gear) from the 1990-1994 period were cause to reclassify the lobster fishery (62 FR 33, Jan. 2, 1997).

For this report, the records of dead, injured, and/or entangled humpbacks (found either stranded or at sea) for the period 1999 through 2003 were reviewed. Out of 169 records, 144 were eliminated from further consideration due to an absence of any evidence of human impact or, in the case of an entangled whale, it was documented that the animal had become disentangled (10 were disentangled in 2003 alone). Of the remaining records, the Gulf of Maine stock sustained 5 mortalities attributable to fishery interactions and 9 cases of serious injuries - 14 records in the five-year period (Table 2). In addition, 3 mortalities and 3 serious injuries were documented in the southeastern and Mid-Atlantic states that involved interactions with fisheries. At the time of this writing, no genetic results were available to identify which of these cases may have involved whales from the Gulf of Maine stock. While these records are not statistically quantifiable in the same way as the observed fishery records, they provide some indication of the frequency of entanglements.

Table 2. Summarized records of mortality and serious injury likely to result in mortality, for North Atlantic humpback whales, January 1999 - December 2003. Causes of mortality or injury, assigned as primary or secondary, are based on records maintained by NMFS. Records counted as from the Gulf of Maine humpback whale stock are indicated by an asterisk (*) following the date. Stock identification of the remaining records are awaiting genetic analysis results. These may identify additional Gulf of Maine whales.

Date	Report Type	Length, sex, age, ID	Location	Assigned Cause: P=primary, S=secondary		Notes
				Ship strike	Entang./ Fsh.inter	
1/12/99*	mortality	9.7m male	Martha's Vineyard, MA		P	Fresh and extensive rope marks on carcass with associated hemorrhaging
3/6/99*	mortality	13.8m female and calf	Bequia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines			Two whales taken by the Bequian harpoon fishery
8/2/99*	serious injury	9.4m estimated	Bay of Fundy, Canada		P	Single wrap of ½ inch poly line pinning flippers
9/23/99*	serious injury	unknown	off Chatham, MA		P	Line out of mouth and several wraps around body; possibly anchored
1/8/00	serious injury	9.9m estimated	30mi east Cape Lookout, NC		P	whale swam off with 600' of sea trout sink gillnet, a chain anchor and a high flyer in tow
8/4/00*	serious injury	10.7m estimated	Bay of Fundy, Canada		P	line wrapped on head with weighted trailing line giving tension
9/6/00*	serious injury	<1 yr old, calf of "Giraffe"	Stellwagen Bank, MA		P	single line wrapped across back; constriction will increase as whale grows
10/14/00	serious injury	9.9m estimated	off Ocean City Inlet, MD		P	Heavily entangled; constrictive--fresh wounds noted
10/20/00*	serious injury	10 yr old male "Tribble"	Stellwagen Bank, MA		P	Entangled in green poly line on multiple body parts; appears constrictive
1/25/01	mortality	6.9m estimated	Avon, NC	P		extensive hemorrhaging along left thoracic, clean cut through center of vertebrae; ship strike
4/7/01	mortality	7.9m juvenile male	Myrtle Beach, SC	S	P	pre-mortem evidence of chronic line entanglement; severe prop wounds
4/7/01	mortality	7.6m juvenile male	Emerald Isle, NC		P	entanglement around peduncle caused extensive edema, hemorrhaging

