Final

Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement

for

Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation

or

Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey

June 2011

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

FINAL

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ OVERSEAS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FOR

MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH FUNDED BY THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION OR CONDUCTED BY THE U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

JUNE 2011

Prepared for:
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725
Arlington, VA
and
U.S. Geological Survey
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston, VA

For additional information, contact:
Mr. Bauke (Bob) Houtman, Head, Integrative Programs Section or
Ms. Holly Smith, Assistant Program Officer, Integrative Programs Section
Division of Ocean Sciences,
National Science Foundation
(703) 292–8583 or nepacomments@nsf.gov

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 INTRODUCTION

This Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) (hereafter called PEIS) for Marine Seismic Research funded by the National Science Foundation or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey has been prepared by the National Science Foundation (NSF) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code [USC] §4321 et seq.); the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] §§ 1500-1508); NSF procedures for implementing NEPA and CEQ regulations (45 CFR 640); and Executive Order (EO) 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions*.

NSF is the proponent for the NSF-funded marine seismic research and is the lead agency for the preparation of this Final PEIS. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) are cooperating agencies.

ES.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

This Final PEIS examines the potential impacts that may result from geophysical exploration and scientific research using seismic surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS. The Proposed Action is for academic and U.S. government scientists in the U.S., and possible international collaborators, to conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions and government agencies. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to fund the investigation of the geology and geophysics of the seafloor by collecting seismic reflection and refraction data that reveal the structure and stratigraphy of the crust and/or overlying sediment below the world's oceans. NSF has a continuing need to fund seismic surveys that enable scientists to collect data essential to understanding the complex Earth processes beneath the ocean floor. Data collected from marine seismic surveys:

- were important in hypothesizing, and subsequently demonstrating, the validity of the theory of plate tectonics;
- are vital to making ocean drilling scientifically useful and environmentally safe;
- provide imaging of ocean faults, which is key to studies of earthquake and landslide hazards;
- are essential to evaluate the potential for tsunami generation, which, in most cases, result from submarine slumping associated with earthquakes;
- are used to define potential failure regions, slip planes, oversteepened slopes, creep, zones of potential overpressures, and concentrations of gas hydrates or shallow free gas that may play a role in destabilization of sedimentary slopes;
- are used to map sedimentary horizons, allowing correlation of sediment type and age across long distances, and providing information on spatial and temporal distributions of processes (such as climatic or oceanographic events) at geologic time scales;
- can be used to directly image magma chambers in volcanoes or mid-ocean ridges, and repeat surveys can be used to image changes in magma reservoirs related to eruptions; and
- can be used to interpret processes of compaction, folding, dewatering, and other processes in subduction zones that lead to uplift, earthquakes, slumping, and other processes that will impact land and people.

The funding and conducting of marine seismic research would continue to meet NSF's critical need to foster a better understanding of Earth's history, natural hazards, and climate history. A few representative, recent examples of NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research include:

- locating stratigraphic records of environmental change that assist in understanding anthropogenic warming and the melting of glaciers;
- understanding source mechanisms, fault locations, and hazard potentials for large earthquakes and tsunamis along faults and segments of tectonic plate boundaries, allowing prioritization of tsunami and earthquake warning systems;
- imaging sedimentary packages that indicate how erosion and sedimentation have impacted and changed the size and shapes of the continental shelves over time;
- examining the formation and evolution of volcanic islands, mid-ocean ridges, and igneous provinces;
- understanding the evolution and movement of tectonic plates;
- providing essential geological information needed for initiation of scientific ocean drilling and bore hole observatory monitoring of the ocean crust;
- studying structures produced by asteroid impacts;
- mapping the seafloor and its topographic relief and understanding the causes of submarine geologic structures;
- mapping hydrothermal vent systems and determining the pattern of circulation of sub-seafloor fluids;
- evaluating the distribution and volume of methane gas in free and hydrated form within a region, and the potential impact on the ocean and atmosphere of a release of large volumes of methane gas; and
- understanding the distribution and amount of sediment-hosted natural gas beneath the world's oceans.

In addition to specific marine seismic research, geoscience exploration through ocean drilling has been an ongoing effort by NSF with international partners since the early 1970s. Seismic reflection surveying is a critical, required element for every site that gets drilled under the auspices of the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program, as well as under the program's predecessors: Ocean Drilling Program and Deep Sea Drilling Project.

ES.3 PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH

Currently, Environmental Assessments (EAs) are prepared for individual or a small group of research cruises. The potential impact identified has been the sound from seismic surveys on marine resources and species listed under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA). The EAs have been used to provide the necessary information to initiate and conduct informal or formal consultation with the NOAA Office of Protected Resources (OPR) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. For research cruises with the potential for adverse impacts to listed species, NOAA OPR and/or USFWS have issued a Biological Opinion and related Incidental Take Statements, which included terms and conditions to minimize impacts on threatened and endangered species. In parallel with this effort, when applicable, a separate application for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) under Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA was submitted for each cruise to another division within NOAA OPR, which subsequently issued the IHA.

NSF and the USGS have decided that a Programmatic EIS/OEIS would minimize duplication of effort in environmental documentation and to address the potential for cumulative effects of marine seismic

research acoustic sources upon marine resources. This PEIS addresses a variety of acoustic sources used for research activities conducted from various research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions or government agencies. A variety of other geoscience research activities, such as, but not limited to, mapping, dredging, drilling, and coring, might also be conducted on any seismic research cruise.

The programmatic NEPA approach provides a format for a comprehensive cumulative impacts analysis by taking a view of the planned marine seismic research activities as a whole. This is accomplished by assembling and analyzing the broadest range of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with all marine seismic research activities in addition to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the region of influence. Furthermore, the collective analysis of representative project locations will provide a strong technical basis for a more global assessment of the potential cumulative impacts of NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic activities in the future.

Subsequent project and cruise-specific NEPA documents or other appropriate environmental documents would use the framework of this programmatic document and address the potential impacts of specific cruise- and site-specific actions.

ES.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

ES.4.1 Exemplary Analysis Areas

Due to the potential for NSF-funded marine seismic cruises to occur across the world's oceans, it was necessary to narrow the focus of the impact analysis presented in this Final PEIS to a number of representative or exemplary analysis areas. The exemplary analysis areas were selected in areas where it was considered likely that a future marine seismic research cruise would be proposed for NSF funding by a scientific investigator, while at the same time including analysis areas within a wide range of Longhurst Biomes. The pelagic biogeography by Longhurst was utilized as a guide to identify areas with similar ecological dynamics.

This concept describes how individual species are distributed in the ocean, and explains how these species aggregate to form characteristic ecosystems under regional conditions of temperature, nutrients, and sunlight exposure. Although Longhurst Biomes are extremely large, the biome concept provided a large-scale selection criterion. For the purposes of this PEIS, 13 exemplary (representative) analysis areas were proposed for analysis within this Final PEIS, as listed in Table ES-1 and depicted in Figure ES-1: 5 areas were subject to detailed analysis [Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)] and 8 subject to qualitative analysis [Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)].

Table ES-1. Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas

Site Name	*Survey Track Area*	*Latitude*	*Longitude*	*Longhurst Biome*	*Survey Season*
DAA					
Western Gulf of Alaska (W Gulf of Alaska)	Between Kodiak & Shumagin Islands	53º–55°N	151–159°W	Pacific Westerly Winds	Summer
Southern California (S California)	Santa Barbara Basin	35° N	120° W	Pacific Coastal	Late Spring/ Early Sum
Galapagos Ridge	W of Galapagos Islands	4°S	103.6°W	Pacific Trade Wind	Austral Sum
Caribbean Sea (Caribbean)	Offshore of Venezuela	12° N	65° W	Atlantic Coastal	Spring/Summer
Northwestern Atlantic (NW Atlantic)	Offshore of New Jersey	39.5° N	73.5° W	Atlantic Coastal	Summer

Table ES-1. Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas

Site Name	*Survey Track Area*	*Latitude*	*Longitude*	*Longhurst Biome*	*Survey Season*
QAA					
British Columbia Coast (BC Coast)	Queen Charlotte Basin	52° N	129° W	Pacific Coastal	Fall
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	Deep water (>9,842 ft [3,000m])	26° N	40° W	Atlantic Westerly Winds	Spring, Summer, or Fall
Mariana Islands (Marianas)	Marianas Islands	17° N	145° E	Pacific Trade Wind	Spring
Sub-Antarctic	E of New Zealand	42° S	145° W	Antarctic Westerly Winds	Austral Summer
Northern Atlantic/Iceland (N Atlantic/Iceland)	S of Iceland	59°–65° N	33°–25° W	Atlantic Polar	Summer
Southwestern Atlantic (SW Atlantic)	NE of Brazil	5° N	45° W	Atlantic Trade Winds	Anytime
Western India (W India)	W of India	20° N	65° E	Indian Ocean Coastal	Late Spring or Early Fall
Western Australia (W Australia)	Offshore of NW Australia	18° S	120° E	Indian Ocean Coastal	Austral Spring or Fall

ES.4.2 Proposed Marine Seismic Research Activities

NSF-funded Marine Seismic Research

Under the Proposed Action, marine seismic surveys funded by NSF may take place across the world's oceans, including the Atlantic, Pacific, Indian, Arctic, and Southern Oceans, and in the Mediterranean Sea, and may be located in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) or territorial waters of the U.S. or foreign countries. About 4-7 cruises are conducted each year with cruises lasting about 1-7 weeks, are generally more than 3 nautical miles (nm) (5.6 kilometers [km]) off the coast, and primarily utilize high-energy source systems such as strings or arrays of 6-36 airguns. The amount of time in which seismic operations are conducted during any specific research cruise may range from 20 to >800 hours (hr) and depends upon the objectives of the research and the requirements of the geophysical study. Seismic operations generally occur in deeper, open ocean waters but can range from <328 feet (ft) (100 meters [m]) to >26,247 ft (8,000 m). The research vessels have the capability of towing different airgun configurations, depending on the need of the research and the scientific objectives. A variety of other research can also be conducted on NSF-funded marine seismic research cruises, including, but not limited to, mapping, water sampling, and scientific dredging, drilling, and coring.



Figure ES-1
Longhurst Biomes and Proposed Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas

USGS Marine Seismic Research

USGS seismic research for the past 3-5 years has been primarily coastal, utilizing high-resolution, low-energy source systems in primarily coastal waters. Among the USGS Coastal Centers in California (Menlo Park and Santa Cruz), Massachusetts (Woods Hole), and Florida (St. Petersburg), about 8-12 cruises are conducted each year. The cruises last about 1-3 weeks, are generally only within 3-5 nm (5.6-9.3 km) of the coast, and primarily utilize low-energy source systems such as chirp and sparker systems. Although USGS operated many large-source multichannel seismic reflection and refraction cruises in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, these kinds of cruises have been more the exception than the rule for USGS during the past decade. Water depths vary by area of operations, for example, on the Pacific west coast water depths are generally <328 ft (100 m), and generally not >3,281 ft (1,000 m). On the Atlantic east coast, water depths are generally <66 ft (20 m), and generally not >328 ft (100 m).

The research vessels used by USGS have the capability of towing different seismic sources and airgun configurations, depending on the need of the research and the scientific objectives. USGS cruises have variable scientific objectives ranging from fault identification (Pacific coast) to geological habitat mapping (all coasts) to assessing methane vents in thawing permafrost regions (North Slope of Alaska). Recent mapping on the west coast has focused on multiyear systematic mapping of California state waters with multiple acoustic systems (e.g., swath mapping, side-scan sonar, and high-resolution chirp sub-bottom imaging). Similarly, the Woods Hole office is engaged in a multiyear systematic mapping of Massachusetts State waters using similar systems for overall coastal management. USGS has conducted similar studies off North Carolina, South Carolina, and New York to evaluate the geologic basis for coastal erosion. Similar systematic mapping studies are expected to continue off Oregon and Washington in future years.

ES.5 ACOUSTIC MODELING

Under the Proposed Action, a variety of airgun configurations ranging from small arrays of 1-4 airguns to large arrays of 18-36 airguns, as well as other lower energy non-seismic acoustic sources including MBESs, SBPs, and pingers, would be operated. Because of the complexities and variability of sound propagation from these sources in different ocean environments, acoustic modeling is a key component in an effective scientific analysis of the extent of the potential acoustic impacts. As described previously, five exemplary areas were identified for detailed acoustic analysis, and a representative seismic survey scenario using airguns as the seismic acoustic source was modeled for each area.

For a quantitative assessment of the potential impact of an exemplary marine seismic survey, it is necessary to integrate the predicted (modeled) seismic survey sound field with the expected distribution of marine animals. This is a three-part process:

1. Estimate the 3-dimensional (3-D) sound field while the airguns are operating at representative locations within the analysis area using an airgun array source model and a sound propagation model.
2. Estimate the 3-D locations and movements of simulated animals in space and time.
3. Integrate these two sets of model outputs to estimate the maximum and cumulative airgun sound that would be received by each simulated animal, and then assess the potential impact of the seismic survey sound source on a specific species or group.

The computer models used to develop these estimates are described in detail in Appendix B, *Acoustic Modeling Report*. A further step in the analysis process is to assess, in a qualitative manner, how the

impacts in eight additional scenarios would be expected to compare with those in the five scenarios analyzed in detail.

In this Final PEIS, the full process outlined above is applied for marine mammals. Marine mammals are a resource of particular concern with regard to seismic surveys. Also, marine mammals are the animals for which most progress has been made in identifying the specific sound exposure criteria that need to be defined in order to undertake a quantitative assessment of impact. Other resources are analyzed in a less detailed and more qualitative way, but taking into account specific impact criteria where available.

ES.6 ACTION ALTERNATIVES

Two action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative are proposed. The two action alternatives are:

- Alternative A: Conduct Marine Seismic Research Using Cruise-specific Mitigation Measures
- Alternative B: Conduct Marine Seismic Research Using Cruise-specific Mitigation Measures with Generic Mitigation Measures for Low-energy Acoustic Sources (Preferred Alternative)

Marine seismic research cruises would use a variety of airgun (pneumatic sound source) array configurations, and often use other non-seismic acoustic sources as well, including multi-beam echo sounders (MBESs), sub-bottom profilers (SBPs), pingers, acoustic Doppler current profilers (ADCPs), and acoustic releases. Seismic sources would include high-energy source arrays of 18-36 airguns (up to a discharge volume of 6,600 cubic inches [in^3]) and low-energy source arrays of 1-4 airguns (up to a discharge volume of 425 in^3). Sources used in NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research include those on the R/V *Langseth*, the primary vessel used to support high-energy source seismic research, as well as airguns and other low-energy seismic acoustic sources (e.g., chirp systems, sparkers, water guns, etc.) on University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS) vessels operated directly by the U.S. Government, such as USGS, and others as needed via contract or charter. All NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic cruises would be conducted according to applicable U.S. federal and state laws and regulations, and as applicable, foreign laws and regulations recognized by the U.S. Government.

Numerous species of marine mammals and sea turtles are expected to be encountered during marine seismic research activities. The following subsections describe mitigation measures that are an integral part of NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research activities under Alternatives A and B.

Alternatives A and B differ in how the proposed safety radii or mitigation zones (MZs) are determined. For operations with no request for MMPA incidental take authorization, the MZs are the same in Alternative A and Alternative B. Where take is expected and authorization is requested, Alternative A would require a specific calculation of MZs and FMZs for every proposed cruise, whereas Alternative B introduces a generic set of MZ conditions that would be applied to low-energy seismic operations proposed in water depths >328 ft (100 m).

The use of small numbers of generator-injector (GI) guns and other acoustic sources (e.g., towed chirp systems, sparkers, boomers) for low-energy seismic survey work in waters >328 ft (100 m) in depth, most often conducted on UNOLS and USGS vessels or in support of ocean-drilling operations, have modeled MZs of <328 ft (100 m). Therefore, in Alternative B, NSF and USGS would conservatively apply the use of a 328-ft (100-m) MZ for all low-energy acoustic sources in water depths >328 ft (100 m).

For the purposes of this PEIS, a low-energy source is defined as an acoustic source whose received level is $\leq$180 decibels reference 1 microPascal (dB re 1μPa) at 328 ft (100 m). Based on this definition and previous modeling results of various acoustic sources previously assumed to be low-energy sources, the following categories of acoustic sources are defined as low-energy seismic sources:

- GI Guns:
  - Any single or any two GI guns.
  - Three or four GI guns, within the allowable range of tow depths and element separations explained in detail in Appendix F.
- Generic single-chamber airguns:
  - A tuned array of four airguns (volumes between 25 and 160 in^3 each) within the allowable range of tow depths and element separations explained in detail in Appendix F.
  - A single pair of clustered airguns with individual volumes of 250 in^3 or less.
  - Two small 2-clusters (four airguns) with maximum volumes of 45 in^3.
  - Any single airgun 425 in^3 or smaller, at any tow depth.
- Any towed sparker, boomer, water gun, or chirp system with a source level <205 dB re 1μPa-m.

Table ES-2 provides a summary of the MZs proposed under Alternative A and Alternative B.

Table ES-2. Comparison of Alternatives A and B

Stipulation	*Alternative A*	*Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)*
200-m FMZ for expected no-take situations	X	X
100-m MZ for defined low-energy sources		X
Cruise-specific calculations of MZs for all sources defined as low energy	X	
Cruise-specific calculations of FMZs for all sources defined as low or high energy	X	X

ES6.1 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would apply in general to all proposed NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research cruises under Alternatives A or B. However, for those cruises that may be conducted within the EEZ and territorial waters of another nation, additional or different mitigation measures may be required by that nation. In addition, the following proposed mitigation measures are identified for NEPA purposes. While similar mitigation and monitoring may be required for incidental take authorizations under the MMPA, such mitigation would be developed in coordination with NMFS or the USFWS on a case-by-case basis for specific cruises during the processing of the incidental take authorization.

Under Alternative B, for any seismic survey cruise that proposes a low-energy source as defined above, there would be a standard MZ of 328 ft (100 m) for all marine mammals and turtles. For acoustic sources not defined as low-energy sources, cruise-specific MZs would need to be modeled to determine the effective MZs for marine mammals and turtles.

Mitigation during Planning Phases

Research proposals submitted to NSF undergo a competitive, merit review process which typically includes external expert review by an *ad hoc* panel and/or mail review. After scientific, technical, and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. After Division approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding are forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications and the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. NSF strives to make funding decisions within 6 months of proposal receipt. Awardees that require time on research vessels are typically scheduled a minimum of 1 year in advance of the desired cruise date.

Considerable planning is required to schedule a marine seismic research cruise. In scheduling a seismic survey, NSF and the entities that propose to conduct the cruise would consider potential environmental impacts including seasonal, biological, and weather factors; ship schedules; and equipment availability. This preliminary assessment of potential environmental impacts would be part of the NSF proposal review and cruise scheduling processes, with a full assessment completed prior to cruise departure.

A preliminary assessment would include identifying within a proposed seismic survey area the occurrence, level and type of use (e.g., breeding, feeding, migrating, etc.), and seasons of use by marine mammals, sea turtles, and other ESA-listed species; potential occurrence of commercial, local, and subsistence fishing activities; and other site-specific concerns. This preliminary information would be used to assess the feasibility of conducting an NSF-funded marine seismic study at a specific location; specific times or locations within an area where potential impacts would be avoided or minimized; and to identify any additional mitigation and/or monitoring measures that would be implemented to avoid or minimize potential impacts.

