SPERM WHALE (*Physeter macrocephalus*): Northern Gulf of Mexico Stock

**STOCK DEFINITION AND GEOGRAPHIC RANGE**

Sperm whales are found throughout the world's oceans in deep waters to the edge of the ice at both poles (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Rice 1989; Whitehead 2002). Sperm whales were commercially hunted in the Gulf of Mexico by American whalers from sailing vessels until the early 1900s (Townsend 1935). In the northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., U.S. Gulf of Mexico) systematic aerial and ship surveys indicate that sperm whales inhabit continental slope and oceanic waters where they are widely distributed (Figure 1; Fulling et al. 2003; Mullin and Fulling 2004; Mullin *et al.* 2004; Maze-Foley and Mullin 2006; Mullin 2007). Seasonal aerial surveys confirm that sperm whales are present in the northern Gulf of Mexico in all seasons (Mullin *et al.* 1994; Hansen *et al.* 1996; Mullin and Hoggard 2000).

Because there are many confirmed records from Gulf of Mexico waters beyond U.S. boundaries (e.g., Jefferson and Schiro 1997, Ortega Ortiz 2002), sperm whales almost certainly occur throughout the oceanic Gulf of Mexico (Jefferson *et al.* 2008), which is also composed of waters belonging to Mexico and Cuba where there is currently little information on cetacean species abundance and distribution. U.S. waters only comprise about 40% of the entire Gulf of Mexico, and 65% of oceanic waters are south of the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

Sperm whales throughout the world exhibit a geographic social structure where females and juveniles of both sexes occur in mixed groups and inhabit tropical and subtropical waters. Males, as they mature, initially form bachelor groups but eventually become more socially isolated and more wide-ranging, inhabiting temperate and polar waters as well (Whitehead 2003). While this pattern also applies to the Gulf of Mexico, results of multi-disciplinary research conducted in the Gulf since 2000 confirms speculation by Schmidly (1981) and indicates clearly that Gulf of Mexico sperm whales constitute a stock that is distinct from other Atlantic Ocean stocks(s) (Mullin *et al.* 2003; Jaquet 2006; Jochens *et al.* 2008). The following summarizes the most significant stock structure-related findings from the Sperm Whale Seismic Study (Jochens *et al.* 2008) and associated projects. Measurements of the total length of Gulf of Mexico sperm whales indicate that they are 1.5-2.0m smaller on average compared to whales measured in other areas. Female/immature group size in the Gulf is about one-third to one-fourth that found in the Pacific Ocean but more similar to group sizes in the Caribbean (Richter *et al.* 2008; Jaquet and Gendron 2009). Tracks from 39 whales satellite tagged in the northern Gulf were monitored for up to 607 days. No discernable seasonal migrations were made, but Gulf-wide movements primarily along the northern Gulf slope did occur. The tracks showed that whales exhibit a range of movement patterns within the Gulf, including movement into the southern Gulf in a few cases, but that only 1 whale (a male) left the Gulf of Mexico. This animal moved into the North Atlantic and then back into the Gulf after about 2 months. Additionally, no matches were found when 285 individual whales photo-identified from the Gulf and
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**Figure 1. Distribution of sperm whale sightings from SEFSC vessel surveys during summer 2003 and spring 2004, and during summer 2009. All the on-effort sightings are shown, though not all were used to estimate abundance. Solid lines indicate the 100m and 1,000m isobaths and the offshore extent of the U.S. EEZ.**
about 2500 from the North Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea were compared. Engelhaupt et al. (2009) conducted an analysis of maternally inherited mtDNA and found a significant genetic differentiation between animals from the northern Gulf of Mexico compared to those from the western North Atlantic Ocean, North Sea and Mediterranean Sea. Analysis of biparentally inherited nuclear DNA showed no significant difference between whales sampled in the Gulf and those from the other areas of the North Atlantic, indicating that mature males move in and out of the Gulf. Sperm whales make vocalizations used in a social context called “codas” that have distinct patterns that are apparently culturally transmitted (Watkins and Schevill 1977; Whitehead and Weilgart 1991; Rendell and Whitehead 2001), and based on degree of social affiliation, mixed groups of sperm whales worldwide can be placed in recognizable acoustic clans (Rendell and Whitehead 2003). Recordings from mixed groups in the Gulf of Mexico compared to those from other areas of the Atlantic indicated that Gulf sperm whales constitute a distinct acoustic clan that is rarely encountered outside of the Gulf. It is assumed from this that groups from other clans enter the northern Gulf only infrequently (Gordon et al. 2008). Antunes (2009) used additional data to further examine variation in sperm whale coda repertoires in the North Atlantic Ocean, and found that variation in the North Atlantic is mostly geographically structured based on findings of coda patterns unique to certain regions and a significant negative correlation between coda repertoire similarities and geographic distance. His work also suggested sperm whale coda differentiation of the Gulf of Mexico from the North Atlantic.

