STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE

This stock is found in U.S. and Canadian Atlantic waters. The distribution of harbor porpoises has been documented by sighting surveys, strandings and takes reported by NMFS observers in the Sea Sampling Programs. During summer (July to September), harbor porpoises are concentrated in the northern Gulf of Maine and southern Bay of Fundy region, generally in waters less than 150 m deep (Gaskin 1977; Kraus et al. 1983; Palka 1995), with a few sightings in the upper Bay of Fundy and on Georges Bank (Palka 2000). During fall (October–December) and spring (April–June), harbor porpoises are widely dispersed from New Jersey to Maine, with lower densities farther north and south. They are seen from the coastline to deep waters (>1800 m; Westgate et al. 1998), although the majority of the population is found over the continental shelf. During winter (January to March), intermediate densities of harbor porpoises can be found in waters off New Jersey to North Carolina, and lower densities are found in waters off New York to New Brunswick, Canada. There does not appear to be a temporally coordinated migration or a specific migratory route to and from the Bay of Fundy region. However, during the fall, several satellite-tagged harbor porpoises did favor the waters around the 92-m isobath, which is consistent with observations of high rates of incidental catches in this depth range (Read and Westgate 1997). There were two stranding records from Florida during the 1980s (Smithsonian strandings database) and one in 2003 (NE Regional Office/NMFS strandings and entanglement database).

Gaskin (1984, 1992) proposed that there were four separate populations in the western North Atlantic: the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy, Gulf of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, and Greenland populations. Analyses involving mtDNA (Wang et al. 1996; Rosel et al. 1999a; 1999b), organochlorine contaminants (Westgate et al. 1997; Westgate and Tolley 1999), heavy metals (Johnston 1995), and life history parameters (Read and Hohn 1995) support Gaskin’s proposal. Genetic studies using mitochondrial DNA (Rosel et al. 1999a) and contaminant studies using total PCBs (Westgate and Tolley 1999) indicate that the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy females were distinct from females from the other populations in the Northwest Atlantic. Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy males were distinct from Newfoundland and Greenland males, but not from Gulf of St. Lawrence males according to studies comparing mtDNA (Palka et al. 1996; Rosel et al. 1999a) and CHLORs, DDTs, PCBs and CHBs (Westgate and Tolley 1999). Nuclear microsatellite markers have also been applied to samples from these four populations, but this analysis failed to detect significant population sub-division in either sex (Rosel et al. 1999a). These patterns may be indicative of female philopatry coupled with dispersal of males. Both mitochondrial DNA and microsatellite
analyses indicate that the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy stock is not the sole contributor to the aggregation of porpoises found off the mid-Atlantic states during winter (Rosel et al. 1999a; Hiltunen 2006). Mixed-stock analyses using twelve microsatellite loci in both Bayesian and likelihood frameworks indicate that the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy is the largest contributor (~60%), followed by Newfoundland (~25%) and then the Gulf of St. Lawrence (~12%), with Greenland making a small contribution (<3%). For Greenland, the lower confidence interval of the likelihood analysis includes zero. For the Bayesian analysis, the lower 2.5% posterior quantiles include zero for both Greenland and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Intervals that reach zero provide the possibility that these populations contribute no animals to the mid-Atlantic aggregation.

This report follows Gaskin's hypothesis on harbor porpoise stock structure in the western North Atlantic, where the Gulf of Maine and Bay of Fundy harbor porpoises are recognized as a single management stock separate from harbor porpoise populations in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Newfoundland, and Greenland.

**POPULATION SIZE**

The best current abundance estimate of the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy harbor porpoise stock is from the 2011 survey: 79,883 (CV=0.32).

**Earlier abundance estimates**

Please see Appendix IV for a summary of abundance estimates, including earlier estimates and survey descriptions. As recommended in the GAMMS II Workshop Report (Wade and Angliss 1997), estimates older than eight years are deemed unreliable for the determination of the current PBR.

