DRAFT U.S. PACIFIC MARINE MAMMAL STOCK ASSESSMENTS: 2024

James V. Carretta[1], Erin M. Oleson[2], Karin. A. Forney[3], Amanda L. Bradford[2], Kym Yano[2], David W. Weller[1], Aimée R. Lang[1], Jason Baker[2], Anthony J. Orr[4], Brad Hanson[5], Jeffrey E. Moore[1], Megan Wallen[6], and Robert L. Brownell Jr.[1]

NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-XXX
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service
Southwest Fisheries Science Center

1 - NOAA Fisheries, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 8901 La Jolla Shores Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037.
2 - NOAA Fisheries, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, 1845 Wasp Blvd., Building 176, Honolulu, HI 96818.
3 - NOAA Fisheries, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 110 Shaffer Road, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.
4 - NOAA Fisheries, National Marine Mammal Laboratory, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115.
5 - NOAA Fisheries, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle WA 98112.
6 - NOAA Fisheries, Protected Resources Division, West Coast Region.#600 Sand Point Way Northeast
Seattle, WA 98115

Reports revised in 2024 are highlighted; all others can be found at the NOAA marine mammal stock assessment homepage.

PINNIPEDS

CALIFORNIA SEA LION (*Zalophus californianus californianus*): U.S. Stock x
HARBOR SEAL (*Phoca vitulina richardii*): California Stock x
HARBOR SEAL (*Phoca vitulina richardii*): Oregon & Washington Coast Stock x
HARBOR SEAL (*Phoca vitulina richardii*): Washington Inland Waters Stocks (Hood Canal, Southern Puget Sound, and Northern Washington Inland Waters) x
NORTHERN ELEPHANT SEAL (*Mirounga angustirostris*): California Breeding Stock..... 1
GUADALUPE FUR SEAL (*Arctocephalus townsendi*)..... 7
NORTHERN FUR SEAL (*Callorhinus ursinus*): California Stock..... 13
HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL (*Neomonachus schauinslandi*) 20

CETACEANS - U.S. WEST COAST

HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena vomerina*): Morro Bay Stock x
HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena vomerina*): Monterey Bay Stock x
HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena vomerina*): San Francisco-Russian River Stock x
HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena vomerina*): Northern California/Southern Oregon Stock x
HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena vomerina*): Central Oregon Stock (New Stock) x
HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena vomerina*): Northern Oregon/Washington Coast Stock x
HARBOR PORPOISE (*Phocoena phocoena vomerina*): Washington Inland Waters Stock x
DALL'S PORPOISE (*Phocoenoides dalli dalli*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
PACIFIC WHITE-SIDED DOLPHIN (*Lagenorhynchus obliquidens*):
California/Oregon/Washington, Northern and Southern Stocks x
RISSO'S DOLPHIN (*Grampus griseus*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
COMMON BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus*): California Coastal Stock x
COMMON BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus*):
California/Oregon/Washington Offshore Stock x
STRIPED DOLPHIN (*Stenella coeruleoalba*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
SHORT-BEAKED COMMON DOLPHIN (*Delphinus delphis delphis*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
LONG-BEAKED COMMON DOLPHIN (Delphinus capensis capensis): California Stock x
NORTHERN RIGHT-WHALE DOLPHIN (*Lissodelphis borealis*): California/Oregon/Washington x
KILLER WHALE (*Orcinus orca*): Eastern North Pacific Offshore Stock x
KILLER WHALE (*Orcinus orca*): Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident Stock 31
SHORT-FINNED PILOT WHALE (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*): California/Oregon/Washington x
BAIRD'S BEAKED WHALE (*Berardius bairdii*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
MESOPLODONT BEAKED WHALES (*Mesoplodon* spp.): California/Oregon/Washington Stocks x
CUVIER'S BEAKED WHALE (*Ziphius cavirostris*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
PYGMY SPERM WHALE (*Kogia breviceps*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
DWARF SPERM WHALE (*Kogia sima*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
SPERM WHALE (*Physeter macrocephalus*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
GRAY WHALE (Eschrichtius robustus): Eastern North Pacific Stock and Pacific Coast Feeding Group x
GRAY WHALE (Eschrichtius robustus): Western North Pacific Stock x
HUMPBACK WHALE (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): Central America / Southern Mexico - California-Oregon-Washington Stock x
HUMPBACK WHALE (*Megaptera novaeangliae*): Mainland Mexico - California-Oregon-Washington Stock x
BLUE WHALE (*Balaenoptera musculus musculus*): Eastern North Pacific Stock x
FIN WHALE (*Balaenoptera physalus physalus*): California/Oregon/Washington Stock x
SEI WHALE (*Balaenoptera borealis borealis*): Eastern North Pacific Stock x
MINKE WHALE (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata scammoni*): California/Oregon/Washington x
BRYDE'S WHALE (*Balaenoptera edeni*): Eastern Tropical Pacific x

CETACEANS – HAWAI'I & WESTERN PACIFIC

ROUGH-TOOTHED DOLPHIN (*Steno bredanensis*): Hawai‘i Stock x
ROUGH-TOOTHED DOLPHIN (*Steno bredanensis*): American Samoa Stock x
RISSO'S DOLPHIN (*Grampus griseus*): Hawai‘i Stock x
COMMON BOTTLENOSE DOLPHIN (*Tursiops truncatus truncatus*): Hawaiian Islands Stock Complex (Kaua‘i/Ni‘ihau, O‘ahu, Maui Nui, Hawai‘i Island, and Hawai‘i Pelagic Stocks x
PANTROPICAL SPOTTED DOLPHIN (*Stenella attenuata attenuata*): Hawaiian Islands Stock Complex – O‘ahu, Maui Nui, Hawai‘i Island, and Hawai‘i Pelagic Stocks x
SPINNER DOLPHIN (*Stenella longirostris longirostris*): Hawai‘i Pelagic, Hawai‘i Island, Oahu / 4 Islands, Kauai / Niihau, Kure / Midway, and Pearl and Hermes Reef Stocks x
SPINNER DOLPHIN (*Stenella longirostris longirostris*): American Samoa Stock x
STRIPED DOLPHIN (*Stenella coeruleoalba*): Hawai‘i Stock x
FRASER’S DOLPHIN (*Lagenodelphis hosei*): Hawai‘i Stock x
MELON-HEADED WHALE (*Peponocephala electra*): Hawaiian Islands and Kohala Resident Stocks x
PYGMY KILLER WHALE (*Feresa attenuata*): Hawaiian Stock x
FALSE KILLER WHALE (*Pseudorca crassidens*): Hawaiian Islands Stock Complex: Main Hawaiian Islands Insular, Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, and Hawai‘i Pelagic x
FALSE KILLER WHALE (*Pseudorca crassidens*): Palmyra Atoll Stock x
FALSE KILLER WHALE (*Pseudorca crassidens*): American Samoa Stock x
KILLER WHALE (*Orcinus orca*): Hawaiian Stock x
SHORT-FINNED PILOT WHALE (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*): Hawai‘i Stock x
BLAINVILLE’S BEAKED WHALE (*Mesoplodon densirostris*): Hawai‘i Stock x
LONGMAN’S BEAKED WHALE (*Indopacetus pacificus*): Hawai‘i Stock x
CUVIER'S BEAKED WHALE (*Ziphius cavirostris*): Hawai‘i Stock x
PYGMY SPERM WHALE (*Kogia breviceps*): Hawai‘i Stock x
DWARF SPERM WHALE (*Kogia sima*): Hawai‘i Stock x
SPERM WHALE (*Physeter macrocephalus*): Hawai‘i Stock x
BLUE WHALE (*Balaenoptera musculus musculus*): Central North Pacific Stock x
FIN WHALE (*Balaenoptera physalus physalus*): Hawai‘i Stock x
BRYDE'S WHALE (*Balaenoptera edeni*): Hawai‘i Stock x
SEI WHALE (*Balaenoptera borealis borealis*): Hawai‘i Stock x
MINKE WHALE (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata scammoni*): Hawai‘i Stock x
HUMPBACK WHALE (*Megaptera novaeangliae)*: American Samoa Stock x

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Fishery Classifications, Fishery Descriptions and Interactions with Marine Mammals x
APPENDIX 2: Summary of 2024 U.S. Pacific Draft Marine Mammal Stock Assessment Reports 39

PREFACE

Under the 1994 amendments to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are required to publish Stock Assessment Reports for all stocks of marine mammals within U.S. waters, to review new information every year for strategic stocks and every three years for non-strategic stocks, and to update the stock assessment reports when significant new information becomes available.

Pacific region stock assessments include those studied by the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC, La Jolla, CA), the Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center (PIFSC, Honolulu, HI), the Marine Mammal Laboratory (NMML, Seattle, WA), and the Northwest Fisheries Science Center (NWFSC, Seattle, WA). The 2024 Pacific marine mammal stock assessments include revised reports for 5 stocks under NMFS jurisdiction, including 3 "strategic" stocks: Guadalupe fur seal, Hawaiian monk seal, and Southern Resident killer whale. Information on sea otters, manatees, walrus, and polar bears are published separately by the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

This is a working document and individual stock assessment reports will be updated as new information on marine mammal stocks and fisheries becomes available. Background information and guidelines for preparing stock assessment reports are reviewed in NOAA (2023). The authors solicit any new information or comments which would improve future stock assessment reports. Draft versions of the 2024 stock assessment reports were reviewed by the Pacific Scientific Review Group (PSRG) at the March 2024 meeting. These Stock Assessment Reports summarize information from a wide range of original data sources and an extensive bibliography of published sources are provided in each report. We recommend users of this document refer to and *cite original literature* sources cited within the stock assessment reports rather than citing this report or previous Stock Assessment Reports.

References:

NMFS. 2023. Guidelines for Preparing Stock Assessment Reports Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Protected Resources Policy Directive 02-204-01.

Revised ~~03/14/2022~~ 09/30/2024

NORTHERN ELEPHANT SEAL (*Mirounga angustirostris*): California Breeding Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Northern elephant seals breed and give birth ~~in California (U.S.) and Baja California (Mexico),~~ primarily on offshore islands (Stewart *et al*. 1994)~~,~~ in California (U.S.) and Baja California (Mexico) from December to March (Stewart and Huber 1993). Spatial segregation in foraging areas between males and females is evident from satellite tag data (Le B~~e~~oeuf *et al*. 2000). Males migrate to the Gulf of Alaska and western Aleutian Islands along the continental shelf to feed on benthic prey, while females migrate to ~~pelagic areas in the Gulf of Alaska and~~ the central North Pacific and the Gulf of Alaska to feed on pelagic prey (Le B~~e~~oeuf *et al*. 2000; Fig. 1). Adults return to land between March and August to molt, with males returning later than females. Adults return to their feeding areas again between their spring/summer molting and their winter breeding season~~s~~.



Figure 1. Approximate ~~P~~pelagic range of northern elephant seals including ~~in~~ the ~~e~~Eastern North Pacific Ocean. Major breeding rookeries occur along the west coast of Baja California and the California coast, as described in Lowry et al. (2014).

Populations of northern elephant seals in the U.S. and Mexico have recovered ~~after being~~ from near~~ly hunted to~~ extinction ~~(Stewart *et al*. 1994). Northern elephant seals underwent~~ following a severe population bottleneck ~~and loss of genetic diversity when the population was~~ after hunting reduced their numbers to an estimated 10~~-~~ to 30 individuals, resulting in a substantial loss of genetic diversity (Hoelzel *et al*. 2002). Although movement and genetic exchange continues between rookeries, most elephant seals return to natal rookeries ~~when they start~~to breed~~ing~~ as they reach reproductive maturity (Huber *et al*. 1991). The California breeding population is ~~now~~considered demographically ~~isolated~~distinct from the Baja California population. ~~No international agreements exist for the joint management of this species by the U.S. and Mexico. The~~ Therefore, the California breeding population (subsequently referred to as the U.S. breeding population) is considered ~~here~~ to be a separate stock. No international agreements exist for the joint management of this species by the U.S. and Mexico.

POPULATION SIZE

A ~~complete population count~~ census of elephant seals is not possible because all age classes are not ashore simultaneously. ~~Elephant seal population~~ The U.S. stock size ~~is~~ has been historically estimated by counting the number of pups produced and multiplying by the inverse of the expected ratio of pups to total animals (McCann 1985). More recently, pup births were estimated using aerial and/or ground counts of adult females present on the rookery during the breeding season (Le Boeuf *et al*. 2011, Lowry *et al*. 2014). The number of adult females was estimated based on rookery arrival dates and tenure (Condit *et al*. 2007). Total number of births were estimated by multiplying the estimated number of adult females by the reported fecundity rate (F = 0.975; Le Boeuf *et al*. (2011)) derived from the Año Nuevo rookery. ~~Based on counts of elephant seals at U.S. Channel Islands rookeries in 2013, Lowry *et al*. (2020) reported 34,788 pups were born. This value represents the sum of live pups (33,454) and estimated pre-census pup mortality (1,334), but it excludes un-surveyed areas in central and northern California (Lowry *et al*. 2020). Lowry *et al*. (2014) reported that 81.5% of t~~ The U.S. ~~population~~ stock abundance estimate ~~resided at the Channel Islands and uses the inverse of this percentage to e~~stimate ~~statewide births, which is 42,685 pups. Lowry *et al*. (2020)~~ has been historically extrapolated from the estimated total births, which are multiplied by a ~~to a statewide population estimate of 187,386 (95% CI 161,876 – 214,418). This~~ correction factor based on the best available data at the time (Barlow et al. 1993, Boveng 1998). Starting in 2013, correction factors (c_{Pop}) were ~~is~~ based on life table data ~~on~~(Lowry et al. 2020) constructed from elephant seal fecundity and survival rates, where approximately 23% of the population ~~represents~~is comprised of pups (Cooper and Stewart~~,~~ 1983~~,~~; ~~Le Boeuf and Reiter, 1988;~~ Hindell~~,~~ 1991~~,~~; Huber *et al*.~~,~~ 1991~~;~~ Reiter and Le Boeuf~~,~~ 1991~~,~~; Clinton and Le Boeuf~~,~~ 1993~~;~~ Le Boeuf *et al*.~~,~~ ~~1994~~2019; Pistorius and Bester~~,~~ 2002~~,~~; McMahon *et al*.~~,~~ 2003~~,~~; Pistorius *et al*.~~,~~ 2004~~,~~; Condit *et al*.~~,~~ 2014). In years when ground counts are only completed at the Channel Islands (i.e., excludes un-surveyed areas in central and northern California), estimates of the total population are calculated as the

sum of live and dead pups multiplied by the inverse of the U.S. population that resides at the Channel Islands (81.5%; Lowry et al. 2014). In 2023, a range-wide survey was conducted during the elephant seal breeding season to count individuals of all age classes. Unlike previous population estimates, the estimate for 2023 implemented an updated model that that derives true adult female attendance at rookeries ($N_{Adult\ Females}$ = 45,536) from counts of adult females during specific days of the year based on turnover of reproductive females throughout the breeding season (Condit et al. 2022). The number of births (N_{Births} = 44,398; 95% CL 42,876-46,308) was calculated using the estimated adult female population and mean fecundity rate (F = 0.975). As with previous population estimates, the estimated number of births was multiplied by a correction factor (c_{Pop} = 4.39; 95% CL 3.87-4.92), assuming a population growth rate of 1.038 (Lowry et al. 2014) along the U.S. Pacific coast. Total population size was thus estimated as $N_{Total} = c_{Pop} \times N_{Births}$, where $N_{births} = N_{Adult\ Females} \times F$, resulting in an estimate for 2023 of 194,907 (95% CI 170,185-233,677).



Figure 2. Estimated total U.S. ~~population~~ stock abundance~~number~~ of northern elephant seals ~~births~~ in California, 1958-~~2010~~2023. Circles represent estimates from a population growth rate of 17% (correction factor 4.4) from 1958-1987 and 3.8% (correction factor 4.39) from 1988-present. Pup birth estimates used to derive the total U.S. population ~~Multiple independent estimates are presented for the Channel Islands 1988-91. E~~estimates are from Stewart et al. (1994), Lowry et al. (1996), Lowry (2002), Lowry et al. (2014), and unpublished data from Sarah Allen, Dan Crocker, Brian Hatfield, Ron Jameson, Bernie Le Boeuf, Mark Lowry, Pat Morris, Guy Oliver, Derek Lee, and William Sydeman. Triangles represent estimates from previous Stock Assessment Reports that used a correction of 3.5 (Barlow et al. 1993, Boveng, 1988). The open diamond represents the population estimate derived from an updated published model (Condit et al. 2022) to estimate the number of adult females and an assumed population growth rate of 3.8% (Lowry et al. 2014).

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population size for northern elephant seals in ~~2013~~ 2023 can be estimated conservatively as ~~85,369~~ 88,794 seals, which is equal to twice the estimated ~~statewide~~ pup count (to account for the pups and their mothers).

Current Population Trend

The California population is reported to have grown at ~~3.1~~ 3.8% annually since 1988 (Lowry et al. ~~2020~~2014).

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATE

An annual growth rate of 17% for elephant seals in the U.S. from 1958 to 1987 is reported by

Lowry *et al.* (2014), but some of this growth is likely due to immigration of animals from Mexico and the consequences of a small population recovering from past exploitation. From 1988 to 2013, the population is estimated to have grown ~~3.1~~ 3.8% annually (Lowry *et al*. ~~2020~~ 2014)~~.~~, which is assumed to have continued through 2023. For this stock assessment report, we use the default maximum theoretical net productivity rate for pinnipeds, or 12% (~~Wade and Angliss 1997~~ NMFS 2023).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

The potential biological removal (PBR) level for this stock is calculated as the minimum population size (~~85,369~~ 88,794) ~~times~~multiplied by one half the observed maximum net growth rate for this stock (½ of 12%) times a recovery factor of 1.0 (for a stock of unknown status that is increasing, ~~Wade and Angliss 1997~~ NMFS 2023) resulting in a PBR of ~~5,122~~ 5,328 animals per year.

HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Fisheries Information

A summary of known commercial fishery mortality and serious injury for this stock of northern elephant seals is given in Table 1. Total estimated commercial fishery mortality is ≥~~5.3~~ 6.8 elephant seals annually (Table 1). Although ~~all of the~~ mortality and serious injury in Table 1 occurred in U.S. waters, some may be of seals from Mexico's breeding population that are migrating through U.S. waters.

Table 1. Summary of available information on the mortality and serious injury of northern elephant seals (California breeding stock) in commercial fisheries that might take this species (Carretta 2023, Carretta et al. ~~2020a, 2020b~~ 2024, Jannot *et al.* ~~2018~~ 2022, NMFS-MML, unpublished estimates based on methods in Breiwick 2013,). n/a indicates information is not available. Mean annual takes are based on ~~2015-2019~~ 2018-2022 data unless noted otherwise. ~~The California halibut and white seabass set gillnet fishery has been observed only sporadically in recent years and no elephant seal entanglements have been recorded in this fishery since 2000 when the fishery operated north of Point Conception.~~

Fishery Name	Year(s)	Data Type	Percent Observer Coverage	Observed Mortality	Estimated Mortality (CV in parentheses)	Mean Annual Takes (CV in parentheses)
Alaska Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Atka Mackerel Trawl	2018-2022	observer	99%	2	2 (CV=0.085)	0.4 (CV=0.04)
Alaska Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Flatfish Trawl	2018-2022	observer	99%	1	1 (n/a)	0.2 (n/a)
CA thresher shark/swordfish drift gillnet fishery	~~2015-2019~~ 2018-2022	observer	~~21%~~ 20%-25%	~~3~~ 0	~~10.8 (0.41)~~ 2.6 (>0.8)	~~2.2 (0.41)~~ 0.52 (>0.8)
Dungeness Crab Pot Fishery (California)	2020	stranding	n/a	1	1	0.2
~~CA halibut and white seabass set gillnet fishery~~	~~2017~~	~~observer~~	~~10%~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0 (n/a)~~
~~California halibut trawl fishery open access~~	~~2012~~ ~~2013~~ ~~2014~~ ~~2015~~ ~~2016~~	~~observer~~	~~0.06~~ ~~0.06~~ ~~0.22~~ ~~0.33~~ ~~0.30~~	~~0~~ ~~0~~ ~~0~~ ~~0~~ ~~1~~	~~0.63 (n/a)~~ ~~0.76 (n/a)~~ ~~0.63 (n/a)~~ ~~0.60 (n/a)~~ ~~1.61 (n/a)~~	~~0.85 (n/a)~~
~~Limited Entry Sablefish Hook and Line~~	~~2012~~ ~~2013~~ ~~2014~~ ~~2015~~ ~~2016~~	~~observer~~	~~0.22~~ ~~0.22~~ ~~0.27~~ ~~0.42~~ ~~0.33~~	~~1~~ ~~0~~ ~~0~~ ~~3~~ ~~0~~	~~2.33 (n/a)~~ ~~0.95 (n/a)~~ ~~0.87 (n/a)~~ ~~3.86 (n/a)~~ ~~1.08 (n/a)~~	~~1.82 (n/a)~~
Gillnet fishery, unidentified	2018-2022	stranding	n/a	3	3	0.6

WA, OR, CA domestic groundfish trawl fishery (includes at-sea hake and other limited-entry groundfish sectors)	~~2012-2016~~ 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019	observer data	98% to 100% of tows in at-sea hake fishery	~~2~~ n/a	~~2~~ 9.2 (>0.8) 4.6 (>0.8) 3.7 (>0.8) 3.4 (>0.8) 3.5 (>0.8)	~~0.4 (n/a)~~ 4.9 (>0.8)
Total annual takes						~~≥ 5.3 (n/a)~~ ≥ 6.8 (CV>0.8)

Other Mortality

~~For the period 2015-2019, deaths~~ Total mortality and serious ~~injuries~~ injury from ~~the following non-commercial fishery sources were documented~~ sources other than commercial fisheries for 2018-2022 includes the following: shootings (~~2~~ 4); marine debris entanglement (~~4~~ 2); hook and line fisheries (~~2~~ 2); research-related (2), dog attack (~~1~~ 2); unidentified human interaction (~~2~~ 1); harassment (~~7~~ 1); vehicle collision (1); tar/oil (~~22~~ 6); and vessel strike (1) (Carretta et al. ~~2021~~ 2024). These ~~non-commercial fishery~~ other sources of mortality and serious injury total ~~42~~ 22 animals, or an average of ~~8.4~~ 4.4 elephant seals annually ~~(Carretta et al. 2014b)~~.