Additional research by Gero et al. (2007) suggested that movements of sperm whales between the adjacent areas of the Caribbean Sea, Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic may not be common. No matches were made from animals photo-identified in the eastern Caribbean Sea (islands of Dominica, Guadeloupe, Grenada, St. Lucia and Martinique) with either animals from the Sargasso Sea or the Gulf of Mexico.

**POPULATION SIZE**

The best abundance estimate available for northern Gulf of Mexico sperm whales is 763 (CV=0.38; Table 1). This estimate is from a summer 2009 oceanic survey covering waters from the 200-m isobath to the seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ.

**Earlier abundance estimates**

All estimates of abundance were derived through the application of distance sampling analysis (Buckland et al. 2001) and the computer program DISTANCE (Thomas et al. 1998) to line-transect survey data collected from ships in the oceanic northern Gulf of Mexico (i.e., 200-m isobath to seaward extent of the U.S. EEZ) and are summarized in Appendix IV.

From 1991 through 1994, and from 1996 through 2001 (excluding 1998), annual surveys were conducted during spring along a fixed plankton-sampling trackline. Due to limited survey effort in any given year, the survey effort-weighted estimated average abundance of sperm whales for all surveys combined was estimated. For 1991 to 1994, the estimate was 530 (CV=0.31) (Hansen et al. 1995), and for 1996 to 2001, 1,349 (CV=0.23) (Mullin and Fulling 2004; Table 1).

During summer 2003 and spring 2004, surveys dedicated to estimating cetacean abundance were conducted along a grid of uniformly-spaced transect lines from a random start. The abundance estimate for sperm whales, pooled from 2003 to 2004, was 1,665 (CV=0.20) (Mullin 2007; Table 1).

**Recent survey and abundance estimate**

During summer 2009, a line-transect survey dedicated to estimating the abundance of oceanic cetaceans was conducted in the northern Gulf of Mexico. Survey lines were stratified in relation to depth and the location of the Loop Current. The abundance estimate for sperm whales in oceanic waters during 2009 was 763 (CV=0.38; Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>N_{best}</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun 1991-1994</td>
<td>Oceanic waters</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-Jun 1996-2001 (excluding 1998)</td>
<td>Oceanic waters</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-Aug 2003, Apr-Jun 2004</td>
<td>Oceanic waters</td>
<td>1,665</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-Aug 2009</td>
<td>Oceanic waters</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>0.38</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 abundance estimate. This is equivalent to the 20th percentile of the log-normal distributed abundance estimate as specified by Wade and Angliss (1997). The best estimate of abundance for sperm whales is 763 (CV=0.38). The minimum population estimate for the northern Gulf of Mexico is 560 sperm whales.

Current Population Trend

Four point estimates of sperm whale abundance have been made based on data from surveys covering 1991-2009. The estimates vary by a maximum factor of more than three. To determine whether changes in abundance have occurred over this period, an analysis of all the survey data needs to be conducted which incorporates covariates (e.g., survey conditions, season) that could potentially affect estimates. Nevertheless, differences in temporal abundance estimates will still be difficult to interpret without a Gulf of Mexico-wide understanding of sperm whale abundance. The oceanography of the Gulf of Mexico is quite dynamic, and the spatial scale of the Gulf is small relative to the ability of most cetacean species to travel. Studies based on abundance and distribution surveys restricted to U.S. waters are unable to detect temporal shifts in distribution beyond U.S. waters that might account for any changes in abundance.

Current and Maximum Net Productivity Rates

Current and maximum net productivity rates are unknown for this stock. For purposes of this assessment, the maximum net productivity rate was assumed to be 0.04. This value is based on theoretical modeling showing that cetacean populations may not grow at rates much greater than 4% given the constraints of their reproductive history (Barlow et al. 1995).