**Recent surveys and abundance estimates**

An abundance estimate of 79,883 (CV=0.32) harbor porpoises was generated from a shipboard and aerial survey conducted during June–August 2011 (Palka 2012). The aerial portion that contributed to the abundance estimate covered 5,313 km of tracklines that were over waters north of New Jersey from the coastline to the 100-m depth contour through the U.S. and Canadian Gulf of Maine and up to and including the lower Bay of Fundy. The shipboard portion covered 3,107 km of tracklines that were in waters offshore of central Virginia to Massachusetts (waters that were deeper than the 100-m depth contour out to beyond the U.S. EEZ). Both sighting platforms used a double-platform team data-collection procedure, which allows estimation of abundance corrected for perception bias of the detected species (Laake and Borchers 2004). Estimation of the abundance was based on the independent-observer approach assuming point independence (Laake and Borchers 2004) and calculated using the mark-recapture distance sampling option in the computer program Distance (version 6.0, release 2, Thomas et al. 2009).

No harbor porpoises were detected in an abundance survey that was conducted concurrently (June-August 2011) in waters between central Virginia and central Florida. This shipboard survey included shelf-break and inner continental slope waters deeper than the 50-m depth contour within the U.S. EEZ. The survey employed the double-platform methodology searching with 25x150 "bigeye" binoculars. A total of 4,445 km of tracklines was surveyed, yielding 290 cetacean sightings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>N&lt;sub&gt;best&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jul-Aug 2011</td>
<td>Central Virginia to lower Bay of Fundy</td>
<td>79,883</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minimum Population Estimate**

The minimum population estimate is the lower limit of the two-tailed 60% confidence interval of the log-normal distributed best abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distribution as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for harbor porpoises is 79,883 (CV=0.32). The minimum population estimate for the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy harbor porpoise is 61,415.

**Current Population Trend**

A trend analysis has not been conducted for this stock. The statistical power to detect a trend in abundance for this stock is poor due to the relatively imprecise abundance estimates and long survey interval. For example, the power to detect a precipitous decline in abundance (i.e., 50% decrease in 15 years) with estimates of low precision
(e.g., CV > 0.30) remains below 80% (alpha = 0.30) unless surveys are conducted on an annual basis (Taylor et al. 2007).

**CURRENT AND MAXIMUM NET PRODUCTIVITY RATES**

Several attempts have been made to estimate potential population growth rates. Barlow and Boveng (1991), who used a re-scaled human life table, estimated the upper bound of the annual potential growth rate to be 9.4%. Woodley and Read (1991) used a re-scaled Himalayan tahr life table to estimate a likely annual growth rate of 4%. In an attempt to estimate a potential population growth rate that incorporates many of the uncertainties in survivorship and reproduction, Caswell et al. (1998) used a Monte Carlo method to calculate a probability distribution of growth rates. The median potential annual rate of increase was approximately 10%, with a 90% confidence interval of 3–15%. This analysis underscored the considerable uncertainty that exists regarding the potential rate of increase in this population. Moore and Read (2008) conducted a Bayesian population modeling analysis to estimate the potential population growth of harbor porpoise in the absence of bycatch mortality. Their method used fertility data, in combination with age-at-death data from stranded animals and animals taken in gillnets, and was applied under two scenarios to correct for possible data bias associated with observed bycatch of calves. Demographic parameter estimates were “model averaged” across these scenarios. The Bayesian posterior median estimate for potential natural growth rate was 0.046. This last, most recent, value will be the one used for the purpose of this assessment.

**POTENTIAL BIOLOGICAL REMOVAL**

Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is the product of minimum population size, one-half the maximum productivity rate, and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3. 16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 61,415. The maximum productivity rate is 0.046. The recovery factor is 0.5 because stock's status relative to OSP is unknown and the CV of the average mortality estimate is less than 0.3 (Wade and Angliss 1997). PBR for the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy harbor porpoise is 706.

**ANNUAL HUMAN-CAUSED MORTALITY AND SERIOUS INJURY**

The total annual estimated average human-caused mortality is 437 harbor porpoises per year. This is derived from two components: 394 harbor porpoise per year (CV=0.18) from U.S. fisheries using observer and MMAP data, and 43 per year (unknown CV) from Canadian fisheries using observer data.

**Fishery Information**

Recently, Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy harbor porpoise takes have been documented in the U.S. northeast sink gillnet, mid-Atlantic gillnet, and northeast bottom trawl fisheries and in the Canadian herring weir fisheries (Table 2). Detailed U.S. fishery information is reported in Appendix III.