STATUS OF STOCK

Northern elephant seals are not listed as "endangered" or "threatened" under the Endangered Species Act nor designated as "depleted" under the MMPA. Total annual human-caused mortality (commercial fishery (~~5.3~~ 6.8) + other human-caused sources (~~8.4~~ 4.4) = ~~13.7~~ 11.2) is less than the calculated PBR for this stock (~~5,122~~5,328); ~~,~~ thus, northern elephant seals are not considered a "strategic" stock under the MMPA. The average rate of incidental commercial fishery related mortality for this stock over the last five years (11.2) ~~≥ 5.3)~~ is less than 10% of the calculated PBR (~~5,122~~ 533); therefore, the total commercial fishery serious injury and mortality appears to be insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate. The population growth rate between 1958 and 1987 was 17% annually (Lowry *et al*. 2014). From 1988 to ~~2013~~ 2010, the population grew at an annual rate of ~~3.1~~ 3.8% (Lowry *et al*. ~~2020~~ 2014). The population continues to grow, with ~~~80%~~ most ~~of~~ births occurring at southern California rookeries (Lowry *et al*. 2014~~, 2020~~). No estimate of carrying capacity is available for this population and the population status relative to OSP is unknown. There are no known habitat issues that are of concern for this stock. However, expanding pinniped populations in general have resulted in increased human-caused serious injury and mortality, due to shootings, entrainment in power plants, interactions with recreational hook and line fisheries, separation of mothers and pups due to human disturbance, dog bites, and vessel and vehicle strikes (Carretta *et al*. ~~2021~~ 2024).

REFERENCES

Barlow, J., P. Boveng, M. S. Lowry, B. S. Stewart, B. J. Le Boeuf, W. J. Sydeman, R. J. Jameson, S. G. Allen, and C. W. Oliver. 1993. Status of the northern elephant seal population along the US west coast in 1992. Admin. Rept. LJ-93-01. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Boveng, P. L. (1988). Status of the northern elephant seal population on the US west coast (Report LJ-88-05). NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Breiwick, J. M. 2013. North Pacific marine mammal bycatch estimation methodology and results, 2007-2011. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-260, 40 p

~~Carretta, J.V., L. Enriquez, and C. Villafana. 2014a. Marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in California gillnet fisheries in 2012. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-526. 16p.~~

~~Carretta, J.V., S.M. Wilkin, M.M. Muto, K. Wilkinson, and J. Rusin. 2014b. Sources of human-related injury and mortality for U.S. Pacific west coast marine mammal stock assessments, 2008-2012. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-533. 110 p.Carretta, J.V., L. Enriquez, and C. Villafana. 2014. Marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in California gillnet fisheries in 2012. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-526. 16 p.~~

~~Carretta, J.V. and L. Enriquez. 2012a. Marine mammal and seabird bycatch in California gillnet fisheries in 2011. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-500. 14p.~~

~~Carretta, J.V. and L. Enriquez. 2012b. Marine mammal and seabird bycatch in California gillnet fisheries in 2010. Administrative Report LJ-12-01. NOAA Fisheries, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA 92037. 14 p.~~

~~Carretta, J.V. and L. Enriquez. 2010. Marine mammal and sea turtle bycatch in the California/Oregon swordfish and thresher shark drift gillnet fishery in 2009. Administrative Report LJ-10-03,~~

~~available from Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 3333 North Torrey Pines Ct., La Jolla, California, 92037. 11p.~~

~~Carretta, J.V. and L. Enriquez. 2009. Marine mammal bycatch in the California/Oregon swordfish and thresher shark drift gillnet fishery in 2008. Administrative Report LJ-09-03, available from Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 3333 North Torrey Pines Ct., La Jolla, California, 92037. 10 p.~~

Carretta, J.V. 2023. Estimates of marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in the California large-mesh drift gillnet fishery: 1990-2022. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-687. https://doi.org/10.25923/kp3k-r222

Carretta, J.V., J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, L. Saez, D. Lawson, and J. Viezbicke. 2024. Sources of human-related injury and mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2018-2022. Document PSRG-2024-11 presented to the Pacific Scientific Review Group, March 2024.

Clinton, W.L., and Le Boeuf, B. J. 1993. Sexual selection's effects on male life history and the pattern of male mortality. Ecology, 74, 1884-1892.

Condit, R., Allen, S. G., Costa, D. P., Codde, S., Goley, P. D., Le Boeuf, B. J., Lowry, M. S., & Morris, P. (2022). Estimating population size when individuals are asynchronous: A model illustrated with northern elephant seal breeding colonies [Journal Article]. PloS One, 17(1), e0262214.

Condit, R., Le Boeuf, B. J., Morris, P. A., & Sylvan, M. (2007). Estimating population size in asynchronous aggregations: A bayesian approach and test with elephant seal censuses [Journal Article]. Marine Mammal Science, 23(4), 834–855.

Condit, R., Reiter, J., Morris, P. A., Berger, R., Allen, S. G. and Le Boeuf, B. J. 2014, Lifetime survival rates and senescence in northern elephant seals. Marine Mammal Science, 30: 122–138.

Cooper, C.F. and B.S. Stewart. 1983. Demography of northern elephant seals, 1911-1982. Science 219:969-971.

Hindell, M.A. 1991. Some life-history parameters of a declining population of southern elephant seals, Mirounga leonina. Journal of Animal Ecology, 60, 119-134.

Hoelzel, A.R., Fleischer, R.C., Campagna, C., Le Boeuf, B.J., and Alvord, G. 2002. Impact of a population bottleneck on symmetry and genetic diversity in the northern elephant seal. Journal of Evolutionary Biology, 15(4), 567-575.

Huber, H.R., A.C. Rovetta, L.A. Fry, and S. Johnston. 1991. Age-specific natality of northern elephant seals at the South Farallon Islands, California. J. Mamm. 72(3):525-534.

~~Jannot, J.E., K.A. Somers,V. Tuttle, J. McVeigh, J.V. Carretta, and V. Helker. 2018. Observed and Estimated Marine Mammal Bycatch in U.S. West Coast Groundfish Fisheries, 2002–16. U.S. Department of Commerce, NWFSC Processed Report 2018-03.~~

Jannot, J. E., K. A. Somers, V. J. Tuttle, J. Eibner, K. E. Richerson, J. T. McVeigh, J. V. Carretta, N. C. Young, and J. Freed. 2022. Marine Mammal Bycatch in U.S. West Coast Groundfish Fisheries, 2002–19. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-176.

~~Le Boeuf, B.J., and Reiter, J. 1988. Lifetime reproductive success in northern elephant seals. In T. H. Clutton-Brock (Ed.), Reproductive success: Studies of individual variation in contrasting breeding systems (pp. 344-362). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.~~

Le Boeuf, B.J., and Laws, R.M. 1994. Elephant seals: An introduction to the genus. In B. J. Le Boeuf and R. M. Laws (Eds.), Elephant seals: Population ecology, behavior, and physiology (pp. 1-28). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Le Boeuf, B. J., Condit, R., Morris, P. A., & Reiter, J. 2011. The northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*) rookery at año nuevo: A case study in colonization. Aquatic Mammals 37(4): 486.

Le Boeuf, B. J., Condit, R., & Reiter, J. 2019. Lifetime reproductive success of northern elephant seals (*Mirounga angustirostris*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 97(12): 1203–1217.

Le Boeuf, B.J., Crocker, D.E., Costa, D.P., Blackwell, S.B., Webb, P.M., and Houser, D.S. 2000. Foraging ecology of northern elephant seals. Ecological monographs, 70(3), 353-382.

~~Le Boeuf, B. J., D. Crocker, S. Blackwell, and P. Morris. 1993. Sex differences in diving and foraging behaviour of northern elephant seals. In: I. Boyd (ed.). Marine Mammal: Advances in Behavioural and Population Biology. Oxford Univ. Press.~~

Lowry, M. S. (2002). Counts of northern elephant seals at rookeries in the southern california bight: 1981-2001 (Report NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-345). National Oceanic; Atmospheric Administration.

Lowry, M. S., Perryman, W. L., Lynn, M. S., Westlake, R. L., & Julian, F. (1996). Counts of northern elephant seals, *Mirounga angustirostris*, from large-format aerial photographs in southern California during the breeding season. Fishery Bulletin 94: 176–185.

Lowry, M.S., E.M. Jaime, S.E. Nehasil, A. Betcher, and R. Condit. 2020. Winter surveys at the Channel Islands and Point Conception reveal population growth of northern elephant seals and residence

counts of other pinnipeds. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-627.

Lowry, M.S., R. Condit, B.Hatfield, S.G. Allen, R. Berger, P.A. Morris, B.J. Le Boeuf, and J. Reiter. 2014. Abundance, Distribution, and Population Growth of the Northern Elephant Seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*) in the United States from 1991 to 2010. Aquatic Mammals 40(1):20-31.

McCann, T.S. 1985. Size, status and demography of southern elephant seal (Mirounga leonina) populations. In J. K. Ling and M. M. Bryden (eds.), Studies of Sea Mammals in South Latitudes. South Australian Museum. 132 pp.

McMahon, C.R., Burton, H.R., and Bester, M.N. 2003. A demographic comparison of two southern elephant seal populations. Journal of Animal Ecology, 72, 61-74.

NMFS. 2023. Guidelines for Preparing Stock Assessment Reports Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Protected Resources Policy Directive 02-204-01. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/s3/2023-05/02-204-01-Final-GAMMS-IV-Revisions-clean-1-kdr.pdf

Pistorius, P.A., and Bester, M.N. 2002. A longitudinal study of senescence in a pinniped. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 80, 395-401.

Pistorius, P.A., Bester, M.N., Lewis, M.N., Taylor, F.E., Campagna, C., and Kirkman, S.P. ~~(~~2004~~)~~. Adult female survival, population trend, and the implications of early primiparity in a capital breeder, the southern elephant seal (*Mirounga leonina*). Journal of Zoology, 263, 107.

Reiter, J., and Le Boeuf, B.J. 1991. Life history consequences of variation in age at primiparity in northern elephant seals. Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 28, 153-160.

Stewart, B. S., & Huber, H. R. (1993). *Mirounga angustirostris*. Mammalian Species, 449, 1–10.

Stewart, B. S., B. J. Le Boeuf, P. K. Yochem, H. R. Huber, R. L. DeLong, R. J. Jameson, W. Sydeman, and S. G. Allen. 1994. History and present status of the northern elephant seal population. In: B. J. Le Boeuf and R. M. Laws (eds.) Elephant Seals. Univ. Calif. Press, Los Angeles.

~~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 Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-12 available from Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Springs, MD. 93pp.~~

Revised ~~04/15/2020~~ 9/30/2024

GUADALUPE FUR SEAL (*Arctocephalus townsendi*)

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Commercial sealing during the 19th century reduced the once abundant Guadalupe fur seal to near extinction in 1894 (Townsend 1931). Prior to the harvest it ranged from Monterey Bay, California, to the Revillagigedo Islands, Mexico (Hanni *et al*. 1997, Repenning *et al.* 1971; Figure 1). The prehistoric distribution of Guadalupe fur seals during the Holocene was apparently quite different from today, as the archeological record indicates Guadalupe fur seal remains accounted for 40%-80% of all pinniped bones at the California Channel Islands (Rick *et al*. 2009). The live capture of two adult males (and killing of ~60 more animals) at Guadalupe Island in 1928 established the continued existence of the species (Townsend 1931). Guadalupe fur seals pup and breed mainly at Isla Guadalupe, Mexico. In 1997, a second rookery was discovered at Isla Benito del Este, Baja California (Maravilla-Chavez and Lowry 1999) and a pup was born at San Miguel Island, California (Melin and DeLong 1999). Since 2008, individual adult females, subadult males, and between one and three pups have been observed annually on San Miguel Island (NMFS, unpublished data). The population at Isla Benito del Este is now well-established, though very few pups are observed there. Population increases at Isla San Benito are attributed to immigration of animals from Isla Guadalupe (Aurioles-Gamboa *et al.* 2010, García-Capitanachi 2011). Along the U.S. West Coast, strandings occur ~~almost~~ annually in California waters and animals are increasingly observed in Oregon and Washington waters. ~~In 2015-2016~~ During 2015-2021, a total of 715 Guadalupe fur seals were observed stranded in U.S. West Coast waters and NMFS declared an **Unusual Mortality Event**, which closed in 2021 (see section below on other factors that may be causing a decline or impeding recovery). ~~, Guadalupe fur seal strandings totaled approximately 175 animals along the coast of California (compared with approximately 10 animals annually in prior years), and NMFS declared an Unusual Mortality Event. Most strandings involved animals less than 2 years old with evidence of malnutrition.~~ Individuals have stranded or been sighted inside the Gulf of California and ~~as far~~ south ~~as~~ to Zihuatanejo, Mexico (Hanni *et al*. 1997 and Aurioles-Gamboa and Hernadez-Camacho 1999) ~~and another in 2012, at~~ Cerro Hermoso, Oaxaca, Mexico (Esperon-Rodriguez and Gallo-Reynoso 2012), and the Galapagos Islands (Páez-Rosas *et al*. 2020). Multiple sightings have been reported from the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands region (Pace *et al*. 2022). ~~Recent video records of pinnipeds hooked in the mouth from international waters west of the California Current involving the shallow set Hawaii longline fishery were independently reviewed by pinniped experts and at least one animal in early 2016 was identified as a~~ There are several records of Guadalupe fur seals being hooked in the mouth by longline gear in the Hawai‘i shallow set longline fishery (Carretta *et al*. 2024). Guadalupe fur seals that stranded in central California and treated at rehabilitation centers were fitted with satellite tags and documented to travel as far north as Graham Island and Vancouver Island, British Columbia, Canada (Norris *et al.* 2015). Some satellite-tagged animals traveled far offshore outside the U.S. EEZ to areas 700 nmi west of the California / Oregon border. The population is considered to be a single stock because all are recent descendants from one breeding colony at Isla Guadalupe, Mexico.



Figure 1. Sighting data and approximate range of the Guadalupe fur seal. The location of Guadalupe Island is noted with the large black asterisk.

POPULATION SIZE

Population size prior to commercial harvests in the 19th century is unknown, but estimates range from 20,000 to ~~100,000~~ 200,000 animals (Fleischer 1987, Hubbs 1979). Juárez-Ruiz *et al*. (2022) estimated pup production for the period 1991 – 2019, and estimated total population size in 2019 at 63,850 animals (range: 57,199 – 72,631), based on a total population to pup ratio of 4:1 (estimated for the northern fur seal, Johnson, 1975). This expansion factor is the mean of previous expansion factors used by García-Aguilar *et al*. (2018) to estimate total Guadalupe fur seal population size from pup counts, based on the work of Harwood and Prime (1978). Additional, unpublished estimates of total population size appear in a Guadalupe fur seal workshop report (Marine Mammal Commission 2023), but until new estimates are published, the best estimate of Guadalupe fur seal abundance is considered to be the 2019 estimate of 63,850 animals reported by Juárez-Ruiz *et al*. (2022) (Figure 2). ~~estimate current population size is approximately one fifth of its historical pre-exploitation size. The most recent estimate of population size is based on pup count data collected in 2013 and a range of correction factors applied to pup counts to account for uncounted age classes and pre-census pup mortality (García-Aguilar *et al*. 2018). The 2013 estimates are based on 4,924 pups counted from a boat survey of Isla Guadalupe and corrected for pre-census mortality, resulting in an estimated 9,768 pups (range 8,863 – 10,869) born. García-Aguilar *et al*. (2018) estimated total population size by scaling up pup counts assuming two different total population size to pup count ratios (3.5:1 and 4.5:1) that have been used as defaults for other pinniped populations (Harwood and Prime 1978). Resulting estimates were 34,187 individuals (range 31,019–38,043), and 43,954 individuals (range 39,882–48,912). These estimates do not include animals at San Benito Island, for which Elorriaga-Verplancken *et al*. (2016) counted a maximum of 3,710 animals (including 28 pups) and 1,494 animals (16 pups) in July of 2014 and 2015, respectively. García-Aguilar *et al*. (2018) and Elorriaga-Verplancken *et al*. (2016) note that the San Benito Island rookery is represented almost exclusively by immature animals migrating from Guadalupe Island, and that negligible numbers of pups are produced at San Benito.~~



Figure 2. Estimated pup production of Guadalupe fur seals reported by Juárez-Ruiz *et al*. (2022) for 1991 – 2019. Horizontal lines represent point estimates ± 2 standard deviations.

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population size is taken as the lower bound of the estimate provided by Juárez-Ruiz *et al*. (2022), or 57,199 animals. ~~García-Aguilar *et al*. (2018) using a population size:pup count ratio of 3.5, or 31,019 animals.~~

Current Population Trend

~~Counts of Guadalupe fur seals have been made sporadically since 1954 and are compiled by Seagars (1984), Fleischer (1987), Gallo (1994), Torres et al. (1990), and García-Capitanachi (2011). Historic counts vary in reliability in that some census efforts represent partial counts, either of age classes or lack complete spatial coverage of Guadalupe Island. A more recent study, based on only pup counts between 1984 and 2013 at Guadalupe Island, resulted in an estimated annual rate of increase of 5.9% (range 4.1–7.7%) (García-Aguilar *et al*. 2018) (Figure 2). This estimate of annual rate of increase does not include years prior to 1984 when the population was considerably smaller and higher population growth rates would be expected as the population recovered from historic anthropogenic removals.~~ Juárez-Ruiz *et al*. (2022) estimated an annual

growth rate of 8.4% (range: 8–8.8) from 1991–2019, which is higher than the 5.9% estimated for 1984–2013 (García-Aguilar *et al.*, 2018).

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Reported annual growth rates of 21% at Isla San Benito over an 11-year period are too high for intrinsic growth and likely result from immigration from Isla Guadalupe (Esperón-Rodríguez and Gallo-Reynoso 2012). The maximum net productivity rate is assumed to be equal to the maximum annual growth rate observed between 1955 and 1993 (13.7%) when the population was at a very low level and should have been growing at nearly its maximum rate (Gallo 1994). The current maximum net productiviy rate is taken as the most-recent growth estimate provided by Juárez-Ruiz *et al*. (2022), or 8.4%.

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

The potential biological removal (PBR) for this stock is calculated as the minimum population size (~~31,019~~ 57,199) times one half the maximum net growth rate observed for this species (½ of 13.7%) times a recovery factor of 0.5 (for a threatened species, Wade and Angliss 1997), resulting in a PBR of ~~1,062~~ 1,959 Guadalupe fur seals per year. The vast majority of this PBR would apply towards incidental mortality in Mexico as most of the population occurs outside of U.S. waters. The fraction of this stock that occurs in U.S. waters and the amount of time spent in U.S. waters is unknown, thus, a proration factor for calculating a PBR in U.S. waters is not available.

HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Fisheries Information

Table 1. Summary of available information on the incidental mortality and serious injury (MSI) of Guadalupe fur seals in commercial fisheries and other unidentified fisheries ~~that might take this species~~.

Fishery Name	Year(s)	Data Type	Percent Observer Coverage	Sum of Observed Mortality and Serious Injury (MSI) ~~(and non-serious injuries)~~	Estimated Mortality and Serious Injury (CV)	Mean Annual Takes (CV)
CA driftnet fishery for sharks and swordfish	~~2013-2017~~ 2018-2022	observer	~~12%-37%~~ 20%-25%	0	0	0
CA set gillnet fishery for halibut/white seabass and other species	2013-2017	observer	<10%	0	0	0
Hawaii Shallow Set Longline Fishery	~~2013-2017~~ 2018-2022	observer	100%	~~2 (2)~~ 4	~~2 (0)~~ 4	~~0.4 (0)~~ 0.8 (n/a)
Unidentified fishery interactions, including ~~generic~~ gillnets and trawls of unknown origin	~~2013-2017~~ 2018-2022	strandings	n/a	~~4 (1)~~ 32	~~≥4~~ ≥ 32	~~≥ 0.8~~ ≥ 6.4
Minimum total annual takes						~~≥ 1.2~~ ≥ 7.2 (n/a)

No Guadalupe fur seals have been observed entangled in California gillnet fisheries between 1990 and ~~2017~~ 2022 (Julian and Beeson 1998, Carretta 2023 ~~Carretta *et al*. 2004, Carretta *et al*. 2016b, Carretta *et al*. 2019a, 2019b~~), although stranded animals have been found entangled in gillnet of unknown origin (see 'Other mortality' below). 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.

Guadalupe fur seals occasionally are observed hooked in the Hawaii shallow set longline fishery (100% observer coverage, Table 1). Between ~~2013 and 2017~~ 2018 and 2022 there ~~were~~ was one death, ~~2~~ 3 serious, and ~~2~~ 5 non-serious injuries involving this species (Carretta *et al*. ~~2019a~~ 2024). These interactions occurred outside of the U.S. EEZ, west of the California Current.

Most records of serious injury and mortality of Guadalupe fur seals with fishing gear is derived from opportunistic stranding data, which includes 32 mortality / serious injury cases involving gillnet and trawl fisheries (Table 1.)

Other mortality and serious injury

~~There were 13 records of human-related deaths and/or serious injuries to Guadalupe fur seals from stranding data for the most recent 5-year period of 2013-2017 (Carretta *et al.* 2016a, Carretta *et al*. 2019a). These strandings~~ Other human-related mortality and serious injury during 2018-2022 included entanglement in marine debris (∑MSI = 8), ~~and~~ shootings (∑MSI = 3), unidentified human interactions (∑MSI = 2) and oil/tar (∑MSI = 1). The average annual observed human-caused mortality and serious injury of Guadalupe fur seals for ~~2013-2017~~ 2018-2022 from non-fishery sources is ~~2.6~~ 2.8 animals ~~annually (13~~ 14 animals / 5 years). Observed human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock very likely represents a fraction of the true impacts because not all cases are documented. No correction factors to account for undetected mortality and injury are currently available for pinnipeds along the U.S. west coast.