For each proposed research cruise, NSF and the project applicants would consider whether the research objectives could be met with a smaller source and a survey design that minimizes seismic operations. If there is concern about exposure of sensitive biota, NSF and the project proponents would also consider whether a different survey time would reduce those effects. Through pre-cruise planning, areas and seasons where there are expected concentrations of marine mammals and sea turtles would be identified and avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Special consideration would be given to marine biota engaged in sensitive activities such as breeding, rearing of young, and feeding. If appropriate, NSF and the project proponents would also implement mitigation measures to address potential impacts to fishing activities.

USGS marine seismic research projects are conducted to support approved programs of the USGS for which the agency has direct or reimbursable funding. The potential environmental impact of such marine seismic projects is considered throughout the planning process. Like NSF, the USGS also considers whether research objectives can be attained using smaller seismic sources or alternative survey design and, to the extent possible, surveys are planned to reduce the potential impact of seismic sources on sensitive marine biota and human activities (e.g., fishing).

Visual Monitoring for Marine Mammals and Turtles

Under Alternative A, Protected Species Visual Observers (PSVOs) would be based aboard the seismic source vessel, and would watch for marine mammals and turtles near the vessel during daytime airgun operations and start-ups of airguns at night. PSVOs would also watch for marine mammals and turtles near the seismic vessel for at least 30 minutes (min) prior to the start of airgun operations after an extended shutdown. When feasible, PSVOs would also make observations during daytime periods when the seismic systems are not operating for comparison of animal abundance and behavior during seismic and non-seismic periods. Based on PSVO observations, airguns would be powered down (see below) or, if necessary, shut down completely, when marine mammals are observed within or about to enter a designated MZ (see below). The MZ is a region in which a possibility exists of effects on animal hearing or other physical effects (Level A harassment). PSVOs also monitor for species to the full mitigation zone (FMZ) which includes the area identified for potential behavioral harassment (Level B harassment).

PSVOs would be appointed by the academic institution conducting the research cruise in the case of NSF-funded research and by USGS in the case of USGS marine seismic research, with NMFS Office of Protected Resources concurrence after review of their qualifications. At least one PSVO would monitor the MZ during daytime airgun operations and any nighttime startups. PSVOs would normally work in

shifts of 4-hr duration or less and work no more than three shifts in a 24-hr period. The vessel crew would also be instructed to assist in detecting marine mammals and turtles. A report summarizing PSVO observations would be submitted to NMFS and/or USFWS after the cruise in compliance with terms of authorizations for marine mammal harassment or endangered species takes. The report would describe the seismic operations and include a complete description of the data collected about marine mammals, turtles, and any other threatened or endangered species observed.

All vessels conducting NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would be required to have suitable platforms for marine mammal and turtle observation. On the observation platform, the eye level of the PSVO would be sufficiently above sea level, and the observer would have a clear view around most of the vessel. During daytime operations, the PSVO would scan the area around the vessel systematically with reticule binoculars, "Big-eye" 25x power binoculars (on the R/V *Langseth* only), and with the naked eye. Night vision devices (NVDs) would be available for their use. Laser rangefinding binoculars would be available to assist in distance estimation.

Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM)

PAM involves towing hydrophones that detect frequencies produced by vocalizing marine mammals. Ideally, two or more hydrophones are used to allow some localization of the bearing (direction) of the animal from the vessel. A key component of PAM which allows more effective use is the computer signal processing to detect and localize marine mammal vocalizations. Several prototype systems are under development.

During some cruises, PAM would be used during seismic operations in conjunction with visual monitoring. PAM would normally be used for high-energy source surveys unless in the rare and unlikely circumstances that, (1) it is damaged and rendered unoperable during a survey and back-up systems fail; (2) it is deemed to be ineffective in detecting animals under the circumstances of the cruise; or (3) safety of operations prevent its use. When implemented, PAM would typically be used during both daytime and nighttime seismic operations as well as when the vessel is underway in the survey area with the airguns silent. During a seismic survey, PAM can be effective at detecting some animals before they are detected visually. Its value can be limited, however, by bottom configuration (water depth) and other environmental factors, and in some cases towing the PAM equipment is not practicable. Because of present limitations to determine range of acoustic contacts, the value of PAM is to detect acoustic cues that alert visual observers of the presence and general direction of marine mammals.

Inclusion of PAM does not reduce the need for visual observations, and it is expected that PAM operation would require additional personnel beyond those aboard as PSVOs, including at least one with previous PAM experience. NMFS would need to provide concurrence on the use of PAM personnel after review of their qualifications. When PAM is used, PAM procedures and results would be included in post-cruise reports submitted to NMFS and/or USFWS in accordance with MMPA and ESA regulatory requirements.

Proposed Safety Radii or MZ: Operations for Which Incidental Take of Marine Mammals is Anticipated

For operations under an IHA or LOA under Alternative A, detection of marine mammals within a specified distance around the airguns (the MZ) would be followed by an immediate power down or shutdown of the airguns. The mitigation radii under Alternative A would normally be the distances at which the effective received sound level would diminish below 190 or 180 dB re 1 μPa (rms). Radii were calculated for both M-weighted as well as flat (unweighted) levels. These radii are determined by acoustical modeling that considers site-specific acoustic characteristics (water depth, in particular), the airgun configurations to be used, and the hearing characteristics of expected marine mammals in the study

area. Modeling would incorporate the most current data on airgun output and species hearing characteristics as it becomes available. However, for certain cetaceans of special concern, more precautionary criteria would apply (see "*Special Mitigation Measures*" below).

Proposed Safety Radii or MZ: Operations for Which Incidental Take of Marine Mammals is not Anticipated or Authorized

Shutdowns or power downs would be required whenever marine mammals or turtles are detected within an FMZ, defined as an extended MZ encompassing the full region in which NMFS estimates behavioral disturbance (≥160 dB re 1 µPa [rms]), also called 'Level B harassment', might occur. The FMZ must be clearly visible and PSVOs available to monitor it throughout any period of seismic source use. These operations would use low-energy seismic sound sources in which 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) is not exceeded or within close proximity to the source and the extent of 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) sound levels are within 200 m of the source.

While technically the FMZ may be an overestimation of the area potentially ensonified to 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms), it must be within a range that can be effectively monitored. Proposed use of sources would be on the order of hours or short-duration shooting over several days (not extensive track-lines). Examples of proposed actions would be the use of 1 to 2 GI-guns for bore-hole testing (e.g., VSP). The small number of airguns in these situations limits application of ramp-ups and power-downs. Immediate shut-down for a marine mammal or turtle approaching the FMZ would be the primary mitigation response.

With mitigation, no takes would be expected. When proposed research cannot avoid an area of particular sensitivity, the action would require additional considerations and potentially an incidental take authorization. In general, surveying with small sources as well as VSP carried out in the vicinity of drill sites (stationary vessel sources) that have habitat sensitivity or other issues that might require a specific incidental take authorization (e.g., IHA or LOA) would be determined in consultation with NMFS OPR.

Mitigation during Operations

Operational measures to mitigate the impact of sound on marine mammals and turtles include:

1. Vessel speed or course alteration;
2. Airgun array power down;
3. Airgun array shutdown;
4. Airgun array ramp-up; and
5. Special mitigation measures for circumstances of particular concern.

Speed or course alteration. If a marine mammal or turtle is detected outside the MZ but is likely to enter it based on relative movement of the vessel and the animal, then if safety and scientific objectives allow, the vessel speed and/or course would be adjusted to minimize the likelihood of the animal entering the MZ. It should be noted that major course and speed adjustments are often impractical when towing long seismic streamers and large source arrays; thus for surveys involving large sources, alternative mitigation measures would often be required.

Power down procedures. A power down involves reducing the number of airguns operating to a single airgun in order to minimize the size of the MZ. The continued operation of one airgun is intended to alert marine mammals and turtles to the presence of the seismic vessel nearby.

If a marine mammal or turtle is detected within, or is likely to enter the MZ of the array in use, and if vessel course/speed changes are impractical or would not be effective to prevent the animal from entering the MZ, then the array would be powered down to ensure the animal remains outside the smaller MZ of

the single airgun. If the size of the MZ for the single airgun would not prevent the animal from entering it, then a shutdown would be required, as described below.

Following a power down, airgun activity would not resume until the marine mammal or turtle is outside the MZ for the full array. The animal would be considered to have cleared the MZ if it:

- is visually observed to have left the MZ;
- has not been seen within the MZ for 15 min in the case of small odontocetes, pinnipeds, and sea otters;
- has not been seen within the MZ for 30 min in the case of mysticetes and large odontocetes, including sperm, pygmy sperm, dwarf sperm, and beaked whales; or
- the vessel has moved outside the applicable MZ in which the animal in question was last seen.

Following a power down and subsequent animal departure as noted above, the airgun array would resume operations following ramp-up procedures described below.

Shutdown procedures. If a marine mammal or turtle is within or about to enter the MZ for a single airgun, or for a single airgun following a power down, all operational airguns would be shut down immediately. Airgun activity would not resume until the animal had cleared the MZ for the full array of airguns to be used, as described above.

Ramp-up procedures. A ramp-up procedure would be followed when an airgun array begins operating after a specified period without operations. The period would vary depending on the speed of the source vessel and the size of the airgun array being used. The specified period is defined as the time taken for the source vessel to travel the radius of the MZ specified for the array to be used.

Ramp-up would begin with the smallest airgun in the array. Airguns would be added in a sequence such that the source level of the array would increase in steps not exceeding 6 dB per 5-min period. A 36-airgun array would take approximately 30 min to achieve full operation via ramp-up. During ramp-up, the PSVOs would monitor the MZ, and if marine mammals or turtles are sighted, decisions about course/speed changes, power down, and shutdown would be implemented as though the full array were operational.

Initiation of ramp-up procedures from shutdown requires that the full MZ must be visible by the PSVOs for 30 min, whether conducted in daytime or nighttime. This requirement would often preclude startups under nighttime or poor-visibility conditions except for small sources with restricted MZs. Ramp-up is allowed from a power down under reduced visibility conditions, but only if at least one airgun has operated continuously with a source level of at least 180 dB re 1 μPa-m (rms) throughout the survey interruption. It is assumed that the single airgun would alert marine mammals and turtles to the approaching seismic vessel, allowing them to move away if they choose. Ramp-up procedures would not be initiated if a marine mammal or turtle is observed within the MZ of the airgun array to be operated.

Special mitigation measures. Airgun arrays would be shut down (not just powered down) if any of the following four species is sighted from the vessel, even if outside the MZ, due to their rarity and sensitive status: N Pacific right whale, N Atlantic right whale, Northeast Atlantic bowhead whale, and W Pacific gray whale. In case of confirmed sightings of any of these species, airgun operations would not resume until 30 min after the last documented whale visual sighting and the PSVO is confident that the whale is no longer in the vicinity of the vessel. Other species can be designated for special measures when appropriate.

Special measures would also apply over continental slopes, especially regions with submarine canyons, where beaked whales are believed to concentrate. Extra mitigation would be implemented there to minimize potential impacts on these species. Where possible, NSF-funded and USGS seismic surveys would minimize operations near submarine canyons. Extra vigilance, including use of extra PSVOs, would be maintained where such approaches are unavoidable. These special monitoring and mitigation requirements would be established in advance in consultation with NMFS for each cruise that would conduct seismic survey operations over slopes and canyon regions.

In addition to the mitigation efforts described above, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research operations would take special precautions to avoid impacting migrating, breeding, and nursing congregations of marine mammals; waters proximal to nesting sites and feeding areas of sea turtles; and waters important to juvenile or adult listed salmon and other protected species.

ES.7 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Potential impacts on the following resources were assessed and the following sections summarize the findings:

- Marine Invertebrates
- Marine Fish
- Sea Turtles
- Seabirds
- Marine Mammals – Cetaceans: Mysticetes (Baleen Whales)
- Marine Mammals – Cetaceans: Odontocetes (Toothed Whales and Dolphins)
- Marine Mammals – Pinnipeds (Seals and Sea Lions)
- Other Marine Mammals (Sea Otter, West Indian Manatee)
- Socioeconomics
- Cultural Resources

Alternatives A and B would have similar impacts on these resources. The No Action Alternative would have no impacts on these resources, because the proposed marine seismic surveys funded by NSF or conducted by USGS would not occur.

ES.7.1 Marine Invertebrates

The existing body of published and unpublished scientific literature on the impacts of seismic survey sound on marine invertebrates is limited, and there are no known systematic studies of the effects of sonar sound on invertebrates. Furthermore, it has not been specifically documented that invertebrates are capable of detecting the acoustic sources proposed for use in NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research.

Generally, adverse effects on a particular invertebrate species can be considered significant if they result in a reduction in the overall health and viability of a population or significantly impact fisheries targeting that population.

Under Alternatives A and B, some decapod crustaceans and cephalopods might detect the sound from the airguns and airgun arrays (Table ES-3). The MBESs, SBPs, and pingers might be similarly detectable by fewer invertebrate species. For those invertebrate species capable of detecting such sounds, there would theoretically be potential for adverse pathological and physiological effects at extremely close range, and for behavioral effects extending to somewhat greater ranges. These effects could temporarily change the catchability of some crustacean and mollusk fisheries in localized areas. The likelihood of each of these

effects depends on the sound level received by the individual. The received sound level is generally related to proximity to the source but is influenced by other factors as well (e.g., water depth, sound velocity profile of the water, bottom conditions, airgun array size, etc.). The potential for pathological effects is expected to be limited to those individual invertebrates within several meters of an active source operating at high levels and producing sounds within the frequency range to which the animals are sensitive. On a population level, the potential effects are considered insignificant.

Table ES-3. Summary of Potential Impacts to Crustaceans, Mollusks (Cephalopods), and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternative A and B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Alternatives A and B**
DAA	
NW Atlantic W Gulf of Alaska Caribbean Sea S California Galapagos Ridge	• Potential short-term behavioral or possibly physiological effects on individuals. • Potential adverse but not significant impacts to individuals < several m from the active sound source. • No significant impacts at the population level.
QAA	
BC Coast Marianas Sub-Antarctic N Atlantic/Iceland SW Atlantic W India W Australia Mid-Atlantic Ridge	• Potential short-term behavioral or possibly physiological effects on individuals. • Potential adverse but not significant impacts to individuals < several m from the active sound source. • No significant impacts at the population level.

Note: *Impacts under Alternatives A and B assume that provisions would be made to plan the seismic surveys to avoid EFH and commercially important fisheries to the maximum extent practicable.

In summary, based on the limited available information about the effects of airgun and sonar sounds on invertebrates, there would be no significant impacts to marine invertebrate populations, fisheries, and associated Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) with implementation of Alternative A or B.

ES.7.2 Marine Fish

Short-term behavioral effects potentially resulting in short-term, localized displacement or disturbance of individual fish are the most likely effects expected under Alternative A or B as a result of exposure to airgun and airgun array sounds. The small number of individual fish that could potentially experience injurious or mortal impacts when within a few meters of a high-energy acoustic source is considered insignificant on a population scale.

The potential for impacts upon exposure of fish to the MBES and SBP is considerably less for two reasons. First, few fish species are capable of detecting or hearing the high-frequency sounds produced by these two acoustic sources. Secondly, the narrower along-track beam of these two acoustic sources would affect a considerably smaller area than the broader areas affected by the airguns and arrays; as a result, a given fish location near the transiting source would be ensonified for only one brief ping at most. The potential for impacts upon exposure of fish to the pingers is not likely given the much higher frequency of this instrument relative to fish hearing capabilities.

For any ESA-listed species of fish whose hearing is within the frequency range of the airguns, there may be short-term impacts to a small number of individuals that are very close to an airgun (a few meters), but these effects are not likely to adversely affect these populations. Furthermore, impacts to ESA-listed fish species or EFH are not anticipated to occur as implementation of Alternatives A or B include provisions

to plan the seismic surveys to avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, federally designated critical habitat for threatened or endangered fish populations. With these mitigation measures in place, no significant impacts on threatened or endangered fish populations or to EFH are anticipated in any of the exemplary DAAs or QAAs due to any of the proposed sound sources (Table ES-4).

Table ES-4. Summary of Potential Impacts to Fish Species of Special Concern, EFH, and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Species, EFH, or Fisheries*	*Alternative A or B**
DAA		
NW Atlantic	• ESA-listed species: shortnose sturgeon, Atlantic salmon • EFH for numerous species • Important fisheries	• May affect but would not adversely affect ESA-listed species. • Primarily short-term behavioral or possibly physiological impacts to small numbers of individuals of most higher groups. • No significant impacts to fisheries. • No adverse effects on EFH. • No significant impacts at the population level.
W Gulf of Alaska	• Important fisheries • EFH for numerous species including salmon and groundfish	
Caribbean Sea Galapagos Ridge	• Important fisheries	
S California	• ESA-listed species: green sturgeon, Chinook & coho salmon, steelhead, bull trout • EFH for numerous species • Important fisheries	
QAA		
BC Coast	• ESA-listed species: green sturgeon; bull trout; steelhead; sockeye salmon; Chinook, chum, and coho salmon • Important fisheries	• May affect but would not adversely affect ESA-listed species. • Primarily short-term behavioral or possibly physiological impacts to small numbers of individuals of most higher groups. • No significant impacts to fisheries. • No adverse effects to EFH. • No significant impacts at the population level.
Mid-Atlantic Ridge Marianas Sub-Antarctic N Atlantic/Iceland	• Important fisheries	
SW Atlantic	• EFH for numerous species • Important fisheries	
W India W Australia	• Important fisheries	

Note: *Potential impacts under both alternatives assume that provisions would be made to plan the seismic surveys to avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, critical habitat for federally listed species

ES.7.3 Sea Turtles

Little is known about the acoustic capabilities of sea turtles, either in terms of hearing ability or sound production. With such limited data, it is currently not possible to determine how far away a particular airgun array may be audible to a sea turtle. Thus, it is not possible to identify specific sound criteria for sea turtles above which temporary threshold shift (TTS), permanent threshold shift (PTS), or injury could occur based on empirical data. However, as a conservative measure, NMFS has identified two levels of sound exposure criteria for sea turtles during seismic research surveys in areas where sea turtles were anticipated to be numerous. The most recent (through 2009) of these two criteria correspond to a conservative safety radius of 180 dB re 1 µPa above which TTS or PTS is considered possible and should thus be avoided. The second is a conservative radius of 166 dB re 1 µPa above which behavioral "harassment" changes may occur. These criteria were identified to precautionarily limit the potential risk of physical injury and to address behavioral disturbance, respectively, since the associated limits were unknown.

Under Alternatives A and B, with the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures in place, no significant impacts are likely to sea turtle populations due to airgun operations in any of the analysis areas where they may occur (Table ES-5). The number of individual sea turtles expected to be closely approached during the exemplary surveys would be small in relation to regional population sizes. With the proposed monitoring, ramp-up, power- and shut-down provisions, effects on those individuals are likely to be limited to short-term behavioral disturbance and short-term localized avoidance of an area of unknown size near the active airguns. Operation of the MBES, SBP, or pingers is not expected to affect sea turtles, because the associated frequency ranges are above the known hearing range of sea turtles. Furthermore, the intermittent and/or narrow downward-directed nature of these sounds and the fact that they are emitted from a transiting seismic vessel would result in no more than one or two brief pulse exposures to relatively slow-moving sea turtles. In summary, implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed sea turtle species occurring in analysis areas. No significant impacts are expected to occur at the population level for any sea turtle species.