4/9/01*	mortality	8.8m juvenile female "Inland"	offshore of Sandbridge, Virginia Beach		P	found anchored in gillnet gear; line wraps around rostrum had immobilized the whale
7/29/01*	mortality	8.5m juvenile female	floating south of Verrazano Bridge, NY	P		large laceration on left side of head, extensive fracturing of skull
10/1/01*	mortality	11.4m 3 yr old female "Pitfall"	Duxbury Beach, MA	P		massive fracturing to skull, focal bruising indicative of pre-mortem ship strike
2/8/02	mortality	8.4m juvenile female	off Cape Henry, VA	P		three large lacerations, hemorrhaging, broken bones
3/24/02	mortality	8.0m juvenile male	off Virginia Beach, VA		P	deep cuts on caudal peduncle and tail indicative of embedded line
6/3/02*	mortality	9.9m	off Cape Elizabeth, ME		P	deep cuts on caudal peduncle indicative of embedded line
6/17/02*	serious injury	10.2m estimated	Cape Cod Bay, MA		P	fluke severely damaged by line, whale emaciated
8/1/02*	mortality	9.3m male	Long Island, NY	P		large hematoma posterior to blow holes
10/1/02*	mortality	7.5m female calf	Plymouth, MA		P	Extensive line chafing and bruising on carcass; no gear recovered
6/6/03	mortality	8.3m female	Chesapeake Bay mouth, VA	P		Major trauma to right side of head, hematoma
7/9/03*	serious injury	calf of Shockwave	Bay of Fundy, Canada		P	Constricting entanglement on a young whale
7/12/03	serious injury	unknown	Oregon Inlet, NC		P	Entangled in substantial amount of gear
8/16/03*	serious injury	unknown	off Cape Cod, MA		P	Poor body condition; line deeply embedded
8/18/03*	serious injury	unknown	off Cape Cod, MA		P	Extensive entanglement

NOTE: Notes: The date sighted and location provided in the table are not necessarily when or where the serious injury or mortality occurred; rather, this information indicates when and where the whale was first reported beached, entangled, or injured.
National guidelines for determining what constitutes a serious injury have not been finalized. Interim criteria as established by NERO/NMFS (62 FR 33, Jan. 2, 1997) have been used here. Some assignments may change as new information becomes available and/or when national standards are established.

Other Mortality

Between November 1987 and January 1988, at least 14 humpback whales died after consuming Atlantic mackerel containing a dinoflagellate saxitoxin (Geraci *et al.* 1989). The whales subsequently stranded or were recovered in the

vicinity of Cape Cod Bay and Nantucket Sound, and it is highly likely that other mortalities occurred during this event which went unrecorded. In July 2003, another Unusual Mortality Event was recorded in offshore waters when an estimated minimum of 12-15 humpback whales died in the vicinity of the Northeast Peak of Georges Bank. Preliminary tests of samples taken from some of these whales tested positive for domoic acid at low levels, but it is currently unknown what levels would affect the whales and therefore no definitive conclusions can yet be drawn regarding the cause of this event. Its effect on the status of the Gulf of Maine humpback whale population is currently unknown.

During the first six months of 1990, seven dead juvenile (7.6 to 9.1m long) humpback whales stranded between North Carolina and New Jersey. The significance of these strandings is unknown, but is a cause for some concern.

As reported by Wiley *et al.* (1995), injuries possibly attributable to ship strikes are more common and probably more serious than those from entanglements. In the NMFS records for 1999 through 2003, 15 records had some evidence of a collision with a vessel. Of these, 6 were mortalities as a result of the collision, and 8 did not have sufficient information to confirm the collision as the cause of death. The remaining incident occurred on 10/4/01 and involved a whale-watch vessel. Photos taken at the time of the collision confirmed that the injury was minor and follow-up documentation provided evidence that the injury sustained had healed. Three out of the 6 cases of mortality from a vessel collision involved whales identified as members of the Gulf of Maine stock (7/29/01, 10/1/01 and 8/1/02; see Table 2).

On 6 March 1999, a 46-foot female and what was likely her calf (20-23 feet in length) were taken by the Bequian harvest in St. Vincent and the Grenadines. The larger whale was identified as a Gulf of Maine whale (J. Robbins, pers. comm.).