STATUS OF STOCK

The Endangered Species Act lists the Guadalupe fur seal as a threatened species, which automatically qualifies this stock as "depleted" and "strategic" stock under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. There is insufficient information to determine ~~whether fishery~~levels of human-caused mortality and serious injury in Mexico ~~exceeds the PBR for this stock, but given the observed growth of the population over time, this is unlikely~~. The total U.S. commercial fishery mortality and serious injury for this stock (≥~~1.2~~ 7.2 animals per year) is less than 10% of the calculated PBR (1,959) for the entire stock, but it is not currently possible to calculate a prorated PBR for U.S. waters with which to compare serious injury and mortality from U.S. fisheries. Therefore, it is unknown whether total U.S. fishery mortality is insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. The combined annual serious injury and mortality from commercial fisheries (≥~~1.2~~ 7.2) and other sources (≥~~2.6~~ 2.8) is ~~3.8~~ 10 animals per year, which is less than the range-wide PBR of ~~1,062~~ 1,959 animals for this stock. The population was estimated to grow at ~~5.9%~~ 8.4% annually for the period 1991-2019 (Juárez-Ruiz *et al*. 2022) ~~1984 to 2013 (García-Aguilar *et al*. 2018)~~.

OTHER FACTORS THAT MAY BE CAUSING A DECLINE OR IMPEDING RECOVERY

Guadalupe fur seals may be negatively affected by marine heatwaves (Cavole *et al*. 2016, Gálvez *et al*. 2023), including reduction and changes in prey availability, with impacts to pup and juvenile survival. The 2015-2021 UME coincided with multiple marine heatwaves.

REFERENCES

Aurioles-Gamboa, D. and C. J. Hernadez-Camacho. 1999. Notes on the southernmost records of Guadalupe fur seal, Arctocephalus townsendi, in Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 15:581-583.

Aurioles-Gamboa, D., Elorriaga- Verplancken, F. and Hernández-Camacho, C.J. 2010. Guadalupe fur seal population status on the San Benito Islands, Mexico. Marine Mammal Science 26(2): 402-408.

Aurioles-Gamboa, D. 2015. Arctocephalus townsendi. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015: e.T2061A45224420. http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2015-2.RLTS.T2061A45224420.en

~~Carretta, J.V., T. Price, D. Petersen, and R. Read. 2004. Estimates of marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird mortality in the California drift gillnet fishery for swordfish and thresher shark, 1996-2002. Marine Fisheries Review 66(2):21-30.~~

~~Carretta J.V., V. Helker, M.M. Muto, J. Greenman, K.Wilkinson, D. Lawson, J. Viezbicke, and J. Jannot. 2019a. Sources of Human-related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2013-2017. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-616. 150 p.~~

~~Carretta, J.V., J.E. Moore, and K.A. Forney. 2019b. Estimates of marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch from the California large mesh drift gillnet fishery: 1990-2017. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-619. 76 p.~~

Carretta, J.V. 2023. Estimates of marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in the California large-mesh drift gillnet fishery: 1990-2022. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-687. https://doi.org/10.25923/kp3k-r222

Carretta, J.V., J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, L. Saez, D. Lawson, and J. Viezbicke. 2024. Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2018-2022. Document PSRG-2024-11, presented to the Pacific Scientific Review Group, March 2024.

Cavole, L.M., Demko, A.M., Diner, R.E., Giddings, A., Koester, I., Pagniello, C.M., Paulsen, M.L., Ramirez-Valdez, A., Schwenck, S.M., Yen, N.K. and Zill, M.E. 2016. Biological impacts of the 2013–2015 warm-water anomaly in the Northeast Pacific: winners, losers, and the future. *Oceanography*, *29*(2), pp.273-285.

Elorriaga-Verplancken, F. R., G. E. Sierra-Rodríguez, H. Rosales-Nanduca, K. Acevedo-Whitehouse, and J. Sandoval-Sierra. 2016. Impact of the 2015 El Niño-Southern oscillation on the abundance and foraging habits of Guadalupe fur seals and California sea lions from the San Benito Archipelago, Mexico. PLoS One 11:e0155034.

Esperón-Rodríguez, M. and Gallo-Reynoso, J.P., 2012. Analysis of the re-colonization of San Benito Archipelago by Guadalupe fur seals (*Arctocephalus townsendi*). Latin American Journal of Aquatic Research, 40(1), pp.213-223.

Fleischer, L. A. 1987. Guadalupe fur seal, *Arctocephalus townsendi*. In J. P. Croxall and R. L. Gentry (eds.). Status, biology, and ecology of fur seals. Proceedings of an international symposium and workshop. Cambridge, England, 23-27 April 1984. p. 43-48. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA, NMFS, NOAA Tech. Rept. NMFS 51.

Gallo, J. P. 1994. Factors affecting the population status of Guadalupe fur seal, *Arctocephalus townsendi* (Merriam, 1897), at Isla de Guadalupe, Baja California, Mexico. Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz, 199 p.

Gálvez C, Raverty S, Galván-Magaña F, Field CL and Elorriaga-Verplancken FR. 2023. Mortality in an off-shore predator critical habitat during the Northeast Pacific marine heatwave. Front. Mar. Sci. 10:1202533. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2023.1202533

García-Aguilar, M.C., F.R. Elorriaga-Verplancken, H. Rosales-Nanduca, and Y. Schramm. 2018. Population status of the Guadalupe fur seal (*Arctocephalus townsendi*). Journal of Mammalogy, 99(6):1522–1528, 2018.

García-Capitanachi, B. 2011. Estado de la población de lobo fino de Guadalupe (Arctocephalus townsendi) en Isla Guadalupe e Islas San Benito. MC Thesis dissertation. Facultad de Ciencias Universidad de Baja California, México.

Hanni, K. D., D. J. Long, R. E. Jones, P. Pyle, and L. E. Morgan. 1997. Sightings and strandings of Guadalupe fur seals in central and northern California, 1988-1995. J. of Mamm. 78:684-690.

Harwood, J., and J. H. Prime. 1978. Some factors affecting the population size of the British grey seal populations. Journal of Applied Ecology 15:401–411.

Johnson, A.M., 1975. The status of the northern fur seal populations. Rapports et Proces-Verbaux des Reunions (Denmark), 169.

Julian, F. and M. Beeson. 1998. Estimates for marine mammal, turtle, and seabird mortality for two California gillnet fisheries: 1990-95. Fish. Bull. 96:271-284.

Juárez-Ruiz, A., Pardo, M.A., Hernández-Montoya, J.C., Elorriaga-Verplancken, F.R., Milanés-Salinas, M.D.L.Á., Norris, T., Beier, E. and Heckel, G., 2022. Guadalupe fur seal pup production predicted from annual variations of sea surface temperature in the southern California Current Ecosystem. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 79(5), pp.1637-1648.

Maravilla-Chavez, M. O. and M. S Lowry. 1999 Incipient breeding colony of Guadalupe fur seals at Isla Benito del Este, Baja California, Mexico. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 15:239-241.

Marine Mammal Commission. 2023. Guadalupe Fur Seal Research and Planning Workshop. https://www.mmc.gov/wp-content/uploads/Guadalupe-Fur-Seal-Research-and-Conservation-Planning-Workshop-Report.pdf

Melin, S. R. and R. L. DeLong. 1999. Observations of a Guadalupe fur seal (*Arctocephalus townsendi*) female and pup at San Miguel Island, California. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 15:885-888.

Norris, T., G. DeRango, R. DiGiovanni, and C. Field. 2015. Distribution of and threats to Guadalupe fur seals off the California coast. Poster presented at the Society of Marine Mammalogy Biennial meeting. San Francisco, CA.

Pace, C.N., Webber, M.A., Tobin, D.D.B., Pemberton, S., Belovarac, J. and Goertz, C.E., 2022. The Northernmost and Westernmost Records of the Guadalupe Fur Seal (*Arctocephalus philippii townsendi*). *Aquatic Mammals*, *48*(6), pp.592-601.

Páez-Rosas, D., Pazmiño, D. A., and Riofrío-Lazo, M. 2020. Unprecedented records of Guadalupe and Juan Fernández fur seals in the Galapagos Archipelago. *Aquatic Mammals*, *46*(6), 549-555. https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.46.6.2020.549

Repenning, C. A., Peterson, R. S. and Hubbs, C. L. (1971) Contributions to the Systematics of the Southern Fur Seals, with Particular Reference to the Juan Fernández and Guadalupe Species, in Antarctic Pinnipedia (ed W. H. Burt), American Geophysical Union, Washington, D.C. doi: 10.1029/AR018p0001.

Rick, T.C., DeLong, R.L., Erlandson, J.M., Braje, T.J., Jones, T.L., Kennett, D.J., Wake, T.A. and Walker, P.L., 2009. A trans-Holocene archaeological record of Guadalupe fur seals (Arctocephalus townsendi) on the California coast. Marine Mammal Science, 25(2), pp.487-502.

Seagars, D. J. 1984. The Guadalupe fur seal: a status review. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Admin. Rep. SWR-84-6. 29pp.

Sosa-Nishizaki, O., R. De la Rosa Pacheco, R. Castro Longoria, M. Grijalva Chon, and J. De la Rosa Velez. 1993. Estudio biologico pesquero del pez (*Xiphias gladius*) y otras especies de picudos (marlins y pez vela). Rep. Int. CICESE, CTECT9306.

Torres-G., A., A. Aguayo-L., and N. Valdez-T. 1990. Tamaño y distribucion de la poblacion del lobo fino de Guadalupe, *Arctocephalus townsendi* (Merriam, 1897), durante el verano de 1988. [Abstracts] XV Reunion internacional para el estudio de los mamiferos marinos, 18-20 April 1990. La Paz, B. C. S., Mexico.

Townsend, C. H. 1931. The fur seal of the California islands with new descriptive and historical matter. Zoologica 9:443-457.

Revised ~~12/31/2015~~ 9/30/2024

NORTHERN FUR SEAL (*Callorhinus ursinus*): California Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Northern fur seals occur from southern California north to the Bering Sea and west to the Okhotsk Sea and Honshu Island, Japan (Fig. 1). ~~As of 2014, t~~The worldwide population ~~size is approximately 1.1 million animals~~ has been in a long-term decline since the 1950s (York and Hartley 1981, Towell *et al*. 2006, Gelatt *et al*. 2015), however it remains in excess of a million individuals. The global population has experienced inconsistent abundance trends at various breeding sites, with the most pronounced change occurring at the largest breeding colony, St. Paul Island, one of the Pribilof Islands, Alaska (Gelatt *et al*. 2015). During the breeding season, ~~approximately 45%~~ northern fur seals are primarily located at eight main colonies. Most of the worldwide population is found on the Pribilof (St. Paul and St. George) Islands, United States in the southern Bering Sea and the Commander (Bering and Medny) Islands, Russia.~~, with the remaining animals spread throughout the North Pacific Ocean (Gelatt *et al*. 2015). Of the seals in U.S. waters outside of the Pribilofs, approximately 9% of the population is found on~~ Smaller rookeries are located at Tuleny (Robben) Island and the Kuril Islands in Russia, as well as Bogoslof Island ~~in the southern Bering Sea~~, ~~1% on~~ San Miguel Island ~~off southern California~~, and ~~0.3% on the~~ Farallon Islands, United States ~~off central California~~ (Gelatt *et al*. 2015). Northern fur seals may temporarily haul out on land at other sites in Alaska, British Columbia, and on islets along the coast of the continental United States, but generally this occurs outside of the breeding season (Fiscus 1983).

Figure 1. Approximate distribution of northern fur seals ~~in the North Pacific~~ (shaded area).

Due to differing requirements during the annual reproductive season, adult males and females typically occur ashore at different, though overlapping, times. Adult males occur ashore and defend reproductive territories during a 3-month period from June through August, though some may be present until November (well after giving up their territories). Adult females are found ashore for as long as 6 months (June-November). After their respective times ashore, fur seals of both sexes spend the next 7 to 8 months at sea (Roppel 1984). Adult females and pups from the Pribilof Islands migrate through the Aleutian Islands into the North Pacific Ocean, often to waters off Washington, Oregon, and California. Many pups may remain at sea for 22 months before returning to their natal rookery. Adult females and pups from San Miguel Island and the Farallon Islands migrate northward to these same areas (Lea *et al*. 2009). Adult males from the Pribilof Islands generally migrate only as far south as the Gulf of Alaska (Kajimura 1984). Little is known about where adult males from San Miguel Island and the Farallon Islands migrate.

The following information was considered in classifying stock structure based on the Dizon *et al*. (1992) phylogeographic approach: 1) Distributional data: continuous geographic distribution during feeding, geographic separation during the breeding season, and high natal site fidelity (DeLong 1982); 2) Population response data: substantial differences in population dynamics between the Pribilof~~s~~ and San Miguel Island~~s~~ (DeLong 1982, DeLong and Antonelis 1991, NMFS 2007); 3) Phenotypic data: unknown; and 4) Genotypic data: little evidence of genetic differentiation among breeding islands (Ream 2002, Dickerson *et al*. 2010). Based on this information, two separate stocks of northern fur seals are recognized within U.S. waters: an Eastern Pacific stock (including the Pribilof and Bogoslof Islands) and a California stock (including San Miguel ~~Island~~ and the Farallon Islands). The Eastern Pacific stock is reported separately in the Stock Assessment Reports for the U.S. Alaska Region.

This stock assessment report assesses the California Stock of northern fur seals, which resides at their southernmost breeding rookeries in U.S. waters.

POPULATION SIZE

The population estimate for northern fur seals on San Miguel Island (including Castle Rock, an islet 1km from the main island) is calculated as the estimated number of pups at rookeries multiplied by an expansion factor. Based on research conducted on the Eastern Pacific stock of northern fur seals, Lander's (1981) life table analysis was used to estimate the number of yearlings, two-year-olds, three-year-olds, and animals at least four years old. The resulting population estimate was equal to the pup count multiplied by 4.475. The expansion factors ~~are~~ were based on a sex and

age distribution estimated after the commercial harvest of juvenile males was terminated in 1984. A more appropriate expansion factor for San Miguel Island is 4.0, because immigration of recruitment-aged females is occurring in the population (DeLong 1982), as well as mortality and possible emigration of adults associated with the El Niño events in 1982-1983 and 1997-1998 (Melin *et al*. 2008). A 1998 pup count resulted in an 80% decrease from the 1997 count (Melin *et al*. 2005). In 1999, the population began to recover, and in ~~2010~~ 2017 the highest total pup count of ~~3,408~~ 4,491 was recorded (~~Orr *et al*. in review~~Fig. 1). ~~A~~ There could be multiple possible causes for the decline in total pup counts after 2017.~~from 2010 to 2011 was a combination of oceanographic events that occurred in the California Current in 2009, a coastal upwelling relaxation event in May and June and an El Niño event from Fall 2009 to Spring 2010. The oceanographic events caused fewer reproductive males and females to return to San Miguel Island to breed in 2010. During 2012, the population increased 9.4% from 2011 and this level was maintained during 2013. No counts were conducted at Castle Rock in 2014; however, a record number of pups (2,289) were counted at Adam's Cove that year. Additionally, the second highest number of territorial bulls (224) was observed in 2014 (Orr *et al*. in review). Based on these factors, and assuming the trends were similar at Castle Rock, the population size during 2014 would have been the highest recorded.~~ No counts were conducted during 2020 due to travel restrictions resulting from the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. The abundance of territorial males decreased dramatically in 2015 and 2016, perhaps due to warm environmental conditions, such as the North Pacific marine heat wave of 2014-2015 (Cavole *et al*. 2015, Di Lorenzo and Mantua 2016) and the El Niño of 2015-2016. The North Pacific marine heat wave (formerly termed "the blob"; Bond *et al*. 2015) consisted of a large area of abnormally high sea-surface temperature anomalies that started in the Gulf of Alaska in late 2013 (Bond *et al*. 2015). The North Pacific heat wave interacted with an El Niño in 2015, resulting in an abnormally long period of exceptionally high-temperature anomalies in the California Current System from 2014 to mid-2016 (McClatchie *et al*. 2016). The warm-water conditions that prevailed in 2015 and parts of 2016 may have adversely affected the foraging ecology and condition of territorial bulls during the non-breeding season and their subsequent return to San Miguel Island. As with adult male northern fur seals, adult females may not have returned San Miguel Island perhaps because they were nutritionally challenged to sustain their pregnancy. The decrease in reproductive animals may have led to subsequent decreases in recruited cohorts and decreases in pup production after 2017. Another possible explanation may be due to habitat loss (erosion) on the island. During the past 5-10 years, the sandy beach where the northern fur seal rookery is primarily located has been subject to larger and more frequent storm generated waves. Subsequently, a large amount of substrate has been removed, resulting in flood ponds in the rookery ranging from a day to over a week. During these conditions, the pups might be thermally challenged, leading to death in some cases. Additionally, their carcasses might get swept out to sea and never accounted for during mortality surveys, resulting in lower production numbers. ~~However, b~~Based on the ~~2013~~ 2019 count (the most recent complete data set) and the expansion factor, the most recent population estimate of northern fur seals at San Miguel Island is ~~13,384~~ 12,548 (~~3,346~~ 3,137 x 4.0) ~~northern fur seals (Orr *et al*. in review)~~. Currently, a coefficient of variation (CV) for the expansion factor is unavailable; however, studies are underway to determine the accuracy and precision of the expansion factor.



Figure 2. Estimated total production of northern fur seal pups counted on San Miguel Island, California, including the mainland rookeries (primarily Adam's Cove) and the offshore islet (Castle Rock), 1972-2022.

The population estimate for northern fur seals on the Farallon Islands (more specifically, the rookery on Southeast Farallon Island) is calculated as the highest number of pups, juveniles, and adults counted at the rookery. The long-term population estimate at the Farallon Islands should be regarded as an index of abundance rather than a precise indicator of population size for several reasons: 1) population censuses are incomplete because researchers do not enter rookery areas until the end of the breeding/pupping season in order to reduce human disturbance to other breeding pinnipeds and nesting seabirds, and counts are conducted from a lighthouse at the highest point of the island but part of the rookery area is obstructed from view; 2) mortality occurring early in the season is not accounted for; and 3) estimates of the number of pups are compromised because by the time counts are conducted, many pups have learned to swim and may not be present at the rookery. Additionally, yearlings may be present at rookeries and misidentified as pups. Keeping these factors in mind, the peak counts of northern fur seals increased steadily from 1995 to 2006 and have

increased exponentially from 2008 to ~~2013~~ 2022 (Fig 3.; Tietz 2012, Berger *et al*. 2013, Point Blue Conservation unpubl. data). Based solely on the count, the population estimate of northern fur seals at the Farallon Islands was ~~666 in 2013 and increased to 1,019 in 2014 (Orr *et al*. in review)~~ 1,464 in 2013 and increased to 7,086 in 2022. These estimates were based on applying a correction factor of 0.336 to the actual count. This number was derived from taking the annual maximums from ground surveys at West End Island and corrected using the mean correction factor estimated from aerial surveys for northern fur seal pups (Lee *et al*. 2018). This correction factor might not be applicable for non-pups, but it is the only one currently available. Efforts are being made to obtain more accurate counts at the Farallon Islands closer to the period of peak production.

The most recent population estimate for the entire stock of California northern fur seals, which incorporates estimates from San Miguel ~~Island~~ and the Farallon Islands in ~~2013~~ 2022, is ~~14,050 (13,384 + 666)~~ 19,634 (12,548 + 7,086).

Minimum Population Estimate

Minimum population size is calculated as the sum of the minimum number of animals at San Miguel Island and the Farallon Islands in ~~2013~~2022 (~~Tietz 2012, Berger *et al*. 2013, Orr *et al*. in review~~NMFS unpubl. data, Point Blue Conservation unpubl. data). The minimum number of animals at San Miguel Island is twice the pup count (~~3,346~~ 3,137 x 2 = ~~6,692~~ 6,274), to account for pups and mothers, plus the number of territorial males (~~166~~ 133) counted the same year (i.e., ~~2013~~ 2022), or ~~6,858~~ 6,407 fur seals. The minimum number at the Farallon Islands is the total number of individuals (~~666~~ 2,381; raw count) counted during the survey in 2022 ~~2013. It should be noted that 1,019 individuals were counted in 2014, but this number is not used here to be consistent with data collected at San Miguel Island~~. The total minimum population size is the sum of the minimum population sizes at San Miguel Island (6,407) and the Farallon Islands (2,381) in 2022, or 8,788 northern fur seals.

Current Population Trend

Northern fur seals were extirpated on San Miguel ~~Island~~ and the Farallon Islands during the late 1700s and early 1800s. Immigrants from the Pribilof Islands and Russian populations recolonized San Miguel Island during the late 1950s or early 1960s (DeLong 1982). The colony has increased steadily, since its discovery in 1968, except for severe declines in 1983 and 1998 associated with El Niño events in 1982-1983 and 1997-1998 (DeLong and Antonelis 1991, Melin *et al*. 2005). El Niño events impact population growth of northern fur seals at San Miguel Island and are an important regulatory mechanism for this population (DeLong and Antonelis 1991; Melin and DeLong 1994, 2000; Melin *et al*. 1996, 2005, 2008; Orr *et al*. 2012, ~~in review~~2016).



Figure 3. Estimated total production of northern fur seal pups counted at the Farallon Islands, California, 1970-2022.

Live pup counts increased about 24% annually from 1972 through 1982 (Fig. 2), partly due to immigration of females from the Bering Sea and the western North Pacific Ocean (DeLong 1982). The 1982-1983 El Niño event resulted in a 60% decline in the northern fur seal population at San Miguel Island (DeLong and Antonelis 1991). It took the population 7 years to recover from this decline, because adult female mortality or emigration occurred in addition to pup mortality (Melin and DeLong 1994). The 1992-1993 El Niño resulted in reduced pup production in 1992, but the population recovered in 1993 and increased during 1994 (Melin *et al*. 1996).

