RINGED SEAL (Phoca hispida hispida): Alaska Stock

STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

Ringed seals have a circumpolar distribution and are found in all seasonally ice-covered seas of the Northern Hemisphere as well as in certain freshwater lakes (King 1983). Most taxonomists currently recognize five subspecies of ringed seals: Phoca hispida hispida in the Arctic Ocean and Bering Sea; Phoca hispida ochotensis in the Sea of Okhotsk and northern Sea of Japan; Phoca hispida botnica in the northern Baltic Sea; Phoca hispida lagodensis in Lake Ladoga, Russia; and Phoca hispida saimensis in Lake Saimaa, Finland. The lake-inhabiting subspecies are genetically isolated and those in the Baltic Sea and the Sea of Okhotsk apparently exchange genes with the Arctic subspecies minimally or not at all (Palo et al. 2001, Palo 2003, Kelly et al. 2009). The genetic structuring of Phoca hispida hispida, however, remains unresolved, and it may prove to be composed of multiple distinct populations (Kelly et al. 2010a). For the purposes of this stock assessment, the Alaska stock of ringed seals is considered the portion of Phoca hispida hispida that occurs within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone of the Beaufort, Chukchi, and Bering Seas (Fig. 12).

Throughout their range, ringed seals have an affinity for ice-covered waters and are well adapted to occupying both shorefast and pack ice (Kelly 1988a). They remain in contact with ice most of the year and use it as a platform for pupping and nursing in late winter to early spring, for molting in late spring to early summer, and for resting at other times of the year, although land haulouts may be increasingly used because of increases in summer sea ice retreat. In Alaskan waters, during winter and early spring when sea ice is at its maximal extent, ringed seals are abundant in the northern Bering Sea, Norton and Kotzebue Sounds, and throughout the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas. They occur as far south as Bristol Bay in years of extensive ice coverage but generally are not abundant south of Norton Sound except in nearshore areas (Frost 1985). Although details of their seasonal movements have not been adequately documented, it is thought that most ringed seals that winter in the Bering and Chukchi Seas migrate north in spring as the seasonal ice melts and retreats (Burns 1970) and have historically spent summer in the pack ice of the northern Chukchi and Beaufort seas, as well as in nearshore ice remnants in the Beaufort Sea (Frost 1985); however, very little pack ice exists in the summer months in the northern Chukchi and Beaufort seas. During summer, ringed seals range hundreds to thousands of kilometers to forage along ice edges or in highly productive open-water areas (Freitas et al. 2008, Kelly et al. 2010b). With the onset of freeze-up in the fall, ringed seal movements become increasingly restricted and seals that have summered in the Beaufort Sea are thought to move west and south with the advancing ice pack, with many seals dispersing throughout the Chukchi and Bering Seas while some remain in the Beaufort Sea (Frost and Lowry 1984, Crawford et al. 2012). Many adult ringed seals return to the same small home ranges they occupied during the previous winter (Kelly et al. 2010b).