Table ES-5. Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Turtles with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Species**	*Alternative A or B***
DAA		
NW Atlantic, Caribbean	Green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, leatherback, loggerhead	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of feeding/migrating leatherbacks and possibly loggerheads likely by small array in shallow to deep waters, other species highly unlikely. Affected number smaller than large-array areas with similar water depths. • Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but unlikely to occur as turtles expected to avoid such exposure and vessel would quickly pass. • Potential for PTS, injury, lethal effects from airguns unknown but considered unlikely as turtles expected to avoid such exposure and vessel would quickly pass. • No significant impacts expected at the population level. • May affect, likely to adversely affect leatherbacks and loggerheads. • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley.
S California, Galapagos	Green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of breeding or feeding green and hawksbill likely and smaller numbers of breeding, feeding or migrating loggerhead, olive ridley, Kemp's ridley, and leatherback possible by large array in shallow to deep waters. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, likely to adversely affect all six ESA-listed sea turtles.
W Gulf of Alaska	Green, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Effects highly unlikely as all species considered rare in the project area. • No significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback.
QAA		
BC Coast	Green, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of migrating green and leatherback possible by large array in shallow and intermediate-depth waters, other species highly unlikely/rare. • TTS and PTS highly unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, likely to adversely affect green and leatherback. • May affect, not likely to adversely affect loggerhead and olive ridley
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	Green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Effects highly unlikely as all species considered rare within the project area. • No significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect all six ESA-listed species

Table ES-5. Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Turtles with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Species**	*Alternative A or B***
Marianas	Green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of migrating or feeding individuals possible by large array in shallow to deep waters (all five species likely uncommon) • TTS and PTS highly unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic) • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback.
Sub-Antarctic	Green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, leatherback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of very small numbers of migrating green, hawksbill and olive ridley likely and smaller numbers of migrating or feeding loggerhead and leatherback possible by small array in only deep waters. Affected number expected to be smaller than most other analysis areas with larger arrays and/or in shallow or intermediate-depth waters. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback.
SW Atlantic	Green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, leatherback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small number of breeding or feeding green likely and smaller numbers of hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback possible by large array in shallow to deep waters. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, and leatherback.
W India	Green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, leatherback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small number of breeding or migrating green and olive ridley likely and smaller numbers of hawksbill, loggerhead, and leatherback possible by large array in intermediate to deep waters. Affected number expected to be smaller than large array operating in shallow water. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback.
N Atlantic/ Iceland	Leatherback, loggerhead	• Effects highly unlikely as both species considered rare • No significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic) • May affect, not likely to adversely affect loggerhead and leatherback
W Australia	Green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley, flatback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of breeding, feeding or migrating green, hawksbill and olive ridley likely and smaller numbers of feeding or migrating loggerhead and leatherback, and breeding or feeding non-listed flatback possible by small array in shallow to deep waters. Affected number expected to be smaller than areas with larger array at same water depths. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect all six ESA-listed species.

Notes: *All sea turtle species listed except for the flatback have ESA status. ** No acoustic impacts to sea turtles from MBES, SBP, or pingers (above turtle hearing capability) in all the analysis areas. Low risk of potential entanglement in towed/deployed seismic gear (e.g., lines, buoys, etc.); proposed mitigation and monitoring reduces this risk.

ES.7.4 Seabirds

It is not possible to use quantitative sound-energy criteria to assess impacts of airguns or sonar on seabirds as there are no measured or predicted underwater audiograms for any seabird species, published or otherwise, or quantitative noise criteria used to characterize effects of airgun noise on seabirds, such as auditory thresholds corresponding to TTS or PTS levels caused by underwater noise. Considering the potential for other forms of acoustic injury, it is assumed that animals very close to the acoustic source (e.g., within a few meters) would theoretically be at risk. However, available data suggest that seabirds are not expected to occur this close to the acoustic source at depth. Other potential impacts from disturbance, collisions, and entanglement were evaluated according to documented ecological aspects of

seabirds, description of the proposed action and alternatives, and documented interactions with analogous components of the proposed action (e.g., lighted vessel at night).

Implementation of Alternative A or B would have no significant impact on seabirds and no effect on ESA-listed species or populations (Table ES-6). However, site-specific mitigation and monitoring measures should be considered if nesting or breeding colonies of ESA-listed seabirds or other sensitive aggregations or habitat-use areas for seabirds are found to be located near actual proposed seismic survey lines.

Table ES-6. Summary of Potential Impacts to Seabirds with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*ESA-listed Species* or Family*	*Alternative A or B*
DAA		
NW Atlantic	Loons, grebes, petrels/shearwaters, pelicans, gannets/boobies, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies (**roseate tern**), alcids, seaducks	• Low numbers of birds potentially displaced by physical presence of vessel. • Potential for TTS, PTS, injury, lethal effects < several m from airguns unknown but not expected.** • Petrels/shearwaters and alcids possibly attracted to vessel lights at risk for collision. • For alcids that dive to escape disturbance, potential collision with vessel or gear. • No effect to ESA-listed species. • No significant impacts expected at the population level for all seabird species.
Caribbean	Grebes, petrels/shearwaters, tropicbirds, pelicans, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies (**roseate tern**), seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
S California	Loons, grebes, albatrosses, petrels/shearwaters, tropicbirds, pelicans (**brown pelican**), gannets/ boobies, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids (**marbled murrelet**), seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
W Gulf of Alaska	Loons, grebes, albatrosses (**short-tailed albatross**), petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids (**marbled murrelet**), seaducks (**Steller eider**)	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
Galapagos	Albatrosses, petrels/shearwaters, gannets/boobies, terns/noddies	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level
QAA		
BC Coast	Loons, grebes, albatrosses (**short-tailed albatross**), petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids (**marbled murrelet**), seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	Loons, petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level
Marianas	Albatrosses (**short-tailed albatross**), petrels/shearwaters, tropicbirds, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
Sub-Antarctic	Petrels/shearwaters, diving-petrels, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
N Atlantic/ Iceland	Loons, grebes, petrels/shearwaters, pelicans, gannets/boobies, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
SW Atlantic	Petrels/shearwaters, pelicans, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
W India	Petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.

Table ES-6. Summary of Potential Impacts to Seabirds with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*ESA-listed Species* or Family*	*Alternative A or B*
W Australia	Tropicbirds, gannets/boobies, Terns/noddies (**roseate tern**)	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.

Notes: *ESA-listed species in **bold** font.
**As determined from the lack of any published data of such effects, together with observational data by PSVOs with LGL Ltd. during numerous seismic surveys throughout the world, suggesting that seabirds do not remain in the water near the airgun array where they would be at risk of injury.

ES.7.5 Marine Mammals: Cetaceans: Mysticetes

The potential impacts on mysticetes with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are summarized in Table ES-7. With implementation of the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, unavoidable impacts to mysticetes under Alternative A or B are expected to be limited to short-term behavioral disturbance and short-term localized avoidance of the area near the active airguns. This is expected to have no significant short- and long-term impacts on individual mysticetes, their habitats, and regional populations within the exemplary analysis areas.

Based on empirical studies, mysticetes are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sounds levels $\geq$180 dB re 1 μPa (rms) and these avoidance behaviors typically begin at lower received sound levels. Furthermore, modeling indicates that no Level A exposures of mysticetes would occur under Alternative A or B based on the more realistic cumulative energy exposure criterion. However, because the modeled potential Level A (rms) exposures would be of concern and involve ESA-listed species, further site-specific consultation with NMFS would occur. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for a specific area in the future, in accordance with ESA and MMPA, site-specific consultations with NMFS and USFWS would occur if necessary, as well as the preparation of any other appropriate tiered supporting environmental documentation (e.g., EA). Overall, the primary anticipated impacts to mysticetes with implementation of Alternative A or B are:

- Small numbers of mysticetes are modeled or would be expected to experience Level B behavioral disturbance in all of the DAAs and potentially all eight of the QAAs. However, this is not expected to result in any long term or significant consequences to disturbed individuals or their populations. The S California DAA is the only site where mysticetes are not likely to be disturbed by the proposed seismic survey activities. This is due primarily to the near-zero estimated mysticete densities at the season (late spring/early summer) of the exemplary survey, the proposed small airgun array, and the acoustic characteristics of the S California DAA.

Table ES-7. Summary of Potential Impacts to Mysticetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs

DAA	*Whale Species*[(a)]	*Alternative A or B*[(a)]
NW Atlantic	**N Atlantic right, Humpback,** Minke**, Sei, Fin**	Limited to insignificant number of short-term Level B behavioral effects in shallow water. Likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species or their populations and consultation with NMFS required.
Caribbean	**Humpback, Fin**	Limited to insignificant number of short-term Level B behavioral effects in shallow water. Likely to adversely affect ESA-listed humpback and fin whales and consultation with NMFS required.
	Minke, **Sei**, **Blue**	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)]. Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species.
	Bryde's	Limited to small number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures.
S California	**N Pacific right,** Bryde's, **Sei, Fin, Blue**, E Pacific gray, **Humpback**	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 densities.[(b)]
	Minke	Limited to insignificant number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures.
W Gulf of Alaska	**N Pacific right**	Limited to small number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures and likely to adversely affect right whales; consultation with NMFS required.
	E Pacific gray, Minke	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects possible but highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposure.
	Humpback, Fin	Limited to short-term Level B behavioral exposures. Likely to adversely affect ESA-listed humpback and fin whales and consultation with NMFS required. Level A effects possible but highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure. No Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposure predicted. No effects expected at population level. However, given species' ESA status, common occurrence, and modeled small number of Level A (rms) exposures, further site-specific consultation with NMFS and tiered EA/OEA to be prepared when a seismic survey is definitively proposed in the future.
	Sei, Blue	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)].
Galapagos Ridge	**Humpback,** Minke	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)].
	Bryde's	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely primarily in deep water; insignificant number[(b)] of Level A (rms) exposures. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposure. Level A exposures highly unlikely as whales expected to avoid such exposure.
	Sei, Fin	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)].
	Blue	Limited to small number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures and likely to adversely affect blue whales; consultation with NMFS required.

[(a)]No effects expected at population level for any species. Insignificant number = >0.0 / <1.0 individual exposed representing <1% of estimated regional population size. Small number =>0.0 / ≤3.1% of estimated regional population size exposed. **bold** = ESA-listed species.
[(b)]See Appendix B, Annex 4 Tables A4-1 – A4-6 for estimated densities in the DAAs based on best available data.

- Modeling predicts that, under Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative), a small number of Level A exposures could occur in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA based on the current 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) NMFS criterion, despite proposed mitigation and monitoring. However, no or insignificant (<0.019 whales) Level A exposures are expected to occur based on the more realistic cumulative energy exposure criterion. Cumulative energy (SEL) is now considered a more appropriate metric for assessing potential exposure of mysticetes to pulsed underwater sounds. Furthermore, Level A effects are highly unlikely to occur during a seismic survey, as mysticetes are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sound levels that could actually result in Level A exposures.

Operation of MBESs, SBPs, and pingers is not likely to impact mysticetes. The intermittent and narrow downward-directed nature of the MBES and SBP acoustic sources would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures of any individual mysticete given the movement and speed of the vessel; such brief exposure to this sound is not expected to cause injury or PTS based on results of limited studies of some odontocete species. The streamer and core-mounted pingers are also highly unlikely to affect mysticetes given their intermittent nature, short-term and transitory use from a moving vessel, relatively low source levels, brief signal durations, and in the case of ancillary core sampling their relatively infrequent use.

ES.7.6 Marine Mammals – Cetaceans: Odontocetes

The potential impacts on odontocetes with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are summarized in Tables ES-8 and ES-9. Overall, the primary anticipated impacts to odontocetes with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are:

- Small numbers of odontocetes are modeled or would be expected to experience Level B exposures at all five DAAs and potentially all eight QAAs. These numbers represent <1.0% of regional populations of most species. The exception is *Stenella* spp. in the NW Atlantic and Caribbean DAAs where up to approximately 2.7% of the regional population could experience Level B behavioral disturbance.
- In general, modeling results indicate that large airgun arrays operating in shallow water where odontocetes are common to abundant would cause the highest numbers of short-term Level B exposures.
- No short- or long-term significant impacts are expected on odontocete populations or their habitats, including ESA-listed sperm whales, as a result of implementation of Alternative A or B.
- Modeling suggests that no cumulative energy exposures of odontocetes to $\geq$198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$ (SEL), the Level A criterion used in this analysis, would occur in any of the analysis areas.
- Small numbers of individuals representing approximately <0.1% of regional populations of some odontocetes are predicted to be exposed to the NMFS Level A criterion of $\geq$180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Predicted Level A exposures would be similar for the two alternatives except for a few individuals of common to abundant delphinid species at the NW Atlantic and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs.
- No TTS and no potential injury (e.g., PTS) are expected to occur during the exemplary seismic surveys. Many odontocetes are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sound levels that could potentially cause these effects. The model used for analyses does not account for this expected behavioral avoidance and thus is precautionary. These avoidance behaviors typically begin at lower received sound levels. Moreover, modeling indicates that no Level A exposures of odontocetes would occur under Alternative A and Alternative B based on the more realistic cumulative energy (SEL) exposure criterion (Tables ES-7 and ES-8).

Table ES-8. Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs

DAA	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
NW Atlantic	**Sperm whale**	Small number [(a)] of short-term Level B exposures. Negligible[(b)] NMFS Level A (rms) exposures primarily in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation and monitoring measures and behavioral avoidance, but analysis model does not account for avoidance. Further site-specific consultation with NMFS would be required for actual seismic survey due to ESA status.
	Beaked whales	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures in shallow water.
	Common, bottlenose, and Stenellid dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures primarily in shallow water. Small number[(a)] Level A (rms) exposures of common & bottlenose dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance but analysis model does not account for avoidance.
	Other mid-frequency(MF) odontocetes	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. No modeled Level A exposures.
	High-frequency (HF) porpoises	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities. No modeled Level A or B exposures.
Caribbean	**Sperm whale**	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. No modeled Level A exposures.
	Beaked whales	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities. No modeled Level A or B exposures.
	Common , bottlenose, and Stenellid dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures primarily in shallow water. Small number Level A (rms) exposures of primarily Atlantic spotted dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance, but analysis model does not account for avoidance.
	Other MF odontocetes	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures of mostly pilot whales primarily in shallow water. No Level A exposure modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
S California	Beaked whales	See above.
	Common dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures in shallow water. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
	Other MF odontocetes	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures and modeled Level A (rms) exposures of only Pacific white-sided dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance, but analysis model does not account avoidance.
	HF porpoises	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures of only Dall's porpoises in shallow water. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.

Table ES-8. Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs

DAA	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
W Gulf of Alaska	**Sperm whale**	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
	Beaked whales	See sperm whale above.
	Other MF odontocetes	Small number[(a)] Level B behavioral effects of killer whales and Pacific white-sided dolphins primarily in shallow water. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to planned mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
	HF porpoises	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures and small number modeled Level A (rms) exposures of primarily Dall's porpoises in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance, but analysis model does not account for avoidance.
Galapagos	**Sperm whale**	See sperm whale above.
	Beaked whales	See sperm whale above
	Common, bottlenose, and Stenellid dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. Small number modeled Level A (rms) exposures of only Stenellid dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance, but analysis model does not account for avoidance.
	Other MF odontocetes	See sperm whale above.

Notes: [(a)] Small number = ≤2.1% of estimated regional population size exposed.
[(b)] Negligible number: for non-listed species = 0.5- <1.0 individual exposed representing <1.0% of estimated regional population size; for ESA-listed species = 0.05-<0.5 individual exposed representing <0.01% of estimated regional population size.

Table ES-9. Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) in the QAAs

QAA	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
BC Coast	**Sperm whale,** beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	Small number[(b)] short-term Level B exposures likely. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to planned mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	**Sperm whale,** beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.
Marianas	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.
Sub-Antarctic	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	See above.
N Atlantic/Iceland	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	See above.
SW Atlantic	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	See above.
W India	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.
W Australia	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.

Notes: **bold** = ESA-listed species
[(a)] For the purpose of analysis, for non-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.5 animal as presented in Appendix Tables B-14 – B-25 are considered an actual exposure. For ESA-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.05 animal as presented in Appendix Tables B-14 – B-25 are considered an actual exposure.
[(b)] Small number = ≤2-3% of estimated regional population size.

Operation of MBESs, SBPs, and pingers is not likely to impact odontocetes. The intermittent and narrow downward-directed nature of the MBES and SBP acoustic sources would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures of any individual odontocete given the movement and speed of the vessel; such brief exposure to this sound is not expected to cause injury or PTS based on results of limited studies of some odontocete species. The streamer and core-mounted pingers are also highly unlikely to affect odontocetes given their intermittent nature, their short-term and transitory use from a moving vessel, their relatively low source levels, their brief ping durations, and in the case of ancillary core sampling their relatively infrequent use.

In summary, implementation of Alternative A or B, with the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, is likely to result in minor short-term and localized behavioral disturbance of small numbers of individual odontocetes. These temporary effects are not anticipated to result in any significant long-term or population-level impacts on odontocete populations. The numbers of individual odontocetes modeled or estimated to be exposed to the current NMFS Level B criterion of $\geq$160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) during the exemplary surveys would be small in relation to regional population sizes. No PTS or other potential injury of odontocetes is anticipated during an actual seismic survey under Alternative A or B with proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for a specific area in the future, in accordance with ESA and MMPA, site-specific consultations with NMFS and USFWS would occur if necessary, as well as the preparation of any other appropriate tiered supporting environmental documentation (e.g., EA).

ES.7.7 Marine Mammals – Pinnipeds

The potential impacts on pinnipeds with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are summarized in Table ES-10. Pinnipeds are absent or rare in the areas where some seismic surveys would occur. Overall, the primary anticipated impacts to pinnipeds with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are:

- Small numbers of individual pinnipeds are predicted to be exposed to ≥160 dB re 1 µPa rms at three of the five DAAs; these numbers represent <1.0% of regional populations. However, many of these exposed pinnipeds would not show any overt disturbance. These exposures are not expected to result in any long-term or significant consequences to the affected individuals or their populations.
- In general, modeling results indicate that large airgun arrays operating in shallow water where pinnipeds are common to abundant would cause the highest numbers of short-term Level B exposures.
- Small numbers of individuals representing <0.01% of regional populations of some pinnipeds are predicted to be exposed to the NMFS Level A criterion of $\geq$190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) or SEL $\geq$186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ in certain exemplary project areas under the simplifying assumptions of the modeling.
- PTS and other injurious effects are not expected to occur during the actual seismic surveys. Most pinnipeds are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sound levels that could potentially cause these effects. The model used for analysis overestimates Level A exposures, because it does not account for this expected behavioral avoidance and also does not allow for the higher TTS and PTS thresholds of some pinnipeds.

Table ES-10. Summary of Potential Impacts to Pinnipeds with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Species or Group*[1]	*Alternative A or B*[1]
DAA		
NW Atlantic	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities.[2]
Caribbean	No pinniped species	-
S California	**Steller sea lion, Guadalupe fur seal**	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities.[2] No effect on ESA-listed species or their populations.
	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	No significant impacts; limited to small number[3] of short-term Level B behavioral exposures. No modeled Level A exposures.
W Gulf of Alaska	**Steller sea lion**	May affect, likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species; consultation with NMFS required. Limited to small number[3] of short-term Level B behavioral exposures; <1 modeled Level A exposure but highly unlikely to occur in actual seismic survey as pinnipeds expected to avoid such exposure (see text).
	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	Limited to small number[3] of short-term Level B behavioral exposures; small number of modeled Level A exposures are highly unlikely to occur in actual seismic survey as pinnipeds expected to avoid such exposure (see text).
Galapagos Ridge	No pinniped species	-
QAA		
BC Coast	**Steller sea lion**	See W Gulf of Alaska DAA.
	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	See above
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	No pinniped species	-
Marianas	No pinniped species	-
Sub-Antarctic	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	Level B behavioral effects possible but unlikely; Level A effects highly unlikely as species are rare and expected to avoid such exposure.
N Atlantic/Iceland	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	See BC Coast QAA.
SW Atlantic	No pinniped species	-
W India	No pinniped species	-
W Australia	Australian sea lion	See Sub-Antarctic QAA.