The northern fur seal population appears to be greatly affected by El Niño events. These events cause changes in marine communities by altering sea-level height, sea-surface temperature, thermocline and nutricline depths, current-flow patterns, and upwelling strength. Fur seal prey generally move to more productive areas farther north and deeper in the water column and, thereby, become less accessible for fur seals. Consequently, fur seals at San Miguel Island are in poor physical condition during El Niño events and the population experiences reduced reproductive success and high mortality of pups and, occasionally, adults. From July 1997 through May 1998, the most severe El Niño event in recorded history affected California coastal waters (Lynn *et al*. 1998). In 1997, total fur seal pup production was the highest recorded since the colony has been monitored. However, it appears that up to 87% of the pups born in 1997 died before weaning, and total production in 1998 declined 80% from 1997 (Melin *et al*. 2005). Total production

increased to a record high of ~~3,408~~ 4,491 in ~~2010~~ 2017 ~~and, except for a slight decrease during 2011, levels have remained around 3,350 individuals in subsequent years (Orr *et al*. in review)~~. Since then, the population has decreased, not due to acute responses of the North Pacific marine heat wave or the El Niño in 2015-2016, but rather a delayed response to these warm-water anomalies resulting in a decrease in recruitment and pup production after 2017. Additionally, recent pup production decreases may be attributed to increases in storm generated wave heights and frequency reaching northern fur seals on the rookery. Despite recent declines, pup production in ~~The total production of northern fur seals has exceeded the 1997 levels during three of the last four~~ years with complete counts still exceed the 1997 levels; therefore, the San Miguel Island population has recovered from the 1997-1998 El Niño event. Hookworm disease has decreased pup survival for the past 25 years and is also a major factor affecting the population dynamics of this species at its southernmost rookery (Lyons *et al*. 2001).

Compared to San Miguel Island, less information is known about the population of northern fur seals on the Farallon Islands. Based on tag-resight data, it appears that the population originated from emigrants from the Pribilof and San Miguel Islands. The first pup was observed on the Farallon Islands in 1996 (Pyle *et al*. 2001). After this discovery, annual ground surveys were conducted in early fall to document population trends of the colony (Tietz 2012). The colony increased steadily from 1996 to the early 2000s. However, the population has grown exponentially during the past several years, with an occasional decline (Tietz 2012). Because counts are conducted during the fall after the breeding season, population trends and demographic information are less clear than for San Miguel Island.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Currently, productivity rates for northern fur seals on the Farallon Islands are unknown. A growth rate of 20% was calculated for northern fur seals on San Miguel Island in 1972-1982 by linear regression of the natural logarithm of pup count against year. However, it is clear that this rate of increase was due in part to immigration of females from Russian and Pribilof Islands populations (DeLong 1982). Immigration was also occurring from the early 1980s to 1997. In the absence of a reliable estimate of the maximum net productivity rate for the California stock of northern fur seals, the pinniped default maximum theoretical net productivity rate (R_{MAX}) of 12% (Wade and Angliss 1997) is used as an estimate of R_{MAX}.

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

The potential biological removal (PBR) level for this stock is calculated as the minimum population estimate (~~7,524~~ 8,788) times one-half the default maximum net growth rate (½ of 12%) times a recovery factor of 1.0 (for stocks of unknown status that are increasing in size: Wade and Angliss 1997), resulting in a PBR of ~~451~~ 527 northern fur seals from the California stock per year.

HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Fisheries Information

Northern fur seals taken by commercial fisheries during the winter/spring along the west coast of the continental U.S. could be from either the Eastern Pacific or California stock; therefore, any mortality or serious injury of northern fur seals reported off the coasts of California, Oregon, or Washington during December through May ~~will be~~ is assigned to both the Eastern Pacific and California stocks of northern fur seals. ~~There were no observer reports of northern fur seal deaths or serious injuries in any observed fishery along the west coast of the continental U.S. in 2009-2013 (Carretta and Enriquez 2010, 2012a, 2012b; Jannot *et al*. 2011; Carretta *et al*. 2014a, 2015).~~ During 2018-2022 there were two deaths reported from trawl fisheries along the U.S. West Coast (Carretta *et al*. 2024). Jannot *et al*. (2022) report that two northern fur seals were observed killed or seriously injured in observed U.S. groundfish fisheries along the U.S. West Coast during the 18-year period from 2002-2019, with annual estimates of bycatch between zero and one animal per year. Updated bycatch estimates for U.S. West Coast groundfish fisheries are forthcoming. No northern fur seals have been observed entangled in the California large-mesh drift gillnet fishery for swordfish since observations began in 1990 (Carretta 2023).

Table 1. Summary of available information on the incidental mortality and serious injury of the California stock of northern fur seals in commercial fisheries that might take this species and calculation of the mean annual mortality and serious injury rate; n/a indicates that data are not available. Mean annual takes are based on ~~2009-2013~~2018-2022 data unless noted otherwise.

Fishery name	Years	Data type	Percent observer coverage	Observed mortality	Estimated mortality	Mean annual takes (CV in parentheses)
~~Unknown West Coast fisheries~~ Rockfish midwater trawl	~~2009-2013~~ 2018-2022	~~stranding data~~ observer	n/a	~~1, 0, 2, 1, 0~~ 0, 0, 0, 1, 0	n/a	~~≥0.8 (n/a)~~ ≥ 0.2

Unidentified trawl fishery	2018-2022	Stranding	n/a	0, 0, 0, 1, 0	n/a	≥ 0.2
Minimum total annual takes						~~≥0.8 (n/a)~~ ≥ 0.4

~~Strandings of northern fur seals entangled in fishing gear or with serious injuries caused by interactions with gear are another source of fishery-related mortality information. According to stranding records for California, Oregon, and Washington (Carretta *et al*. 2014b, 2015), four fishery-related deaths (in unidentified net and unknown trawl fisheries) were reported between 2009 and 2013 (Table 1), resulting in a mean annual mortality and serious injury rate of 0.8 California northern fur seals. This estimate is considered a minimum because not all stranded animals are found, reported, or examined for cause of death (via necropsy by trained personnel). Two of the fishery-related deaths (one in an unidentified fishing net in February 2009 and one in trawl gear in April 2011) were also assigned to the Eastern Pacific stock of northern fur seals. Two additional northern fur seal strandings in 2012 (one in May and one in July) with serious injuries due to fishery interactions were treated and released with non-serious injuries (Carretta *et al*. 2014b). Both of these animals were assigned to the California stock of northern fur seals and the animal that stranded in May 2012 was also assigned to the Eastern Pacific stock.~~

Other Mortality

~~Since the Eastern Pacific and California stocks of northern fur seals overlap off the west coast of the continental U.S. during December through May, non-fishery mortality and serious injury reported off the coasts of California, Oregon, or Washington during that time will be assigned to both stocks. Mortality and serious injury of northern fur seals may occur incidental to research fishery activities. In 2007 and 2008, four northern fur seals were incidentally killed in California waters during scientific sardine trawling operations conducted by NMFS (Carretta *et al*. 2013): one death in 2007 and one in 2008 occurred before NMFS scientists implemented a mitigation plan to avoid future mortality. The initial mitigation plan included use of 162-dB acoustic pingers, a marine mammal watch, and scheduling trawls to occur when the ship first arrived on station to avoid attracting animals to a stationary vessel. Two additional northern fur seals were killed in subsequent 2008 trawls, so a marine mammal excluder device was added to the trawls in 2009 and no northern fur seal deaths or serious injuries were observed in this research fishery in 2009-2013. However, one northern fur seal was killed in a scientific rockfish trawling operation conducted by NMFS (Carretta *et al*. 2014b) in California waters in May 2009. This death was assigned to both the California and Eastern Pacific stocks of northern fur seals. The mean annual research-related mortality and serious injury rate of California northern fur seals from 2009 to 2013 is 0.2 northern fur seals.~~

~~According to stranding~~ Stranding records for California, Oregon, and Washington (Carretta *et al*. ~~2014b, 2015~~2024)~~,~~ ~~four~~ include 5 non-fishery related injuries or deaths during 2018-2022. ~~human-caused northern fur seal deaths were reported from non-fisheries sources in 2009-2013. Three northern fur seals were entangled in marine debris~~ One seal was covered in oil and tar and was considered a serious injury due to its poor condition. Two dead seals showed evidence of blunt force trauma to their heads that was considered to be human-related. One seal died during research activities at a rookery. ~~in Oregon waters in April 2009 and one was entrained in the cooling water system of a California power plant in May 2012. All four of these deaths were assigned to both the California and Eastern Pacific stocks of northern fur seals.~~ The mean annual mortality and serious injury rate from non-fishery sources in ~~2009-2013~~ 2018-2022 includes 3 deaths, and 1 serious injury, or ~~is~~ 0.8 California northern fur seals annually. This estimate is considered a minimum because not all stranded animals are found, reported, or examined for cause of death (via necropsy by trained personnel).

STATUS OF STOCK

The California northern fur seal stock is not considered to be "depleted" under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) or listed as "threatened" or "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act. Based on currently available data, the minimum annual level of total human-caused mortality and serious injury (~~1.8~~ 1.2) does not exceed the PBR (~~451~~ 527). Therefore, the California stock of northern fur seals is not classified as a "strategic" stock. The minimum annual commercial fishery mortality and serious injury rate for this stock (~~0.8~~ 0.4) is not known to exceed 10% of the calculated PBR (~~45~~ 53) and, therefore, appears to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. The stock (based on San Miguel Island data) decreased 80% from 1997 to 1998 but is considered to have recovered from that event~~, began to recover in 1999, and currently has surpassed the 1997 level by 2%~~. The status of this stock relative to its Optimum Sustainable Population (OSP) is unknown, unlike the Eastern Pacific northern fur seal stock which is formally listed as "depleted" under the MMPA.

REFERENCES

Berger, R. W., R. W. Bradley, G. J. McChesney, J. R. Tietz, and M. S. Lowry. 2013 Comparison of aerial photographic and land-based surveys of northern fur seals on the South Farallon Islands in 2013. Unpublished report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Point Blue Contribution Number 1961. Point Blue Conservation Science,

Petaluma, California.

Bond, N. A., M. F. Cronin, H. Freeland, and N. Mantua. 2015. Causes and impacts of the 2014 warm anomaly in the NE Pacific. Geophys. Res. Lett. 42(9):3414-3420.

~~Carretta, J. V., and L. Enriquez. 2010. Marine mammal and sea turtle bycatch in the California/Oregon swordfish and thresher shark drift gillnet fishery in 2009. Southwest Fisheries Science Center Administrative Report LJ-10-03. 11 pp. Available from Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 8901 La Jolla Shores Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037.~~

~~Carretta, J. V., and L. Enriquez. 2012a. Marine mammal and seabird bycatch in California gillnet fisheries in 2010. Southwest Fisheries Science Center Administrative Report LJ-12-01. 14 pp. Available from Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 8901 La Jolla Shores Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037.~~

~~Carretta, J. V., and L. Enriquez. 2012b. Marine mammal and seabird bycatch in California gillnet fisheries in 2011. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-500. 14 pp.~~

~~Carretta, J. V., S. M. Wilkin, M. M. Muto, and K. Wilkinson. 2013. Sources of human-related injury and mortality for U.S. Pacific west coast marine mammal stock assessments, 2007-2011. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-514. 83 pp.~~

~~Carretta, J. V., L. Enriquez, and C. Villafana. 2014a. Marine mammal, sea turtle and seabird bycatch in California gillnet fisheries in 2012. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-500. 16 pp.~~

~~Carretta, J. V., S. M. Wilkin, M. M. Muto, K. Wilkinson, and J. Rusin. 2014b. Sources of human-related mortality for U.S. Pacific west coast marine mammal stock assessments: 2008-2012. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-533. 110 pp.~~

~~Carretta, J.V., M. M. Muto, S. Wilkin, J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, M. DeAngelis, J. Viezbicke, D. Lawson, J. Rusin, and J. Jannot. 2015. Sources of human-related injury and mortality for U.S. Pacific west coast marine mammal stock assessments, 2009-2013. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum, NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-548. 108 p.~~

Carretta, J.V. 2023. Estimates of marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in the California large-mesh drift gillnet fishery: 1990-2022. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-687. https://doi.org/10.25923/kp3k-r222

Carretta, J.V., J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, L. Saez, D. Lawson, and J. Viezbicke. 2024. Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2018-2022. Document PSRG-2024-11, presented to the Pacific Scientific Review Group, March 2024.

Cavole, L.M., Demko, A.M., Diner, R.E., Giddings, A., Koester, I., Pagniello, C.M., Paulsen, M.L., Ramirez-Valdez, A., Schwenck, S.M., Yen, N.K. and Zill, M.E. 2016. Biological impacts of the 2013–2015 warm-water anomaly in the Northeast Pacific: winners, losers, and the future. *Oceanography*, *29*(2), pp.273-285.

DeLong, R. L. 1982. Population biology of northern fur seals at San Miguel Island, California. Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Berkeley, CA. 185 pp.

DeLong, R. L., and G. A. Antonelis. 1991. Impacts of the 1982-1983 El Niño on the northern fur seal population at San Miguel Island, California. Pp. 75-83, *In*: Trillmich, F., and K. Ono (eds.), Pinnipeds and El Niño: Responses to Environmental Stress. Springer-Verlag, New York. 293 pp.

Dickerson B. R., R. R. Ream, S. N. Vignieri, and P. Bentzen. 2010. Population structure as revealed by mtDNA and microsatellites in northern fur seals, *Callorhinus ursinus*, throughout their range. PLoS ONE 5(5): e10671. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0010671.

Di Lorenzo, E. and N. Mantua. 2016. Multi-year persistence of the 2014/15 North Pacific marine heatwave. Nat. Clim. Change 6:1042-1047.

Dizon, A. E., C. Lockyer, W. F. Perrin, D. P. DeMaster, and J. Sisson. 1992. Rethinking the stock concept: a phylogeographic approach. Conserv. Biol. 6:24-36.

Fiscus, C. H. 1983. Fur seals and islands. *In:* Background papers submitted by the United States to the 26th meeting of the Standing Scientific Committee of the North Pacific Fur Seal Commission, Washington, D.C., March 28-April 5, 1983. Available from National Marine Mammal Laboratory, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115.

Gelatt, T., R. Ream, and D. Johnson. 2015. *Callorhinus ursinus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015:e.T3590A45224953. Available at: http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/3590/0

~~Jannot, J., E. Heery, M. A. Bellman, and J. Majewski. 2011. Estimated bycatch of marine mammals, seabirds, and sea turtles in the US west coast commercial groundfish fishery, 2002-2009. West Coast Groundfish Observer Program. Unpublished Report. 104 pp. Available at: http://www.nwfsc.noaa.gov/research/divisions/fram/observer/pdf/mmsbt_report02-09.pdf.~~

Jannot, J.E., K.A. Somers, V.J. Tuttle, J. Eibner, K.E. Richerson, J.T. McVeigh, J.V. Carretta, N.C. Young, and J. Freed. 2022. Marine Mammal Bycatch in U.S. West Coast Groundfish Fisheries, 2002–19. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NWFSC-176. https://doi.org/10.25923/h6gg-c316

Kajimura, H. 1984. Opportunistic feeding of the northern fur seal, *Callorhinus ursinus*, in the eastern North Pacific

Ocean and eastern Bering Sea. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Report NMFS-SSRF-779. 49 pp.
Lander, R. H. 1981. A life table and biomass estimate for Alaskan fur seals. Fisheries Research (Amsterdam) 1:55- 70.
Lea, M. A., D. Johnson, R. Ream, J. Sterling, S. Melin, and T. Gelatt. 2009. Extreme weather events influence dispersal of naïve northern fur seals. Biol. Lett. DOI: 10.1098/rsbl.2008.0643.
Lee, D. E., R. W. Berger, J. R. Tietz, P. Warzybok, R. W. Bradley, A. J. Orr, R. G. Towell, and J. Jahncke. 2018. Initial growth of northern fur seal (*Callorhinus ursinus*) colonies at the South Farallon, San Miguel, and Bogoslof Islands. J. Mammal. 99(6):1529-1538.
Lynn, R. J., T. Baumgartner, J. Garcia, C. A. Collins, T. L. Hayward, K. D. Hyrenbach, A. W. Mantyla, T. Murphree, A. Shankle, F. B. Schwing, K. M. Sakuma, and M. J. Tegner. 1998. The state of the California Current, 1997-1998: transition to El Niño conditions. CalCOFI Report 39:25-49.
Lyons, E. T., S. R. Melin, R. L. DeLong, A. J. Orr, F. M. Gulland, and S. C. Tolliver. 2001. Current prevalence of adult Uncinaria spp. in northern fur seal (*Callorhinus ursinus*) and California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*) pups on San Miguel Island, California, with notes on the biology of these hookworms. Vet. Parasitol. 97:309–318.
McClatchie, S., J. Field, A. R. Thompson, T. Gerrodetter, M. Lowry, P. C. Fiedler, W. Watson, K. M. Nieto, and R. D. Vetter. 2016. Food limitation of sea lion pups and the decline of forage off central and southern California. R. Soc. Open Sci. 3(3):150628.
Melin, S. R., and R. L. DeLong. 1994. Population monitoring of northern fur seals on San Miguel Island, California. Pp. 137-141, *In:* Sinclair, E. H. (ed.), Fur seal investigations, 1992. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-45. 190 pp.
Melin, S. R., and R. L. DeLong. 2000. Population monitoring studies of northern fur seals at San Miguel Island, California. Pp. 41-51, *In:* Robson, B. W. (ed.), Fur seal investigations, 1998. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-113. 101 pp.
Melin, S. R., R. L. DeLong, and J. R. Thomason. 1996. Population monitoring studies of northern fur seals at San Miguel Island, California. Pp. 87-102, *In:* Sinclair, E. H. (ed.), Fur seal investigations, 1994. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-69. 144 pp.
Melin, S. R., R. L. DeLong, and A. J. Orr. 2005. The status of the northern fur seal population at San Miguel Island, California, 2002-2003. Pp. 44-52, *In:* Testa, J. W. (ed.), Fur seal investigations, 2002-2003. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-151. 72 pp.
Melin, S. R., A. J. Orr, and R. L. DeLong. 2008. The status of the northern fur seal population at San Miguel Island, California, 2006 and 2007. Pp. 41-54, *In:* Testa, J. W. (ed.), Fur seal investigations, 2006-2007. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-188. 76 pp.
NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2007. Conservation plan for the Eastern Pacific stock of northern fur seal (*Callorhinus ursinus*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Juneau, AK. Available at: http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/protectedresources/seals/fur.htm
Orr, A. J., S. R. Melin, J. D. Harris, and R. L. DeLong. 2012. Status of the northern fur seal population at San Miguel Island, California during 2010 and 2011. Pp. 41-58, *In:* Testa, J. W. (ed.), Fur seal investigations, 2010-2011. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-241. 77 pp.
Orr, A. J., S. R. Melin, ~~J. D. Harris,~~ and R. L. DeLong. ~~In review~~2016. Status of the California stock of northern fur seals~~, population at San Miguel Island, California during~~ 2013-2014. Pp. ~~XX-XX~~51-76, *In:* Testa, J. W. (ed.), Fur seal investigations, 2013-2014. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-~~XXX~~316. ~~XX~~124 pp.
Pyle, P., D. J. Long, J. Schonewald, R. E. Jones, and J. Roletto. 2001. Historical and recent colonization of the South Farallon Islands, California, by northern fur seals (*Callorhinus ursinus*). Mar. Mammal Sci. 17:397- 402.
Ream, R. R. 2002. Molecular ecology of North Pacific otariids: genetic assessment of northern fur seal and Steller sea lion distributions. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, WA. 134 pp.
Roppel, A. Y. 1984. Management of northern fur seals on the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, 1786-1981. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Report NMFS-4. 32 pp.
Tietz, J. R. 2012. Pinniped surveys on West End Island, Farallon National Wildlife Refuge 2011. Unpublished report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. PRBO Contribution Number 1853. PRBO Conservation Science, Petaluma, California.
Towell, R. G., R. R. Ream, and A. E. York. 2006. Decline in northern fur seal (*Callorhinus ursinus*) pup production on the Pribilof Islands. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 22:486–491.
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 pp.
York, A. E. and J. R. Hartley. 1981. Pup production following harvest of northern fur seals. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 38(1):84-90.

Revised 09/30/2024

HAWAIIAN MONK SEAL (*Neomonachus schauinslandi*)

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Hawaiian monk seals are distributed throughout the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI), with subpopulations at French Frigate Shoals, Laysan Island, Lisianski Island, Pearl and Hermes Reef, Midway Atoll, Kure Atoll, and Necker and Nihoa Islands. They also occur throughout the main Hawaiian Islands (MHI). Genetic variation among monk seals is extremely low and may reflect a long-term history at low population levels and more recent human influences (Kretzmann *et al*. 1997, 2001, Schultz *et al*. 2009). Though monk seal subpopulations often exhibit asynchronous variation in demographic parameters (such as abundance trends and survival rates), they are connected by animal movement throughout the species' range (Johanos *et al*. 2013). Genetic analysis (Schultz *et al*. 2011) indicates the species is a single panmictic population. The Hawaiian monk seal is therefore considered a single stock. Scheel *et al*. (2014) established a new genus, *Neomonachus*, comprising the Caribbean and Hawaiian monk seals, based upon molecular and skull morphology evidence.

POPULATION SIZE

The best estimate of the total population size is ~~1,564~~ 1,605 (95% confidence interval ~~1,475~~ 1,512 – ~~1,719~~1,743; CV = 0.05), (Table 1, Johanos ~~2023a~~ 2024a, b, c). ~~In 2016, new approaches were developed to estimate Hawaiian monk seal abundance, both range-wide and at individual subpopulations (Baker *et al.* 2016, Harting *et al.* 2017).~~ Obtaining abundance estimates for all NWHI subpopulations requires sea-going vessel support for approximately 56 days. ~~In brief, m~~Methods for abundance estimation vary by site and year depending on the type and quantity of data available. Total enumeration is the favored method, but requires sufficient field presence to convincingly identify all the seals present, which is typically not achieved at most sites (Baker *et al*. 2006). When total enumeration is not possible, capture-recapture estimates (using Program CAPTURE) are conducted (Baker 2004; Otis *et al*. 1978, Rexstad & Burnham 1991, White *et al*. 1982). When no reliable estimator is obtainable in Program CAPTURE (i.e., the model selection criterion is < 0.75, following Otis *et al*. 1978), total non-pup abundance is estimated using pre-existing information on the relationship between proportion of the population identified and field effort hours expended (referred to as discovery curve analysis). At rarely visited sites (Necker, Nihoa, Ni'ihau and Lehua Islands) where data are insufficient to use any of the above methods, beach counts are corrected for the proportion of seals at sea. In the MHI other than Ni'ihau and Lehua Islands, abundance is estimated as the minimum tally of all individuals identified by an established sighting network during the calendar year. At all sites, pups are tallied. Finally, site-specific abundance estimates and their uncertainty are combined using Monte Carlo methods to obtain a range-wide abundance estimate distribution. All the above methods are described or referenced in Baker *et al*. (2016) and Harting *et al*. (2017). Note that because some of the abundance estimation methods utilize empirical distributions which are updated as new data accrue, previous years' estimates can change slightly when recalculated using these updated distributions.