**Earlier Interactions**

One harbor porpoise was observed taken in the Atlantic pelagic drift gillnet fishery during 1991–1998; the fishery ended in 1998. This observed bycatch was notable because it occurred in continental shelf edge waters adjacent to Cape Hatteras (Read et al. 1996). See Appendix V for more information on historical takes.

**U.S. Northeast Sink Gillnet**

Harbor porpoise bycatch in the northern Gulf of Maine occurs primarily from June to September, while in the southern Gulf of Maine, bycatch occurs from January to May and September to December. Annual bycatch is estimated using ratio estimator techniques that account for the use of pingers (Orphanides 2013; Hatch and Orphanides 2014, 2015, 2016). See Table 2 for bycatch estimates and observed mortality and serious injury for the current 5-year period, and Appendix V for historical bycatch information. There appeared to be no evidence of differential mortality in U.S. or Canadian gillnet fisheries by age or sex in animals collected before 1994, although there was substantial inter-annual variation in the age and sex composition of the bycatch (Read and Hohn 1995). Using observer data collected during 1990–1998 and a logit regression model, females were 11 times more likely to be caught in the offshore southern Gulf of Maine region, males were more likely to be caught in the south Cape Cod region, and the overall proportion of males and females caught in a gillnet and brought back to land were not significantly different from 1:1 (Lamb 2000).

Scientific experiments that demonstrated the effectiveness of pingers in the Gulf of Maine were conducted during 1992 and 1993 (Kraus et al. 1997). After the scientific experiments, experimental fisheries were allowed in
the general fishery during 1994 to 1997 in various parts of the Gulf of Maine and south of Cape Cod areas. During these experimental fisheries, bycatch rates of harbor porpoises in pingered nets were less than in non-pingered nets.

A study on the effects of two different hanging ratios in the bottom-set monkfish gillnet fishery on the bycatch of cetaceans and pinnipeds was conducted by NEFSC in 2009 and 2010 with 100% observer coverage which took place in both the Northeast and mid-Atlantic gillnet fisheries. Commercial fishing vessels from Massachusetts and New Jersey were used for the study, which took place south of the Harbor Porpoise Take Reduction Cape Cod South Management Area (south of 40° 40´N) in February–April. Researchers purposely picked an area of historically high bycatch rates in order to have a chance of finding a significant difference. Eight research strings of fourteen nets each were fished and 159 hauls were completed during the course of the 2009–2010 study. Results showed that while a 0.33 mesh performed better at catching commercially important finfish than a 0.50 mesh, there was no statistical difference in cetacean or pinniped bycatch rates between the two hanging ratios. Twelve harbor porpoises were caught in this project in 79 hauls during 2009 and one animal was caught in 72 hauls during the 2010 experiment in the Northeast (A.I.S., Inc. 2010). The 2010 animal was included in the observed interactions and added into the total estimates (Table 2), though these animals and the fishing effort from this experiment were not included in the estimation of the bycatch rate that was expanded to the rest of the fishing effort. The 2009 takes were included in earlier editions of this report.

Mid-Atlantic Gillnet

Annual bycatch is estimated using ratio estimator techniques (Orphanides 2013; Hatch and Orphanides 2014, 2015, 2016). See Table 2 for bycatch estimates and observed mortality and serious injury for the current 5-year period, and Appendix V for historical bycatch information.

In the northeast gillnet fishery section above, see the description of the study on the effects of two different hanging ratios in the bottom-set gillnet fishery which took place in both the northeast and mid-Atlantic gillnet fisheries. Ten harbor porpoises were caught in 8 hauls in the mid-Atlantic in 2010 as part of this experiment (A.I.S., Inc. 2010). Harbor porpoises that were caught in this study were included in the observed interactions and added into the total estimates (Table 2), though these animals and the fishing effort from this experiment were not included in the estimation of the bycatch rate that was expanded to the rest of the fishing effort.

Northeast Bottom Trawl

Since 1989, harbor porpoise mortalities have been observed in the northeast bottom trawl fishery, but many of these were not attributable to this fishery because decomposed animals are presumed to have been dead prior to being taken by the trawl. New serious injury criteria were applied to all observed interactions retroactive back to 2007 (Waring et al. 2014, 2015, Wenzel et al. 2015, 2016). Fishery-related bycatch rates for years since 2008 were estimated using an annual stratified ratio-estimator (Lyssikatos 2015). These estimates replace the 2008–2010 annual estimates reported in the 2013 stock assessment report that were generated using a different method. See Table 2 for bycatch estimates and observed mortality and serious injury for the current 5-year period, and Appendix V for historical bycatch information.