[1]No significant effects expected at population level for any species. **Bold** = ESA-listed species.
[2]See Appendix B, Annex 4 for estimated marine mammal densities in the DAAs.
[3] Small number (<1%) of estimated regional population size exposed.

Although the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers can presumably be heard by pinnipeds, their operation is not likely to affect pinnipeds. The intermittent and narrow downward-directed nature of the MBESs and SPBs would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures of any individual pinniped given the movement and speed of the vessel and animal; such brief exposure to this sound is not expected to cause injury or PTS based on results of limited studies of some pinniped species (reviewed in Appendix E). The streamer-mounted pingers and pingers used during coring are also highly unlikely to affect pinnipeds given their intermittent nature, their short-term and transitory use from a moving vessel, their relatively low source levels, their brief ping durations, and (in the case of ancillary core sampling) their relatively infrequent use.

In summary, implementation of Alternative A or B is likely to result in minor short-term and localized behavioral disturbance of small numbers of individual pinnipeds. These temporary effects are not anticipated to result in any long-term or population-level effects on pinniped populations. The numbers of individual pinnipeds estimated to be exposed to the current NMFS Level B criterion of $\geq$160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) during the exemplary surveys would be small in relation to regional population sizes. No PTS or

other potential injury of pinnipeds is anticipated during an actual seismic survey under Alternative A or B with proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. No significant short- or long-term impacts are expected on pinniped populations or their habitats, including ESA-listed species, as a result of implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative). If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for a specific area in the future, in accordance with ESA and MMPA, site-specific consultations with NMFS and USFWS would occur if necessary, as well as the preparation of any other appropriate tiered supporting environmental documentation (e.g., EA).

ES.7.8 Other Marine Mammals (Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee)

Implementation of Alternatives A or B may result in minor short-term and localized behavioral disturbance of individual sea otters and W Indian manatees (Table ES-11). The number of individuals of these species estimated to be closely approached during the proposed seismic surveys is expected to be very small to none and limited to the three DAAs and one QAA where they occur. No PTS or other potential injury of these species is anticipated during an actual seismic survey under Alternative A with proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. No significant short- or long-term impacts are expected on ESA-listed species populations or their habitats as a result of implementation of Alternative A or B.

Table ES-11. Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
DAA		
Caribbean	West Indian manatee	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.
S California	Sea otter	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.
W Gulf of Alaska	Sea otter	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.
QAA		
BC Coast	Sea otter	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.

Sounds from some of the MBESs and SBPs are within the frequency ranges detectable to W Indian manatees and presumed detectable to sea otters. Short-term behavioral disturbance of these species may occur during proposed seismic activities. However, no Level A exposures are expected. W Indian manatees typically inhabit quite shallow coastal areas characterized by seabeds where seismic surveys are not proposed to occur. Furthermore, the intermittent and downward-directed nature of the echosounder

signals emitted from the transiting seismic vessel would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures to an animal that happened to occur under the vessel.

ES.7.9 Socioeconomics

Based on available information, there would be no significant impacts to socioeconomics with implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) within the exemplary analysis areas (Table ES-12). The analysis is limited to the DAAs and QAAs found within the U.S. EEZ.

Table ES-12. Summary of Potential Impacts to Socioeconomics with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Alternative A or B*
NW Atlantic	• Temporary, localized reduced fish catch to some species – not significant to commercial fisheries. • No significant impacts to commercial shipping, research and exploration activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and recreational fishing and boating.
S California	• Temporary, localized reduced fish catch to some species – not significant to commercial fisheries. • No significant impacts to commercial shipping, research and exploration activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and recreational fishing and boating.
W Gulf of Alaska	• Temporary, localized reduced fish catch to some species – not significant to commercial fisheries. • No significant impacts to commercial shipping, research and exploration activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and recreational fishing and boating.

ES.7.10 Cultural Resources

Based on available information, there would be no significant impacts to cultural resources with implementation of Alternative A or B within the exemplary analysis areas (Table ES-13). The analysis is limited to the DAAs and QAAs found within the U.S. EEZ.

Table ES-13. Summary of Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative)

DAA	*Alternative A or B*
NW Atlantic	• No significant impacts to archaeological resources. • No traditional cultural resources present.
S California	• No significant impacts to archaeological resources. • No traditional cultural resources present.
W Gulf of Alaska	• No significant impacts to archaeological and traditional cultural resources.

ES.7.11 Cumulative Impacts

The results of this cumulative impacts analysis indicate that there would not be any significant cumulative effects to marine resources from the proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research. All seismic cruises would be permitted according to the rules and regulations of the applicable agencies of U.S. federal, state, and foreign governments.

While there are uncertainties about the location and timing of future human activities in combination with the proposed seismic surveys at the programmatic level, cruise-specific EAs would be prepared when a particular seismic research activity is proposed. A more detailed, cruise-specific cumulative effects analysis would be conducted at the time of the preparation of the cruise-specific EAs, allowing for the identification of other potential activities in the area of the proposed seismic survey that may result in

cumulative impacts to environmental resources. These cruise-specific EAs would also take into consideration the seasonal distribution of marine resources and acoustic properties of a proposed site to develop site-specific mitigation measures. These additional mitigation measures would be followed to ensure that potential cumulative impacts do not become significant. For example, if noise modeling results indicate that Level A (injury) harassment impacts to marine mammals or threatened and endangered marine mammal species may occur, then additional mitigation measures would be added to the cruise parameters to reduce and eliminate the potential for Level A harassment impacts to marine mammals that may occur in the project area.

FINAL
PROGRAMMATIC EIS/OEIS
MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH FUNDED BY NSF OR CONDUCTED BY USGS
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations ..... **x**
Glossary ..... **xii**
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **ES-1**
ES.1 INTRODUCTION ES-1
ES.2 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION ES-1
ES.3 PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH ES-2
ES.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION ES-3
ES.5 ACOUSTIC MODELING ES-6
ES.6 ACTION ALTERNATIVES ES-7
ES.7 POTENTIAL IMPACTS ES-13
CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE AND NEED **1-1**
1.1 COOPERATING AGENCIES 1-1
1.2 MISSION OF NSF 1-2
1.3 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION 1-2
1.4 PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH TO THE PEIS 1-4
1.5 BACKGROUND OF NSF-FUNDED MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH 1-5
1.6 BACKGROUND OF USGS MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH 1-6
1.7 PEIS ANALYSIS AREAS 1-6
1.8 REGULATORY SETTING 1-7
1.8.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 1-7
1.8.2 EO 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions* 1-8
1.8.3 Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) 1-8
1.8.4 Endangered Species Act (ESA) 1-9
1.8.5 Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA) 1-11
1.8.6 Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) 1-11
1.8.7 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) 1-11
1.9 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS 1-12
1.9.1 Notice of Intent (NOI) 1-12
1.9.2 Scoping Process 1-12
1.9.3 Draft PEIS 1-13
1.9.4 Final PEIS 1-14
1.9.5 Record of Decision (ROD) 1-15
CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES **2-1**
2.1 MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH METHODS 2-1
2.1.1 Seismic Acoustic Sources Used in Marine Seismic Research 2-3
2.1.2 Non-Seismic Acoustic Sources Used in Marine Seismic Research 2-7
2.1.3 Acoustic Receivers Used in Marine Seismic Research 2-8
2.1.4 Types of Marine Seismic Surveys 2-8
2.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION 2-16
2.2.1 Overview of Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by USGS 2-16

2.2.2 Research Vessels Used in Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by USGS 2-19
2.2.3 Proposed Acoustic Sources and Receivers for NSF-funded and USGS Marine Seismic Research 2-22
2.3 APPROACH TO ANALYSIS FOR THE PEIS 2-38
2.3.1 Exemplary (Representative) Analysis Areas Analyzed under the PEIS 2-38
2.3.2 Acoustic Impact Criteria 2-47
2.3.3 Acoustic Modeling 2-54
2.4 ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR ANALYSIS 2-63
2.4.1 Alternative A: Conduct Marine Seismic Research Using Cruise-specific Mitigation Measures 2-63
2.4.2 Alternative B: Conduct Marine Seismic Research using Cruise-specific Mitigation Measures with Generic Mitigation Measures for Low-energy Acoustic Sources (Preferred Alternative) 2-72
2.4.3 Comparison of Alternative A and Alternative B 2-74
2.4.4 Alternative C: No-Action Alternative 2-75
2.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT 2-75
2.6 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS 2-76
CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES 3-1
3.1 ACOUSTIC ENVIRONMENT 3-2
3.1.1 Ambient Noise 3-2
3.1.2 Factors Affecting Sound Propagation in the Marine Environment 3-3
3.2 MARINE INVERTEBRATES 3-6
3.2.1 Overview of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks 3-7
3.2.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-9
3.2.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-12
3.2.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-15
3.2.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-21
3.2.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-22
3.2.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Invertebrates 3-22
3.3 MARINE FISH 3-23
3.3.1 Overview of Fish Groups 3-23
3.3.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-31
3.3.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-36
3.3.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-39
3.3.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-47
3.3.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-49
3.3.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Fish 3-49
3.4 SEA TURTLES 3-50
3.4.1 Overview of Sea Turtle Species 3-50
3.4.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-54
3.4.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-62
3.4.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-68

3.4.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-80
3.4.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-86
3.4.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Sea Turtles 3-86
3.5 SEABIRDS 3-88
3.5.1 Overview of Seabird Groups 3-88
3.5.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-92
3.5.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-93
3.5.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-93
3.5.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-98
3.5.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-99
3.5.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Seabirds 3-100
3.6 MARINE MAMMALS – CETACEANS: MYSTICETES 3-102
3.6.1 Overview of Mysticete Groups 3-102
3.6.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-108
3.6.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-113
3.6.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-123
3.6.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-139
3.6.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-151
3.6.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Mysticetes 3-151
3.7 MARINE MAMMALS – CETACEANS: ODONTOCETES 3-156
3.7.1 Overview of Odontocete Groups 3-156
3.7.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-165
3.7.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-171
3.7.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-178
3.7.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-191
3.7.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-199
3.7.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Odontocetes 3-199
3.8 MARINE MAMMALS – PINNIPEDS 3-203
3.8.1 Overview of Pinniped Groups 3-203
3.8.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-209
3.8.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-211
3.8.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-214
3.8.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-220
3.8.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-226
3.8.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Pinnipeds 3-226
3.9 OTHER MARINE MAMMALS (SEA OTTER AND W INDIAN MANATEE) 3-229
3.9.1 Overview of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee 3-229
3.9.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) 3-233
3.9.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs) 3-235
3.9.4 Environmental Consequences – General 3-236

3.9.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-241
3.9.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative) 3-244
3.9.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee .. 3-244
3.10 SOCIOECONOMICS 3-246
3.10.1 Affected Environment 3-246
3.10.2 Environmental Consequences 3-252
3.10.3 Summary of Environmental Consequences 3-257
3.11 CULTURAL RESOURCES 3-258
3.11.1 Affected Environment 3-259
3.11.2 Environmental Consequences 3-261
3.11.3 Summary of Environmental Consequences 3-264

CHAPTER 4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND IRREVERSIBLE/IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES 4-1
4.1 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS 4-1
4.1.1 Potential Cumulative Effects Issues 4-1
4.1.2 Assessment of Cumulative Impacts 4-2
4.1.3 Summary of Cumulative Impacts 4-6
4.2 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES 4-7
4.3 POSSIBLE CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE PROPOSED ACTION AND THE OBJECTIVES OF FEDERAL LAND USE POLICIES, PLANS, AND CONTROLS 4-7
4.3.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) 4-7
4.3.2 Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) 4-8
4.3.3 Endangered Species Act (ESA) 4-8
4.3.4 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA) 4-8
4.3.5 Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) 4-8
4.3.6 Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act 4-8
4.3.7 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) 4-8
4.3.8 Clean Water Act (CWA) 4-9
4.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY 4-9
4.5 COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER EOS 4-9
4.5.1 EO 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions* 4-9
4.6 GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION 4-9

CHAPTER 5 LITERATURE CITED 5-1

CHAPTER 6 LIST OF PREPARERS 6-1

CHAPTER 7 DISTRIBUTION LIST 7-1

Appendices

Appendix A – Agency and Public Correspondence
Appendix B – Acoustic Modeling Report
Appendix C – Common and Scientific Names of Faunal Species Discussed in the Text
Appendix D – Summary of Potential Effects of Airguns on Marine Invertebrates and Fish
Appendix E – Summary of Potential Effects of Sonar and Seismic Surveys on Marine Mammals
Appendix F – Low-Energy Acoustic Sources
Appendix G – Summary of NSF-Funded Marine Seismic Surveys (2003-2009)
Appendix H – Acoustic Calibration and Modeling of Seismic Acoustic Sources on the R/V *Langseth*
Appendix I – Distribution of and Public Hearings on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS
Appendix J – Response to Public Comments on the October 2010 Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

List of Figures

Figure **Page**

ES-1 Longhurst Biomes and Proposed Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas ES-5
1-1 EIS/OEIS Process 1-13
2-1 General Concept of Marine Seismic Reflection and Refraction Surveys 2-2
2-2 Representative Airgun 2-3
2-3 Operating Principles of a Generic Airgun 2-5
2-4 Examples of OBS/Hs 2-9
2-5 3-D View of a Representative 2-String Array 2-12
2-6 Overall View of a Representative 4-String Airgun Array 2-14
2-7 Representative Research Vessels Potentially Used in Marine Seismic Research 2-20
2-8 R/V *Langseth* during Modification and Outfitting 2-21
2-9 R/V *Langseth* in Gulf of Mexico during Fall 2007 Calibration Cruise 2-21
2-10 Typical Airgun String Proposed for Use on the R/V *Langseth* 2-24
2-11 R/V *Langseth* 4-String Airgun Array for 2-D Reflection (total active volume 6,600 in^3) 2-25
2-12 R/V *Langseth* 4-String Airgun Array for 2-D Refraction (total active volume 6,600 in^3) 2-26
2-13 R/V *Langseth* 2-String Airgun Array for Unsedimented Ocean Crust 2-D Reflection (total active volume 3,300 in^3) 2-27
2-14 R/V *Langseth* 2-String GI Gun Array for 2-D High-Resolution Reflection Surveys 2-28
2-15 R/V *Langseth* 4-String Airgun Array for "Standard" 3-D Reflection (total active volume 3,300 in^3) 2-30
2-16 R/V *Langseth* 4-String Airgun Array for "Wide" 3-D Reflection (total active volume 3,300 in^3) 2-31
2-17 R/V Langseth 2-String GI Gun Array for 3-D Dual-Source High-Resolution Surveys 2-32
2-18 Longhurst Biomes and Proposed Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas 2-40
2-19 Regional Location of the W Gulf of Alaska Detailed Analysis Area (D1) 2-41

2-20 Regional Location of the S California Detailed Analysis Area (D2) 2-42
2-21 Regional Location of the Galapagos Ridge Detailed Analysis Area (D3) 2-43
2-22 Regional Location of the Caribbean Detailed Analysis Area (D4) 2-44
2-23 Regional Location of the NW Atlantic Detailed Analysis Area (D5) 2-45
2-24 Predicted Unweighted/Flat Frequency SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites 1 and 3 2-58
2-25 Predicted Unweighted/Flat Frequency SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Site 2 2-59
2-26 Predicted Unweighted/Flat Frequency SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figures 2-24 and 2-25) 2-60
2-27 Relationship of Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM) and Acoustic Integration Model (AIM) 2-62
3.10-1 ECORD Drilling on the New Jersey Shallow Shelf 3-248

List of Tables

Table **Page**

ES-1 Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas ES-3
ES-2 Comparison of Alternatives A and B ES-8
ES-3 Summary of Potential Impacts to Crustaceans, Mollusks (Cephalopods), and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternative A and B (Preferred Alternative) ES-14
ES-4 Summary of Potential Impacts to Fish Species of Special Concern, EFH, and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) ES-15
ES-5 Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Turtles with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) ES-16
ES-6 Summary of Potential Impacts to Seabirds with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) ES-18
ES-7 Summary of Potential Impacts to Mysticetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs ES-20
ES-8 Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs ES-22
ES-9 Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) in the QAAs ES-23
ES-10 Summary of Potential Impacts to Pinnipeds with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) ES-25
ES-11 Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) ES-26
ES-12 Summary of Potential Impacts to Socioeconomics with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) ES-27

ES-13 Summary of Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources with Implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) ES-27

1-1 Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas 1-7

1-2 Summary of Public Hearing Attendance and Written Comments on the Draft EIS/OEIS 1-14

2-1 NSF-funded and USGS Marine Seismic Surveys (2003-2009)* 2-16

2-2 Research Vessels Used or Potentially Used in NSF-funded or USGS Marine Seismic Research 2-19

2-3 Proposed Seismic Source Configurations Used by the R/V *Langseth* for NSF-funded Marine Seismic Research 2-23

2-4 Past Configurations of Seismic Sources for Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by the USGS (2003-2009) 2-35

2-5 Acoustic Parameters of MBESs, SBPs, ADCPs, Pingers, and Acoustic Releases Used by NSF-Funded or USGS Research Vessels Conducting Marine Seismic Research 2-37

2-6 Location and Source Characteristics for Assumed Seismic Surveys within the DAAs and QAAs 2-39

2-7 Comparison of QAAs to DAAs Relative to Acoustic Characteristics, Array Configurations, and Other Factors 2-48

2-8 Existing and Proposed Injury and Behavior Exposure Criteria for Cetaceans and Pinnipeds Exposed to Pulsed Sounds 2-51

2-9 Lower and Upper Boundary Frequencies Used in M-Weighting of Model Results for Marine Mammal Hearing Groups 2-53

2-10 Summary of Predicted 180- and 190-dB Radii (Unweighted and M-weighted) for the W Gulf of Alaska Sites 2-57

2-11 Summary of Level A Flat- and M-weighted Mitigation Radii under Alternative A for DAAs . 2-68

2-12 Summary of Modeled Level A Mitigation Radii for Low-Energy Sources used in Previous Seismic Survey Cruises or Proposed in this EIS/OEIS 2-73

2-13 Defined Low-Energy Towed Sources under Alternative B 2-74

2-14 Comparison of Alternatives A and B 2-74

3.2-1 Summary of the Status, Economic Importance, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-6

3.2-2 Summary of Underwater Acoustic Capabilities of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks 3-8

3.2-3 Potential Occurrence of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks within the DAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-10

3.2-4 Potential Occurrence of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks within the Qualitative Analysis Areas during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-14

3.2-5 Summary of Known or Suggested Effects of Seismic Survey Sound on Marine Invertebrates (Crustaceans and Cephalopods) and Associated Fisheries* 3-19

3.2-6 Summary of Potential Impacts to Crustaceans, Mollusks (Cephalopods), and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternatives A and B 3-21

3.3-1 Summary of the Status, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Higher Fish Groups Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-23

3.3-2 Potential Occurrence of Special-Status Fish Species within the Analysis Areas 3-26

3.3-3 Summary of Underwater Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Fish 3-29