Potential Biological Removal

Potential Biological Removal (PBR) is the product of the minimum population size, one half the maximum net productivity rate and a recovery factor (MMPA Sec. 3.16 U.S.C. 1362; Wade and Angliss 1997). The minimum population size is 560. The maximum productivity rate is 0.04, the default value for cetaceans. The recovery factor, which accounts for endangered, depleted, threatened stocks, or stocks of unknown status relative to optimum sustainable population (OSP), is assumed to be 0.1 because the sperm whale is an endangered species. PBR for the northern Gulf of Mexico sperm whale is 1.1.

Annual Human-Caused Mortality and Serious Injury

There has been no reported fishing-related mortality or serious injury of a sperm whale during 1998-2010 (Yeung 1999; 2001; Garrison 2003; Garrison and Richards 2004; Garrison 2005; Fairfield Walsh and Garrison 2006; Fairfield-Walsh and Garrison 2007; Fairfield and Garrison 2008; Garrison et al. 2009; Garrison and Stokes 2010; 2011). However, during 2008 there was 1 sperm whale released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Garrison et al. 2009). Also during 2008 there was 1 sperm whale mortality due to entanglement in the sea anchor (parachute anchor and lines) of a longline fishing vessel.

Fisheries Information

The commercial fishery which potentially could interact with this stock in the Gulf of Mexico is the Atlantic Ocean, Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico large pelagic longline fishery (Appendix III). Pelagic swordfish, tunas and billfish are the targets of the longline fishery operating in the northern Gulf of Mexico. There were no reports of mortality or serious injury to sperm whales by this fishery. However, on 2 June 2008 there was 1 sperm whale released alive with no serious injury after an entanglement interaction with the pelagic longline fishery (Garrison et al. 2009). The whale was entangled in mainline and other gear and was accompanied by a calf. The mainline broke when the whale dove and gear remained on the animal; however, since it was a large whale it was not considered seriously injured (Garrison and Stokes 2008). This was the first observed interaction between a sperm whale and this fishery. During 15 April – 15 June 2008 observer coverage in the Gulf of Mexico was greatly enhanced to collect more robust information on the interactions between pelagic longline vessels and spawning bluefin tuna. Resulting observer coverage for this time and area is dramatically higher than typical for previous years (Garrison et al. 2009).

A commercial fishery for sperm whales operated in the Gulf of Mexico in deep waters between the Mississippi River delta and DeSoto Canyon during the late 1700s to the early 1900s (Mullin et al. 1991), but the exact number of
whales taken is not known (Townsend 1935; Lowery 1974). Townsend (1935) reported many records of sperm whales from April through July in the north-central Gulf (Petersen and Hoggard 1996).

Other Mortality

There were 8 sperm whale strandings in the northern Gulf of Mexico during 2006–2010 (Table 1; NOAA National Marine Mammal Health and Stranding Response Database unpublished data, accessed 16 November 2011). For 1 stranding, no evidence of human interaction was detected; for the remaining 7 strandings, it could not be determined if there was evidence of human interactions. During June 2010, 1 dead sperm whale was found floating 77 miles due south of the Deepwater Horizon spill site. It was not found in oiled waters; however, the location of its death is unknown. Cause of death is also unknown; the animal did not appear oily. Stranding data probably underestimate the extent of human-related mortality and serious injury because not all of the marine mammals which die or are seriously injured in human interactions wash ashore, not all that wash ashore are discovered, reported or investigated, nor will all of those that do wash ashore necessarily show signs of entanglement or other human interaction. Finally, the level of technical expertise among stranding network personnel varies widely as does the ability to recognize signs of fishery interactions.

An Unusual Mortality Event (UME) was declared for cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico beginning 1 February 2010; and, as of early 2012, the event is still ongoing. It includes cetaceans that stranded prior to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill (see “Habitat Issues” below), during the spill, and after. During 2010, 2 animals from this stock were considered to be part of the UME.

Ship strikes to whales occur world-wide and are a source of injury and mortality. One possible sperm whale mortality due to a vessel strike has been documented for the Gulf of Mexico. The incident occurred in 1990 in the vicinity of Grande Isle, Louisiana. Deep cuts on the dorsal surface of the whale indicated the ship strike was probably pre-mortem (Jensen and Silber 2004).