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of the North Atlantic humpback whale population was the topic of an International Whaling Commission Comprehensive Assessment in June 2001, and again in May 2002; these meetings conducted a detailed review of all aspects of this population (IWC 2002). Although the most recent estimates of abundance indicate continued population growth, the size of the humpback whale stock may be below OSP in the U.S. Atlantic EEZ. This is a strategic stock because the humpback whale is listed as an endangered species under the ESA. A Recovery Plan has been published and is in effect (NMFS 1991). There are insufficient data to reliably determine current population trends for humpback whales in the North Atlantic overall. The average annual rate of population increase was estimated at 3.1% (SE=0.005, Stevick *et al.* 2003). As noted above, a recent analysis of demographic parameters for the Gulf of Maine (Clapham *et al.* 2003) suggested a lower rate of increase than the 6.5% reported by Barlow and Clapham (1997), but results may have been confounded by distribution shifts. The total level of human-caused mortality and serious injury is unknown, but current data indicate that it is significant. In particular, the continued high level of mortality among humpback whales off the U.S. Mid-Atlantic states (Barco *et al.* 2002), is cause for considerable concern given that at least some of these animals are known to be from the Gulf of Maine. This is a strategic stock because the average annual fishery-related mortality and serious injury exceeds PBR, and because the North Atlantic humpback whale is an endangered species.

A new large-scale assessment called More of North Atlantic Humpbacks (MoNAH) project is currently underway. This two-year study will attempt to estimate abundance and refine knowledge of population structure with extensive sampling in the Gulf of Maine/Scotian Shelf region and on the primary wintering ground on Silver Bank; additional research will focus on the U.S. Mid-Atlantic states. The work is intended to update the YONAH assessment of North Atlantic humpback whales in preparation for a possible status review under the Endangered Species Act.

REFERENCES

Angliss, R.P., and D.P. DeMaster. 1998. Differentiating serious and non-serious injury of marine mammals taken incidental to commercial fishing operations: report of the serious injury workshop 1-2 April 1997, Silver Spring, Maryland. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-13, January 1998.

Balcomb, K.C. and G. Nichols. 1982. Humpback whale censuses in the West Indies. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 32: 401-406.

Barco, S., W.A. McLellan, J. Allen, R. Asmutis, R. Mallon-Day, E. Meagher, D.A. Pabst, J. Robbins, R. Seton, R.M. Swingle, M.T. Weinrich and P.J. Clapham. 2002. Population identity of humpback whales in the waters of the U.S. Mid-Atlantic states. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 4: 135-141.

Barlow, J. and P.J. Clapham. 1997. A new birth-interval approach to estimating demographic parameters of humpback whales. Ecology 78: 535-546.

Barlow, J., S.L. Swartz, T.C. Eagle and P.R. Wade. 1995. U.S. Marine mammal stock assessments: Guidelines for preparation, background, and a summary of the 1995 assessments. U.S.Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-6, 73 pp.

Brandão, A., D.S. Butterworth and M.R. Brown. 2000. Maximum possible humpback whale increase rates as a function of biological parameter values. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 2 (supplement): 192-193.

Christensen, I., T. Haug, and N. Øien. 1992. Seasonal distribution, exploitation and present abundance of stocks of large baleen whales (Mysticeti) and sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) in Norwegian and adjacent waters. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 49: 341-355.

Clapham, P.J. and C.A. Mayo. 1987. Reproduction and recruitment of individually identified humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, observed in Massachusetts Bay, 1979-1985. Can. J. Zool. 65: 2853-2863.

Clapham, P.J., L.S. Baraff, C.A. Carlson, M.A. Christian, D.K. Mattila, C.A. Mayo, M.A. Murphy, and S. Pittman. 1993. Seasonal occurrence and annual return of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in the southern Gulf of Maine. Can. J. Zool. 71: 440-443.

Clapham, P.J., Bérubé, M.C. and Mattila, D.K. 1995. Sex ratio of the Gulf of Maine humpback whale population. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 11: 227-231.

Clapham, P.J., J. Barlow, T. Cole, D.K. Mattila, R. Pace, D. Palka, J. Robbins and R. Seton. 2003. Stock definition, abundance and demographic parameters of humpback whales from the Gulf of Maine. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 5: 13-22.

Clapham, P.J., J. Robbins, M. Brown, P. Wade, and K. Findlay. 2001. A note on plausible rates of population growth for humpback whales. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 3 (suppl.): 196-197.