In ~~2021~~2022, total enumeration was not achieved at any subpopulation. Consequently, capture-recapture estimates were obtained at ~~French Frigate Shoals, Laysan and~~ Lisianski Island~~s~~, ~~and at~~ Pearl and Hermes Reef, and Midway Atoll. Discovery curve analysis was used to generate abundance estimates at French Frigate Shoals, Laysan Island, ~~Midway~~ and Kure Atoll~~s~~ (Table 1). Counts at Necker and Nihoa Islands are typically conducted from zero to a few times per year. Pups are born over the course of many months and have very different haulout patterns compared to older animals. Therefore, pup production at Necker and Nihoa Islands is estimated as the mean of the total pups observed in the past 5 years, excluding counts occurring early in the pupping season when most have yet to be born.

In the MHI, NMFS collects information on seal sightings reported throughout the year by a variety of sources, including a volunteer network, the public, and directed NMFS observation effort. A small number of surveys of Ni'ihau and nearby Lehua Islands are conducted through a collaboration between NMFS, Ni'ihau residents and the US Navy. Total MHI monk seal abundance is estimated by adding the number of individually identifiable seals documented during a calendar year on all MHI other than Ni'ihau and Lehua to an estimate for these latter two islands based on counts expanded by a haulout correction factor. A telemetry study (Wilson *et al*., 2017) found that MHI monk seals (N=23) spent a greater proportion of time ashore than Harting *et al*. (2017) estimated for NWHI seals. Therefore, the total non-pup estimate for Ni'ihau and Lehua Islands was the total beach count at those sites (less individual seals already counted at other MHI) divided by the mean proportion of time hauled out in the MHI (Wilson *et al*., 2017). The total pups observed at Ni'ihau and Lehua Islands were added to obtain the total (Table 1).

Table 1. Total and minimum estimated abundance (N_{min}) of Hawaiian monk seals by location in ~~2021~~2022. The estimation method is indicated for each site. Methods used include DC: discovery curve analysis, EN: total enumeration; CR: capture-recapture; CC: counts corrected for the proportion of seals at sea; Min: minimum tally. Median values are presented. Note that the median range-wide abundance is not equal to the total of the individual sites' medians, because the median of sums may differ from the sum of medians for non-symmetrical distributions. N_{min} for individual sites are either the minimum number of individuals identified or the 20th percentile of the abundance distribution (the latter applies to Necker, Nihoa, Ni'ihau/Lehua, and range-wide).

	~~Total~~			~~Nmin~~			
~~Location~~	~~Non-pups~~	~~Pups~~	~~Total~~	~~Non-pups~~	~~Pups~~	~~Total~~	~~Method~~
~~French Frigate Shoals~~	~~196~~	~~45~~	~~241~~	~~178~~	~~45~~	~~223~~	~~CR~~
~~Laysan~~	~~195~~	~~37~~	~~232~~	~~190~~	~~37~~	~~227~~	~~CR~~
~~Lisianski~~	~~140~~	~~19~~	~~159~~	~~130~~	~~19~~	~~149~~	~~CR~~
~~Pearl & Hermes Reef~~	~~130~~	~~18~~	~~148~~	~~124~~	~~18~~	~~142~~	~~CR~~
~~Midway~~	~~78~~	~~17~~	~~95~~	~~75~~	~~17~~	~~92~~	~~DC~~
~~Kure~~	~~85~~	~~19~~	~~104~~	~~82~~	~~19~~	~~101~~	~~DC~~
~~Necker~~	~~93~~	~~11~~	~~104~~	~~77~~	~~11~~	~~88~~	~~CC~~
~~Nihoa~~	~~82~~	~~3~~	~~85~~	~~68~~	~~3~~	~~71~~	~~CC~~
~~MHI Kauai to Hawaii~~	~~184~~	~~23~~	~~207~~	~~184~~	~~23~~	~~207~~	~~Min~~
~~Ni'hau/Lehua~~	~~148~~	~~20~~	~~168~~	~~124~~	~~20~~	~~144~~	~~CC~~
~~Range-wide total~~	~~1352~~	~~212~~	~~1564~~	~~1232~~	~~212~~	~~1444~~	~~---~~
	Total			Nmin			
Location	Non-pups	Pups	Total	Non-pups	Pups	Total	Method
French Frigate Shoals	198	45	243	195	45	240	DC
Laysan	197	53	250	195	53	248	DC
Lisianski	143	19	162	138	19	157	CR
Pearl & Hermes Reef	126	27	153	116	27	143	CR
Midway	65	10	75	61	10	71	CR
Kure	89	23	112	89	23	112	DC
Necker	85	8	93	71	8	79	CC
Nihoa	75	2	77	63	2	65	CC

	~~Total~~			~~Nmin~~			
~~Location~~	~~Non-pups~~	~~Pups~~	~~Total~~	~~Non-pups~~	~~Pups~~	~~Total~~	~~Method~~
MHI Kauai to Hawaii	190	25	215	190	25	215	Min
Ni'ihau /Lehua	191	17	208	161	17	178	CC
Range-wide total	1376	229	1605	1279	229	1508	---

Minimum Population Estimate

The total numbers of seals identified at the NWHI subpopulations other than Necker and Nihoa, and in the MHI other than Ni'ihau and Lehua, are the best estimates of minimum population size at those sites. Minimum population sizes for Necker, Nihoa, Ni'ihau, and Lehua Islands are estimated as the lower 20th percentiles of the non-pup abundance distributions generated using haulout corrections as described above, plus the pup estimates. The minimum abundance estimates for each site and for all sites combined (~~1,444~~1,508) are presented in Table 1.

Current Population Trend

Range-wide abundance estimates are available from 2013 to ~~2021~~2022 (Table 1, Figure 1). While these estimates remain somewhat negatively-biased for reasons explained in Baker et al. (2016), they provided a ~~much more comprehensive~~robust and consistent assessment of status and trends ~~than has been previously available~~. A Monte Carlo approximation of the annual multiplicative rate of realized population growth during 2013-~~2021~~2022 was generated by fitting 10,000 log-linear regressions to randomly selected values from each year's abundance distributions. The median rate (and 95% confidence limits) is 1.02 (1.~~01~~02, 1.03). Thus, the best estimate is that the population grew at an average rate of about 2% per year from 2013 to ~~2021~~2022.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

Mean non-pup beach counts are used as a long-term index of abundance for years when data are insufficient to estimate total abundance as described above. Prior to 1999, beach count increases of up to 7% annually were observed at Pearl and Hermes Reef, and this is the highest estimate of the maximum net productivity rate (R_{max}) observed for this species (Johanos ~~2023a~~2024a). Consistent with this value, a life table analysis representing a time when the MHI monk seal population was apparently expanding, yielded an estimated intrinsic population growth rate of 1.07 (Baker *et al*. 2011).



Figure 1. Range-wide abundance of Hawaiian monk seals, 2013-~~2021~~2022. Medians and 95% confidence limits are shown. Estimates prior to ~~2021~~2022 are re-estimated based on new data and represent negligible changes compared with values reported in the previous final stock assessments. (Table 1).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Using current minimum population size (~~1,444~~1,508), R_{max} (0.07) and a recovery factor (F_r) for ESA endangered stocks (0.1), yields a Potential Biological Removal (PBR) of ~~5.1~~ 5.3.

HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Human-related mortality has caused two major declines of the Hawaiian monk seal (Ragen 1999). In the 1800s, this species was decimated by sealers, crews of wrecked vessels, and guano and feather hunters (Dill and Bryan 1912; Wetmore 1925; Bailey 1952; Clapp and Woodward 1972). Following a period of at least partial recovery in the first half of the 20th century (Rice 1960), most subpopulations again declined. This second decline has not been fully explained, but long-term trends at several sites appear to have been driven both by variable oceanic productivity (represented by the Pacific Decadal Oscillation) and by human disturbance (Baker *et al*. 2012, Ragen 1999, Kenyon 1972, Gerrodette and Gilmartin 1990). Currently, human activities in the NWHI are limited and human disturbance is relatively rare, but human-seal interactions~~, have become~~are an important issue in the MHI. Intentional killing of seals in the MHI is an ongoing and serious concern (Table 2). In ~~2021~~2022, ~~three seals were bludgeoned or shot to death, all on Molokai~~no intentional seal killings were documented.

Table 2. Intentional and potentially intentional killings of MHI monk seals, and anthropogenic mortalities not associated with fishing gear during ~~2017~~2018-~~2021~~2022 (Johanos ~~2022d~~2024d, Mercer ~~2022~~2024a,b). There were no confirmed cases in ~~2016,~~ 2019,~~, nor~~ 2020, nor 2022.

Year	Age/sex	Island	Cause of Death	Comments
~~2017~~	~~Adult female~~	~~Kauai~~	~~Trauma~~	~~Suspect intentional~~
~~2017~~	~~Juvenile female~~	~~Molokai~~	~~Blunt force trauma~~	~~Suspect intentional~~
2018	Juvenile female	Molokai	Blunt force trauma	Intentional
2021	Subadult male	Molokai	Blunt force trauma	Intentional
2021	Subadult male	Molokai	Blunt force trauma	Intentional
2021	Juvenile female	Molokai	Gunshot	Intentional

Harting et al. (2021) found that ~~the~~ 46% of carcasses of monk seals which died in the MHI during 2004-2019 were detected. Consequently, the cases in Table 2 must be considered a minimum representation of intentional killings.

Fishery Information

Fishery interactions with monk seals can include direct interaction with gear (hooking or entanglement), seal consumption of discarded or depredated catch, and competition for prey. Entanglement of monk seals in derelict fishing gear, which is believed to originate outside the Hawaiian archipelago, is described in a separate section. Fishery interactions are a serious concern in the MHI, especially involving nearshore fisheries managed by the State of Hawaii (Gobush et al. 2016). There are no fisheries operating in or near the NWHI. In ~~2021~~2022, ~~29~~ 22 seal hookings were documented, ~~two~~ one of which ~~were~~ was classified as serious, and ~~27~~ 21 as non-serious, injuries. Of the non-serious injuries, ~~two~~ eight would have been deemed serious had they not been mitigated (~~Henderson 2019a,~~ Mercer ~~2023~~2024a,b). ~~–~~Monk seals also interact with nearshore gillnets, and several confirmed deaths have resulted. In ~~2021~~2022, ~~two sea~~one seal's death was attributed to peracute underwater entrapment (drowning most likely due to net entanglement, Moore et al. 2013)~~ls became entangled in gillnets and were released alive, and were consequently classified as non-serious injuries. One adult seal was discovered swimming inside a mariculture pen and was displaced outside the pen through an existing hole.~~ No mortality or injuries have been attributed to the MHI bottomfish handline fishery, and no interactions with longline fisheries have occurred since 1991. Consequently, these fisheries are not ~~longer~~ included in Table 3. Published studies on monk seal prey selection based upon scat/spew analysis and video from seal-mounted cameras revealed evidence that monk seals fed on families of bottomfish which contain commercial species (many prey items recovered from scats and spews were identified only to the level of family; Goodman-Lowe 1998, Longenecker *et al*. 2006, Parrish *et al*. 2000). Quantitative fatty acid signature analysis (QFASA) results support previous studies illustrating that monk seals consume a wide range of species (Iverson *et al*. 2011). However, deepwater-slope species, including two commercially targeted bottomfishes and other species not caught in the fishery, were estimated to comprise a large portion of the diet for some individuals. Similar species were estimated to be consumed by seals regardless of location, age or gender, but the relative importance of each species varied. Diets differed considerably between individual seals. These results highlight the need to better understand potential ecological interactions with the MHI bottomfish handline fishery.

Table 3. Summary of mortality, serious and non-serious injury of Hawaiian monk seals due to fisheries and calculation of annual mortality rate. n/a indicates that sufficient data are not available Total non-serious injuries are presented as well as, in parentheses, the number of those injuries that would have been deemed serious had they not been mitigated (e.g., by de-hooking or disentangling). Nearshore fisheries injuries and mortalities include seals entangled/drowned in nearshore gillnets and hooked/entangled in hook-and-line gear, recognizing that it is not possible to determine whether the nets or hook-and-line gear involved were being used for commercial purposes.

Fishery Name	Year	Data Type	% Obs. Coverage	Observed/Reported Mortality/Serious Injury	Estimated Mortality/ Serious Injury	Non-serious (Mitigated serious)	Mean Takes (CV)
Nearshore	~~2017~~ 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022	Incidental observations of seals	None	~~3~~ 0 3 4 2 2	n/a	~~19(6)~~ 11(3) 17(5) 29(4) 30(4) 21(8)	≥ ~~2.4~~2.2
Mariculture	~~2017~~ 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022	Incidental Observation	None	~~1~~ 0 0 0 0 0	n/a	~~0~~ 0 0 0 1 0	~~0.2 (2.2)~~0(0)
Minimum total annual takes							≥ ~~2.6~~2.2

Fishery Mortality Rate

Total fishery mortality and serious injury is not considered to be insignificant and approaching a rate of zero.

Monk seals are regularly hooked and entangled in the MHI and the resulting deaths have substantially reduced the population growth rate (Harting et al. 2021). Monk seals also die from entanglement in fishing gear and other debris throughout their range (likely originating from various sources outside of Hawaii~~),~~). ~~and~~ NMFS ~~along with~~and partner ~~agencies~~ ~~is actively~~are working to mitigate entanglement (see below).

Entanglement in Marine Debris

Hawaiian monk seals become entangled in fishing and other marine debris at rates higher than reported for other pinnipeds (Henderson 2001). Several hundred cases of debris entanglement have been documented in monk seals (nearly all in the NWHI), including ten documented deaths (Henderson 2001; ~~Henderson 2019b~~Johanos 2024d, Mercer ~~2023~~2024a,b). The number of marine debris entanglements documented in the past five years (Table 4) is an underestimate of the total impact of this threat because no people are present to document nor mitigate entanglements at most of the NWHI for the majority of the year. Moreover, seals that become entangled at sea and are unable to return to shore are very unlikely to be detected. The low number of entanglements documented in 2020 is due to limited or no surveillance conducted at NWHI subpopulations due to the COVID pandemic. The fishing gear fouling the reefs and beaches of the NWHI and entangling monk seals only rarely includes types used in Hawaii fisheries. For example, trawl net and monofilament gillnet accounted for approximately 35% and 34%, respectively, of the debris removed from reefs in the NWHI by weight, and trawl net alone accounted for 88% of the debris by frequency (Donohue *et al*. 2001), despite the fact that trawl fisheries have been prohibited in Hawaii since the 1980s.

Table 4. Summary of documented marine debris entanglements of Hawaiian monk seals during the most recent five years. Total non-serious injuries are presented as well as, in parentheses, the number of those injuries that would have been deemed serious had the seals not been disentangled.

Year	Observed/Reported Mortality/Serious Injury	Non-serious (Mitigated serious)
~~2017~~	~~0~~	~~15(8)~~
2018	1	15(6)
2019	0	16(10)
2020	0	5(1)
2021	0	11(6)
2022	1	9(5)
Minimum total annual takes	≥ ~~0.2~~0.4	

The NMFS and partner ~~agencies~~s continue to mitigate impacts of marine debris on monk seals as well as turtles, coral reefs and other wildlife. Marine debris is removed from beaches and seals are disentangled during population assessment activities in the NWHI. Since 1996, annual debris survey and removal efforts in the NWHI coral reef habitat have been ongoing (Donohue *et al*. 2000, Donohue *et al*. 2001, Dameron *et al*. 2007).

Toxoplasmosis

Land-to-sea transfer of *Toxoplasma gondii,* a protozoal parasite shed in the feces of cats, is of growing concern. Although the parasite can infect many species, felids are the definitive host, meaning it can only reproduce in cats. There are no native felids in Hawaii, but several hundred thousand feral and domestic cats occur throughout the MHI. As such, all monk seal deaths attributable to toxoplasmosis are considered human caused. A case definition for toxoplasmosis and other protozoal-related mortalities was developed and retrospectively applied to 306 cases of monk seal mortality from 1982-2015 (Barbieri et al. 2016). During the past five years (2018~~2017-2021~~2022) seven monk seal deaths (representing a minimum average of 1.4 deaths per year) have been directly attributed to toxoplasmosis (Mercer 2024a~~2021~~). Five of the seven deaths involved female seals. The number of deaths from this pathogen are likely underrepresented, given that more seals disappear each year than are found dead and examined (Harting et al. 2021), and the potential for chronic infections remains poorly understood in this species. Furthermore, *T. gondii* can be transmitted vertically from dam to fetus, and failed pregnancies are difficult to detect in wild, free-ranging animals. Unlike threats such as hook ingestion or malnutrition, which can often be mitigated through rehabilitation, options for treating seals with toxoplasmosis are challenging and two attempts have not been successful. The accumulating number of monk seal deaths from toxoplasmosis in recent years is a growing concern given the increasing geographic overlap between humans, cats, and Hawaiian monk seals in the MHI.

Other Mortality

Sources of mortality that impede recovery include food limitation (see Habitat Issues), single and multiple-

male intra-species aggression (mobbing), shark predation, and disease. Male seal aggression has caused episodes of mortality and injury. Past interventions to remove aggressive males greatly mitigated, but have not eliminated, this source of mortality (Johanos *et al*. 2010). Galapagos shark predation on monk seal pups has been a chronic and significant source of mortality at French Frigate Shoals since the late 1990s, despite mitigation efforts by NMFS (Gobush 2010). Besides toxoplasmosis, infectious disease effects on monk seal demographic trends are low relative to other stressors. However, a disease outbreak could be catastrophic to the immunologically naïve monk seal population. Key disease threats include West Nile virus, morbillivirus and influenza. NMFS is vaccinating wild seals with the aim of reducing the impact of potential morbillivirus outbreaks.

STATUS OF STOCK

In 1976, the Hawaiian monk seal was designated depleted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 and as endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (NMFS 2007). Therefore, the Hawaiian monk seal is a strategic stock. The species is well below its optimum sustainable population and has not recovered from past declines. Annual human-caused mortality and serious injury for the most recent 5-year period (2018 ~~2017~~-2022 ~~2021~~) was ~~at least~~greater than ~~5.4~~ 4.8 animals, including fishery-related mortality in nearshore gillnets, hook-and-line gear, and mariculture (≥ ~~2.6~~2.2/yr, Table 3), intentional killings and other human-caused mortalities (≥ ~~1.2~~ 0.8/yr, Table 2), entanglement in marine debris (≥ ~~0.2~~0.4/yr, Table 4), and deaths due to toxoplasmosis (≥ 1.4/yr). The minimum rate of annual human-caused mortality and serious injury ~~exceeds~~ was slightly below PBR (~~5.1~~ 5.3).

OTHER FACTORS THAT MAY BE CAUSING A DECLINE OR IMPEDING RECOVERY

Poor juvenile survival rates and variability in the relationship between weaning size and survival suggest that prey availability has limited recovery of NWHI monk seals (Baker and Thompson 2007, Baker *et al*. 2007, Baker 2008). Multiple strategies for improving juvenile survival, including translocation and ~~captive care~~rehabilitation are being implemented (Baker and Littnan 2008, Baker *et al*. 2013, Norris 2013). A testament to the effectiveness of past actions to improve survival, Harting *et al.* (2014) demonstrated that approximately one-third of the monk seal population alive in 2012 was made up of seals that either had been intervened with to mitigate life-threatening situations, or were descendants of such seals. In 2014, NMFS produced a final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) on current and future anticipated research and enhancement activities and issued a permit covering the activities described in the PEIS preferred alternative. Loss of terrestrial habitat at French Frigate Shoals is a serious threat to the viability of the resident monk seal population (Baker et al. 2020). Prior to 2018, pupping and resting islets had shrunk or virtually disappeared (Antonelis *et al*. 2006). In 2018, the two remaining primary islands where pups were born at French Frigate Shoals (Trig and East Islands) were obliterated due to progressive erosion and hurricane *Walaka* (in September 2018). Projected increases in global average sea level are expected to further significantly reduce terrestrial habitat for monk seals in the NWHI (Baker *et al*. 2006, Reynolds *et al*. 2012).

The seawall at Tern Island, French Frigate Shoals, continues to degrade and poses an ~~increasing~~ entrapment hazard for monk seals and other fauna. The situation has worsened ~~since~~ after 2012, when the USFWS ceased operations on Tern Island, thus leaving the island unmanned for most of the year. Previously, daily surveys were conducted throughout the year to remove entrapped animals. Now this only occurs when NMFS staff are on site. Furthermore, sea wall breaches are allowing sections of the island to erode and undermine buildings and other infrastructure. Several large water tanks have collapsed, exposing pipes and wiring that may entangle or entrap seals. In September 2018, hurricane *Walaka* exacerbated this situation by largely destroying remaining structures and strewing the resulting debris around the island. Strategies to mitigate these threats are currently under consideration. In 2020, the Papahānaumokuākea Marine Debris Project (PMDP), a non-profit organization, conducted an extensive cleanup operation at Tern Island, removing over 80,000 lb of debris and cutting multiple gaps in the seawall to provide escape routes for seals.

Goodman-Lowe (1998) provided information on prey selection using hard parts in scats and spewings. Information on at-sea movement and diving is available for seals at all six main subpopulations in the NWHI using satellite telemetry (Stewart *et al*. 2006). Cahoon (2011) and Cahoon *et al*. (2013) described diet and foraging behavior of MHI monk seals, and found no striking difference in prey selection between the NWHI and MHI.

