SPERM WHALE (*Physeter macrocephalus)*: Hawaii Stock

**STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE**

Sperm whales are widely distributed across the entire North Pacific and into the southern Bering Sea in summer but the majority are thought to be south of 40°N in winter (Rice 1974, 1989; Gosho et al. 1984; Miyashita et al. 1995). For management, the International Whaling Commission (IWC) had divided the North Pacific into two management regions (Donovan 1991) defined by a zig-zag line which starts at 150°W at the equator to 160°W between 40-50°N, and ending at 180°W north of 50°N; however, the IWC has not reviewed this stock boundary in many years (Donovan 1991). Summer/fall surveys in the eastern tropical Pacific (Wade and Gerrodette 1993) show that although sperm whales are widely distributed in the tropics, their relative abundance tapers off markedly westward towards the middle of the tropical Pacific (near the IWC stock boundary at 150°W) and tapers off northward towards the tip of Baja California. The Hawaiian Islands marked the center of a major nineteenth century whaling ground for sperm whales (Gilmore 1959; Townsend 1935). Since 1936, at least 28 strandings have been reported from the Hawaiian Islands (Woodward 1972; Nitta 1991; Maldini et al. 2005, NMFS PIR Marine Mammal Response Network database), including 7 since 2007. Sperm whales have also been sighted throughout the Hawaiian EEZ, including nearshore waters of the main and Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (Rice 1960; Barlow 2006; Lee 1993; Mobley et al. 2000; Shallenberger 1981). In addition, sperm whale sounds have been recorded throughout the year off Oahu (Thompson and Friedl 1982). Summer/fall shipboard surveys of waters within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of the Hawaiian Islands resulted in 43 sperm whale sightings in 2002 and 46 in 2010 throughout the study area (Figure 1; Barlow 2006, Bradford et al. 2013).

The stock identity of sperm whales in the North Pacific has been inferred from historical catch records (Bannister and Mitchell 1980) and from trends in CPUE and tag-recapture data (Ohsumi and Masaki 1977). A 1997 survey designed specifically to investigate stock structure and abundance of sperm whales in the northeastern temperate Pacific revealed no apparent hiatus in distribution between the U.S. EEZ off California and areas farther west, out to Hawaii (Barlow and Taylor 2005). Recent genetic analyses revealed significant differences in mitochondrial and nuclear DNA and in single-nucleotide polymorphisms between sperm whales sampled off the coast of California, Oregon and Washington and those sampled near Hawaii and in the eastern tropical Pacific (ETP) (Mesnick et al. 2011). These results suggest demographic independence between matrilineal groups found California, Oregon, and Washington, and those found elsewhere in the central and eastern tropical Pacific. Further, assignment tests identified male sperm whales sampled in the sub-Arctic with each of the three regions, suggesting mixing of males from potentially several populations during the summer (Mesnick et al. 2011).

For the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) stock assessment reports, sperm whales within the Pacific U.S. EEZ are divided into three discrete, non-contiguous stocks: 1) waters around Hawaii (this report), 2) California, Oregon and Washington waters, and 3) Alaskan waters. The Hawaii stock includes animals found both within the Hawaiian Islands EEZ and in adjacent high seas waters; however, because data on abundance, distribution, and human-caused impacts are largely lacking for high seas waters, the status of the Hawaii stock is evaluated based on data from U.S. EEZ waters of the Hawaiian Islands (NMFS 2005).

Figure 1. Sperm whale sighting locations during the 2002 (open diamonds) and 2010 (black diamonds) shipboard surveys of U.S. EEZ waters surrounding the Hawaiian Islands (Barlow 2006, Bradford et al. 2013; see Appendix 2 for details on timing and location of survey effort). Outer line represents approximate boundary of survey area and U.S. EEZ. Gray shading indicates area of Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument.
POPULATION SIZE