3.3-4 Potential Occurrence of Higher Fish Groups and EFH within the DAAs during the Season of the Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-32

3.3-5 Potential Occurrence of Higher Fish Groups within the QAAs during the Season of the Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-36

3.3-7 Summary of Potential Impacts to Fish Species of Special Concern, EFH, and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternatives A or B 3-48

3.4-1 Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Sea Turtles Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-51

3.4-2 Summary of Underwater Sound Production and Hearing Characteristics of Sea Turtles 3-54

3.4-3 Potential Occurrence of ESA-listed Sea Turtles within the DAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-55

3.4-4 Potential Occurrence of Sea Turtles within the QAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-63

3.4-5 Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Noise and Other Project-Related Noise on Sea Turtles* 3-69

3.4-6 Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Turtles with Implementation of Alternative A or B 3-82

3.5-1 Summary of the Status, General Ecology, and General Distribution & Movement of Seabirds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-89

3.5-2 Potential Occurrence of Seabirds within the DAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-92

3.5-3 Potential Occurrence of Seabirds within the QAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-94

3.5-4 Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sound and Other Project-Related Sound on Seabirds 3-94

3.5-5 Summary of Potential Impacts to Seabirds with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B 3-100

3.6-1 Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Mysticetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-103

3.6-2 Summary of Characteristics of Underwater Sounds Produced by Mysticetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-107

3.6-3 Potential Occurrence of Mysticetes within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-108

3.6-4 Potential Occurrence of Mysticetes within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-114

3.6-5 Summary of Known and Anticipated Effects of Seismic Surveys on Mysticetes* 3-127

3.6-6 Estimated Number of Level A and B Exposures (Individuals) of Mysticetes to Seismic Survey Sound with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs Based on Modeling Results 3-142

3.6-7 Summary of Potential Impacts to Mysticetes with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs 3-153

3.6-8 Summary of Potential Impacts to Mysticetes with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the QAAs 3-154

3.7-1 Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Habitat, and General Distribution and Movement of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas* 3-157

3.7-2 Summary of Underwater Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-164

3.7-3 Potential Occurrence of Odontocetes within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-166

3.7-4 Potential Occurrence of Odontocetes within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-172

3.7-5 Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sounds on Odontocetes* 3-182

3.7-6 Estimated Number of Level A and Level B Exposures (Individuals) of Odontocetes to Seismic Survey Sound with Implementation of Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs Based on Modeling Results 3-194

3.7-7 Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B in the DAAs 3-201

3.7-8 Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B in the QAAs 3-202

3.8-1 Summary of the Status, Population Trends, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution & Movement of Pinnipeds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-204

3.8-2 Summary of Underwater Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Pinnipeds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas 3-208

3.8-3 Potential Occurrence of Pinnipeds within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-209

3.8-4 Potential Occurrence of Pinnipeds within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-212

3.8-5 Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Airgun Sounds on Pinnipeds* 3-216

3.8-6 Estimated Number of Level A and Level B Exposures (Individuals) of Pinnipeds to Seismic Survey Sound with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs, Based on Modeling Results 3-222

3.8-7 Summary of Potential Impacts to Pinnipeds with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-228

3.9-1 Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee 3-229

3.9-2 Summary of Underwater or In-Air Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee 3-233

3.9-3 Potential Occurrence of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-233

3.9-4 Potential Occurrence of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys 3-235

3.9-5 Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sounds on Sea Otters and W Indian Manatees 3-238

3.9-6 Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-245

3.10-1 Pounds and Value of Landings for New Jersey Commercial Fisheries (2001-2004) 3-246

3.10-2 Pounds and Value of Landings for New York Commercial Fisheries (2001-2004) 3-247

3.10-3 Pounds and Value of Landings for Santa Barbara Area Ports (2001-2004) 3-249

3.10-4 Major Commercially Fished Species in S California DAA 3-249

3.10-5 Pounds and Value of Landings for W Gulf of Alaska Ports (2001-2004) 3-251

3.10-6 Summary of Socioeconomic Activities within the DAAs 3-252

3.10-7 Summary of Potential Impacts to Socioeconomics with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-257

3.11-1 Summary of Occurrence of Cultural Resources within the DAAs 3-261

3.11-2 Summary of Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) 3-264

Acronyms and Abbreviations

2-D	two-dimensional
3-D	three-dimensional
4-D	four-dimensional
ADCP	acoustic Doppler current profiler
ADEH	Australian Department of Environment and Heritage
ADFG	Alaska Department of Fish and Game
AEWC	Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission
AIM	Acoustic Integration Model
AWOIS	Automated Wreck and Obstruction Information System
BA	Biological Assessment
BC	British Columbia
BLI	BirdLife International
BO	Biological Opinion
^{o}C	degrees Celsius
CCC	Caribbean Conservation Corporation
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CETAP	Cetacean and Turtle Assessment Program
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
cm	centimeter(s)
COSEWIC	Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada
CPA	closest point of approach
CSLC	California State Lands Commission
DAA	detailed analysis area
dB	decibel(s)
dB re 1 μPa-m	dB referenced 1 microPascal at 1 meter
dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$	decibels referenced 1 microPascal squared second
DFOC	Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DSDP	Deep Sea Drilling Project
E	East/Eastern
EA	Environmental Assessment
ECORD	European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
ESA	United States Endangered Species Act
ESU	Evolutionary Significant Unit
ETP	Eastern Tropical Pacific
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FM	frequency modulated
FMZ	full mitigation zone
ft	foot/feet
GEO	Directorate for Geosciences
GI	generator-injector
HF	high-frequency
hr	hour(s)
Hz	hertz
IAGC	International Association of Geophysical Contractors
IHA	Incidental Harassment Authorization
in^3	cubic inches
IODP	Integrated Ocean Drilling Program
ITS	Incidental Take Statement
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IWC	International Whaling Commission
kg	kilogram(s)
kHz	kilohertz
km	kilometer(s)
kt	knot or nautical mile per hour
lbs	pounds
L-DEO	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
LF	low-frequency
LME	Large Marine Ecosystem
LOA	Letter of Authorization
m	meter(s)
MBES	multibeam echosounder
MCS	Multichannel Seismic
MF	mid-frequency
M_{hf}	M-weighted, high frequency
mi	mile(s)
min	minute(s)
M_{lf}	M-weighted, low frequency
MMC	Marine Mammal Commission
M_{mf}	M-weighted, mid-frequency
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MMS	Minerals Management Service
MONM	Marine Operations Noise Model
M_{pw}	M-weighted, pinnipeds in water
ms	millisecond(s)
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Act
MZ	mitigation zone
N	North/Northern
NAMMCO	North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission
NAVFAC	Naval Facilities Engineering Command
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NJDEP	New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
nm	nautical mile(s)
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NRC	National Research Council
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSF	National Science Foundation
NVD	night vision device

NW	Northwestern
OBC	ocean bottom cable
OBS/H	ocean bottom seismometer/hydrophone
OCS	Outer Continental Shelf
ODP	Ocean Drilling Program
OEIS	Overseas Environmental Impact Statement
OGP	International Association of Oil & Gas Producers
OPP	Office of Polar Programs
OPR	Office of Protected Resources
PAM	passive acoustic monitoring
PFMC	Pacific Fishery Management Council
psi	pounds per square inch
PSVO	Protected Species Visual Observer
PTS	permanent threshold shift
QAA	qualitative analysis area
rms	root mean square
ROD	Record of Decision
R/V	Research Vessel
S	South/Southern
SAUP	Sea Around Us Project
SBP	sub-bottom profiler
sec	second(s)
SE	southeastern
SEL	sound exposure level
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIO	Scripps Institution of Oceanography
SODV	Scientific Ocean Drilling Vessel
SPL	sound pressure level
spp.	species
SSP	sound speed profile
SW	Southwestern
TTS	temporary threshold shift
UAF	University of Alaska-Fairbanks
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNOLS	University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System
U.S.	United States
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USCG	U.S. Coast Guard
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
USIO	U.S. Implementing Organization
UTA	University of Texas-Austin
VSP	vertical seismic profile
W	West/Western
WHOI	Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
2-dimensional (2-D) and 3-D seismic surveys	Airguns are the acoustic source for most 2-D and 3-D marine seismic surveys. Their individual size can range from tens to several hundred in^3. A combination of airguns is called an airgun array, and investigators configure an array to optimize the resolution of the geophysical data collected in support of the particular research objectives. 3-D seismic surveys generally require more equipment than 2-D surveys. By using a greater number of channels and flexible configuration, 3-D seismic data provide more extensive and detailed information regarding the subsurface geology than do 2-D data. • A 3-D source array typically consists of 2-3 subarrays of 6-9 airguns each. A vessel usually tows 1-2 source arrays, depending on the scientific objectives of the survey. The arrays usually are aligned parallel with one another and towed 50-200 m behind the vessel. In a 3-D survey, the firing of the source arrays alternates. Following behind the source arrays by another 100-200 m are multiple (4-12) hydrophone streamers, and each streamer can be up to 3-8 km long. Collectively, the streamers may be spread out over a width of 400-900 m. The 3-D survey data are acquired on a line-by-line basis, whereby the vessel continues down a trackline to provide adequate subsurface coverage for the survey area. Adjacent ship tracklines for a 3-D survey are typically spaced a few hundred meters apart and are parallel to each other across the survey area. Survey lines are normally traversed in a racetrack or "mowing the lawn" pattern. • Marine 2-D surveys use similar geophysical-survey techniques as 3-D surveys, but the mode of operation is very different. The 2-D surveys are designed to provide a less-detailed, coarser sampled subsurface image compared to 3-D surveys, and they are conducted over wide areas or on a regional basis. The airguns are usually arranged in a single airgun array (often with 2-4 subarrays), but all airguns are fired simultaneously. Following behind the source array is a single hydrophone streamer up to 8-12 km long, depending on the geophysical objectives of the survey. The 2-D surveys acquire data along single track lines that are spread at wide intervals compared to 3-D surveys, which acquire data in a closely packed rectangular area. Therefore, considerably less acoustic energy is used in a given area during a 2-D as compared to a 3-D survey.
Acoustics	The scientific study of sound, especially of its generation, transmission, and reception.
Acoustic Integration Model (AIM)	An animal movement and acoustics model that integrates information on the estimated propagation of sound from an underwater acoustic source and on the assumed movement patterns of simulated animals (animats) to predict the anticipated frequency distribution of received sound levels. Predicted sound levels at specific locations are derived from another acoustical model, such as MONM (see below). This calculates the expected levels of sound received, as a function of time, by a population of "animats". Animats are modeled representations of marine mammals (or other receivers). A large sample of animats is programmed to move in a way that takes account of species- or group-specific information such as density, seasonal occurrence, habitat preferences, group size, and swimming and dive behavior. There is provision to calculate received sound levels with allowance for the hearing abilities of the animals in question, via application of appropriate frequency weighting curves (e.g., M-weighting, see below). The resulting distribution of predicted received sound levels can be used, in conjunction with impact or "take" criteria, to predict the number of animals that might be exposed to specified sound levels.
Airgun	A pneumatic device used as an acoustic source to acquire marine seismic data. It is submerged below the water surface and towed behind a ship, usually as part of an array consisting of a number of airguns. An airgun array is a series of two or more airguns that are most often towed in single or multiple lines behind a surface vessel that can be "tuned" by their geometry and interference so that the seismic signal is primarily directed downward. Upon being triggered, an airgun releases a specified volume of pneumatically compressed air into the water. The expansion and collapse of the resulting bubble serves to generate a pulse of acoustic energy that travels spherically outward from the airgun. When airguns are positioned optimally within an array, most of the energy can be directed downward into the seafloor. The return signals that are reflected off the seafloor and from discontinuities in the subsea geological structures are received by a towed array of hydrophones located in streamers.

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
Alternative	In the context of a NEPA document (i.e., an EA or EIS), a different method for accomplishing the Proposed Action. As examples, an alternative can consist of the same action in a different location, or the use of different mitigation measures.
Ambient noise	The typical or persistent environmental background noise present in the ocean, with contributions from natural sources (wind, waves, rain, animal sounds, earthquakes, etc.) and, often, from distant and indistinguishable anthropogenic sources such as shipping. Sound from specific nearby anthropogenic activities is usually not considered to be part of the ambient noise.
Anadromous	Species of fish that are born in fresh water, migrate as juveniles to the ocean and grow into adults, and then return to fresh water to spawn.
Anthropogenic noise	Noise related to, or produced by, human activities.
Baleen whale	Whales with parallel rows of fibrous plates that hang from the upper jaw and are used for filter feeding. Also known as mysticetes (see Mysticete below).
Bathymetry	The water depth at various places in a body of water; the information derived from measurements to determine water depth.
Behavioral effect	Defined in this PEIS as a change in an animal's behavior or behavior patterns that results from exposure to some stimulus (e.g., an anthropogenic acoustic exposure) and exceeds some defined criterion (e.g., extends beyond the range of normal daily variation in behavior).
Benthic	Referring to the bottom-dwelling community of organisms that live on or in either the sea bottom or such structures as ships, buoys, and wharf pilings (e.g., crabs, clams, worms).
Boomer	A low-energy towed device used as an acoustic source to acquire marine seismic data. The acoustic pulse is generated when an electrical signal discharges a capacitor bank causing two spring-loaded, electrically charged plates in the boomer transducer to repel, creating a precisely repeatable pressure pulse primarily directed downward to the seafloor.
Cetacea or cetacean	An order of aquatic mammals including baleen whales (Mysticetes, see below) and toothed whales, dolphins, and porpoises (Odontocetes, see below). Also see Figure G-1 below.
Chirp system	Chirp refers to a variety of pulsed sonar systems capable of conducting high-resolution reflection profiling of the sub-bottom using low energy acoustic sources with a nominal frequency range of a few kilohertz up to several tens or hundreds of kilohertz. Often chirp data are collected by sweeping through a range of frequencies in a single pulse, but some systems referred to as chirp may be associated with only a single frequency.
Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)	A federal council that coordinates federal environmental efforts and works closely with federal agencies and other White House offices to develop environmental policies and initiatives. Established by the U.S. NEPA (see below), the CEQ consists of three members appointed by the President. CEQ regulations (Title 40 CFR 1500-1508) describe the process for implementing NEPA, including preparation of EAs and EISs, and the timing and extent of public participation.
Critical Habitat	Critical habitat is defined in section 3 of the U.S. ESA as (1) the specific areas within the geographical area occupied by a species, at the time it is listed in accordance with the ESA, on which are found those physical or biological features (i) essential to the conservation of the species and (ii) that may require special management considerations or protection; and (2) specific areas outside the geographical area occupied by a species at the time it is listed, upon a determination that such areas are essential for the conservation of the species.
Cumulative impact	The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.
Decibel (dB)	A relative unit used to describe sound intensities. It is used to express the relative difference, usually between acoustic or electrical signals, equal to 10 or 20 times the common logarithm of the ratio of the two quantities. Since the dB scale is logarithmic and not linear, a 20-dB sound is 10 times louder than a 10-dB sound and a 30-dB sound is 100 times louder than a 10-dB sound.
Demersal	Living at or near the bottom of a waterbody, but having the capacity for active swimming. Term used particularly when describing various fish species.

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
Detailed Analysis Area (DAA)	In this PEIS, a geographic area where effects on marine mammals have been analyzed through consideration of a detailed site-specific sound propagation model and use of the AIM (see above) to allow for the occurrence, distribution, and movements of marine mammals. Via this process, the potential acoustic exposures of marine mammals expected during an exemplary, or representative, marine seismic survey were estimated. Effects on other key biota occurring in the same geographic area are evaluated in a more qualitative manner.
Distinct population segment (DPS)	A vertebrate population or group of populations that is discrete from other populations of the species and significant in relation to the entire species. The U.S. ESA provides for listing species, subspecies, or DPSs of vertebrate species.
Endangered species	Under the U.S. ESA, any species that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range (ESA §3[6]).
Endangered Species Act (ESA)	A U.S. federal law whose purpose is to protect and recover imperiled species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. It is administered by the USFWS and the NMFS. The USFWS has primary responsibility for terrestrial and freshwater organisms, but including manatees, polar bears, walruses, sea otters, and nesting sea turtles, while the responsibilities of NMFS are mainly marine wildlife including all cetaceans and sea turtles (in the marine stage), most pinnipeds, and anadromous fish such as salmon. Under the ESA, species may be listed as either endangered or threatened. The ESA also requires the designation of critical habitat for listed species (see above).
Energy flux density level (EFDL)	The energy traversing in a time interval over a small area perpendicular to the direction of the energy flow, divided by that time interval and by that area. EFDL is stated in dB re 1 μPa^2-s for underwater sound.
Epifauna	Organisms living on the surface of the sediment/sea bed.
Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)	As identified in the U.S. Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act, those waters and substrate that are defined within Fishery Management Plans for federally managed fish species as necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity.
Evolutionary Significant Unit (ESU)	A species or stock that is substantially reproductively isolated from other stocks of the same species and which represents an important part of the evolutionary legacy of the species. An ESU is treated as a species for purposes of listing under the U.S. ESA. NMFS uses this designation.
Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)	A maritime zone adjacent to the territorial sea that may not extend beyond 200 nm from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.
Federal Register	The official daily publication for actions taken by the U.S. federal government, such as Rules, Proposed Rules, and Notices of federal agencies and organizations, as well as Executive Orders and other Presidential documents.
Frequency	In acoustics, a description of the rate of vibration, measured in cycles per second. One cycle per second is usually referred to as 1 hertz (Hz). Frequency is perceived by humans as pitch.
Full mitigation zone (FMZ)	An extended MZ encompassing the full region in which NMFS estimates that behavioral disturbance, also called Level B harassment (see below), might occur. It also includes the smaller MZ where Level A harassment might occur (see MZ and Level A harassment below). NMFS usually assumes that behavioral disturbance may occur upon exposure to airgun sounds with a received level ≥160 dB re 1 μPa (rms).
Generator-injector (GI) gun	A GI gun is a specialized kind of airgun that utilizes two, independently fired air chambers (the 'generator' and the 'injector', respectively) to tune the air bubble oscillation and minimize the amplitude of the bubble pulse. The primary chamber (generator) produces a primary pulse, while the secondary chamber (injector) injects a second pulse near the maximum expansion of the primary pulse, which allows for near-total suppression of the bubble oscillation by preventing bubble collapse. Using one or more GI guns, the geophysicist can achieve very high peak-to-bubble amplitude ratios without using an array of GI guns. GI guns are often used for shallow, high-resolution seismic profiling.
Habituation (behavioral)	Gradual waning of behavioral responsiveness over time as animals learn that a repeated or ongoing stimulus lacks significant consequences for the animal.