Monk seal juvenile survival rates are favorable in the MHI (Baker *et al*. 2011). Further, the excellent condition of pups weaned on these islands suggests that there are ample prey resources available, perhaps in part due to fishing pressure that has reduced monk seal competition with large fish predators (sharks and jacks) (Baker and Johanos 2004). Yet, there are many challenges that may limit the potential for growth in this region. The human population in the MHI is approximately 1.4 million compared to fewer than 100 in the NWHI, such that anthropogenic threats in the MHI are considerable. Intentional killing of seals is a very serious concern. Also, the same fishing

pressure that may have reduced the monk seal's competitors is a source of injury and mortality. Vessel traffic in the populated islands entails risk of collision with seals and impacts from oil spills. A mortality in 2015 was deemed most likely due to boat strike. Finally, as noted above, toxoplasmosis is now recognized as a serious anthropogenic threat to seals in the MHI.

REFERENCES

Antonelis, G.A., J.D. Baker, T.C. Johanos, R.C. Braun, and A.L. Harting. 2006. Hawaiian monk seal (*Monachus schauinslandi*): Status and Conservation Issues.Atoll Res. Bull. 543:75-101.

Bailey, A.M. 1952. The Hawaiian monk seal. Museum Pictorial, Denver Museum of Natural History 7:1-32.

Baker, J.D. 2004. Evaluation of closed capture-recapture methods to estimate abundance of Hawaiian monk seals, *Monachus schauinslandi*. Ecol. Appl. 14:987-998.

Baker J.D. 2008. Variation in the relationship between offspring size and survival provides insight into causes of mortality in Hawaiian monk seals. Endangered Species Research 5:55-64.

Baker J.D., A.L. Harting, and C.L. Littnan. 2013. A two-stage translocation strategy for improving juvenile survival of Hawaiian monk seals. Endang. Species Res. 21:33–44.

Baker, J.D., A.L. Harting, and T.C. Johanos. 2006. Use of discovery curves to assess abundance of Hawaiian monk seals. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 22:847-861.

Baker J.D., A.L. Harting, T.C. Johanos, and C.L. Littnan. 2016. Estimating Hawaiian monk seal range-wide abundance and associated uncertainty. Endang. Species Res. 31:317-324.

Baker JD, Harting AL, Johanos TC, London JM, Barbieri MM, Littnan CL. 2020. Terrestrial habitat loss and the long-term viability of the French Frigate Shoals Hawaiian monk seal subpopulation. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS- PIFSC-107, 34 p. doi:10.25923/76vx-ve75.

Baker J.D., A. L. Harting, T.A. Wurth, and T.C, Johanos. 2011. Dramatic shifts in Hawaiian monk seal distribution predicted from divergent regional trends. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 27: 78–93.

Baker, J.D. and T.C. Johanos. 2004. Abundance of Hawaiian monk seals in the main Hawaiian Islands. Biol. Conserv. 116:103-110.

Baker J.D., and Littnan C.L. 2008. Report of the Hawaiian Monk Seal Captive Care Workshop, Honolulu, Hawaii, June 11–13, 2007. Pacific Islands Fish. Sci. Cent., Natl. Mar. Fish. Serv., NOAA, Honolulu, HI 96822-2396. Pacific Islands Fish. Sci. Cent. Admin. Rep. H-08-02, 42 p.

Baker J.D., E.A. Howell, and J.J. Polovina. 2012. Relative influence of climate variability and direct anthropogenic impact on a sub-tropical Pacific top predator, the Hawaiian monk seal. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 469:175-189.

Baker J.D., C.L. Littnan, and D.W. Johnston. 2006. Potential effects of sea-level rise on the terrestrial habitats of endangered and endemic megafauna in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Endang. Species Res. 4:1-10.

Baker, J.D., J.J. Polovina, and E.A. Howell. 2007. Effect of variable oceanic productivity on the survival of an upper trophic predator, the Hawaiian monk seal, Monachus schauinslandi. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 346:277-283.

Baker J.D. and P.M. Thompson. 2007. Temporal and spatial variation in age-specific survival rates of a long-lived mammal, the Hawaiian monk seal. Proc. Roy. Soc. B 274:407-415.

Barbieri, M.M., L. Kashinsky, D.S. Rotstein, K.M. Colegrove, K.H. Haman, S.L. Magargal, A.R. Sweeny, A.C. Kaufman, M.E. Grigg, and C.L. Littnan. 2016. Protozoal-related mortalities in endangered Hawaiian monk seals Neomonachus schauinslandi. Dis. Aquat. Organisms 121:85-95.

Cahoon, M.K. 2011. The foraging ecology of monk seals in the main Hawaiian Islands. MSc thesis, University of Hawaii, 172 p.

Cahoon M.K., C.L. Littnan, K. Longenecker, and J.R. Carpenter. 2013. Dietary comparison of two Hawaiian monk seal populations: the role of diet as a driver of divergent population trends. Endang. Species Res. 20:137-146.

Clapp, R.B., and P.W. Woodward. 1972. The natural history of Kure Atoll, Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, Atoll Res. Bull. 164:303-304.

Dameron OJ., M. Park, M. Albins, and R. Brainard. 2007. Marine debris accumulation in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands: An examination of rates and processes. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 54(4): 423-433.

Dill, H.R., and W.A. Bryan. 1912. Report on an expedition to Laysan Island in 1911. U.S. Dept. of Agric. Surv. Bull. 42:1-30.

Donohue, M.J., R. Brainard, M. Parke, and D. Foley. 2000. Mitigation of environmental impacts of derelict fishing gear through debris removal and environmental monitoring. *In* Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, Proceedings of the International Marine Debris Conference on Derelict Fishing Gear and the Ocean Environment, 6-11 August 2000, Honolulu, Hawaii. p. 383-402.

Donohue, M.J., R.C. Boland, C.M. Sramek, and G.A. Antonelis. 2001. Derelict fishing gear in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands: diving surveys and debris removal in 1999 confirm threat to coral reef ecosystems. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 42:1301-1312.

Gerrodette, T.M., and W.G. Gilmartin. 1990. Demographic consequences of changed pupping and hauling sites of the Hawaiian monk seal. Conserv. Biol. 4:423-430.

Gobush, K.S. 2010. Shark predation on Hawaiian monk seals: Workshop II & post-workshop developments, November 5-6, 2008. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo., NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFSC-21, 43 p. + Appendices.

Gobush, K.S., Wurth, T.A., Henderson, J. R., Becker, B. L., and C.L. Littnan. 2016. Prevalence of interactions between Hawaiian monk seals (*Nemonachus schauinslandi*) and nearshore fisheries in the main Hawaiian Islands. Pac. Conserv. Biol. 23:25-31.

Goodman-Lowe, G.D. 1998. Diet of the Hawaiian monk seal (*Monachus schauinslandi*) from the northwestern Hawaiian islands during 1991 to 1994. Mar. Biol. 132:535-546.

Harting AL, Baker JD, Johanos TC. 2017. Estimating population size for Hawaiian monk seals using haulout data. J. Wildl. Manage. 81:1202-9.

Harting AL, Barbieri MM, Baker JD, Mercer TA, Johanos TC, Robinson SJ, Littnan CL, Colegrove KM, Rotstein DS. 2021. Population-level impacts of natural and anthropogenic causes-of-death for Hawaiian monk seals in the main Hawaiian Islands. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 37:235–250.

Harting A.L., T.C. Johanos, and C.L. Littnan. 2014. Benefits derived from opportunistic survival-enhancing interventions for the Hawaiian monk seal: the silver BB paradigm. Endang. Spec. Res. 25: 89-96.

Henderson, J.R. 1990. Recent entanglements of Hawaiian monk seals in marine debris. In R. S. Shomura and M. L. Godfrey (eds.), Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Marine Debris, April 2-7, 1989, Honolulu, Hawaii, p. 540-553. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA, Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-154.

Henderson, J.R. 2001. A Pre and Post MARPOL Annex V Summary of Hawaiian Monk Seal Entanglements and Marine Debris Accumulation in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, 1982-1998. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 42:584-589.

Henderson, J.R. 2019a. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal fisheries interaction data collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1976-2018. US National Oceanographic Data Center.

Henderson, J.R. 2019b. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal entanglement data collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1974-2018. US National Oceanographic Data Center.

Iverson, S., J. Piché, and W. Blanchard. 2011. Hawaiian monk seals and their prey: assessing characteristics of prey species fatty acid signatures and consequences for estimating monk seal diets using Quantitative Fatty Acid Signature Analysis. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo., NOAA-TM-NMFS-PIFSC-23, 114 p. + Appendices.

Johanos, T.C. 2024a. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal survey data collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1981-2022. US National Oceanographic Data Center, https://www.fisheries.nmfs.noaa.gov/inport/item/5676.

Johanos, T.C. 2024b. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal master identification records (annual) collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1981-2022. US National Oceanographic Data Center, https://www.fisheries.nmfs.noaa.gov/inport/item/12939.

Johanos, T.C. 2024c. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal master identification records (seal) collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1981-2022. US National Oceanographic Data Center, https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/inport/item/5677.

Johanos, T.C. 2024d. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal survival factors collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1977-2022. US National Oceanographic Data Center, https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/inport/item/5679. ~~Johanos, T.C. 2023a. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal survey data collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1981-2021. US National Oceanographic Data Center.~~

~~Johanos, T.C. 2023b. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal master identification records (annual) collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1981-2021. US National Oceanographic Data Center.~~

~~Johanos, T.C. 2023c. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal master identification records (seal) collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1981-2021. US National Oceanographic Data Center.~~

~~Johanos, T.C. 2023d. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal survival factors collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1977-2021. US National Oceanographic Data Center.~~

Johanos, T.C. and J.D. Baker (editors). 2001. The Hawaiian monk seal in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands, 1999.

U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-310, 130 p.
Johanos T.C., B.L. Becker, J.D. Baker, T.C. Ragen, W.G. Gilmartin, and T. Gerrodette. 2010. Impacts of sex ratio reduction on male aggression in the critically endangered Hawaiian monk seal *Monachus schauinslandi.* Endang. Species Res. 11:123–132.
Johanos, T.C., A.L. Harting, T.A. Wurth, and J.D. Baker. 2013. Range-wide movement patterns of Hawaiian monk seals. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 30:1165-1174.
Kenyon, K.W. 1972. Man versus the monk seal. J. Mammal. 53:687-696.
Kretzmann, M.B., W.G. Gilmartin, A. Meyer, G.P. Zegers, S.R. Fain, B.F. Taylor, and D.P. Costa. 1997. Low genetic variability in the Hawaiian monk seal. Conserv. Biol. 11:482-490.
Kretzmann, M.B., N.J. Gemmell, and A. Meyer. 2001. Microsatellite analysis of population structure in the endangered Hawaiian monk seal. Conserv. Biol. 15:457-466.
Mercer, T.A. 2024a. Summary of documented human-caused mortality, serious injury and non-serious injury in Hawaiian monk seals: supporting documentation for the 2024 Stock Assessment Report.
Mercer, T.A. 2024b. Hawaiian Monk Seal Research Program Hawaiian monk seal fisheries interaction data collected in the Hawaiian Archipelago, 1976-2022. US National Oceanographic Data Center, https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/inport/item/5687.
~~Mercer, T.A. 2023. Summary of documented human-caused mortality, serious injury and non-serious injury in Hawaiian monk seals: supporting documentation for the 2023 Stock Assessment Report.~~
Moore M.J., J. van der Hoop, S.G. Barco, A.M. Costidis, et al. 2013. Criteria and case definitions for serious injury and death of pinnipeds and cetaceans caused by anthropogenic trauma. Dis. Aquat. Org. 103:229-264. https://doi.org/10.3354/dao02566.
National Marine Fisheries Service. 2007. Recovery Plan for the Hawaiian Monk Seal (Monachus schauinslandi). Second Revision. National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD. 165 pp.
Norris, T.A. 2013. Foraging behavior, habitat, health, and survival of resident and translocated Hawaiian monk seals at Nihoa Island, Hawaii. Msc thesis, San Jose State University, 121 p.
Otis, D.L., K.P. Burnham, G.C. White, and D.R. Anderson. 1978. Statistical inference from capture data on closed animal populations. Wildl. Monogr. 62:1-135.
Parrish, F.A., M.P. Craig, T.J. Ragen, G.J. Marshall, and B.M. Buhleier. 2000. Identifying diurnal foraging habitat of endangered Hawaiian monk seals using a seal-mounted video camera. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 16:392-412.
Ragen, T.J. 1993. Status of the Hawaiian monk seal in 1992. Admin. Rep. H-93-05. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, 2570 Dole St., Honolulu, HI 96822-2396. 79 pp.
Ragen, T.J. 1999. Human activities affecting the population trends of the Hawaiian monk seal. Pages 183-194 *in* J.A. Musick, ed. Life in the slow lane: Ecology and conservation of long-lived marine animals. American Fisheries Society Symposium 23, American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD.
Reynolds, M.H., P. Berkowitz, K.N. Courtot, and C.M. Krause, eds. 2012. Predicting sea-level rise vulnerability of terrestrial habitat and wildlife of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2012–1182, 139 p.
Rexstad, E.A., and K.P. Burnham. 1991. User's manual for interactive Program CAPTURE. Colorado Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. 29 pp.
Rice, D.W. 1960. Population dynamics of the Hawaiian monk seal. J. Mammal. 41:376-385.
Scheel, D.M., G.J. Slater, S.O. Kolokotronis, C.W. Potter, D.S. Rotstein, K. Tsangaras, A.D. Greenwood, and K.M. Helgen. 2014. Biogeography and taxonomy of extinct and endangered monk seals illuminated by ancient DNA and skull morphology. ZooKeys 409:1-33.
Schultz J.K., Baker J.D., Toonen R.J., Bowen B.W. 2009. Extremely low genetic diversity in the endangered Hawaiian monk seal (*Monachus schauinslandi*). J. Heredity 100:25-33.
Schultz J.K., J.D. Baker, R.J. Toonen, A.L. Harting, and B.W. Bowen. 2011. Range-wide genetic connectivity of the Hawaiian monk seal and implications for translocation. Conserv. Biol. 25:124-132.
Stewart B.S., G.A. Antonelis, J.D. Baker, and P.Y. Yochem. 2006. Foraging biogeography of the Hawaiian monk seal in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Atoll Res Bull 543:131-145.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. U. S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-12. 93 pp.
Wade, P.R. 1998. Calculating limits to the allowable human-caused mortality of cetaceans and pinnipeds. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 14:1-37.
Wetmore, A. 1925. Bird life among lava rock and coral sand. The Natl. Geograp. Mag. 48:77-108.
White, G.C., D.R. Anderson, K.P. Burnham, and L. Otis. 1982. Capture-recapture and removal methods for sampling

closed populations. Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico.
Wilson K, Littnan C, Read AJ. 2017. Movements and home ranges of monk seals in the main Hawaiian Islands. Marine Mammal Science. 33:1080-96.

Revised 09/30/2024

KILLER WHALE (*Orcinus orca*): Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Killer whales occur in all oceans and seas (Leatherwood and Dahlheim 1978). Although they occur in tropical and offshore waters, killer whales prefer the colder waters of both hemispheres, with greatest abundances found within 800 km of major continents (Forney and Wade 2006). Along the west coast of North America, killer whales occur along the entire Alaskan coast (Braham and Dahlheim 1982), in British Columbia and Washington inland waterways (Bigg *et al.* 1990), and along the outer coasts of Washington, Oregon and California. Seasonal and year-round occurrence is documented for killer whales throughout Alaska (Braham and Dahlheim 1982) and in the intracoastal waterways of British Columbia and Washington, where three ecotypes have been recognized: 'resident', 'transient' and 'offshore' (Bigg *et al.* 1990, Ford *et al.* 1994), based on aspects of morphology, ecology, genetics and behavior (Ford and Fisher 1982; Baird and Stacey 1988; Baird *et al.* 1992, Hoelzel *et al.* 1998, Morin *et al.* 2010, Ford *et al.* 2014). Genetic studies of killer whales globally suggest that residents and transient ecotypes warrant subspecies recognition (Morin *et al.* 2010) and each are currently listed as unnamed subspecies of *Orcinus orca* (Committee on Taxonomy 2018).



Figure 1. Approximate April - October distribution of the Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident killer whale stock (shaded area) and range of sightings (diagonal lines).

The range of Southern Resident killer whales is described in the biological report for the Revision of the Critical Habitat Designation for Southern Resident Killer Whales (NMFS 2021a, 2021b): "The three pods of the Southern Resident DPS, identified as J, K, and L pods, reside for part of the year in the inland waterways of Washington State and British Columbia known as the Salish Sea (Strait of Georgia, Strait of Juan de Fuca, and Puget Sound), principally during the late spring, summer, and fall (Ford *et al*. 2000, Krahn *et al*. 2004). The whales also occur in outer coastal waters, primarily in winter, off Washington and Vancouver Island, especially in the area between Grays Harbor and the Columbia River, and off Westport, WA (Ford *et al*. 2000, Hanson *et al*. 2017), but have been documented as far south as central California and as far north as ~~the~~ Southeast Alaska. Although less is known about the whales' movements in outer coastal waters, satellite tagging, opportunistic sighting, and acoustic recording data suggest that Southern Residents spend nearly all of their time on the continental shelf, within 34 km (21.1 mi) of shore in water less than 200 m (656.2 ft) deep (Hanson *et al*. 2017)." Details of their winter range from satellite-tagging reveal whales use the entire Salish Sea (northern end of the Strait of Georgia and Puget Sound) in addition to coastal waters from the central west coast of Vancouver Island, British Columbia to Pt. Reyes in northern California. Animals from J pod were documented moving between the northern Strait of Georgia and the western entrance of the Strait of Juan de Fuca, with limited movement into coastal waters. In contrast, K and L pod movements were characterized by a coastal distribution from the western entrance to the Strait of Juan de Fuca to Pt. Reyes California (Hanson *et al*. 2017). Of the three pods comprising this stock, one (J) is commonly sighted in inshore waters in winter, while the other two (K and L) apparently spend more time offshore (Ford *et al.* 2000). Krahn *et al*. (2009) described sample pollutant ratios from K and L pod whales that were consistent with a hypothesis of time spent foraging in California waters, which is consistent with sightings of K and L pods as far south as Monterey Bay. In June 2007, whales from L-pod were sighted off Chatham Strait, Alaska, the farthest north they have ever been documented (J. Ford, pers. comm.). Southern Resident killer whale attendance in their core summer habitat in the Salish Sea appears to be declining, with occurrence well-below average since 2017 (Center for Whale Research 2019) and shifting later in more recent years (Ettinger *et al*. 2022). Passive autonomous acoustic recorders have provided more information on the seasonal occurrence of these pods along the west coast of the U.S.

(Hanson *et al.* 2013). In addition, satellite-linked tags were deployed in winter months on members of J, K, and L pods. Results were consistent with previous data, but provided much greater detail, showing wide-ranging use of inland waters by J pod whales and extensive movements in U.S. coastal waters by K and L pods.

Based on data regarding association patterns, acoustics, movements, genetic differences, and potential fishery interactions, eight killer whale stocks are recognized within the Pacific U.S. EEZ: 1) the Eastern North Pacific Alaska Resident stock - occurring from Southeast Alaska to the Bering Sea, 2) the Eastern North Pacific Northern Resident stock - occurring from British Columbia through Alaska, 3) the Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident stock - occurring mainly within the inland waters of Washington State and southern British Columbia but extending from central California into southern Southeast Alaska (see Fig. 1), 4) the West Coast Transient stock - occurring from Alaska through California, 5) the Gulf of Alaska, Aleutian Islands, and Bering Sea Transient stock - occurring from southeast Alaska to the Bering Sea, 6) the AT1 Stock – found only in Prince William Sound, 7) the Eastern North Pacific Offshore stock - occurring from Southeast Alaska through California, 8) the Hawaiian stock. The Stock Assessment Reports for the Alaska Region contain information concerning the Eastern North Pacific Alaska Resident, Eastern North Pacific Northern Resident and the Gulf of Alaska, Aleutian Islands, and Bering Sea, AT1, and Eastern North Pacific Transient stocks.

POPULATION SIZE

The Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident stock is a trans-boundary stock including killer whales in inland Washington and southern British Columbia waters. In 1993, the three pods comprising this stock totaled 96 killer whales (Ford *et al.* 1994). The population increased to 99 whales in 1995, then declined to 79 whales in 2001, and most recently numbered ~~73~~ 75 whales in ~~2022~~ 2023 (Fig. 2; Ford *et al.* 2000; Center for Whale Research ~~2022~~ 2023). The most recent census spanning 1 July ~~2021~~ 2022 through 1 July ~~2022~~ 2023 includes two new calves (~~J59, K45~~L126, L127) and no deaths. ~~, and the death of three adult males (K21, K44, and L89). No other births or mortalities have been documented since completion of the census~~ Since completion of the census, one additional calf was born (J60), but subsequently went missing, and one adult male is presumed dead (K34).

Minimum Population Estimate

The abundance estimate for this stock of killer whales is a direct count of individually identifiable animals. It is thought that the entire population is censused every year. This estimate therefore serves as both a best estimate of abundance and a minimum estimate of abundance. Thus, the minimum population estimate (N_{min}) for the Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident stock of killer whales is ~~73~~ 75 animals.



Figure 2. Population of Eastern North Pacific Southern Resident stock of killer whales, 1974- ~~2022~~ 2023. Each year's count includes animals first seen and first missed; a whale is considered first missed the year after it was last seen alive (Ford *et al.* 2000; Center for Whale Research ~~2022~~ 2023).

Current Population Trend

During the live-capture fishery that existed from 1967 to 1973, it is estimated that 47 killer whales, mostly immature, were taken out of this stock (Ford *et al.* 1994). Since the first complete census of this stock in 1974 when 71 animals were identified, the number of southern resident killer whales has fluctuated. Between 1974 and the mid-1990s, the Southern Resident stock increased approximately 35% (Ford *et al.* 1994), representing a net annual growth rate of 1.8% during those years. Following the peak census count of 99 animals in 1995, the population size has declined approximately 1% annually and currently stands at ~~73~~ 75 animals as of the ~~2022~~ 2023 census (Ford *et al.* 2000; Center for Whale Research ~~2022~~ 2023). Recent population models, based on an analysis of the entire SRKW genome, suggest that inbreeding depression is limiting population growth, and predicts further decline if the population remains genetically isolated and typical environmental conditions continue (Kardos *et al.* ~~in press~~2023).