A large 1982 abundance estimate for the entire eastern North Pacific (Gosho et al. 1984) was based on a CPUE method which is no longer accepted as valid by the International Whaling Commission. A spring 1997 combined visual and acoustic line-transect survey conducted in the eastern temperate North Pacific resulted in estimates of 26,300 (CV=0.81) sperm whales based on visual sightings, and 32,100 (CV=0.36) based on acoustic detections and visual group size estimates (Barlow and Taylor 2005). Sperm whales appear to be a good candidate for acoustic surveys due to the increased range of detection; however, visual estimates of group size are still required (Barlow and Taylor 2005). In the eastern tropical Pacific, the abundance of sperm whales has been estimated as 22,700 (95% C.I.=14,800-34,600; Wade and Gerrodette 1993). However, it is not known whether any or all of these animals routinely enter the U.S. EEZ of the Hawaiian Islands. A 2002 shipboard line-transect survey of the entire Hawaiian Islands EEZ resulted in an abundance estimate of 6,919 (CV=0.81) sperm whales (Barlow 2006). The recent 2010 shipboard line-transect survey of the Hawaiian Islands EEZ resulted in an abundance estimate of 3,354 (CV = 0.34) sperm whales (Bradford et al. 2013), including a correction factor for missed diving animals. This is currently the best available abundance estimate for this stock.

Minimum Population Estimate

The minimum population size is calculated as the lower 20th percentile of the log-normal distribution (Barlow et al. 1995) around the 2010 abundance estimate or 2,539 sperm whales within the Hawaiian Islands EEZ.

Current Population Trend

The broad and overlapping confidence intervals around the 2002 and 2010 estimates preclude assessment of trend with the available data.

CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES

No data on current or maximum net productivity rate are available.

POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL

The potential biological removal (PBR) level for the Hawaii stock of sperm whales is calculated as the minimum population size (2,539) within the U.S. EEZ of the Hawaiian Islands times one half the default maximum net growth rate for cetaceans (½ of 4%) times a recovery factor of 0.2 (for an endangered species with \( N_{\text{min}} > 1,500 \) and \( CV_{N_{\text{min}}} > 0.50 \), with low vulnerability to extinction; (Taylor et al. 2003), resulting in a PBR of 10.2 sperm whales per year.

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, NMFS 2012). NMFS defines serious injury as an “injury that is more likely than not to result in mortality”. Injury determinations for stock assessments

Figure 2. Locations of observed sperm whale take (filled diamonds) in the Hawaii-based longline fishery, 2007-2011. Solid lines represent the U. S. EEZ. Fishery descriptions are provided in Appendix 1.
revised in 2013 or later incorporate the new serious injury guidelines, based on the most recent 5-year period for which data are available.

**Fishery Information**

Information on fishery-related mortality of cetaceans in Hawaiian waters is limited, but the gear types used in Hawaiian fisheries are responsible for marine mammal mortality and serious injury in other fisheries throughout U.S. waters. One stranded sperm whale was found with fishing line and netting its stomach, though it is unclear whether the gear caused its death, nor what fisheries the gear came from (NMFS PIR MMRN). No estimates of human-caused mortality or serious injury are currently available for nearshore hook and line fisheries because these fisheries are not observed or monitored for protected species bycatch.

There are currently two distinct longline fisheries based in Hawaii: a deep-set longline (DSLL) fishery that targets primarily tunas, and a shallow-set longline fishery (SSLL) that targets swordfish. Both fisheries operate within U.S. waters and on the high seas. Between 2007 and 2011, no sperm whales were observed hooked or entangled in the SSLL fishery (100% observer coverage) and one was observed either hooked or entangled in the DSLL fishery (20-22% observer coverage) (Bradford & Forney 2013). The observer could not determine whether the whale was hooked or entangled; however, the mainline came under tension when the animal surfaced. The whale was cut free with the hook, 0.5m wire leader, 45g weight, 12m of branchline, and 25-30 ft of mainline possibly attached. This interaction was prorated as 75% probability of serious injury because the whale was hooked or entangled but the exact nature of the injury could not be determined (Bradford & Forney 2013). This determination is based on an evaluation of the observer’s description of the interaction and following the most recently developed criteria for assessing serious injury in marine mammals (NMFS 2012). The prorating of serious injury is based on the proportion of known outcomes for whales with similar fisheries interactions in other regions. Average 5-yr estimates of annual mortality and serious injury for sperm whales during 2007-2011 are zero sperm whales outside of U.S. EEZs, and 0.7 (CV = 0.6) within the Hawaiian Islands EEZ (Table 1, McCracken 2013).