POPULATION SIZE

Ringed seal population surveys in Alaska have used various methods and assumptions, had incomplete coverage of their habitats and range, and were conducted more than a decade ago; therefore, current, comprehensive, and reliable abundance estimates or trends for the Alaska stock are not available. Burns and Harbo (1972) conducted aerial surveys along the North Slope of Alaska (between Point Lay and Kaktovik) during June 1970, and reported a minimal estimate of 11,612 ringed seals in areas of shorefast ice. Frost and Lowry (1984) produced a rough estimate...
of 40,000 ringed seals in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea during winter and spring by applying an assumed correction factor for availability bias (i.e., for seals not hauled out at the time of the surveys) to the average density observed from 7 years of aerial surveys in the Alaskan and Yukon Beaufort Sea and extrapolating over the entire area of the continental shelf. Their estimate during summer of 80,000 ringed seals was based on the assumption that this population doubles as seals from the Bering and Chukchi Seas move in with the receding ice edge. Based on an analysis of surveys conducted during the 1970s, Frost (1985) estimated 1 to 1.5 million ringed seals in Alaskan waters, of which 250,000 were estimated in shorefast ice. These estimates were considered conservative when compared with polar bear predation rates (Frost 1985); however, details of the analysis were not published. Frost et al. (1988) reported detailed methods and results of surveys conducted in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort Seas during May-June 1985-1987. Survey effort was directed towards shorefast ice within 20 nmi of shore, though some areas of adjacent pack ice were also surveyed, and estimates were based on observed densities extrapolated over estimates of available habitat without correcting for availability bias. In the Chukchi Sea, total numbers of hauled out ringed seals in shorefast ice ranged from \(18,400 \pm 1,700\) in 1985 to \(35,000 \pm 3,000\) in 1986. The 1987 estimate of \(20,200 \pm 2,300\) was similar to 1985. In the Beaufort Sea, the estimated number of ringed seals hauled out within the 20-m depth contour ranged from \(9,800 \pm 1,800\) in 1985 to \(13,000 \pm 1,600\) in 1986. The 1987 estimate \((19,400 \pm 3,700)\) was considerably higher but may have included seals that had moved in from other areas as the ice began to break up (Frost et al. 1988). Frost et al. (2004) conducted surveys within 40 km of shore in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea during May-June 1996-1999, and observed ringed seal densities ranging from 0.81 seals/km² in 1996 to 1.17 seals/km² in 1999. Moulton et al. (2002) conducted similar, concurrent surveys in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea during 1997-1999 but reported substantially lower ringed seal densities than Frost et al. (2004). The reason for this disparity was unclear (Frost et al. 2004). Bengtson et al. (2005) conducted surveys in the Alaskan Chukchi Sea during May-June 1999 and 2000. While the surveys were focused on the coastal zone within 37 km of shore, additional survey lines were flown up to 185 km offshore. Population estimates were derived from observed densities corrected for availability bias using a haul-out model from 6 tagged seals. Ringed seal abundance estimates for the entire survey area were 252,488 (SE = 47,204) in 1999 and 208,857 (SE = 25,502) in 2000. The estimates from 1999 and 2000 in the Chukchi Sea only covered a portion of this stock’s range and were conducted over a decade ago. Using the more recent estimates from surveys by Bengtson et al. (2005) and Frost et al. (2004) in the late 1990s, the total population in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort Sea regions is at least 300,000 seals, which is likely an underestimate (Kelly et al. 2010a). Using the most recent estimates from surveys by Bengtson et al. (2005) and Frost et al. (2004) in the late 1990s and 2000, for purposes of the ESA status review of the species, Kelly et al. (2010a) estimated the total population in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort Seas as at least 300,000 ringed seals, which Kelly et al. (2010a) state is likely an underestimate since the Beaufort surveys were limited to within 40 km of shore.

Minimum Population Estimate

The estimate of 300,000 seals presented in Kelly et al. (2010a) is based on estimates from surveys by Bengtson et al. (2005) and Frost et al. (2004) in the late 1990s and 2000. This is not considered a reliable abundance estimate, is likely an underestimate, and is based on surveys of a portion of the range and are greater than 8 years old. A reliable estimate of \(N_{\text{MIN}}\) for the total population in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort Sea regions is not available.

Current Population Trend

Frost et al. (2002) reported that trend analysis based on an ANOVA comparison of observed seal densities in the central Beaufort Sea suggested marginally significant but substantial declines of 50% on shorefast ice and 31% on all ice types combined from 1985-1987 to 1996-1999. A Poisson regression model indicated highly significant density declines of 72% on shorefast ice and 43% on pack ice over the 15-year period. However, the apparent decline between the mid-1980s and the late 1990s may have been due to a difference in the timing of surveys rather than an actual decline in abundance (Frost et al. 2002, Kelly et al. 2006). As these surveys represent only a fraction of the stock’s range and occurred more than a decade ago, current and reliable data on trends in population abundance for the Alaska stock of ringed seals are considered unavailable.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

A reliable estimate of the maximum net productivity rate is currently unavailable for the Alaska stock of ringed seals. Hence, until additional data become available, it is recommended that the pinniped maximum theoretical net productivity rate \((R_{\text{MAX}})\) of 12% be employed for this stock (Wade and Angliss 1997).
POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

Under the 1994 reauthorized Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), the potential biological removal (PBR) is defined as the product of the minimum population estimate, one-half the maximum theoretical net productivity rate, and a recovery factor: \( PBR = N_{\text{MIN}} \times 0.5R_{\text{MAX}} \times F_R \). The recovery factor \( F_R \) for this stock is 0.5, the value for pinniped stocks with unknown population status (Wade and Angliss 1997). Since the data used to produce the abundance estimate presented in Kelly et al. (2010a) are more than 8 years old, and no reliable \( N_{\text{MIN}} \) is available, PBR is undetermined.

ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY

New Serious Injury Guidelines

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

Fisheries Information

Until 2003, there were three different federally-regulated commercial fisheries in Alaska that could have interacted with ringed seals and were monitored for incidental mortality by fishery observers. As of 2003, changes in fishery definitions in the List of Fisheries have resulted in separating these three fisheries into 12 fisheries (69 FR 70094, 2 December 2004). This change does not represent a change in fishing effort, but provides managers with better information on the component of each fishery that is responsible for the incidental serious injury or mortality of marine mammal stocks in Alaska. Between 2007 and 2011, there were incidental serious injuries and mortalities of ringed seals in the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands flatfish trawl fishery, the Bering Sea/ Aleutian Islands pollock trawl, Bering Sea/ Aleutian Islands Pacific cod trawl, and the Bering Sea/ Aleutian Islands Pacific cod longline (Table 24). Based on data from 2007 to 2011, there have been an average of 3.52 (CV = 0.06) mortalities of ringed seals incidental to commercial fishing operations.

Table 24. Summary of incidental mortality of ringed seals (Alaska stock) due to commercial fisheries from 2007 to 2011 and calculation of the mean annual mortality rate (Breiwick 2013). Details of how percent observer coverage is measured is included in Appendix 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishery name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Observer coverage</th>
<th>Observed mortality (in given yrs.)</th>
<th>Estimated mortality (in given yrs.)</th>
<th>Mean annual mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bering Sea/Aleutian Is. flatfish trawl</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0 (CV = 0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6 (+1)*</td>
<td>6.0 (7)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bering Sea/ Aleutian Is. pollock trawl</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0 (CV = 0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bering Sea/ Aleutian Is. Pacific cod trawl</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2 (CV = 0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fishery name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Data type</th>
<th>Observer coverage</th>
<th>Observed mortality (in given yrs.)</th>
<th>Estimated mortality (in given yrs.)</th>
<th>Mean annual mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.32 (CV = 0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>obs data</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total estimated annual mortality: 3.52 (CV = 0.06)

*Total mortalities observed in unsampled hauls.
**Total mortalities observed in sampled and unsampled hauls. Since the total known mortality (7) exceeds the estimated mortality (6.0) for 2011, the sum of actual mortalities observed (7) will be used as a minimum estimate for that year.

### Subsistence/Native Harvest Information

Ringed seals are an important species for Alaska Native subsistence hunters. The estimated annual subsistence harvest in Alaska dropped from 7,000 to 15,000 in the period from 1962 to 1972 to an estimated 2,000 to 3,000 in 1979 (Frost 1985). Based on data from two villages on St. Lawrence Island, the annual take in Alaska during the mid-1980s likely exceeded 3,000 seals (Kelly 1988a).

The Division of Subsistence, Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG), maintained a database that provided additional information on the subsistence harvest of ice seals in different regions of Alaska (ADFG 2000a, b). Information on subsistence harvest of ringed seals was compiled for 129 villages from reports from the Division of Subsistence (Coffing et al. 1998, Georgette et al. 1998, Wolfe and Hutchinson-Scarborough 1999) and a report from the Eskimo Walrus Commission (Sherrod 1982). Data were lacking for 22 villages; their harvests were estimated using the annual per capita rates of subsistence harvest from a nearby village. Harvest levels were estimated from data gathered in the 1980s for 16 villages; otherwise, data gathered from 1990 to 1998 were used. As of August 2000, the subsistence harvest database indicated that the estimated number of ringed seals harvested for subsistence use per year is 9,567. Data on community subsistence harvests are no longer routinely being collected, and no new statewide annual harvest estimates exist. Five Alaska Native communities in the Northwest Arctic region of Alaska voluntarily reported a total of 40 ringed seals were harvested during 2012 (Ice Seal Committee, 2013).

At this time, there are no efforts to quantify the total statewide level of harvest of ringed seals by all Alaska communities. A report on ice seal subsistence harvest in three Alaskan communities indicated that the number and species of ice seals harvested in a particular village may vary considerably between years (Coffing et al. 1999). These interannual differences are likely due to differences in ice and wind conditions that change the hunters’ access to different ice habitats frequented by different types of seals. Regardless of the extent to which the harvest may vary interannually, it is clear that the harvest level of 9,567 ringed seals estimated by the Division of Subsistence is considerably higher than the previous minimum estimate reported by Frost (1985). Although some of the more recent entries in the ADFG database have associated measures of uncertainty (Coffing et al. 1999, Georgette et al. 1998), the overall total does not. The estimate of 9,567 ringed seals is the best estimate currently available.