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

A reliable estimate of the maximum net productivity rate is currently unavailable for this stock of killer whales. Matkin *et al.* (2014) estimated a maximum population annual growth rate of 1.035 for ~~southern~~ Alaska resident killer whales. The authors noted that the 3.5% annual rate estimated for ~~southern~~ Alaska residents is higher than previously measured rates for British Columbia northern residents (2.9%, Olesiuk *et al.* 1990) and "probably represents a population at r-max (maximum rate of growth)." In the absence of published estimates of R_{max} for Southern Resident killer whales, the maximum annual rate of 3.5% found for Alaska residents is used for this stock of Southern Resident killer whales. This reflects more information about the known life history of resident killer whales than the default R_{max} of 4% and results in a more conservative estimate of potential biological removal (PBR).

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

The potential biological removal (PBR) level for this stock is calculated as the minimum population size (~~73~~ 75) times one-half the maximum net growth rate for *Alaska* resident killer whales (½ of 3.5%) times a recovery factor of 0.1 (for an endangered stock, Wade and Angliss 1997), resulting in a PBR of 0.13 whales per year, or approximately 1 animal every 7 years.

HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

Fisheries Information

The only known case of southern resident killer whale mortality due to fisheries is an adult male, L8, who became entangled in gillnet fishing gear and drowned in 1977 (Center for Whale Research 2015). The entanglement occurred near southeastern Vancouver Island (Ford *et al*. 1998), and upon necropsy two pounds of recreational fishing lures and lines were found in the stomach. It was noted that some of the fishing gear found did not appear to be used locally at the time and the ingestion of the gear did not cause the death of the animal. Salmon drift gillnet fisheries in Washington inland waters were last observed in 1993 and 1994 and no killer whale entanglements were documented, though observer coverage levels were less than 10% (Erstad *et al.* 1996, Pierce *et al.* 1994, Pierce *et al.* 1996, NWIFC 1995). Fishing effort in the inland waters drift gillnet fishery has declined considerably since 1994 because far fewer vessels participate today. Past marine mammal entanglements in this fishery included harbor porpoise, Dall's porpoise, and harbor seals. Coastal marine tribal set gillnets also occur along the outer Washington coast and no killer whale interactions have been reported in this fishery since the inception of the observer program in 1988, though the fishery is not active every year (Gearin *et al.* 1994, Gearin *et al.* 2000, Makah Fisheries Management). No fishery-related mortality from gillnet fisheries in California waters was documented between ~~2017-2021~~ 2018-2022 (Carretta ~~2022~~ 2023, Carretta *et al*. ~~2023~~ 2024).

An additional source of information on killer whale mortality and injury incidental to commercial fishery operations is the self-reported fisheries information required of vessel operators by the MMPA. No self-report records of killer whale mortality have been reported.

In 2015, J39, a young male southern resident killer whale, was found near False Bay, WA, with a recreational salmon flasher dangling from its mouth (Center for Whale Research, 2015). The whale was seen five days later without the gear attached and appeared energetic. The whale was monitored over the following weeks and there was no evidence of injury or behavioral changes (Center for Whale Research, 2015).

Due to a lack of observer programs, there are few data concerning the mortality of marine mammals incidental to Canadian commercial fisheries. Since 1990, there have been no reported fishery-related strandings of killer whales in Canadian waters. However, in 1994 one killer whale was reported to have contacted a salmon gillnet but did not entangle (Guenther *et al.* 1995). In 2014 a northern resident killer whale became entangled in a gillnet, was released from the net, but died the next winter (Fisheries and Oceans Canada 2018). Data regarding the level of killer whale mortality related to commercial fisheries in Canadian waters are not available.

The known total fishery mortality and serious injury for the southern resident stock of killer whales is zero, but undetected mortality and serious injury may occur.

Other Mortality

In 2012, a moderately decomposed juvenile female southern resident killer whale (L-112) was found dead near Long Beach, WA. A full necropsy was performed and the cause of death was determined to be blunt force trauma to the head, however the source of the trauma (vessel strike, intraspecific aggression, or other unknown source) could not be established (NOAA 2014). There was documentation of a whale-boat collision in Haro Strait in 2005 which resulted in a minor injury to a whale. In 2006, whale L98 was killed during a vessel interaction. It is important to note that L98 had become habituated to regularly interacting with vessels during its isolation in Nootka Sound. In spring 2016, a young adult male, L95, was found to have died of a fungal infection related to a satellite tag deployment approximately 5 weeks prior to its death. The expert panel reviewing the stranding noted that "the tag loss, tag petal retention with biofilm formation or direct pathogen implantation, and development of a fungal infection at the tag site

contributed to the illness, stranding, and death of this whale." (NMFS 2016). In fall 2016 another young adult male, J34, was found dead in the northern Georgia Strait. The necropsy indicated that "the animal had injuries consistent with blunt trauma to the dorsal side, and a hematoma indicating that it was alive at the time of injury and would have survived the initial trauma for a period of time prior to death" (Fisheries and Oceans Canada 2019). The injuries are consistent with those incurred during a vessel strike. A recent summary of killer whale strandings in the northeastern Pacific Ocean and Hawaii noted the occurrence of human interactions across all age classes (Raverty *et al*. 2020).

STATUS OF STOCK

Total documented annual fishery mortality and serious injury for this stock from ~~2017-2021~~ 2018-2022 (zero) is not known to exceed 10% of the calculated PBR (0.13). Given the low PBR level, a single undetected / undocumented fishery mortality or serious injury would exceed 10% of the PBR, thus it is unknown if fishery mortality and serious injury is approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. The documented annual level of human-caused mortality and serious injury for the most-recent 5-year period of ~~2017-2021~~ 2018-2022 is zero. Southern Resident killer whales were formally listed as "endangered" under the ESA in 2005 and consequently the stock is automatically considered as a "strategic" stock under the MMPA. This stock was considered "depleted" (68 FR 31980, May 29, 2003) prior to its 2005 listing under the ESA (70 FR 69903, November 18, 2005).

OTHER FACTORS THAT MAY BE CAUSING A DECLINE OR IMPEDING RECOVERY

A population viability analysis identified several risk factors to this population, including limitation of preferred Chinook salmon prey, anthropogenic noise and disturbance resulting in decreased foraging efficiency, and high levels of contaminants, including PCBs and DDT (Ebre 2002, Clark *et al.* 2009, Krahn *et al.* 2007, 2009, Lacy *et al.* 2017). The summer range of this population, the inland waters of Washington and British Columbia, are home to a large commercial whale watch industry, and high levels of recreational boating and commercial shipping. Potential for acoustic masking effects on the whales' communication and foraging due to vessel traffic remains a concern (Erbe 2002, Clark *et al.* 2009, Lacy *et al.* 2017, Holt *et al*. 2021a, b). In 2011, federal vessel approach regulations were implemented to restrict vessels from approaching closer than ~~200m~~ 200 yards and parking in the path of the whales within 400 yards. Current state regulations in Washington restrict vessel approaches to 300 yards to the side or 400 yards in the path or behind, and will be expanded to 1000 yards in 2025. Annual interim orders in British Columbia have prohibited vessels from approaching killer whales within 400 m since 2019 and have established several interim sanctuary zones that prohibit vessel traffic altogether in key foraging areas.

A genetic study of the diet of Southern Resident killer whales from fecal remains collected during 2006-2011 noted that salmonids accounted for >98.6% of genetic sequences (Ford *et* al. 2016). Of six salmonid species documented, Chinook salmon accounted for 79.5% of the sequences, followed by coho salmon (15%). Chinook salmon dominate the diet in early summer, with coho salmon averaging >40% of the diet in late summer. Sockeye salmon were also found to be occasionally important (>18% in some samples). Non-salmonids were rarely observed. These results are consistent with those obtained from surface prey remains, and confirm the importance of Chinook salmon in this population's diet. These authors also noted the absence of pink salmon in the fecal samples. Prior studies note the prevalence of Chinook salmon in the killer whale diet, despite the relatively low abundance of this species in the region, supporting the thesis that southern resident killer whales are Chinook salmon specialists (Ford and Ellis 2006, Hanson *et al.* 2010). Recent studies of diet in other seasons and regions of their range indicate that although Chinook represent a major component of their diet almost year-round, other species also make potentially important contributions, likely when Chinook salmon are less available (Hanson *et al*. 2021). There is evidence that reduced abundance of Chinook salmon has negatively affected this population via reduced fecundity (Ayres *et al*. 2012, Ford *et al.* 2009, Ward *et al.* 2009, Wasser *et al.* 2017). Studies on body condition and sizes of Southern Resident killer whales using aerial photogrammetry (Fearnbach *et al*. 2011, ~~Fearnbach *et al.*~~ 2018, 2020; Stewart *et al*. 2021) reflect hypotheses between Chinook salmon abundance and killer whale body condition and overall body size. In some cases (J pod), Chinook salmon abundance was found to have the greatest predictive power on Southern Resident body condition, while this relationship was absent for K pod (Stewart *et al*. 2021). In other studies (Fearnbach *et al*. 2011), authors suggest that nutritional stress is linked to a longer term decrease in body size in the population. In addition, the high trophic level and longevity of the population has predisposed them to accumulate high levels of contaminants that potentially impact health (Krahn *et al.* 2007, 2009). In particular, there is evidence of high levels of flame retardants in young animals (Krahn *et al.* 2007, 2009). High DDT/PCB ratios have been found in Southern Resident killer whales, especially in K and L pods (Krahn *et al.* 2007, NMFS ~~2019b~~ 2021b), which spend more time in California waters where DDTs still persist in the marine ecosystem (Sericano *et al*. 2014).

REFERENCES

Angliss, R. P., and K. L. Lodge. 2002. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2002. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-133. 224 pp.

Ayres K.L., Booth R.K., Hempelmann J.A., Koski K.L., Emmons C.K., Baird R.W., et al. 2012. Distinguishing the Impacts of Inadequate Prey and Vessel Traffic on an Endangered Killer Whale (Orcinus orca) Population. PLoS ONE 7(6): e36842.

Baird, R. W., and P. J. Stacey. 1988. Variation in saddle patch pigmentation in populations of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) from British Columbia, Alaska, and Washington State. Canadian Journal of Zoology 66:2582-2585.

Baird, R. W., P. A. Abrams, and L. M. Dill. 1992. Possible indirect interactions between transient and resident killer whales: implications for the evolution of foraging specializations in the genus *Orcinus*. Oecologia 89:125-132.

Barlow, J. and K.A. Forney. 2007. Abundance and population density of cetaceans in the California Current ecosystem. Fishery Bulletin 105:509-526.

Bigg, M. A., P. F. Olesiuk, G. M. Ellis, J. K. B. Ford, and K. C. Balcomb III. 1990. Social organization and genealogy of resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the coastal waters of British Columbia and Washington State. Pp. 386-406, *In:* Hammond, P. S., S. A. Mizroch, and G. P. Donovan (eds.), Individual Recognition of Cetaceans: Use of Photo-identification and Other Techniques to Estimate Population Parameters. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. Special Issue 12.

Braham, H. W., and M. E. Dahlheim. 1982. Killer whales in Alaska documented in the Platforms of Opportunity Program. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 32:643-646.

Brault, S., and H. Caswell. 1993. Pod-specific demography of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*). Ecology 74(5):1444-1454.

~~Carretta, J.V., J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, L. Saez, D. Lawson, and J. Viezbicke. 2023. Sources of Human-Related Injury and Mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2017-2021. Document PSRG-2023-xx, presented to the Pacific Scientific Review Group, March 2023.~~

Carretta, J.V. 2023. Estimates of marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in the California large-mesh drift gillnet fishery: 1990-2022. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-687. https://doi.org/10.25923/kp3k-r222

~~Carretta, J.V. 2022. Estimates of marine mammal, sea turtle, and seabird bycatch in the California large-mesh drift gillnet fishery: 1990-2021. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-671. https://doi.org/10.25923/kh19-sk22~~

Carretta, J.V., J. Greenman, K. Wilkinson, L. Saez, D. Lawson, and J. Viezbicke. 2024. Sources of human-related injury and mortality for U.S. Pacific West Coast Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2018-2022. Document PSRG-2024-11 presented to the Pacific Scientific Review Group, March 2024.

Center for Whale Research 2015.

Center for Whale Research ~~2022~~ 2023. https://www.whaleresearch.com/orca-population

Clark, C.W., Ellison, W.T., Southall, B.L., Hatch, L., Van Parijs, S.M., Frankel, A. and Ponirakis, D., 2009. Acoustic masking in marine ecosystems: intuitions, analysis, and implication. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 395, pp.201-222.

Clarke, J.T., C.L. Christman, A.A. Brower, and M.C. Ferguson. 2013. Distribution and Relative Abundance of Marine Mammals in the Northeastern Chukchi and Western Beaufort Seas, 2012. Annual Report, OCS Study BOEM 2013-00117. National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, NMFS, NOAA, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, F/AKC3, Seattle, WA 98115-6349.

Dahlheim, M. E., D.K. Ellifrit, and J.D. Swenson. 1997. Killer whales of Southeast Alaska: a catalogue of photoidentified individuals. National Marine Mammal Laboratory, AFSC, NMFS, NOAA, 7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115. 79 pp.

Erbe, C., 2002. Underwater noise of whale-watching boats and potential effects on killer whales (*Orcinus orca*), based on an acoustic impact model. Marine Mammal Science, 18(2), pp.394-418.

Erstad, P., S.J. Jeffries, and D.J. Pierce. 1996. 1994 Report for the Puget Sound fishery observer program in management areas 10/11 & 12/12B: nontreaty chum gill net fishery. Final Report, Washington Dept. Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA. 14 pp.

Ettinger AK, Harvey CJ, Emmons C, Hanson MB, Ward EJ, Olson J.K., Samhouri J.F. (2022) Shifting phenology of an endangered apex predator mirrors changes in its favored prey. Endang. Species Res. 48:211-223. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr01192

Fearnbach H., Durban J.W., Ellifrit D.K., Balcomb K.C. III. 2011. Size and long-term growth trends of Endangered fish-eating killer whales. Endang Species Res 13:173-180. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00330

Fearnbach, H., Durban, J.W., Ellifrit, D.K. and Balcomb, K.C., 2018. Using aerial photogrammetry to detect changes in body condition of endangered southern resident killer whales. *Endangered Species Research*, *35*, pp.175-180.

Fearnbach, H., J.W. Durban, L.G. Barrett-Lennard, D.K. Ellifrit, K.C. Balcomb III. Evaluating the power of photogrammetry for monitoring killer whale body condition. 2020. Marine Mammal Science, Vol. 36(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/mms.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 2018. Recovery Strategy for the Northern and Southern Resident Killer Whales (Orcinus orca) in Canada. Species at Risk Act Recovery Strategy Series, Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Ottawa, x + 84 pp.

Fisheries and Oceans Canada. 2019. Necropsy results: Southern Resident Killer Whale J34.

Ford, J.K.B. Pacific Biological Station, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Nanaimo, BC V9R 5K6.

Ford, J.K.B., and H. D. Fisher. 1982. Killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) dialects as an indicator of stocks in British Columbia. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. 32:671-679.

Ford, J.K.B., G. M. Ellis, and K. C. Balcomb. 1994. Killer Whales: The Natural History and Genealogy of *Orcinus orca* in British Columbia and Washington State. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver, BC, and University of Washington Press, Seattle. 102 pp.

Ford, J.K., Ellis, G.M., Barrett-Lennard, L.G., Morton, A.B., Palm, R.S. and Balcomb III, K.C., 1998. Dietary specialization in two sympatric populations of killer whales (Orcinus orca) in coastal British Columbia and adjacent waters. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 76(8), pp.1456-1471.

Ford, J.K.B., G. M. Ellis, and K. C. Balcomb. 2000. Killer Whales: The Natural History and Genealogy of *Orcinus orca* in British Columbia and Washington. 2nd edition. University of British Columbia Press, Vancouver, BC, and University of Washington Press, Seattle. 104 pp.

Ford, J.K.B., and G.M. Ellis. 2006. Selective foraging by fish-eating killer whales *Orcinus orca* in British Columbia. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 316:185–199.

Ford, J.K.B., G.M. Ellis, P.F. Olesiuk, and K.C. Balcomb. 2009. Linking killer whale survival and prey abundance: food limitation in the oceans' apex predator? Biol. Lett. published online before print September 15, 2009.

Ford, J.K.B., Stredulinsky, E.H., Ellis, G.M., Durban, J.W., Pilkington, J.F., 2014. Offshore Killer Whales in Canadian Pacific Waters: Distribution, Seasonality, Foraging Ecology, Population Status and Potential for Recovery. DFO Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2014/088. p. vii + 55.

Ford M.J., J. Hempelmann, M.B. Hanson, K.L. Ayres, R.W. Baird, C.K. Emmons, J.I. Lundin, G.S. Schorr, S.K. Wasser, L.K. Park. 2016. Estimation of a Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*) Population's Diet Using Sequencing Analysis of DNA from Feces. PLoS ONE 11(1): e0144956.

Forney, K.A. and P. Wade. 2006. Worldwide distribution and abundance of killer whales. Pages 145-162 In: "Whales, whaling and ocean ecosystems", J.A. Estes, R.L. Brownell, Jr., D.P DeMaster, D.F. Doak, and T.M. Williams (eds), University of California Press. 418p.

Gearin, P. J., S.R. Melin, R.L. DeLong, H. Kajimura, and M. A. Johnson. 1994. Harbor porpoise interactions with a chinook salmon set-net fishery in Washington State. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. Special Issue 15:427-438.

Gearin, P. J., M.E. Gosho, J. L. Laake, L. Cooke, R.L. DeLong, and K.M. Hughes. 2000. Experimental testing of acoustic alarms (pingers) to reduce bycatch of harbour porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena*, in the state of Washington. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. 2(1):1-9.

George, J.C., L.M. Philo, K. Hazard, D. Withrow, G.M. Carroll and R. Suydam. 1994. Frequency of killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) attacks and ship collisions based on scarring on bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) of the Bering-Chukchi-Beaufort seas stock. *Arctic* 47(3): 246-255.

Guenther, T. J., R.W. Baird, R.L. Bates, P.M. Willis, R.L. Hahn, and S.G. Wischniowski. 1995. Strandings and fishing gear entanglements of cetaceans on the west coast of Canada in 1994. Paper SC/47/O6 presented to the International Whaling Commission, May 1995 (unpublished). 7 pp.

Hanson, M.B., R.W. Baird, J.K.B. Ford, J. Hempelmann-Halos, D. M.Van Doornik, J.R. Candy, C. K. Emmons, G. S. Schorr, B. Gisborne, K. L. Ayres, S. K. Wasser, K. C. Balcomb, K. Balcomb-Bartok, J. G. Sneva, and M. J. Ford. 2010. Species and stock identification of prey consumed by endangered "southern resident" killer whales in their summer range. Endangered Species Research 11:69–82.

Hanson, M.B., C.K. Emmons, E.J. Ward, J.A. Nystuen, and M.O. Lammers. 2013. Assessing the coastal occurrence of endangered killer whales using autonomous passive acoustic recorders. J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 134 (5): 3486–3495.

Hanson, M.B., E.J. Ward, C.K. Emmons, M.M. Holt and D.M. Holzer. 2017. Assessing the movements and occurrence of Southern Resident Killer Whales relative to the U.S. Navy's Northwest Training Range Complex in the Pacific Northwest. Prepared for: U.S. Navy, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI. Prepared by: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Northwest Fisheries Science Center under MIPR N00070-15-MP-4C363. 30 June 2017. 23 pp.

Hanson, M.B., C.K. Emmons, M.J. Ford, M. Everett, K. Parsons, L.K. Park, J. Hempelmann, D.M.Van Doornik, G.S. Schorr, J.K. Jacobsen, M.F. Sears, M.S. Sears, J.G. Sneva, R.W. Baird, L. Barre. 2021. Endangered predators and endangered prey: Seasonal diet of Southern Resident killer whales. PLoS ONE 16(3): e0247031.

Hoelzel, A.R. 1991. Analysis of regional mitochondrial DNA variation in the killer whale; implications for cetacean conservation. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. Special Issue 13:225-233.

Hoelzel, A.R., and G. A. Dover. 1991. Genetic differentiation between sympatric killer whale populations. Heredity 66:191-195.

Hoelzel, A. R., M. E. Dahlheim, and S. J. Stern. 1998. Low genetic variation among killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the Eastern North Pacific, and genetic differentiation between foraging specialists. J. Heredity 89:121-128.

Holt, M.M., Tennessen, J.B., Hanson, M.B., Emmons, C.K., Giles, D.A., Hogan, J.T., and Ford, M.J. 2021a. Vessels and their sounds reduce prey capture effort by endangered killer whales (Orcinus orca). Marine Environmental Research, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2021.105429.

Holt, M.M., Tennessen, J.B., Ward, E.J., Hanson, M.B., Emmons, C.K., Giles, D.A., and Hogan, J.T. 2021b. Effects of vessel distance and sex on the behavior of endangered killer whales. Frontiers in Marine Science, 7, 1211.

Kardos, M., Y. Zhang, K.M. Parsons, Y. A, H. Kang, X. Xu, X. Liu, C.O. Matkin, P. Zhang, E. J. Ward, M.B. Hanson, C. Emmons, M.J. Ford, G. Fan, S. Li. 2023~~In press~~. Inbreeding depression explains killer whale population dynamics. Natu. Ecol. Evol. 7, 675–686 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-023-01995-0

Krahn, M.M., M.J. Ford, W.F. Perrin, P.R. Wade, R.P. Angliss, M.B. Hanson, B.L. Taylor, G. Ylitalo, M.E. Dahlheim, J.E. Stein, and R.S. Waples. 2004. 2004 Status review of Southern Resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) under the Endangered Species Act. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo NMFS-NWFSC-62. 73 pp.

Krahn, M.M., M.B. Hanson, R.W. Baird, R.H. Boyer, D.G. Burrows, C.K. Emmons, J. K.B. Ford, L. L. Jones, D. P. Noren, P. S. Ross, G. S. Schorr, T.K. Collier. 2007. Persistent organic pollutants and stable isotopes in biopsy samples (2004/2006) from Southern Resident killer whales. Mar. Poll. Bull. 54 (2007) 1903–1911.