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
Harassment	Two definitions of harassment are used in this PEIS, depending on context. Under the U.S. ESA, harassment is an intentional or negligent act or omission which creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Under the 1994 Amendments to the U.S. MMPA, harassment is any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which (a) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild (Level A harassment); or (b) has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering but which does not have the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild (Level B harassment).
High frequency	In this PEIS, frequencies greater than 10 kHz.
High-frequency (HF) cetaceans	Species of cetaceans and pinnipeds have been assigned to 1 of 5 functional hearing groups based on behavioral psychophysics, evoked potential audiometry, auditory morphology, and (for pinnipeds) the medium in which they listen. Cetaceans account for 3 of the 5 groups, subdivided according to differences in their measured or estimated hearing characteristics. HF cetaceans are the minority of the odontocete (toothed whale) species whose hearing is optimal at exceptionally high frequencies. The HF cetaceans include all true porpoises, river dolphins, and members of the genera *Kogia* and *Cephalorhynchus*, plus the franciscana dolphin. "Functional" hearing in this group has been estimated to occur between 200 Hz and 180 kHz. Refer to Southall et al. (2007) for more information.
Hydrophone	Essentially an underwater microphone, a hydrophone is an underwater receiver used to detect the pressure change caused by sound waves propagating through the water. That pressure is converted to electrical energy which can be recorded or measured.
Incidental harassment	An accidental taking. This does not mean that the taking is unexpected, but rather it includes those takings that are infrequent, unavoidable, or accidental.
Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA)	In 1994, the U.S. MMPA was amended to establish an expedited process by which citizens of the U.S. can apply for an authorization to incidentally take small numbers of marine mammals by "harassment", referred to as IHAs (16 USC 1371 *et seq.*). IHAs will be granted if the harassment will have a negligible impact on the affected species or stock and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of such species or stock for taking for subsistence uses. It must also lay out the permissible methods of taking and requirements for the monitoring and reporting of such taking, including requirements for the independent peer review of proposed monitoring plans where the proposed activity may affect the availability of a species or stock for taking for subsistence uses. It established specific time limits for public notice and comment on any requests for authorization which would be granted under this provision. IHAs can be valid for a period not to exceed 1 year.
Infauna	Animals living within the sediment.
Letter of Authorization (LOA)	The U.S. MMPA provides for "incidental take authorizations" for maritime activities, provided NMFS finds that the takings would be of small numbers, would have no more than a negligible impact on the affected marine mammal species or stock, and would not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of such species or stock for taking for subsistence uses. These "incidental take" authorizations, or LOAs, require that regulations be promulgated and published in the *Federal Register* outlining: (a) permissible methods and the specified geographical region of taking; (b) the means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact on the species or stock and its habitat and on the availability of the species or stock for "subsistence" uses; and, (c) requirements for monitoring and reporting. The regulations can be valid for a period not to exceed 5 consecutive years.
Level A harassment	Under the U.S. MMPA, Level A harassment includes any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild.
Level A harassment zone	Extends from the source out to the distance and exposure at which the slightest amount of injury is predicted to occur. The acoustic exposure that produces the slightest degree of injury is therefore the threshold value defining the outermost limit of the Level A harassment zone.

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
Level B harassment	Level B harassment is any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance which has the potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of natural behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Unlike Level A harassment, which is solely associated with physiological effects, both physiological and behavioral effects have the potential to cause Level B harassment.
Level B harassment zone	Begins just beyond the point of slightest injury and extends outward from that point to include all areas where animals may potentially experience Level B harassment. The animals predicted to be in this zone experience Level B harassment by virtue of temporary impairment of sensory function (altered physiological function) that can disrupt behavior or through behavioral effects not directly associated with any physiological change.
Low frequency	In this PEIS, frequencies less than 1 kHz.
Low-frequency (LF) cetaceans	Species of cetaceans and pinnipeds were assigned to 1 of 5 functional hearing groups based on behavioral psychophysics, evoked potential audiometry, auditory morphology, and (for pinnipeds) the medium in which they listen. Cetaceans account for 3 of the 5 groups, subdivided according to differences in their measured or estimated hearing characteristics. LF cetaceans consist of all species and subspecies of mysticete (baleen) whales (i.e., cetaceans in the genera *Balaena*, *Eubalaena*, *Balaenoptera*, *Caperea*, *Eschrichtius*, and *Megaptera*). In these species, hearing sensitivity has been estimated from behavioral responses (or lack thereof) to sounds at various frequencies, vocalization frequencies they use most, body size, ambient noise levels at the frequencies they use most, and inner ear anatomy. Currently, the estimated lower and upper frequencies for functional hearing in mysticetes are 7 Hz and 22 kHz, respectively. Refer to Southall et al. (2007) for more information.
Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA)	Enacted in October 1972, the U.S. MMPA provides protection for all marine mammals. The MMPA prohibits, with certain exceptions, the "take" of marine mammals in U.S. waters and by U.S. citizens on the high seas, and the importation of marine mammals and marine mammal products into the U.S.
Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM)	An acoustic model used to predict the received levels of airgun or other underwater sounds as a function of source characteristics, site properties, and the receiver's bearing, distance, and depth in the water column. MONM takes account of the frequency-specific source levels for the particular source configuration (in this case, the specific airgun configuration to be used in each DAA). It also takes account of the best available site-specific information about environmental factors that would affect the propagation and attenuation of that sound as it travels outward from the airgun array. These include bathymetry, sub-bottom conditions, and the sound velocity profile of the water column.
Masking	The obscuring of sounds of interest by interfering sounds, generally at the same or similar frequencies.
Mid-frequency	In this PEIS, frequencies between 1 and 10 kHz.
Mid-frequency (MF) cetaceans	Species of cetaceans and pinnipeds were assigned to 1 of 5 functional hearing groups based on behavioral psychophysics, evoked potential audiometry, auditory morphology, and (for pinnipeds) the medium in which they listen. Cetaceans are further subdivided according to differences in their measured or estimated hearing characteristics. MF cetaceans are most of the odontocetes (toothed whales) [see HF cetaceans, above, for exceptions]. MF cetaceans include various species and subspecies of "dolphins," larger toothed whales, and beaked and bottlenose whales. Based on the combined available data, MF cetaceans are estimated to have lower and upper frequency "limits" of nominal hearing at approximately 150 Hz and 160 kHz, respectively. Refer to Southall et al. (2007) for more information.
Mitigation measure	Measures that will likely minimize, avoid, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for significant environmental effects.
Mitigation zone (MZ)	A region in which a possibility exists of injurious effects on animal hearing or other physical effects (Level A harassment).
Multi-channel seismic (MCS)	Using multiple hydrophone streamers, sonobuoys, OBS/H, OBCs, or borehole seismometer to record the reflected and refracted sounds from an airgun array.

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
M-weighting	In general, animals do not hear equally well at all frequencies within their functional hearing range. Frequency weighting is a method of quantitatively compensating for the differential frequency response of sensory systems. Generalized frequency-weighting functions, referred to as M-weighting functions, have been derived by Southall et al. (2007) for each functional hearing group of marine mammals. The M-weighting functions were derived using principles from human frequency-weighting paradigms, with adjustments for the different functional hearing bandwidths of the various marine mammal groups. A precautionary procedure was used in deriving the frequency-specific, marine mammal weighting functions. Each was based on an algorithm that requires only the estimated (based on ~80 dB above best hearing sensitivity) lower and upper frequencies of functional hearing (75 Hz to 75 kHz for pinnipeds in water; for cetaceans, refer to entries for LF, HF, and MF cetaceans). The resulting functions are designed to reasonably represent the bandwidth where acoustic exposures can have auditory effects and be most accurate for describing the potential adverse effects of high-amplitude noise where loudness functions are expected to flatten significantly. The weighting functions (designated "M" for marine mammal) are analogous to the C-weighting function for humans, which is commonly used in measuring high-amplitude sounds. Refer to Southall et al. (2007) for more information.
Mysticete	Any whale of the suborder Mysticeti having plates of whalebone (baleen plates) instead of teeth. Mysticetes are filter-feeding whales, also referred to as baleen whales, such as blue, fin, gray, and humpback whales. Also see Figure G-1 below.
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	U.S. federal law passed by Congress in 1969 (42 USC 4321 et seq.). The Act established a national policy to provide a process for the consideration of environmental issues in federal agency planning and decision-making. The potential environmental impacts of proposed federal actions on the human and natural environment were to be considered prior to decision making. NEPA procedures require that environmental information be made available to the public and the decision makers before decisions are made. Information contained in the NEPA documents must focus on the relevant issues in order to facilitate the decision-making process.
Notice of intent (NOI)	A written notice published in the *Federal Register* that announces the intent to prepare an EIS under the U.S. NEPA. Also provides information about a proposed federal action, alternatives, the scoping process, and points of contact within the lead federal agency regarding the EIS.
Ocean bottom seismometers/ hydrophones (OBS/Hs)	An OBS/H is a portable, self-contained passive receiver system designed to sit on the seafloor and record seismic signals generated primarily by airguns and earthquakes. Broadband OBS/Hs detect sound waves generated by earthquakes. Short-period OBS/Hs detect sound waves generated by sources such as airguns or GI guns. The characteristics of the recorded seismic energy, combined with precise timing and location information for the sound sources and the receiver (the OBS/H), can provide details about the velocity and the geometry of Earth structure.
Odontocete	Any toothed whale (i.e., cetacean without baleen plates) of the suborder Odontoceti, such as sperm whales, killer whales, beaked whales, dolphins, and porpoises. Also see Figure G-1 below.
Onset permanent threshold shift (onset PTS)	PTS (defined below) is non-recoverable and, by definition, must result from the destruction of tissues within the auditory system. PTS therefore qualifies as an injury and is classified as Level A harassment under the wording of the MMPA. In this PEIS, the smallest amount of PTS (onset PTS) is taken to be the indicator for the smallest degree of injury that can be measured. The acoustic exposure associated with onset PTS is used to define the outer limit of the Level A harassment zone.
Onset temporary threshold shift (onset TTS)	A threshold shift represents an increase in the auditory threshold (i.e., a reduced ability to hear at a particular frequency). TTS (defined below) is recoverable and is considered to result from the temporary, non-injurious distortion of hearing-related tissues. In this PEIS, the smallest measurable amount of TTS (onset TTS) is taken as the best indicator for slight temporary sensory impairment. Because it is considered non-injurious, the acoustic exposure associated with onset TTS is used to define the outer limit of the portion of the Level B harassment zone attributable to physiological effects. This follows from the concept that hearing loss potentially affects an animal's ability to react normally to the sounds around it. Therefore, the potential for TTS qualifies as a Level B harassment that results from physiological effects upon the auditory system.
Passive acoustic monitoring (PAM)	A listening system that, in the marine environment, utilizes hydrophones, signal processing software, and (usually) some degree of human listening to detect and often to localize the vocalizations of marine mammals.

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
Pelagic	Pelagic is a broad term applied to species that inhabit the open, upper portion of marine waters rather than waters adjacent to land or near the sea floor.
Permanent threshold shift (PTS)	Exposure to high-intensity sound may result in auditory effects such as noise-induced threshold shift, or simply a threshold shift. If the threshold shift becomes a permanent condition, generally as a result of physical injury to the inner ear and hearing loss, it is known as PTS.
Physiological effect	Defined in this PEIS as a variation in an animal's physiology that results from an anthropogenic acoustic exposure and exceeds the normal daily variation in physiological function.
Ping	A transient sound created by a sonar.
Pinger	A pulse generator using underwater sound to transmit data, such as subject location.
Pinniped	Any member of a suborder (Pinnipedia) of aquatic carnivorous mammals (i.e., seals and sea lions) with all four limbs modified into flippers. Also see Figure G-2 below.
Protected species visual observer (PSVO)	A trained, dedicated, and experienced individual responsible for conducting visual watches for protected species, such as marine mammals and sea turtles, during marine seismic surveys. Previously called Marine Mammal Observer or MMO.
Qualitative Analysis Area (QAA)	In this PEIS, a geographic area that has been addressed in a qualitative manner vs. the quantitative acoustic modeling done for the DAAs (see above). The sound fields to which marine mammals could be exposed during a seismic program were modeled for representative sites in each DAA but they were not modeled for each QAA. In order to qualitatively evaluate sound levels that might be received by marine mammals in each of the eight QAAs, the source configurations and factors affecting sound propagation for each QAA were compared to those for each of the DAAs. This allows an initial qualitative assessment of the QAAs, which in turn may be used as an initial point from which to prepare potential tiered environmental documents.
Ramp Up (or Soft Start)	Turning on the airguns or other acoustic source at low power and gradually and systematically increasing the output until full power is achieved (usually over a period of minutes). The appropriate ramp up or soft-start method depends on factors such as the type of seismic survey equipment being used and vessel speed.
Received level	The level of sound that arrives at the receiver (e.g., marine mammal), or listening device (hydrophone). The received level is the source level minus the transmission losses from the sound traveling through the water.
Record of Decision (ROD)	A concise summary of the decision made by the project proponent (e.g., NSF) from the alternatives presented in a Final EIS. The ROD is published in the *Federal Register*.
Resonance	A phenomenon that exists when an object is vibrated at a frequency near its natural frequency of vibration – the particular frequency at which the object vibrates most readily.
Scoping	An early and open process with federal and state agencies and interested parties to identify possible alternatives and the significant issues to be addressed in an EIS.
Seismic reflection study	A marine experiment in which acoustic sources and receivers are used to image the seafloor and subseafloor geology using signals that are travelling primarily vertically into and out of the seafloor and subseafloor. Seismic reflection is a principle which is utilized in geology to gather information about what is going on underneath the surface of the Earth. Geologists can use the movement of sound waves underground to generate data about subsurface geological formations. As the sound waves from an acoustic source (e.g., airgun array) move underground, some are reflected back up to the sea surface where they are picked up by hydrophones towed behind the survey vessel. Using hydrophone data, researchers can create a plot which reveals the outline of formations and objects in the ground. Reflection methods generally utilize information from the reflected acoustic waves that travel in vertical or near-vertical to wide-angle reflected ray paths, resulting in travel time images that, after processing and geometric corrections, resemble cross sections of the Earth showing the seafloor and sub-seafloor features. Reflection surveys provide very detailed information on the presence and shape of reflectors or discontinuities, though the velocity structure between reflectors is often less well constrained by this method. These data are typically collected using towed hydrophones, configured as single-channel or multichannel arrays.

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
Seismic refraction study	A marine experiment in which acoustic sources and receivers are used to image the seafloor and subseafloor geology using signals that are travelling primarily horizontally through the seafloor and subseafloor. Closely related to seismic reflection, seismic refraction involves the study of the ways in which sound waves bend as they encounter obstacles underground. Refraction of sound waves occurs when the wave moves from one medium to another and there is a change in speed of the sound waves as they move through the different mediums. Refraction methods collect information from near-vertical reflected to near-horizontal refracted raypaths and are interpreted using a combination of modeling and inversion to yield results. Refraction surveys are typically designed to locate the basement layer for a marine sedimentary section, to define different layers of the crust, or to study the velocity characteristics of layered subfloor features. OBS/Hs are often used in refraction surveys. Generally speaking, this method can provide information on the location and shape of reflectors, though the resolution is less than that obtained by reflection data.
Sound exposure level (SEL)	SEL (also called EFDL, see above) is the total noise energy produced from a single noise event and is the integration of all the acoustic energy contained within the event. SEL takes into account both the intensity and the duration of a noise event. SEL is stated in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ for underwater sound. For a seismic survey, the SEL can represent either all energy received at a particular location in the water column from either (1) a given seismic pulse, or (2) a sequence of pulses as the seismic vessel passes. The units are the same, but the numerical value will be higher for (1), often referred to as the cumulative SEL or C-SEL.
Sound navigation and ranging (sonar)	Any anthropogenic (man-made) or animal (e.g., bats, dolphins) system that uses transmitted and/or received acoustic signals for navigation, communication, and determining position and bearing of a target. There are two broad types of anthropogenic sonar: active and passive. *Active sonar* involves the production of a signal that propagates through the environment and bounces off objects (such as a prey item). That reflected sound, or echo, travels back to the receiver, which interprets the echo. Therefore, active sonar involves two-way sound transmission. *Passive sonar* involves one-way sound transmission from an acoustic source (such as conspecific) to a receiver or listener.
Sound pressure level (SPL)	A measure of the root-mean square, or "effective," sound pressure, converted to dB. SPL is expressed in dB re 1 µPa for underwater sound and dB re to 20 µPa for airborne sound.
Source level	For an ideal point source, the sound pressure level as measured 1 m from the source. For arrays and other dimensionally large sources, the sound pressure level that would (in theory) be measured 1 m away from an ideal point source radiating the same amount of sound as the actual distributed source. With a distributed source, the highest sound level measureable anywhere in the water is lower than the theoretical source level.
Sparker	A low-energy acoustic source that generates a precisely timed electrical arc that momentarily vaporizes water between positive and negative leads. The collapsing bubbles produce a broad band omnidirectional pulse which can penetrate several hundred meters into the ocean bottom. Hydrophone arrays towed nearby receive the return signals.
Take	Under the U.S. MMPA: to harass, hunt, capture, or kill, or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, or kill any marine mammal. Under the U.S. ESA: to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct.
Temporary threshold shift (TTS)	Exposure to high-intensity sound may result in auditory effects such as noise-induced threshold shift, or simply a threshold shift. If the threshold shift recovers completely after a few minutes, hours, or days, it is known as TTS. A threshold shift represents an increase in the auditory threshold (i.e., a reduced ability to hear) at a particular frequency. TTS is by definition recoverable and results from the temporary, non-injurious distortion of hearing-related tissues. In this PEIS, the smallest measurable amount of TTS (onset TTS) is taken as the best indicator for slight temporary sensory impairment. Because it is non-injurious, the acoustic exposure associated with onset TTS is used to define the outer limit of the portion of the Level B harassment zone attributable to physiological effects.
Threatened species	Under the U.S. ESA, any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range (ESA §3[20]).

GLOSSARY

Term	*Definition*
Transmission loss	Pressure or energy losses that occur as the sound travels through the water. Losses occur because the wavefront spreads over an increasingly large volume as the sound propagates, and because of additional processes including scattering and the absorption of some of the energy by water.
U.S. Territorial Waters	Sea areas within 12 nm of the U.S. coastline, normally measured from the official baselines of the country (typically the mean of the lower low tide locations for the U.S.), for which coastal nations exercise sovereignty.
Water gun	An alternative to an airgun, a device that uses compressed water rather than compressed air (as with an airgun) to create an acoustic source for marine seismic data. The pulse of compressed water leaving the gun creates a void such that the collapse of water into the void creates a pulse of acoustic energy that radiates outward from the gun.

Figure G-1. CETACEANS

(Marine mammals in the Order Cetacea: Whales, dolphins, and porpoises)

Mysticetes

Whales of the Suborder Mysticeti having plates of whalebone (baleen plates) instead of teeth. Mysticetes are filter-feeding whales, also referred to as baleen whales, such as fin, humpback, and sei whales, depicted below.

Fin whale
(Photo: NOAA-NMFS)

Humpback whale feeding
((Photo: Alaska Adventures)

Sei whale
(Photo: Peter Duley, NOAA-NEFSC)

Odontocetes

Whales of the Suborder Odontoceti having teeth (i.e., cetaceans without baleen plates), such as sperm whales, killer whales, beaked whales, dolphins, and porpoises. Below are examples of Odontocetes: bottlenose dolphin, killer whale, and harbor porpoise.

Bottlenose dolphin
(Photo: NOAA-NMFS)

Killer whales
(Photo: NOAA-AFSC)

Harbor porpoise
(Photo: NOAA-SWFSC)

Figure G-2. PINNIPEDS

(Marine mammals in the Order Carnivora and in the Suborder Pinnipedia: sea lions and seals)

Otariids

Sea lions and fur seals in the Family Otariidae are also called 'eared seals' because they have external ear flaps or pinnae. Eared seals can rotate their foreflippers under their bodies and use both their fore- and hindflippers to walk on land. Below are two examples of eared seals: California sea lion and northern fur seal.

California sea lion

(Photo: Indianapolis Zoo)

Northern fur seal

(Photo: Verena A. Gill, Alaska Sea Grant)

Phocids

Called true or 'earless seals' because they lack external ear flaps. Unlike eared seals (or otariids), phocids cannot rotate their hindflippers under their bodies to walk. On land they use their foreflippers to pull themselves along, while their hindflippers trail passively behind. Below are two examples of earless seals: harbor seal and elephant seal.