CANADA

Bay of Fundy Sink Gillnet

The earlier estimated annual mortality estimates were 38 for 1998, 32 for 1999, 28 for 2000, and 73 for 2001 (Trippel and Shepherd 2004). Estimates of variance are not available. However, since 2002 there has been no observer program in the Bay of Fundy region, but the fishery is still active. Bycatch for these years is unknown. The annual average of the most recent five years with available data (1997–2001) was 43 animals, so this value is used to estimate the annual average for more recent years. In 2011 there was little gillnet effort in New Brunswick waters in the summer; thus the Canadian porpoise by-catch estimates could have been near zero. The fishermen that sought groundfish went into the mid-Bay of Fundy where traditionally bycatch levels were extremely low, though current bycatch levels are unknown. Trippel (pers. comm.) estimated that fewer than 10 porpoises were bycaught in the Canadian fisheries in the Bay of Fundy in 2011. Analysis of port catch records might allow estimation of bycatch for more recent times, however, it would be difficult to also accurately account for the changes in the spatial distribution of the harbor porpoises and fisheries.

Herring Weirs

Harbor porpoises are taken in Canadian herring weirs, but there have been no recent efforts to observe takes in the U.S. component of this fishery. Smith et al. (1983) estimated that in the 1980s approximately 70 harbor
porpoises became trapped annually and, on average, 27 died annually. In 1990, at least 43 harbor porpoises were trapped in Bay of Fundy weirs (Read et al. 1994). In 1993, after a cooperative program between fishermen and Canadian biologists was initiated, over 100 harbor porpoises were released alive (Read et al. 1994). Between 1992 and 1994, this cooperative program resulted in the live release of 206 of 263 harbor porpoises caught in herring weirs. Mortalities (and releases) were 11 (50) in 1992, 33 (113) in 1993, and 13 (43) in 1994 (Neimanis et al. 1995). Since that time, additional harbor porpoises have been documented in Canadian herring weirs: mortalities (releases and unknowns) were 5 (60, 0) in 1995, 2 (4, 0) in 1996, 2 (24, 0) in 1997, 2 (26, 0) in 1998, 3 (89, 0) in 1999, 0 (13, 0) in 2000 (A. Read, pers. comm), 14 (296, 0) in 2001, 3 (46, 4) in 2002, 1 (26, 3) in 2003, 4 (53, 2) in 2004, 0 (19, 5) in 2005, 2 (14, 0) in 2006, 3 (9, 3) in 2007, 0 (8, 6) in 2008, 0 (3,4) in 2009, 1 in 2010 (7, 0), 0 (2, 3) in 2011, 0 (2, 3) in 2012, 0 (2,0) in 2013 and 0 (9, 2) in 2014 (Neimanis et al. 2004; H. Koopman and A. Westgate, pers. comm.).

See Table 2 for bycatch estimates and observed mortality and serious injury for the current 5-year period, and Appendix V for historical bycatch information.

### Table 2. From observer program data, summary of the incidental mortality of Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena phocoena*) by commercial fishery including the years sampled, the type of data used, the annual observer coverage, the mortalities and serious injuries recorded by on-board observers, the estimated annual serious injury and mortality, the estimated CV of the annual mortality, and the mean annual combined mortality (CV in parentheses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishery</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Observer Coverage</th>
<th>Observed Serious Injury</th>
<th>Observed Mortality</th>
<th>Estimated Serious Injury</th>
<th>Estimated Mortality</th>
<th>Combined Serious Injury</th>
<th>Estimated CVs</th>
<th>Mean Annual Combined Mortality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Sink Gillnet</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>Obs. Data, Weighout, Trip Logbook</td>
<td>.17, .19, .15, .11, .18</td>
<td>0, 0, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>50, 66, 34, 20, 28</td>
<td>0, 0, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>387, 273, 277, 399, 128</td>
<td>387, 273, 277, 399, 128</td>
<td>.27, .20, .59, .33, .27</td>
<td>293 (0.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic Gillnet</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>Obs. Data Weighout</td>
<td>.04, .02, .03, .05</td>
<td>0, 0, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>18, 11, 2, 1, 1</td>
<td>0, 0, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>259, 123, 63, 19, 22</td>
<td>259, 123, 63, 19, 22</td>
<td>.88, .41, .83, 1.06, 1.03</td>
<td>97 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast bottom trawl</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>Obs. Data Weighout</td>
<td>.16, .26, .17, .15, .17</td>
<td>0, 1, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>0, 1, 0, 1, 1</td>
<td>0, 2, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>0, 3.9, 0, 7, 5.5</td>
<td>0, 5.9, 0, 7, 5.5</td>
<td>.71, 0, .98, .86</td>
<td>3.7 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>394 (0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANADA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Fundy Sink Gillnet</td>
<td>1997-2001</td>
<td>Can. Trips</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>19, 5, 3, 3, 39</td>
<td>43, 38, 32, 28, 73</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>43 (unk)</td>
<td>0.2 (unk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herring Weir</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>Coop. Data</td>
<td>unk</td>
<td>1, 0, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>1, 0, 0, 0, 0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0 (unk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CANADIAN TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43 (unk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>437 (unk)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = Not available.