Krahn, M.M, M.B. Hanson, G.S. Schorr, C.K. Emmons, D.G. Burrows, J.L. Bolton, R.W. Baird, G.M. Ylitalo. 2009. Effects of age, sex and reproductive status on persistent organic pollutant concentrations in "Southern Resident" killer whales. Marine Pollution Bulletin 58: 1522–1529.

Lacy, R.C., Williams, R., Ashe, E., Balcomb III, K.C., Brent, L.J., Clark, C.W., Croft, D.P., Giles, D.A., MacDuffee, M. and Paquet, P.C., 2017. Evaluating anthropogenic threats to endangered killer whales to inform effective recovery plans. *Scientific reports*, *7*(1), pp.1-12.

Leatherwood, J. S., and M. E. Dahlheim. 1978. Worldwide distribution of pilot whales and killer whales. Naval Ocean Systems Center, Tech. Rep. 443:1-39.

Leatherwood, S., C.O. Matkin, J.D. Hall, and G.M. Ellis. 1990. Killer whales, *Orcinus orca*, photo-identified in Prince William Sound, Alaska 1976 to 1987. Can. Field Nat. 104:362-371.

Lowry, L.F., R.R. Nelson, and K.J. Frost. 1987. Observations of killer whales, Orcinus orca, in western Alaska: Sightings, strandings, and predation on other marine mammals. The Canadian Field Naturalist 101:6-12.

Matkin, C., G. Ellis, E. Saulitis, L. Barrett-Lennard, and D. Matkin. 1999. Killer Whales of Southern Alaska. North Gulf Oceanic Society. 96 pp.

Matkin, C.O., Ward Testa, J., Ellis, G. M. and Saulitis, E. L. 2014. Life history and population dynamics of southern Alaska resident killer whales (Orcinus orca). Marine Mammal Science, 30: 460–479.

Mitchell, E. D. 1975. Report on the meeting on small cetaceans, Montreal, April 1-11, 1974. J. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. 32:914-916.

Morin P. A., F. I. Archer, A. D. Foote, J. Vilstrup, E. E. Allen, P. R. Wade, J. W. Durban, K. M. Parsons, R. Pitman, L. Li, P. Bouffard, S. C. Abel Nielsen, M. Rasmussen, E. Willerslev, M. T. P. Gilbert, T. Harkins. 2010. Complete mitochondrial genome phylogeographic analysis of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) indicates multiple species. Genome Research, 20:908-916.

NOAA. 2014. Wild animal mortality investigation: Southern Resident Killer Whale L-112 final report.

NMFS. 2021a. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision of Critical Habitat for the Southern Resident Killer Whale Distinct Population Segment. Final Rule. 86 FR 41668.

NMFS. 2021b. Revision of the Critical Habitat Designation for Southern Resident Killer Whales Final Biological Report (to accompany the Final Rule). 112 pp + Appendices.

NMFS. 2016. Southern Resident Killer Whale (Orcinus orca) Stranding Event Expert Review Summary, September 21, 2016. Available at: https://archive.fisheries.noaa.gov/wcr/publications/protected_species/marine_mammals/killer_whales/l95_expert_panel.pdf

Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (NWIFC). 1995. Monitoring of marbled murrelet and marine mammal interactions with 1994 tribal gillnet fisheries in northern Puget Sound, Hood Canal, and the Strait of Juan de

Fuca. Final Report to NMFS, Contract No. 52ABNF400087, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Unpubl. report. 41 pp. Available at NWIFC, 6730 Martin Way E, Olympia, WA 98516.

Olesiuk, P.F., M.A. Bigg, and G.M. Ellis. 1990. Life history and population dynamics of resident killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the coastal waters of British Columbia and Washington State. Rep. Int. Whal. Commn. Special Issue 12:209-242.

Pierce, D. J., W. P. Ritchie, and R. Kreuziger. 1994. Preliminary findings of seabird interactions with the non-treaty salmon gill net fishery: Puget Sound and Hood Canal Washington. Unpubl. report. Washington Dept. Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA. 39 pp. Available at WDFW, 600 Capitol Way N, Olympia, WA 98501.

Pierce, D. J., M. Alexandersdottir, S.J. Jeffries, P. Erstad, W. Beattie, and A. Chapman. 1996. Interactions of marbled murrelets and marine mammals with the 1994 Puget Sound sockeye gill net fishery. Final Report, Washington Dept. Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, WA. 21 pp.

Raverty S, St. Leger J, Noren DP, Burek Huntington K, Rotstein DS, Gulland, FMD, Ford, JKB, Hanson, MB, Lambourn, DM, Huggins, J, Delaney, MA, Spaven, L, Rowles, T, Barre, L, Cottrell, P, Ellis, G, Goldstein, T, Terio K, Duffield, D, Rice, J, Gaydos, JK. 2020. Pathology findings and correlation with body condition index in stranded killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the northeastern Pacific and Hawaii from 2004 to 2013. PLOS ONE 15(12): e0242505. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0242505

Reeves, R.R., W.F. Perrin, B.L. Taylor, C.S. Baker, and S.L. Mesnick. 2004. Report of the workshop on shortcomings of cetacean taxonomy in relation to needs of conservation and management, April 30 – May 2, 2004, La Jolla, California. U.S. Department of Commerce NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-363. 94pp. Available from Southwest Fisheries Science Center, 8604 La Jolla Shores Drive, La Jolla, CA. 92037.

Sericano, J.L., T.L. Wade, S.T. Sweet, J. Ramirez and G.G. Lauenstein. 2014. Temporal trends and spatial distribution of DDT in bivalves from the coastal marine environments of the continental United States, 1986–2009. Marine Pollution Bulletin 81: 303-316.

Stevens, T.A., D. Duffield, E. Asper, K. Hewlett, A. Bolz, L. Gage, and G. Bossart. 1989. Preliminary findings of restriction fragment differences in mitochondrial DNA among killer whales (*Orcinus orca*). Can. J. Zool. 67:2592-2595.

Stewart, J. D., J. W. Durban, H. Fearnbach, L. G. Barrett-Lennard, P. K. Casler, E. J. Ward, and D. R. Dapp. 2021. Survival of the fattest: linking body condition to prey availability and survivorship of killer whales. Ecosphere 12(8):e03660. 10.1002/ecs2.3660

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. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-12. 93 pp.

Ward, E.J., E.E. Holmes, and K.C. Balcomb. 2009. Quantifying the effects of prey abundance on killer whale reproduction. Journal of Applied Ecology, 46(3):632-640.

Wasser S.K., Lundin J.I., Ayres K., Seely E., Giles D., Balcomb K., et al. 2017. Population growth is limited by nutritional impacts on pregnancy success in endangered Southern Resident killer whales (Orcinus orca). PLoS ONE 12(6): e0179824.

Yano, K., and M.E. Dahlheim. 1995. Killer whale, *Orcinus orca*, depredation on longline catches of bottomfish in the southeastern Bering Sea and adjacent waters. Fish. Bull. 93:355-372.

Appendix 2. Pacific reports revised in 2024 are highlighted. S=strategic stock, N=non-strategic stock. unk=unknown, undet=undetermined, n/a=not applicable.

Species (Stock)	N_{est}	CV N_{est}	N_{min}	R_{max}	Fr	PBR	Annual Human-Caused Mortality and Serious Injury	Annual Commercial Fishery Mortality and Serious Injury	Strategic Status	Recent Abundance Surveys			Revised
California sea lion (U.S.)	257,606	n/a	233,515	0.12	1	14,011	≥ 321	≥ 197	N	2008	2013	2014	2018
Harbor Seal (California)	30,968	n/a	27,348	0.12	1	1,641	43	30	N	2004	2009	2012	2014
Harbor Seal (Oregon/Washington Coast)	unk	unk	unk	0.12	1	undet	10.6	7.4	N	1999			2013
Harbor Seal (Washington Northern Inland Waters)	unk	unk	unk	0.12	1	undet	9.8	2.8	N	1999			2013
Harbor Seal (Southern Puget Sound)	unk	unk	unk	0.12	1	undet	3.4	1	N	1999			2013
Harbor Seal (Hood Canal)	unk	unk	unk	0.12	0.5	undet	0.2	0.2	N	1999			2013
Northern Elephant Seal (California Breeding)	~~187,386~~ 194,907	n/a	~~85,369~~ 88,794	0.12	1	~~5,122~~ 5,328	~~13.7~~ 11.2	~~5.3~~ 6.8	N	~~2005~~	~~2010~~	~~2013~~ 2023	~~2021~~ 2024
Guadalupe Fur Seal (Mexico)	~~34,187~~ 63,850	n/a	~~31,019~~ 57,199	0.137	0.5	~~1,062~~ 1,959	≥ ~~3.8~~ 10.0	≥ ~~1.2~~ 7.2	S	2008	2009	2013	~~2019~~ 2024
Northern Fur Seal (California)	~~14,050~~ 19,634	n/a	~~7,524~~ 8,788	0.12	1	~~451~~ 527	~~1.8~~ ≥ 1.2	≥ ~~0.8~~ 0.4	N	~~2010~~ 2019	~~2011~~ 2021	~~2013~~ 2022	~~2015~~ 2024
Monk Seal (Hawai‘i)	~~1,564~~ 1,605	0.05	~~1,444~~ 1,508	0.07	0.1	~~5.1~~ 5.3	≥ ~~5.4~~ 4.8	≥ ~~2.6~~ 2.2	S	~~2019~~ 2020	~~2020~~ 2021	~~2021~~ 2022	~~2023~~ 2024
Harbor Porpoise (Morro Bay)	4,191	0.56	2,698	0.096	0.5	65	0	0	N	2008	2011	2012	2021
Harbor Porpoise (Monterey Bay)	3,760	0.561	2,421	0.058	0.5	35	≥ 0.2	≥ 0.2	N	2011	2012	2013	2021
Harbor Porpoise (San Francisco - Russian River)	7,777	0.62	4,811	0.061	0.5	73	≥ 0.4	≥ 0.4	N	2014	2016	2017	2021
Harbor Porpoise (Northern CA/Southern OR)	15,303	0.575	9,759	0.04	1	306	0	0	N	2016	2021	2022	2023
Harbor Porpoise (Central Oregon) [new stock]	7,492	0.421	5,332	0.04	0.5	53	0	0	N	2016	2021	2022	2023
Harbor Porpoise (Northern OR/Washington Coast)	22,074	0.391	16,068	0.04	0.5	161	≥3.2	≥ 2.8	N	2016	2021	2022	2023
Harbor Porpoise (Washington Inland Waters)	11,233	0.37	8,308	0.04	0.4	66	≥ 7.2	≥ 7.2	N	2013	2014	2015	2016

Appendix 2. Pacific reports revised in 2024 are highlighted. S=strategic stock, N=non-strategic stock. unk=unknown, undet=undetermined, n/a=not applicable.

Species (Stock)	N_{est}	CV N_{est}	N_{min}	R_{max}	Fr	PBR	Annual Human-Caused Mortality and Serious Injury	Annual Commercial Fishery Mortality and Serious Injury	Strategic Status	Recent Abundance Surveys			Revised
Dall's Porpoise (California/Oregon/Washington)	16,498	0.61	10,286	0.04	0.48	99	≥ 0.66	≥ 0.66	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Pacific white-sided Dolphin (California/Oregon/Washington)	34,999	0.222	29,090	0.04	0.48	279	7	4	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Risso's Dolphin (California/Oregon/Washington)	6,336	0.32	4,817	0.04	0.48	46	≥ 3.7	≥ 3.7	N	2005	2008	2014	2016
Common Bottlenose Dolphin (California Coastal)	453	0.06	346	0.04	0.48	2.7	≥ 2.0	≥ 1.6	N	2009	2010	2011	2016
Common Bottlenose Dolphin (California/Oregon/Washington Offshore)	3,477	0.696	2,048	0.04	0.48	19.7	≥ 0.82	≥ 0.82	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Striped Dolphin (California/Oregon/Washington)	29,988	0.3	23,448	0.04	0.48	225	≥ 4.0	≥ 4.0	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Common Dolphin, short-Beaked (California/Oregon/Washington)	1,056,308	0.21	888,971	0.04	0.5	8,889	≥ 30.5	≥ 30.5	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Common Dolphin, long-Beaked (California)	83,379	0.216	69,636	0.04	0.48	668	≥ 29.7	≥ 26.5	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Northern right Whale Dolphin (California/Oregon/Washington)	29,285	0.72	17,024	0.04	0.48	163	≥ 6.6	≥ 6.6	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Killer Whale (Eastern N Pacific Offshore)	300	0.1	276	0.04	0.5	2.8	0	0	N	2010	2011	2012	2018
Killer Whale (Eastern N Pacific Southern Resident)	~~73~~ 75	n/a	~~73~~ 75	0.035	0.1	0.13 (no change)	0	0	S	~~2020~~ 2021	~~2021~~ 2022	~~2022~~ 2023	~~2023~~ 2024
Short-finned pilot Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	836	0.79	466	0.04	0.48	4.5	1.2	1.2	N	2005	2008	2014	2016
Baird's Beaked Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	1,363	0.53	894	0.04	0.5	8.9	≥ 0.2	0	N	2008	2014	2018	2021
Mesoplodont Beaked whales (California/Oregon/Washington)	3,044	0.54	1,967	0.04	0.5	20	0.1	0.1	N	2005	2008	2014	2017

Appendix 2. Pacific reports revised in 2024 are highlighted. S=strategic stock, N=non-strategic stock. unk=unknown, undet=undetermined, n/a=not applicable.

Species (Stock)	N_{est}	CV N_{est}	N_{min}	R_{max}	Fr	PBR	Annual Human-Caused Mortality and Serious Injury	Annual Commercial Fishery Mortality and Serious Injury	Strategic Status	Recent Abundance Surveys			Revised
Cuvier's Beaked Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	5,454	0.27	4,214	0.04	0.5	42	< 0.1	< 0.1	N	2008	2014	2016	2022
Pygmy Sperm Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	4,111	1.12	1,924	0.04	0.5	19.2	0	0	N	2005	2008	2014	2016
Dwarf Sperm Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	0	0	N	2005	2008	2014	2016
Sperm Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	2,606	0.135	2,011	0.04	0.1	4.0	0.52	0.52	S	2008	2014	2018	2023
Gray Whale (Eastern N Pacific)	25,960	0.05	25,849	0.062	1	801	131	9.3	N	2011	2015	2016	2020
Gray Whale (Western N Pacific)	290	n/a	271	0.062	0.1	0.12	unk	unk	S	2014	2015	2016	2020
Humpback Whale (Central America / Southern Mexico - California-Oregon-Washington)	1,496	0.171	1,284	0.082	0.1	3.5	14.9	8.1	S	2019	2020	2021	2022
Humpback Whale (Mainland Mexico - California-Oregon-Washington)	3,477	0.101	3,185	0.082	0.5	43	22	11.4	S	2016	2017	2018	2022
Blue Whale (Eastern N Pacific)	1,898	0.085	1,767	0.04	0.2	4.1	≥ 18.6	≥ 0.61	S	2016	2017	2018	2023
Fin Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	11,065	0.405	7,970	0.04	0.5	80	≥ 43.4	≥ 0.41	S	2008	2014	2018	2023
Sei Whale (Eastern N Pacific)	864	0.40	625	0.04	0.1	1.25	0	0	S	2005	2008	2014	2023
Minke Whale (California/Oregon/Washington)	915	0.792	509	0.04	0.4	4.1	≥ 0.19	≥ 0.17	N	2008	2014	2018	2023
Bryde's Whale (Eastern Tropical Pacific)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	N	n/a	n/a	n/a	2015
Rough-toothed Dolphin (Hawai'i)	83,915	0.49	56,782	0.04	0.5	511	3.2	3.2	N	2002	2010	2017	2023
Rough-toothed Dolphin (American Samoa)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	unk	n/a	n/a	n/a	2010
Risso's Dolphin (Hawai'i)	6,979	0.29	5,283	0.04	0.5	53	0	0	N	2010	2017	2020	2023

Appendix 2. Pacific reports revised in 2024 are highlighted. S=strategic stock, N=non-strategic stock. unk=unknown, undet=undetermined, n/a=not applicable.

Species (Stock)	N_{est}	CV N_{est}	N_{min}	R_{max}	Fr	PBR	Annual Human-Caused Mortality and Serious Injury	Annual Commercial Fishery Mortality and Serious Injury	Strategic Status	Recent Abundance Surveys			Revised
Common Bottlenose Dolphin (Hawai‘i Pelagic)	24,669	0.57	15,783	0.04	0.5	158	0	0	N	2010	2017	2020	2023
Common Bottlenose Dolphin (Kaua’i and Ni'ihau)	112	0.24	92	0.04	0.5	0.9	unk	unk	N	2016	2017	2018	2023
Common Bottlenose Dolphin (O'ahu)	112	0.17	97	0.04	0.5	1.0	unk	unk	N	2016	2017	2017	2023
Common Bottlenose Dolphin (Maui Nui)	64	0.15	56	0.04	0.5	0.6	unk	unk	N	2016	2017	2018	2023
Common Bottlenose Dolphin(Hawai‘i Island)	136	0.43	96	0.04	0.5	1.0	≥ 0.2	unk	N	2016	2017	2018	2023
Pantropical Spotted Dolphin(Hawai‘i Pelagic)	67,313	0.27	53,839	0.04	0.5	538	0	0	N	2010	2017	2020	2023
Pantropical Spotted Dolphin (O‘ahu)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	N			n/a	2023
Pantropical Spotted Dolphin (Maui Nui)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	N			n/a	2017
Pantropical Spotted Dolphin (Hawai‘i Island)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	≥ 0.2	≥ 0.2	N			n/a	2017
Spinner Dolphin (Hawai‘i Island)	665	0.09	617	0.04	0.5	6.2	≥ 1.0	unk	N	2010	2011	2012	2018
Spinner Dolphin (O’ahu / 4 Islands Region)	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.04	0.5	undet	≥ 0.4	unk	N	1998	2002	2007	2018
Spinner Dolphin (Kaua’i and Ni’ihau)	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	N	1995	1998	2005	2018
Spinner Dolphin (Hawai‘i Pelagic)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	0	0	N		2002	2010	2018
Spinner Dolphin (Kure / Midway)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	N		1998	2010	2018
Spinner Dolphin (Pearl and Hermes Reef)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	N			n/a	2018
Spinner Dolphin (American Samoa)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	unk			n/a	2010
Striped Dolphin (Hawai‘i Pelagic)	64,343	0.28	51,055	0.04	0.5	511	0	0	N	2010	2017	2020	2023

Appendix 2. Pacific reports revised in 2024 are highlighted. S=strategic stock, N=non-strategic stock. unk=unknown, undet=undetermined, n/a=not applicable.

Species (Stock)	N_{est}	CV N_{est}	N_{min}	R_{max}	Fr	PBR	Annual Human-Caused Mortality and Serious Injury	Annual Commercial Fishery Mortality and Serious Injury	Strategic Status	Recent Abundance Surveys			Revised
Fraser's Dolphin (Hawai'i)	40,960	0.7	24,068	0.04	0.5	241	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Melon-headed Whale (Hawaiian Islands)	40,647	0.74	23,301	0.04	0.5	233	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Melon-headed Whale (Kohala Resident)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	0	0	N	2002	2010	2009	2020
Pygmy killer Whale (Hawai'i)	10,328	0.75	5,885	0.04	0.5	59	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
False killer Whale (NW Hawaiian Islands)	477	1.71	178	0.04	0.4	1.43	0.16	0.16	N	2002	2010	2017	2023
False killer Whale (Hawai'i Pelagic)	5,528	0.35	4,152	0.04	0.5	33	47	47	S	2002	2010	2017	2023
False killer Whale (Main Hawaiian Islands Insular)	138	0.08	129	0.04	0.1	0.26	0.03	0.03	S	2013	2014	2015	2023
False killer Whale (Palmyra Atoll)	1,329	0.65	806	0.04	0.4	6.4	0.3	0.3	N			2005	2012
False killer Whale (American Samoa)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	unk	unk	unk			2006	2010
Killer Whale (Hawai'i)	161	1.06	78	0.04	0.5	0.8	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Pilot Whale, short-finned (Hawai'i)	19,242	0.23	15,894	0.04	0.4	159	0.2	0	N	2010	2017	2020	2023
Blainville's Beaked Whale (Hawai'i Pelagic)	1,132	0.99	564	0.04	0.5	5.6	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Longman's Beaked Whale (Hawai'i)	2,550	0.67	1,527	0.04	0.5	15	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Cuvier's Beaked Whale (Hawai'i Pelagic)	4,431	0.41	3,180	0.04	0.5	32	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Pygmy Sperm Whale (Hawai'i)	42,083	0.64	25,695	0.04	0.5	257	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Dwarf Sperm Whale (Hawai'i)	unk	unk	unk	0.04	0.5	undet	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Sperm Whale (Hawai'i)	5,707	0.23	4,486	0.04	0.2	18	0	0	S	2002	2010	2017	2020
Blue Whale (Central N Pacific)	133	1.09	63	0.04	0.1	0.1	0	0	S		2002	2010	2017
Fin Whale (Hawai'i)	203	0.99	101	0.04	0.1	0.2	0	0	S	2002	2010	2017	2020
Bryde's Whale (Hawai'i)	791	0.29	623	0.04	0.5	6.2	0	0	N	2010	2017	2020	2023

Appendix 2. Pacific reports revised in 2024 are highlighted. S=strategic stock, N=non-strategic stock. unk=unknown, undet=undetermined, n/a=not applicable.

Species (Stock)	N_{est}	CV N_{est}	N_{min}	R_{max}	Fr	PBR	Annual Human-Caused Mortality and Serious Injury	Annual Commercial Fishery Mortality and Serious Injury	Strategic Status	Recent Abundance Surveys			Revised
Sei Whale (Hawai‘i)	391	0.9	204	0.04	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.2	S	n/a	2002	2010	2017
Minke Whale (Hawai‘i)	438	1.05	212	0.04	0.5	2.1	0	0	N	2002	2010	2017	2020
Humpback Whale (American Samoa)	unk	unk	150	0.106	0.1	0.4	0	0	S	2006	2007	2008	2009