Fogarty, M. J., E. B. Cohen, W. L. Michaels, and W. W. Morse. 1991. Predation and the regulation of sand lance populations: An exploratory analysis. ICES Mar. Sci. Symp. 193: 120-124.

Geraci, J.R., D.M. Anderson., R.J. Timperi, D.J. St. Aubin., G.A. Early, J.H. Prescott and C.A. Mayo. 1989 Humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) fatally poisoned by dinoflagellate toxins. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 46: 1895-1898.

IWC. 2002. Report of the Scientific Committee. Annex H: Report of the Sub-committee on the Comprehensive Assessment of North Atlantic humpback whales. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 3 (suppl.) 209-228.

Katona, S.K., and J.A. Beard. 1990. Population size, migrations, and feeding aggregations of the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the western North Atlantic Ocean. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn., Special Issue 12: 295-306.

Larsen, A.H., J. Sigurjónsson, N. Øien, G. Vikingsson, and P.J. Palsbøll. 1996. Population genetic analysis of mitochondrial and nuclear genetic loci in skin biopsies collected from central and northeastern North Atlantic humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): population identity and migratory destinations. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B 263: 1611-1618.

Levenson, C. and W.T. Leapley, 1978. Distribution of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the Caribbean determined by a rapid acoustic method. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 35: 1150-1152.

Lien, J., W. Ledwell, and J. Naven. 1988. Incidental entrapment in inshore fishing gear during 1988: A preliminary report to the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Fisheries and Oceans, 15 pp.

Mattila, D.K. and P.J. Clapham. 1989. Humpback whales and other cetaceans on Virgin Bank and in the northern Leeward Islands, 1985 and 1986. Can. J. Zool. 67: 2201-2211.

Mattila, D.K., P.J. Clapham, S.K. Katona and G.S. Stone. 1989. Population composition of humpback whales on Silver Bank. Can. J. Zool. 67: 281-285.

Mattila, D.K., P.J. Clapham, O.Vásquez, and R. Bowman. 1994. Occurrence, population composition and habitat use of humpback whales in Samana Bay, Dominican Republic. Can. J. Zool. 72: 1898-1907.

NMFS [National Marine Fisheries Service]. 1991. Recovery plan for the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). Prepared by the Humpback Whale Recovery Team for the National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD, 105 pp.

Øien, N. 2001. Humpback whales in the Barents and Norwegian Seas. Paper SC/53/NAH21 presented to the International Whaling Commission Scientific Committee. Available from IWC, 135 Station Road, Impington, Cambridge, UK.

Palka, D. 1995. Abundance estimate of the Gulf of Maine harbor porpoise. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn., Special issue 16: 27-50.

Palka, D. 2000. Abundance of the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy harbor porpoise based on shipboard and aerial surveys during 1999. NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center Ref. Doc. 00-07; 29 pp. Available from: National Marine Fisheries Service, 166 Water Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543.

Paquet, D., C. Haycock and H. Whitehead. 1997. Numbers and seasonal occurrence of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) off Brier Island, Nova Scotia. Can. Field Nat. 111: 548-552.

Palsbøll, P. J., J. Allen,, M. Bérubé, P. J. Clapham, T. P. Feddersen, P. Hammond, H. Jørgensen, S. Katona, A. H. Larsen, F. Larsen, J. Lien, D. K. Mattila, J. Sigurjónsson, R. Sears, T. Smith, R. Sponer, P. Stevick and N. Øien. 1997. Genetic tagging of humpback whales. Nature 388: 767-769.

Palsbøll, P.J., P.J. Clapham, D.K. Mattila, F. Larsen, R. Sears, H.R. Siegismund, J. Sigurjónsson, O. Vásquez and P. Arctander. 1995. Distribution of mtDNA haplotypes in North Atlantic humpback whales: the influence of behavior on population structure. Marine Ecology Progress Series 116: 1-10.