a. Observer data (Obs. Data) are used to measure bycatch rates; the U.S. data are collected by the Northeast...
Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) Sea Sampling Program and At-Sea Monitoring Program; the Canadian data are collected by DFO. NEFSC collects Weighout (Weighout) landings data that are used as a measure of total effort for the U.S. gillnet fisheries. The Canadian DFO catch and effort statistical system collected the total number of trips fished by the Canadians (Can. Trips), which was the measure of total effort for the Canadian groundfish gillnet fishery. Mandatory vessel trip report (VTR) (Trip Logbook) data are used to determine the spatial distribution of fishing effort in the northeast sink gillnet fishery. Observed mortalities from herring weirs are collected by a cooperative program between fishermen and Canadian biologists (Coop. Data).

b. Observer coverage for the U.S. Northeast and mid-Atlantic coastal gillnet fisheries is based on tons of fish landed. Northeast bottom trawl fishery coverages are ratios based on trips. Total observer coverage reported for bottom trawl gear and gillnet gear in the year 2010 includes only samples collected from traditional fisheries observer, but not the fishery monitors. Monitor trips were incorporated starting in 2011, the first full year of monitor coverage.

c. Since 2002 in the Northeast gillnet fishery, harbor porpoises were taken on pingered strings within strata that required pingers but that stratum also had observed strings without pingers. For estimates made during 1998 and after, a weighted bycatch rate was applied to effort from both pingered and non-pingered hauls within a stratum. The weighted bycatch rate was:

\[
\text{Weighted bycatch rate} = \frac{\text{sum of hauls} \times \text{harbor porpoise landings}}{\text{total hauls}}
\]

There were 10, 33, 44, 0, 11, 0, 2, 8, 6, 2, 26, 2, 4, 12, 2, 9, 6, 11, 23, 11, 30, 20, and 27 observed harbor porpoise takes on pinger trips from 1992 to 2014, respectively, that were included in the observed mortality column.

d. There were 255 licenses for herring weirs in the Canadian Bay of Fundy region.

e. Data provided by H. Koopman pers. comm.

f. The Canadian gillnet fishery was not observed during 2002 and afterwards, but the fishery is still active; thus, the current bycatch estimate for this fishery is assumed to be the average estimate using last five years that the fishery was observed in (1997–2001).

g. Fishery related bycatch rates for years 2010–2014 were estimated using an annual stratified ratio-estimator.

h. One harbor porpoise in the Northeast area and 10 in the mid-Atlantic area were incidentally caught in 2010 as part of a 2009-2010 NEFSC gillnet hanging ratio study to examine the impact of hanging ratio on harbor porpoise bycatch in gillnets. These animals were included in the observed interactions and added to the total estimates, though these interactions and their associated fishing effort were not included in the estimation of the bycatch rate that was expanded to the rest of the fishery.

i. Serious injuries were evaluated for the 2010–2014 period using new guidelines and include both at-sea monitor and traditional observer data (Waring et al. 2014, 2015, Wenzel et al. 2015, 2016)

Other Mortality

U.S.