During 2008 there was 1 sperm whale mortality due to entanglement in the sea anchor (parachute anchor and lines) of a longline fishing vessel. The animal was originally identified as “unknown marine mammal,” but was later identified to species via genetic testing.

Table 1. Sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) strandings along the U.S. Gulf of Mexico coast, 2006–2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These strandings are included in the Northern Gulf of Mexico UME

HABITAT ISSUES

The Deepwater Horizon (DWH) MC252 drilling platform, located approximately 50 miles southeast of the Mississippi River Delta in waters about 1500m deep, exploded on 20 April 2010. The rig sank, and for 87 days millions of barrels of oil and gas were discharged from the wellhead until it was capped on 15 July 2010. During the response effort dispersants were applied extensively at the seafloor and at the sea surface (Lehr *et al.* 2010; OSAT 2010). In-situ burning, or controlled burning of oil at the surface, was also used extensively as a response tool (Lehr *et al.* 2010). The oil, dispersant and burn residue compounds present ecological concerns. The magnitude of this oil spill was unprecedented in U.S. history, causing impacts to wildlife, natural habitats and human communities along coastal areas from western Louisiana to the Florida Panhandle (NOAA 2011). It could be years before the entire scope of damage is ascertained (NOAA 2011).
Shortly after the oil spill, the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) process was initiated under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990. A variety of NRDA research studies are being conducted to determine potential impacts of the spill on marine mammals. These studies have focused on identifying the type, magnitude, severity, length and impact of oil exposure to oceanic, coastal and estuarine marine mammals. The research is ongoing and likely will continue for some time. For continental shelf and oceanic cetaceans, the NOAA-led efforts include: aerial surveys to document the distribution, abundance, species and exposure of marine mammals and turtles relative to oil from DWH spill; and ship surveys to evaluate exposure to oil and other chemicals and to assess changes in animal behavior and distribution relative to oil exposure through visual and acoustic surveys, deployment of passive acoustic monitoring systems, collection of tissue samples, and deployment of satellite tags on sperm and Bryde’s whales.

Aerial surveys have observed Risso’s dolphins, spinner dolphins, pantropical spotted dolphins, striped dolphins, bottlenose dolphins and sperm whales swimming in oil in offshore waters (NOAA 2010a). The effects of oil exposure on marine mammals depend on a number of factors including the type and mixture of chemicals involved; the amount, frequency and duration of exposure; the route of exposure (inhaled, ingested, absorbed, or external); and biomedical risk factors of the particular animal (Geraci 1990; NOAA 2010b). In general, direct external contact with petroleum compounds or dispersants with skin may cause skin irritation, chemical burns and infections. Inhalation of volatile petroleum compounds or dispersants may irritate or injure the respiratory tract, which could lead to pneumonia or inflammation. Ingestion of petroleum compounds may cause injury to the gastrointestinal tract, which could affect an animal’s ability to digest or absorb food. Absorption of petroleum compounds or dispersants may damage kidney, liver and brain function in addition to causing immune suppression and anemia. Long-term chronic effects such as lowered reproductive success and decreased survival may occur (Geraci 1990; NOAA 2010b).

Seismic vessel operations in the Gulf of Mexico (commercial and academic) now operate with marine mammal observers as part of required mitigation measures. There have been no reported seismic-related or industry ship-related mortalities or injuries to sperm whales. However, disturbance by anthropogenic noise may prove to be an important habitat issue in some areas of this population’s range, notably in areas of oil and gas activities and/or where shipping activity is high. Results from very limited studies of northern Gulf of Mexico sperm whale responses to seismic exploration indicate that sperm whales do not appear to exhibit horizontal avoidance of seismic survey activities. Data did suggest that there may be some decrease in foraging effort during exposure to full-array airgun firing, at least for some individuals. Further study is needed as sample sizes are insufficient at this time (Miller et al. 2009).

The potential impact, if any, of coastal pollution may be an issue for this species in portions of its habitat, though little is known on this to date.

STATUS OF STOCK

The status of sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Mexico, relative to OSP, is unknown. This species is listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). There are insufficient data to determine the population trends for this species. Total human-caused mortality and serious injury for this stock is not known. There is insufficient information available to determine whether the total fishery-related mortality and serious injury for this stock is insignificant and approaching zero mortality and serious injury rate. This is a strategic stock because the sperm whale is listed as an endangered species under the ESA.
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