Palsbøll, P.J., J. Allen, T.H. Anderson, M. Bérubé, P.J. Clapham, T.P. Feddersen, N. Friday, P. Hammond, H. Jørgensen, S.K. Katona, A.H. Larsen, F. Larsen, J. Lien, D.K. Mattila, F.B Nygaard, J. Robbins, R. Sponer, R. Sears, J. Sigurjónsson, T.D. Smith, P.T. Stevick, G. Vikingsson, and N. Øien. 2001. Stock structure and composition of the North Atlantic humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*. Paper SC/53/NAH11 presented to the

International Whaling Commission Scientific Committee. Available from IWC, 135 Station Road, Impington, Cambridge, UK.

Payne, P. M., J.R. Nicholas, L. O'Brien, and K.D. Powers. 1986. The distribution of the humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, on Georges Bank and in the Gulf of Maine in relation to densities of the sand eel, *Ammodytes americanus*. Fish. Bull., U.S. 84: 271-277.

Payne, P.M., D.N. Wiley, S.B. Young, S. Pittman, P.J. Clapham, and J.W. Jossi. 1990. Recent fluctuations in the abundance of baleen whales in the southern Gulf of Maine in relation to changes in selected prey. Fish. Bull., U.S. 88(4): 687-696.

Price, W.S. 1985. Whaling in the Caribbean: historical perspective and update. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 35: 413-420.

Reiner, F., M.E. Dos Santos, and F.W. Wenzel. 1996. Cetaceans of the Cape Verde archipelago. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 12: 434-443.

Robbins, J. and D.K. Mattila. 2001. Monitoring entanglements of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the Gulf of Maine on the basis of caudal peduncle scarring. Paper SC/53/NAH25 presented to the International Whaling Commission Scientific Committee. Available from IWC, 135 Station Road, Impington, Cambridge, UK.

Smith, T.D., J. Allen, P.J. Clapham, P.S. Hammond, S. Katona, F. Larsen, J. Lien, D. Mattila, P.J. Palsbøll, J. Sigurjónsson, P.T. Stevick and N. Øien. 1999. An ocean-basin-wide mark-recapture study of the North Atlantic humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). Mar. Mamm. Sci. 15(1):1-32.

Stevick, P.T., J. Allen, P.J. Clapham, N. Friday, S.K. Katona, F. Larsen, J. Lien, D.K. Mattila, P.J. Palsbøll, J. Sigurjónsson, T.D. Smith, N. Øien, and P.S. Hammond. 2003. North Atlantic humpback whale abundance and rate of increase four decades after protection from whaling. Marine Ecology Progress Series 258: 263-273.

Stevick, P., N. Øien and D.K. Mattila. 1998. Migration of a humpback whale between Norway and the West Indies. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 14: 162-166.

Swingle, W.M., S.G. Barco, T.D. Pitchford, W.A. McLellan and D.A. Pabst. 1993. Appearance of juvenile humpback whales feeding in the nearshore waters of Virginia. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 9: 309-315.

Volgenau, L., S.D. Kraus, and J. Lien. 1995. The impact of entanglements on two substocks of the western North Atlantic humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*. Can. J. Zool. 73: 1689-1698.

Wade, P.R., and R.P. Angliss. 1997. Guidelines for assessing marine mammal stocks: Report of the GAMMS Workshop, April 3-5, 1996, Seattle, Washington. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-12. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Washington, DC. 93 pp.

Waring, G. T., D.L. Palka, P.J. Clapham, S. Swartz, M.C. Rossman, T. V. N. Cole, K. D. Bisack and L. J. Hansen. 1999. U.S. Atlantic marine mammal stock assessment reports : 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NE-116, 182 pp.

Whitehead, H. and M.J. Moore. 1982. Distribution and movements of West Indian humpback whales in winter. Can. J. Zool. 60: 2203-2211.

Wiley, D.N., R.A. Asmutis, T.D. Pitchford, and D.P. Gannon. 1995. Stranding and mortality of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in the Mid-Atlantic and southeast United States, 1985-1992. Fish. Bull., *U.S.* 93: 196-205.

Winn, H.E., R.K. Edel and A.G. Taruski. 1975. Population estimate of the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the West Indies by visual and acoustic techniques. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 32: 499-506.