There is evidence that harbor porpoises were harvested by natives in Maine and Canada before the 1960s, and the meat was used for human consumption, oil, and fish bait (NMFS 1992). The extent of these past harvests is unknown, though it is believed to have been small. Up until the early 1980s, small kills by native hunters (Passamaquoddy Indians) were reported. In recent years it was believed to have nearly stopped (Polacheek 1989) until media reports in September 1997 depicted a Passamaquoddy tribe member dressing out a harbor porpoise. Further articles describing use of porpoise products for food and other purposes were timed to coincide with ongoing legal action in state court.

During 2010, 82 harbor porpoises were reported stranded on Atlantic U.S. beaches. Of these, six stranding mortalities were reported as having signs of human interaction, three of which were reported to be fishery interactions.

During 2011, 164 harbor porpoises were reported stranded on Atlantic U.S. beaches. Of these, nine stranding mortalities were reported as having signs of human interaction, three of which were reported to be fishery interactions.
During 2012, 45 harbor porpoises were reported stranded on Atlantic U.S. beaches. Of these, four stranding mortalities were reported as having signs of human interaction, one of which was reported to be a fishery interaction.

During 2013, 102 harbor porpoises were reported stranded on Atlantic U.S. beaches. Of these, nine stranding mortalities were reported as having signs of human interaction, three of which were reported to be fishery interactions.

During 2014, 39 harbor porpoises were reported stranded on Atlantic U.S. beaches. Of these, one stranding mortality was reported as having signs of human interactions, which was also reported to have been a fishery interaction.

Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of fishery-related mortality and serious injury because all of the marine mammals that die or are seriously injured may not wash ashore, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other fishery-interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interaction.

Table 4. Harbor Porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena phocoena*) reported strandings along the U.S. and Canadian Atlantic coast, 2010-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine&lt;sup&gt;a,e,h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts&lt;sup&gt;a,e,f,g,h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island&lt;sup&gt;b,f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York&lt;sup&gt;c,f,h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey&lt;sup&gt;e,h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia&lt;sup&gt;d,e,f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL U.S.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia/Prince Edward Island&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and New Brunswick&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. In Massachusetts in 2011, 5 animals were released alive and one taken to rehab. One Maine animal was taken to rehab in 2012. Three Massachusetts live strandings were taken to rehab in 2013 and 1 Maine animal was released alive.

b. In Rhode Island in 2011, one animal classified as human interaction due to fluke amputation.

c. One of the 2012 New York strandings classified as human interaction due to interaction with marine debris.

d. In 2014, one harbor porpoise in Virginia was classified as a fishery interaction.

e. Six total HI cases in 2010; 2 in Massachusetts, 1 in Maine, 1 in North Carolina and 2 in New Jersey. One of the New Jersey records, one of the North Carolina records, and the Maine record were fishery interactions.

f. Nine total HI cases in 2011; 5 in Massachusetts, 1 in Rhode Island, 2 in New York and 1 in Virginia. Two of these Massachusetts animals and the Virginia animal were fishery interactions.
g. Four HI cases in 2012. One of these was a fishery interaction (Massachusetts).
h. Ten total HI cases in 2013 (MA-3, ME-2, NY-3, NJ-1, CT-1), including one released alive (ME). Three of these were considered fishery interactions, including one entangled in gear in Maine.
i. Data supplied by Nova Scotia Marine Animal Response Society (pers. comm.). One of the 2012 animals trapped in mackerel net. Not included in count for 2014 are at least 8 animals released alive from weirs.

CANADA

Whales and dolphins stranded on the coast of Nova Scotia are recorded by the Marine Animal Response Society and the Nova Scotia Stranding Network, including 5 (1 released alive) in 2010, 13 (4 released alive) in 2011, 6 in 2012, 21 in 2013 and 9 in 2014; Table 3).

One dead stranded harbor porpoise was reported in 2010 by the Newfoundland and Labrador Whale Release and Strandings Program, 0 in 2011 and 2012, 3 in 2013, and 0 in 2014 (Ledwell and Huntington 2010, 2011, 2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2014; Table 3).

STATUS OF STOCK

Harbor porpoise in the Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy are not listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, and this stock is not considered strategic under the MMPA. The total U.S. fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is not less than 10% of the calculated PBR and, therefore, cannot be considered to be insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. The status of harbor porpoises, relative to OSP, in the U.S. Atlantic EEZ is unknown. Population trends for this species have not been investigated.
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