### Other human-caused mortality and injury

Between 2007 and 2011, there were 4 records of dead and injured ringed seals reported to the Alaska Regional Office Marine Mammal Stranding Network. All 3 injuries were considered not serious (Allen et al. 2014). One male ringed seal was found in 2008 with a packing band and circumferential wound around its neck; it was disentangled. Two injured ringed seals were reported in 2010, one with a bleeding flipper that was captured and released on site, another that was caught in a subsistence salmon set net. This animal was disentangled by ADFG and released. In 2011, one ringed seal was reported dead from a gunshot wound to the head, presumably a struck and lost animal from the subsistence hunt. This animal presented with skin lesions consistent with those seen in animals considered part of the multi-species northern pinnipeds 2011 Unusual Mortality Event.
STATUS OF STOCK

On December 28, 2012, NMFS listed Arctic ringed seals (Phoca hispida hispida) and, thus, the Alaska stock of ringed seals, as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (77 FR 76706). The primary concern for this population is the ongoing and anticipated loss of sea ice and snow cover stemming from climate change, which is expected to pose a significant threat to the persistence of these seals in the foreseeable future (based on projections through the end of the 21st century; Kelly et al. 2010a). Because of its threatened status under the ESA, this stock is designated as “depleted” under the MMPA. As a result, the stock is classified as a strategic stock. Since PBR is undetermined, it is not known whether current annual level of incidental U.S. commercial fishery-related mortality (3.5) exceeds 10% of the PBR. However, mortality and serious injury incidental to commercial fishing is likely insignificant and approaching a zero mortality and serious injury rate. The total estimated level of human-caused mortality and serious injury based on commercial fisheries observer data (3.5) and Alaska Native harvest (9,567) is 9,571. Population trends and status of this stock relative to OSP are currently unknown.

Habitat Concerns

The main concern about the conservation status of ringed seals stems from the likelihood that their sea-ice and snow habitats have been modified by the warming climate and, more so, that the scientific consensus projections are for continued and perhaps accelerated warming in the foreseeable future (Kelly et al. 2010a). Climate models consistently project overall diminishing ice and snow cover through the 21st century with regional variation in the timing and severity of those loses. Increasing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases are driving climate warming and increasing acidification of the ringed seal’s habitat. Changes in ocean temperature, acidification, and ice cover threaten prey communities on which ringed seals depend. Laidre et al. (2008) concluded that on a worldwide basis ringed seals were likely to be highly sensitive to climate change based on an analysis of various life history features that could be affected by climate.

The greatest impacts to ringed seals from diminished ice cover will be mediated through diminished snow accumulation. While winter precipitation is forecasted to increase in a warming Arctic (Walsh et al. 2005), the duration of ice cover will be substantially reduced, and the net effect will be lower snow accumulation on the ice (Hezel et al. 2012). Ringed seals excavate subnivean lairs (snow caves) in drifts over their breathing holes in the ice, in which they rest, give birth, and nurse their pups for 5-9 weeks during late winter and spring (Chapkii 1940, McLaren 1958, Smith and Stirling 1975). Snow depths of at least 50-65 cm are required for functional birth lairs (Smith and Stirling 1975, Lydersen and Gjertz 1986, Kelly 1988b, Lukin et al. 2006), and such depths typically are found only where 20-30 cm or more of snow has accumulated on flat ice and then drifted along pressure ridges or ice hummocks (Lydersen et al. 1990, Hammill and Smith 1991, Lydersen and Ryg 1991, Smith and Lydersen 1991). According to climate model projections, snow cover is forecasted to be inadequate for the formation and occupation of birth lairs within this century over the Alaska stock’s entire range (Kelly et al. 2010a). Without the protection of the lairs, ringed seals—especially newborns—are vulnerable to freezing and predation (Kumlien 1879, McLaren 1958, Lukin and Potelov 1978, Smith and Hammill 1980, Lydersen and Smith 1989, Stirling and Smith 2004). Changes in the ringed seal’s habitat will be rapid relative to their generation time and, thereby, will limit adaptive responses. As ringed seal populations decline, the significance of currently lower-level threats—such as ocean acidification, increases in human activities, and changes in populations of predators, prey, competitors, and parasites—may increase.

Additional habitat concerns include the potential effects from oil and gas exploration activities, particularly in the outer continental shelf leasing areas, such as disturbance from vessel traffic, seismic exploration noise, or the potential for oil spills.
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