Harbor seal

(Photo: T. Mangelson, Alaska Sea Grant)

Elephant seals

(Photo: D. Endico)

[This page intentionally left blank.]

CHAPTER 1
PURPOSE AND NEED

This Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) (hereafter called PEIS) has been prepared by the National Science Foundation (NSF) in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 United States Code [USC] §4321 et seq.); the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] §§1500-1508); NSF procedures for implementing NEPA and CEQ regulations (45 CFR 640); and Executive Order (EO) 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions*. The NEPA process ensures that environmental impacts of proposed major federal actions are considered in the decision-making process. EO 12114 requires environmental consideration (i.e., preparation of an OEIS) for actions that may significantly affect the environment outside United States (U.S.) Territorial Waters. This PEIS satisfies the requirements of both NEPA and EO 12114. The Draft PEIS is published, distributed to federal, state, local, and private agencies, organizations, and individuals for review and comment, and then filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). A Notice of Availability (NOA) is then announced in the *Federal Register*. Public hearings are held on the Draft PEIS. A Final PEIS is then prepared that provides responses to the comments received from all parties on the Draft PEIS. A Record of Decision (ROD) follows the publication of the Final PEIS and concludes the NEPA process.

1.1 COOPERATING AGENCIES

NSF is the proponent for the NSF-funded marine seismic research and is the lead agency for the preparation of this PEIS. As defined in 40 CFR 1508.6, a cooperating agency may be any federal agency other than the lead agency that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to the environmental impacts expected to result from a proposal. An agency has "jurisdiction by law" if it has the authority to approve, veto, or finance all or part of the proposal (40 CFR 1508.15). An agency has "special expertise" if it has statutory responsibility, agency mission, or related program experience with regard to a proposal (40 CFR 1508.26). A lead agency must request the participation of cooperating agencies as early as possible in the NEPA process, use the environmental analyses and proposals prepared by cooperating agencies as much as possible, and meet with cooperating agencies at their request (40 CFR 1501.6[a]). A cooperating agency's responsibility includes participation in the NEPA process as early as possible, participation in the scoping process, and, on the lead agency's request, development of information to be included in the PEIS and providing staff support in its preparation (40 CFR 1501.6[b]).

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has agreed to be a cooperating agency for the preparation of the Draft and Final PEIS on NSF's Proposed Action. The nature and scope of the Proposed Action involving NSF's funding of seismic research, the use of associated acoustic sources, and potential impacts to marine resources under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), particularly marine mammals and sensitive marine species, including those listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), led to NOAA's agreement on its participation as a cooperating agency. Through its role as a cooperating agency, NMFS is not proposing or authorizing any action through its participation in this programmatic NEPA analysis. NMFS has jurisdiction by law, as well as special expertise over living marine resources, including marine mammals and sea turtles. NMFS served as a technical expert to ensure that the PEIS contained acceptable analysis of impacts of underwater sound on marine mammals and a proper characterization of the general process for authorizing the incidental take of marine mammals under Sections 101(a)(5)(A) and (D) of the

Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). NMFS carried out its responsibilities as a cooperating agency in accordance with the procedures set forth by CEQ at 40 CFR 1501.6. Therefore, in addition to the regulations and requirements discussed elsewhere in this document, this PEIS has been reviewed in accordance with NOAA Administrative Order Series 216-6, *Environmental Review Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act* (May 20, 1999).

The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) has also agreed to be a cooperating agency for the Proposed Action. The nature and scope of the Proposed Action involving seismic research, associated acoustic sources, and potential impact on marine resources make it appropriate for the USGS, which conducts similar seismic research, to be a cooperating agency.

1.2 MISSION OF NSF

Established by Congress with the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (Public Law 810507, as amended), NSF is the federal government's only agency dedicated to the support of fundamental research and education in all scientific and engineering disciplines. In accordance with the Act, NSF's mission is to "promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes." The primary roles of NSF are to support and fund the Nation's academic-based research in science and engineering, enhance the quality of education, and ensure that the U.S. maintains leadership in scientific discovery and the development of new technologies. The Act authorizes and directs NSF to initiate, support, and fund:

- basic scientific research and research fundamental to the engineering process,
- programs to strengthen scientific and engineering research potential,
- science and engineering education programs at all levels and in all fields of science and engineering,
- an information base on science and engineering appropriate for development of national and international policy,
- the interchange of scientific and engineering information nationally and internationally, and
- the development of computer and other methodologies (NSF 2006a, 2008a).

In particular, the research and education activities of NSF promote the discovery, integration, dissemination, and application of new knowledge in service to society and to prepare future generations of scientists, mathematicians, and engineers. In addition, the constantly changing global economic, scientific, and technical environment challenges long-standing assumptions about domestic and international policy, requiring NSF to play a more proactive role in sustaining the competitive advantage of the U.S. through superior research capabilities (NSF 2006a, 2008a).

1.3 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

This PEIS examines the potential impacts that may result from geophysical exploration and scientific research using seismic surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS. The Proposed Action is for academic and U.S. government scientists in the U.S., and possible international collaborators, to conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions and government agencies. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to fund the investigation of the geology and geophysics of the seafloor by collecting seismic reflection and refraction data that reveal the structure and stratigraphy of the crust and/or overlying sediment below the world's oceans. NSF has a continuing need to fund seismic surveys that enable scientists to collect data essential to understanding the complex Earth processes beneath the ocean floor. Data collected from marine seismic surveys:

- were important in hypothesizing, and subsequently demonstrating, the validity of the theory of plate tectonics;

- are vital to making ocean drilling scientifically useful and environmentally safe;
- provide imaging of ocean faults, which is key to studies of earthquake and landslide hazards;
- are essential to evaluate the potential for tsunami generation, which, in most cases, result from submarine slumping associated with earthquakes;
- are used to define potential failure regions, slip planes, oversteepened slopes, creep, zones of potential overpressures, and concentrations of gas hydrates or shallow free gas that may play a role in destabilization of sedimentary slopes;
- are used to map sedimentary horizons, allowing correlation of sediment type and age across long distances, and providing information on spatial and temporal distributions of processes (such as climatic or oceanographic events) at geologic time scales;
- can be used to directly image magma chambers in volcanoes or mid-ocean ridges, and repeat surveys can be used to image changes in magma reservoirs related to eruptions; and
- can be used to interpret processes of compaction, folding, dewatering, and other processes in subduction zones that lead to uplift, earthquakes, slumping, and other processes that will impact land and people.

The funding and conducting of marine seismic research would continue to meet NSF's critical need to foster a better understanding of Earth's history, natural hazards, and climate history. A few representative, recent examples of NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research include:

- locating stratigraphic records of environmental change that assist in understanding anthropogenic warming and the melting of glaciers;
- understanding source mechanisms, fault locations, and hazard potentials for large earthquakes and tsunamis along faults and segments of tectonic plate boundaries, allowing prioritization of tsunami and earthquake warning systems;
- imaging sedimentary packages that indicate how erosion and sedimentation have impacted and changed the size and shapes of the continental shelves over time;
- examining the formation and evolution of volcanic islands, mid-ocean ridges, and igneous provinces;
- understanding the evolution and movement of tectonic plates;
- providing essential geological information needed for initiation of scientific ocean drilling and bore hole observatory monitoring of the ocean crust;
- studying structures produced by asteroid impacts;
- mapping the seafloor and its topographic relief and understanding the causes of submarine geologic structures;
- mapping hydrothermal vent systems and determining the pattern of circulation of sub-seafloor fluids;
- evaluating the distribution and volume of methane gas in free and hydrated form within a region, and the potential impact on the ocean and atmosphere of a release of large volumes of methane gas; and
- understanding the distribution and amount of sediment-hosted natural gas beneath the world's oceans.

In addition to specific marine seismic research, geoscience exploration through ocean drilling has been an ongoing effort by NSF with international partners since the early 1970s. Seismic reflection surveying is a critical, required element for every site that gets drilled under the auspices of the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program (IODP), as well as under the program's predecessors: Ocean Drilling Program (ODP)

and Deep Sea Drilling Project (DSDP). Seismic reflection profiling is an essential technology required for characterization of scientific drilling objectives, as well as for characterization and mitigation of hazards due to environmental factors, and managing the potential safety and pollution risks (e.g., avoiding submarine hazards or the environmental dangers that result from drilling into gas zones or other potential pollution sources). For these reasons, the documentation provided with every proposed scientific drilling site must include seismic reflection imagery of the subsurface in the immediate vicinity. The value of this planning process is borne out in both the scientific success of the DSDP, ODP, and IODP, and in their records of compliance with environmental regulations and policies. The extraordinary safety and environmental record of the NSF-sponsored DSDP, ODP, and IODP results largely from its reliance on seismic reflection data to plan safe operations. This PEIS will also address the acoustic sources proposed for use by the IODP's Scientific Ocean Drilling Vessel (SODV). Further detail is provided in Chapter 2.

1.4 PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH TO THE PEIS

Under the Proposed Action, a variety of acoustic sources used for research activities funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS would be operated from various research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions or government agencies. The seismic acoustic sources would include various airgun configurations (particularly strings or arrays with as little as 2 to as many as 36 seismic airguns), as well as towed low-energy sources including swept frequency modulated (FM) chirp systems, sparker, and boomer type sub-bottom profilers (SBPs). Non-seismic acoustic sources would include multibeam echosounders (MBESs), SBPs, acoustic Doppler current profilers (ADCPs), fathometers, pingers, and acoustic releases. A variety of other geoscience research activities, such as, but not limited to, mapping, dredging, drilling, and coring, might also be conducted on any seismic research cruise funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS.

Currently, individual Environmental Assessments (EAs) are prepared for individual or small numbers of related cruises to assess the impact of the generated seismic survey noise on the marine environment. In the 7 years from 2003 through 2009, NSF prepared 31 EAs assessing the impact of sound from seismic surveys on marine resources and species listed under the MMPA and ESA during research projects investigating the geology and geophysics of the seafloor. These EAs were prepared for various worldwide, academic research cruises that required the use of various marine seismic sources involving different airgun configurations deployed from the primary U.S. academic seismic survey ship, or smaller airgun sources deployed from other research vessels, often with concurrent operations of MBES, SBPs, and depth-sounders.

For past seismic research cruise actions with the potential to adversely affect species of marine mammals listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA, an EA has been used to provide the necessary information to initiate and conduct informal or formal consultation with the NOAA Office of Protected Resources (OPR) and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. For research cruises with the potential for adverse impacts to listed species, NOAA OPR and/or USFWS have issued a Biological Opinion (BO) and related Incidental Take Statements (ITSs), which included terms and conditions to minimize impacts on threatened and endangered species. In parallel with this effort, when applicable, a separate application for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) under Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA was submitted for each cruise to another division within NOAA OPR, which subsequently issued the IHA. The MMPA procedures for issuance of an IHA involve publication of a proposed IHA notice in the *Federal Register*, solicitation of comments on that notice, and publication of a notice of issuance in the *Federal Register*, in addition to compliance with NEPA, and, if applicable, the ESA.

To reduce this apparent duplication of effort in environmental documentation and to address the potential for cumulative effects of marine seismic research acoustic sources upon marine resources, NSF and the USGS have decided that a Programmatic EIS/OEIS should be prepared. Preparing a Programmatic EIS/OEIS for NSF and USGS marine seismic research serves several purposes. First, it provides a format for a comprehensive cumulative impacts analysis by taking a view of the planned marine seismic research activities as a whole. This is accomplished by assembling and analyzing the broadest range of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with all marine seismic research activities in addition to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the region of influence. Furthermore, the collective analysis of representative project locations will provide a strong technical basis for a more global assessment of the potential cumulative impacts of NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic activities in the future.

A Programmatic EIS/OEIS also sets up a framework for streamlining the preparation of subsequent environmental documents where needed for individual cruises. It is expected that time- and location-specific aspects, or similarly detailed technical information if necessary to evaluate unique impacts of specific cruises and projects, will be addressed in EIS supplements, tiered EAs, or other appropriate environmental documentation that would follow the publication of this PEIS (per CEQ regulations at 40 CFR 1502.20). Thus, while NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research is reviewed under this PEIS, the analysis of site-specific impacts from future cruises may be reserved for future analysis. Tiering of environmental documents in this manner makes subsequent documents of greater use and meaning to the public as NSF's and USGS's marine seismic research develops, without duplicating previous paperwork and environmental analyses. Finally, a PEIS enables the identification of an appropriate and prudent set of standard mitigation measures to be integrated into future NSF-funded and USGS cruises, which is a key goal of NSF and USGS and this PEIS.

1.5 BACKGROUND OF NSF-FUNDED MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH

The purpose of this PEIS is to address the same basic environmental concerns for any NSF-funded marine seismic research, but the focus of the PEIS is for actions in the Divisions of Ocean Sciences and Earth Sciences within the Directorate for Geosciences (GEO). GEO is one of the primary research arms within NSF that provides funding for marine seismic research.

GEO supports research in the atmospheric, Earth, and ocean sciences and is the principal source of federal funding for university-based fundamental research in the geosciences. GEO addresses the nation's need to know more about how our planet is structured, how it works as a system, and through its research support, improves our ability to understand, predict, and respond to environmental events and changes. GEO-supported research also advances our ability to locate new resources and understand and predict natural phenomena of economic and human significance, such as climate change, weather, earthquakes, tsunamis, and solar-atmosphere interactions.

NSF has funded marine seismic research for over 50 years. Typically, four to seven NSF-funded marine seismic research cruises are conducted each year. These cruises are conducted across the world's oceans including the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea, Mid-Atlantic Ridge, North Atlantic, Norwegian Sea, Arctic Ocean, Bering Sea, Gulf of Alaska, Northeast Pacific, Eastern Tropical Pacific, and Southwest Pacific. More than one seismic research cruise at one time is rare. The final determination of specific cruise tracks includes multiple factors beginning with the research objectives of proposals recommended for award during panel reviews, the NSF research budget for a given fiscal year, vessel availability, and environmental considerations presented in this PEIS.

1.6 BACKGROUND OF USGS MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH

The USGS conducts marine seismic research in support of its missions: 1) to characterize the seafloor and subseafloor of the nation or other areas of interest; 2) to support analyses of seismic, tsunami, submarine slide, or other marine hazards; 3) to assess the distribution of mineral or unconventional natural gas resources in the offshore environment; 4) to document the impact of climate or environmental change or events; 5) to document the processes related to the formation of and ongoing changes to continental shelves and margins; 6) to understand a variety of geological, geophysical, and biological processes that affect the marine environment; and 7) to collaborate with other government agencies in support of mutual scientific objectives and governmental or public benefits.

In general, USGS marine seismic research is focused on federal offshore and trust territory land, but does occasionally include worldwide locations under special circumstances or collaborations. For much of the past decade, USGS research has been directed progressively more to nearshore and inner shelf coastal research, where low-energy acoustic sources are generally adequate. Mapping the outer limits of the extended continental shelf of the U.S. is an exception to this general trend, where seismic data may be required to map sediment thickness beyond the 200-nautical mile (nm) (370-kilometer [km]) limit of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ).

USGS marine seismic research projects are conducted to support approved programs of the USGS for which the agency has direct or reimbursable funding. The potential environmental impact of such marine seismic projects is considered throughout the planning process. In the planning process, the USGS considers the minimum source size and configuration required to meet the scientific objectives; the impact of the planned activity on sensitive marine species, particularly during critical parts of their life cycle; possible mitigation strategies; and various alternatives to conducting seismic activities. In addition, the final determination of specific cruises includes multiple factors beginning with the research objectives of proposals recommended for award, the USGS research budget for a given fiscal year, vessel availability, and environmental considerations presented in this PEIS.

1.7 PEIS ANALYSIS AREAS

Due to the potential for NSF-funded marine seismic cruises to occur across the world's oceans, it was necessary to narrow the focus of the analysis presented in this PEIS to a number of representative or exemplary analysis areas. The proposed number and location of analysis areas were determined based on past and potential future NSF-funded seismic research objectives and priorities. In other words, locations of exemplary analysis areas were selected in areas where it was considered likely that a future marine seismic research cruise would be proposed for NSF funding by a scientific investigator, while at the same time including analysis areas within a wide range of Longhurst Biomes (see below).

Based on the concept of the Longhurst Biome, the pelagic biogeography by Longhurst (2006) was utilized as a guide to identify areas with similar ecological dynamics. This concept describes how individual species are distributed in the ocean, and explains how these species aggregate to form characteristic ecosystems under regional conditions of temperature, nutrients, and sunlight exposure. Although the Longhurst Biome concept was designed for plankton, it is the most appropriate scientific application available for designating specified geographic regions since no similar biogeographic concept has been designed for marine mammals and other marine vertebrates at the higher trophic levels. In general, the distribution of marine organisms at higher trophic levels resembles the general geographic patterns of primary productivity, with the largest aggregations concentrated in coastal areas and zones of upwelling (Longhurst 2006). Although Longhurst Biomes are extremely large, the biome concept provided a large-scale selection criterion.

Based on this rationale, 13 exemplary analysis areas were proposed for analysis within this PEIS. In some instances, a biome may not be represented (e.g., Antarctic Polar Biome) and other biomes may be represented more than once (e.g., Pacific Coastal Biome). However, it was considered more important to represent where potential NSF-funded marine seismic research activities would most likely occur, including parts of the U.S. margins relevant to future USGS studies, than to include an analysis area within each biome.

The 13 exemplary analysis areas were broken down further into 5 areas of detailed study (Detailed Analysis Areas or DAAs) and 8 areas of qualitative study (Qualitative Analysis Areas or QAAs) (Table 1-1). Impact analysis for the DAAs includes acoustic modeling that assesses impacts on marine species by integrating the predicted seismic survey sound field with the expected distributions and densities of marine animals. The collective analysis of the 13 representative locations provides a technical basis for a general global assessment of the potential environmental impacts of NSF-funded and USGS-conducted seismic survey activities in the future, a key goal of the PEIS. More detailed discussion of the 13 analysis areas is provided in Chapter 2.

Table 1-1. Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas

Qualitative Analysis Area (QAA)	*Detailed Analysis Area (DAA)*
British Columbia Coast (BC Coast)	Western Gulf of Alaska (W Gulf of Alaska)
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	Southern California (S California)
Mariana Islands (Marianas)	Galapagos Ridge
Sub-Antarctic	Caribbean Sea (Caribbean)
Northern Atlantic/Iceland (N Atlantic/Iceland)	Northwestern Atlantic (NW Atlantic)
Southwestern Atlantic (SW Atlantic)	
Western India (W India)	
Western Australia (W Australia)	

1.8 REGULATORY SETTING

1.8.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

In 1969, Congress enacted NEPA to provide for the consideration of environmental issues in federal agency planning and decision-making. Regulations for federal agency implementation of NEPA were established by the CEQ in *Regulations for Implementing Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* (40 CFR Parts 1500 to 1508). NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an EIS for major federal actions that may significantly affect the quality of the human and natural environment. The EIS must disclose significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts and inform decision-makers and the public of reasonable alternatives that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment.

Under customary international law, U.S. Territory generally extends out into the ocean for a distance of 3 nm (5.6 km) from the coastline. By Presidential Proclamation 5928, issued 27 December 1988, the U.S. extended its exercise of sovereignty and jurisdiction under international law to 12 nm (22 km) (i.e., territorial sea). However, the Proclamation expressly provides that it does not extend or otherwise alter existing federal law or any associated jurisdiction, rights, legal interests, or obligations. The Proclamation thus did not alter existing legal obligations under NEPA.