**Table 1.** Summary of available information on incidental mortality and serious injury of sperm whales in commercial longline fisheries, within and outside of the U.S. EEZs (McCracken 2013). Mean annual takes are based on 2007-2011 data. Information on all observed takes (T) and combined mortality events & serious injuries (MSI) is included. Total takes were prorated to deaths, serious injuries, and non-serious injuries based on the observed proportions of each outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishery Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Percent Observer Coverage</th>
<th>Obs. T/MSI</th>
<th>Estimated M&amp;SI (CV)</th>
<th>Obs. T/MSI</th>
<th>Estimated M&amp;SI (CV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii-based deep-set longline fishery</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Estimated Annual Take (CV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii-based shallow-set longline fishery</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Observer data</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Annual Takes (100% coverage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum total annual takes within U.S. EEZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This injury was prorated 75% probability of being a serious injury based on known outcomes from other whales with this injury type (NOAA 2012).*

**Historical Mortality**

Between 1800 and 1909, about 60,842 sperm whales were estimated taken in the North Pacific (Best 1976). The reported take of North Pacific sperm whales by commercial whalers between 1947 and 1987 totaled 258,000 (C.
Allison, pers. comm.). Factory ships operated as far south as 20°N (Ohsumi 1980). Ohsumi (1980) lists an additional 28,198 sperm whales taken mainly in coastal whaling operations from 1910 to 1946. Based on the massive under-reporting of Soviet catches, Brownell et al. (1998) estimated that about 89,000 whales were additionally taken by the Soviet pelagic whaling fleet between 1949 and 1979. Japanese coastal operations apparently also under-reported catches by an unknown amount (Kasuya 1998). Thus a total of at least 436,000 sperm whales were taken between 1800 and the end of commercial whaling for this species in 1987. Of this grand total, an estimated 33,842 were taken by Soviet and Japanese pelagic whaling operations in the eastern North Pacific from the longitude of Hawaii to the U.S. West coast, between 1961 and 1976 (Allen 1980, IWC statistical Areas II and III), and 965 were reported taken in land-based U.S. West coast whaling operations between 1947 and 1971 (Ohsumi 1980). In addition, 13 sperm whales were taken by shore whaling stations in California between 1919 and 1926 (Clapham et al. 1997). There has been a prohibition on taking sperm whales in the North Pacific since 1988, but large-scale pelagic whaling stopped earlier, in 1980. Some of the whales taken during the whaling era were certainly from a population or populations that occur within Hawaiian waters.

STATUS OF STOCK

The only estimate of the status of North Pacific sperm whales in relation to carrying capacity (Gosho et al. 1984) is based on a CPUE method which is no longer accepted as valid. The status of sperm whales in Hawaiian waters relative to OSP is unknown, and there are insufficient data to evaluate trends in abundance. Sperm whales are formally listed as "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), and consequently the Hawaiian stock is automatically considered as a "depleted" and "strategic" stock under the MMPA. The estimated rate of fisheries related mortality or serious injury within the Hawaiian Islands EEZ (0.7 animals per year) is less than the PBR (10.2). Insufficient information is available to determine whether the total fishery mortality and serious injury for sperm whales is insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. The increasing level of anthropogenic noise in the world's oceans has been suggested to be a habitat concern for whales (Richardson et al. 1995), particularly for deep-diving whales like sperm whales that feed in the oceans' "sound channel". One sperm whale stranded in the main Hawaiian Islands tested positive for both Brucella and Morbillivirus (Jacob 2012, West, unpublished data). Brucella is a bacterial infection that may limit recruitment by compromising male and female reproductive systems if it is common in the population, and it can also cause neurological disorders that may result in death (Van Bressem et al. 2009). Morbillivirus is known to trigger lethal disease in cetaceans (Van Bressem et al. 2009); however, investigation of the pathology of the stranded sperm whale suggests that Brucella was more likely the cause of death in this sperm whale (West, unpublished data). The presence of Morbillivirus in 10 species (Jacob 2012) and Brucella in 3 species (Cherbov 2010, West unpublished data) raises concerns about the history and prevalence of these diseases in Hawaii and the potential population impacts on Hawaiian cetaceans. It is not known if Brucella or Morbillivirus are common in the Hawaii stock.
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