In 1983, Presidential Proclamation 5030 established the 200-nm (370-km) zone off all U.S. coasts as the EEZ, declaring, "…to the extent permitted by international law…sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring, exploiting, conserving, and managing natural resources, both living and non-living, of the seabed and subsoil and the superadjacent waters." The assertion of jurisdiction over the EEZ of the U.S.

altered the legal basis for economic exploration and exploitation, scientific research, and protection of the environment by the U.S. For this PEIS, potential impacts to areas within the 200-nm (370-km) boundary of the EEZ are subject to analysis under NEPA, and those beyond the U.S. EEZ are subject to analysis under EO 12114 (as described in Section 1.8.2).

1.8.2 EO 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions*

In addition to NEPA, this PEIS was prepared in accordance with EO 12114. Potential impacts in areas that are outside the U.S. EEZ or the EEZ of any nation (i.e., >200 nm [370 km]), referred to as the global commons, are analyzed using the procedures set out in EO 12114 and associated implementing regulations. If an activity is funded by a U.S. federal entity within the EEZ and/or territorial waters of a foreign nation and that nation is taking part in the proposed activity (e.g., funding or participating), then the U.S. entity does not need to prepare environmental documentation in accordance with EO 12114. It is the responsibility of the "host" nation to prepare its own environmental documentation and review. However, if a U.S. entity is proposing an activity within the waters of a foreign nation and that foreign nation is not participating in any way, then the U.S. entity must prepare the appropriate environmental documents in accordance with EO 12114. A majority of the potential impacts associated with NSF-funded marine seismic research addressed in this PEIS fall outside the U.S. EEZ and are, therefore, addressed in accordance with EO 12114.

1.8.3 Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA)

The MMPA of 1972 protects marine mammals by strictly limiting their "taking" in waters or on lands under U.S. jurisdiction, and on the high seas by vessels or persons under U.S. jurisdiction. The term "take," as defined in Section 3 (16 USC 1362) of the MMPA and its implementing regulations, means "to harass, hunt, capture, or kill, or attempt to harass, hunt, capture, or kill any marine mammal." The term "harassment" was further defined in the 1994 amendments to the MMPA as any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance, at two distinct levels:

- Level A Harassment – potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild.
- Level B Harassment – potential to disturb a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild by causing disruption of natural behavior patterns including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering.

The incidental, but not intentional, taking of marine mammals is allowed if certain findings are made and regulations are issued. In particular, application can be made for authorization to incidentally take marine mammals for specific activities such as seismic surveys. Permission for incidental taking of various marine mammals can be granted by NMFS or the USFWS through the issuance of regulations, which can cover a period of up to 5 consecutive years, and a Letter of Authorization (LOA) under those regulations. NMFS can issue regulations and LOAs concerning cetaceans, seals, and sea lions. USFWS can issue regulations and LOAs concerning walruses, polar bears, sea otters, and sirenians. LOAs for the incidental take of small numbers of marine mammals within a specified geographic area can only be issued if it is determined that the taking would have no more than a negligible impact on the species or stock, and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of such species or stock for taking for subsistence uses (where relevant). Prior to issuing an LOA for a specific activity, NMFS or the USFWS develops and publishes regulations in the *Federal Register*, and holds public comment periods. The regulations must outline:

- the permissible methods and the specified geographical region of taking;

- the means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact on species or stock and its habitat, and on the availability of the species or stock for subsistence uses (where relevant); and
- the requirements pertaining to the monitoring and reporting of such taking.

Once the regulations are finalized, NMFS or the USFWS can move forward with authorizing the activity through issuance of an LOA.

In 1994, the MMPA was amended to establish an expedited process by which citizens of the U.S. can apply for an authorization to take small numbers of marine mammals incidental to specified activities (other than commercial fishing) within a specific geographic region by "harassment", referred to as Incidental Harassment Authorizations or IHAs. It established specific time limits for public notice and comment on any requests for authorization that would be granted under the provision. IHAs are limited in duration to no longer than 1 year and may only be issued if the Secretary of Commerce makes the determinations and establishes conditions described above for regulations and LOAs. Because the IHA process has eliminated the need for promulgating specific regulations on the incidental taking, IHAs are generally used by individuals with relatively short-term activities that may incidentally harass marine mammals. The IHA process cannot be used where incidental take would likely result in serious injury or mortality to marine mammals.

In the past, NSF and the USGS have applied for and received incidental take authorizations for marine mammals through the IHA process on a cruise-by-cruise basis. Although NSF and USGS are not requesting authorizations under section 101(a)(5) of the MMPA at this time, this PEIS may contain information relevant and applicable to support future NSF and USGS consultations in support of potential requests for future incidental take authorizations for site-specific marine seismic cruises for actions described and analyzed in this PEIS. Should marine seismic surveys funded by NSF or conducted by USGS be determined to have the potential to incidentally take marine mammals, NSF or the USGS would submit an MMPA IHA application to NMFS or USFWS. The application would be evaluated and considered based on the determinations and criteria required by Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA on a case-by-case basis.

In order to issue the MMPA authorization required for certain activities, it might be necessary for NMFS to require additional mitigation or monitoring measures beyond those addressed in this PEIS. These could include measures considered, but eliminated in the PEIS, or as yet undetermined measures. The public will have an opportunity to provide information to NMFS through the MMPA process during the 30-day comment period following NMFS' publication of a Notice of Proposed IHA in the *Federal Register*. Measures not considered in the mitigation and monitoring measures in this PEIS, but required through the MMPA process, might require evaluation in accordance with NEPA. In doing so, NMFS may consider "tiering," that is, incorporating this PEIS during the MMPA process.

1.8.4 Endangered Species Act (ESA)

The ESA of 1973 and subsequent amendments provide for the protection and conservation of threatened and endangered species of animals (including some marine mammals) and plants, and the ecosystems on which they depend. The ESA prohibits federal agencies from funding, authorizing or carrying out actions likely to jeopardize endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat designated for them. Section 7 of the ESA requires consultation with NMFS and the USFWS when any endangered or threatened species under their jurisdiction may be affected by a proposed action. Generally, the USFWS manages land and freshwater species while NMFS manages marine species, including anadromous salmon. However, as noted previously, the USFWS has

responsibility for some marine animals such as nesting sea turtles, walruses, polar bears, sea otters, and manatees.

For actions that may result in prohibited "take" of a listed species, federal agencies must obtain authorization for incidental take through the section 7 formal consultation process. Under ESA "take" means to "harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt any such conduct to species listed as threatened or endangered in 50 CFR 402.12(b)." NMFS has further defined harm as follows: "harm" is "…an act which actually kills or injures fish or wildlife. Such an act may include significant habitat modification or degradation which actually kills or injures fish or wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including, breeding, spawning, rearing, migrating, feeding or sheltering (50 CFR 222.102)." "Harass" as defined by the USFWS means an "intentional or negligent act or omission which creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns, which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering (50 CFR 17.3)." NMFS has not defined the term "harass" by regulation.

Under section 7 of the ESA, federal agencies consult with the USFWS and/or NMFS and submit a consultation package for proposed actions that may affect listed species or critical habitat. If a listed species or critical habitat is likely to be affected by a proposed federal action, the federal agency must provide the USFWS and NMFS with an evaluation whether or not the effect on the listed species or critical habitat is likely to be adverse. Often this information is referred to as a "consultation package" or Biological Assessment (BA). The USFWS and/or NMFS uses this documentation along with any other available information to determine if a formal consultation or a conference is necessary for actions likely to result in adverse effects to a listed species or its designated critical habitat. After USFWS and NMFS review the BA, these agencies provide their determinations regarding the nature of any effects on each listed species or critical habitat. For each species that is likely to be adversely affected (i.e., subject to take or adverse effect on critical habitat), formal consultation with the agency is required, culminating in the agency's issuance of a BO, which contains the necessary and sufficient terms and conditions under which the action can proceed. For each species not likely to be adversely affected, informal consultation is required, the conclusion of which is the agency's written concurrence with the findings, including any additional measures mutually agreed upon as necessary and sufficient to minimize adverse impacts to listed species and/or designated critical habitat.

Although an authorization is not required by the MMPA if marine mammals are not being taken, the NMFS and USFWS believe an incidental take authorization under the MMPA is warranted in an area where marine mammal species are likely to occur because seismic-survey sounds have the potential to harass marine mammals. In addition, NMFS cannot issue an exemption to the take prohibitions for harassment through an ITS unless appropriate MMPA incidental take is authorized. Because a BO, including an ITS, is issued under the ESA once the requirements of Section 101(a)(5) of the MMPA have been met, seismic surveys that could affect ESA-listed marine mammals shall not commence until such time that USFWS and NMFS issue the appropriate MMPA incidental take authorizations and coordinate its requirements with those in the ITS. Although NSF and USGS are not requesting section 7 ESA consultation at this time, this PEIS may contain information relevant and applicable to support future NSF and USGS consultations on ESA-listed species and critical habitat for site-specific marine seismic cruises as required under the ESA. NMFS and USFWS, at the request of NSF or USGS, will review any future seismic cruise activity that has the potential to affect a marine species listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA on a case-by-case basis to determine its effect and make necessary determinations and findings in accordance with section 7 of the ESA and its implementing regulations.

1.8.5 Magnuson-Stevens Act (MSA)

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Public Law 94-265) (Magnuson-Stevens Act or MSA) established U.S. jurisdiction from the seaward boundary of the coastal states out to 200 nm (370 km) (i.e., U.S. EEZ) for the purpose of managing fisheries resources. The MSA is the principal federal statute that provides for the management of marine fisheries in the U.S. The purposes of the MSA include: (1) conservation and management of the fishery resources of the U.S.; (2) support and encouragement of international fishery agreements; (3) promotion of domestic commercial and recreational fishing; (4) preparation and implementation of Fishery Management Plans; (5) establishment of Regional Fishery Management Councils; (6) development of fisheries which are underutilized or not utilized; and (7) protection of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH).

Under provisions of the MSA, eight Regional Fishery Management Councils (Councils) were established for the New England, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, Pacific, Western Pacific, and North Pacific regions. Each Council is responsible for developing Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) for domestic fisheries within its geographic jurisdiction. The Secretary of Commerce is responsible for developing an FMP for Atlantic highly migratory species, including tunas, sharks, and swordfish. Each FMP identifies and describes EFH for managed fisheries. EFH is defined as those waters and substrate necessary to fish or invertebrates for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. Areas designated as EFH contain habitat essential to the long-term survival and health of U.S. fisheries.

Federal agencies that authorize, fund, or undertake actions that may adversely affect EFH must consult with the Secretary of Commerce, through NMFS, regarding potential effects to EFH, and NMFS must provide conservation recommendations. To carry out this mandate efficiently, NMFS combines EFH consultations with existing environmental reviews required by other laws, so almost all of the consultations are completed within the time frames of those other reviews. The MSA reiterates that the Councils may, or in the case of anadromous fisheries must, comment on federal or state actions that affect fishery habitat, including EFH. Federal agencies are required to respond in writing within 30 days of receiving EFH conservation recommendations from NMFS or the Councils. Although NSF and USGS are not requesting MSA consultation at this time, this PEIS may contain information relevant and applicable to support future NSF and USGS consultations on EFH on site-specific marine seismic cruises as required under the MSA.

1.8.6 Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)

In general, the jurisdictional purview of each state or territory within the U.S. extends 3 nm (5.6 km) offshore of the coast and coastal islands. While these areas fall within U.S. Territorial Waters and activities within these areas are evaluated under NEPA, they are also subject to additional state regulations when federal sovereign immunity has been waived by Congress. The CZMA requires that "any federal activity within or outside of the coastal zone that affects any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal zone" shall be "consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies" of a state's coastal zone management plan. Federal agencies, in carrying out their functions and responsibilities, shall consult with, cooperate with, and, to the maximum extent practicable, coordinate their activities with other interested federal agencies.

1.8.7 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)

Promulgated in 1982, UNCLOS gives coastal nations sovereign rights to the seafloor and sub-seafloor beyond 200 nm (370 km) if the criteria of Article 76 are satisfied. Although the U.S. has not ratified UNCLOS, it has an inherent interest in knowing where the outer limits of the extended continental shelf

beyond 200 nm (370 km) are located. Because one of the formulae in Article 76 requires sediment thickness, seismic surveys are therefore also sometimes required beyond 200 nm (370 km) for the U.S. to understand the full extent of its sovereign rights. The USGS is the lead agency for seismic studies within the U.S. Extended Continental Shelf Interagency Task Force for identifying these outer limits.

1.9 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

A description of the PEIS process and timeline follows and is summarized in Figure 1-1. Input from the public obtained during the scoping process (Section 1.9.2) was used to refine further the key issues that have been analyzed in this PEIS.

1.9.1 Notice of Intent (NOI)

Official notification of NSF's Proposed Action began with the publication of the NOI in the *Federal Register* on September 22, 2005 (NSF 2005). The NOI briefly summarized the Proposed Action; the scoping process; and the dates, times, and locations of the public scoping meetings.

1.9.2 Scoping Process

Scoping meetings were held in the following six communities that were expected to have public, agency, research institution, or industry interest in the Proposed Action: Silver Spring, Maryland; Woods Hole, Massachusetts; College Station, Texas; Anchorage, Alaska; San Diego, California; and Honolulu, Hawaii. An advertisement describing the Proposed Action was placed a week before the scoping meetings in local newspapers. A copy of this advertisement is found in Appendix A. The advertisements provided the times, dates, and locations of the scoping meetings. Public comment was solicited in the advertisements and during the scoping meetings.

The scoping meetings were designed in an "open house" format to facilitate dialogue with NSF and agency personnel and the public. Displays were presented to enhance public understanding of the NEPA process, the need for the Proposed Action, and the public's role in shaping the proposal.

NSF provided the public with several avenues for providing comments during the scoping process and at the meetings. Scoping meeting attendees could submit written comments prepared prior to the meeting, complete a comment form provided by the NSF, or dictate their comments to an NSF representative for computer entry. An e-mail address was also provided at the meetings and in the advertisements for submitting comments. A total of 78 people attended the six scoping meetings. Four written comments were received during the official comment period between September 22 and October 28, 2005 (refer to Appendix A). Only one written comment sheet (praising the posters as very informative and personnel quite knowledgeable) was received from the six meetings; three more letters (via email) were received during the scoping comment period. One from the Office of Hawaiian Affairs expressing their regrets at not attending the meeting but look forward to receiving the PEIS; one from the USGS indicating they have no comments at this time; and one from the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). Comments received during the scoping period helped refine the NSF proposal and are reflected in Chapter 2, *Description of the Proposed Action and Alternatives*.



Figure 1-1. EIS/OEIS Process

The scoping meetings were designed in an "open house" format to facilitate dialogue with NSF and agency personnel and the public. Displays were presented to enhance public understanding of the NEPA process, the need for the Proposed Action, and the public's role in shaping the proposal.

1.9.3 Draft PEIS

The Draft PEIS was made available for public review beginning in October 2010, with the 45-day public comment period occurring from October 8, 2010 through November 22, 2010. An NOA for the Draft PEIS was announced in the *Federal Register*, local newspapers, and in letters and e-mails to federal and state agencies; and other interested parties (see Appendix I). It was also made available on NSF's Ocean Sciences environmental compliance website (http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/). This notice indicated the duration of the public review and comment period, the address where comments could be sent, and the time and location of the public hearings. Once the public comment period commenced, NSF also:

- Mailed hard copies and electronic copies on CDs of the Draft PEIS to federal and state agencies, and other interested parties, including those who had requested a copy of the Draft PEIS through the scoping process (see Appendix I for the complete distribution list).
- Conducted 2 public hearings each with an "open house" poster session staffed by NSF, USGS, and NMFS subject matter experts, a formal briefing by NSF, and the opportunity to provide oral and/or written comments. The presentation slides used by NSF at both public hearings can be found in Appendix I.
- Distributed a comment sheet to help facilitate public input and feedback.
- Provided a CD to any individual requesting a copy of the Draft PEIS at the public hearings.

The public hearings were held at the following dates, times, and locations:

- October 25, 2010; Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University California-San Diego, Vaughn Hall, Room 100, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA.
- October 27, 2010; Marine Acoustics, Inc. (MAI), 4100 Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA.

The Arlington, Virginia public hearing location was originally planned to be held at the NSF building at 4201 Wilson Blvd. Unfortunately, due to a fire in the NSF building on the afternoon of October 27, 2010, the public hearing location was moved to the offices of MAI located at 4100 Fairfax Drive (a building two blocks from NSF). Signs were posted on the outside doors of the NSF building announcing the new hearing location, and a security guard stationed at the main NSF entrance outside the meeting room directed hearing attendees who were unaware of the NSF emergency to the new hearing venue.

1.9.4 Final PEIS

Following the close of the comment period, written and oral comments on the Draft PEIS were reviewed and responses to those comments prepared. The Final PEIS was prepared, incorporating responses to comments and any additional evaluation that may be warranted. Copies of all comments received on the Draft PEIS and the corresponding responses are included in Appendix J of this Final PEIS. The Final PEIS was distributed and made publically available in the same manner as the Draft PEIS, but to an expanded list of recipients based on requests received during the Draft PEIS comment period.

A total of 31 individuals attended the 2 public hearings, and 2 individuals provided oral comments on the Draft PEIS that expressed support for the Proposed Action (Table 1-2); no written comments were submitted at the public hearings.

Table 1-2. Summary of Public Hearing Attendance and Written Comments on the Draft PEIS

Location (Date)	*Attendees*	*Written Comments*	*Oral Comments*
PUBLIC HEARINGS (see Appendix I for transcripts)			
Scripps Instit. of Oceanography, La Jolla, CA (October 25, 2010)	21	0	1
MAI, Arlington, VA (October 27, 2010)	10	0	1
Total	**31**	**0**	**2**
WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS (see Appendix J)			
Federal Agencies		1	
State Agencies		1	
Interested Parties		5	
Total		**7**	

In addition to the 2 oral comments received at the public hearings in support of the Proposed Action, 7 written comment letters expressing support of or concerns with the Proposed Action were submitted via the NSF comment e-mail address (nepacomments@nsf.gov) or via postal mail. Complete transcripts of the public hearings are provided in Appendix I, and all submitted public comments, as well as responses

to those comments, are provided in Appendix J. The following is a summary of the topics of concern identified by public commenters through comments received via email and postal mail.

- Support for the Proposed Action and implementation of the Preferred Alternative;
- Sufficient peer review of proprietary acoustic models used in the analysis, compliance with Information Quality Act (IQA) and Council for Regulatory Monitoring (CREM) guidelines, and overall usefulness and applicability of those models in the impact analysis;
- Appropriate range of action alternatives;
- Pre-cruise planning guidelines;
- Mitigation and monitoring measures, including use of Protected Species Visual Observers (PSVOs);
- Robustness of cumulative impacts analysis;
- Use of 'precautionary approach' in impact analysis;
- Definition of 'generic' mitigation zones; and
- Use of Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM).

To obtain further clarification on some of the public comments received from the Marine Mammal Commission (MMC) (See Appendix J), NSF, USGS and NMFS representatives contacted MMC representatives via telephone on January 25, 2011. The discussion helped inform the federal agencies in developing their response to the MMC's comments and making appropriate changes to the Final PEIS, where appropriate.

1.9.5 Record of Decision (ROD)

Following issuance of this Final PEIS, and the subsequent 30-day "cooling off period," a ROD will be issued by NSF and USGS. The NSF/USGS ROD will be published in the *Federal Register* and distributed to interested agencies and parties.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

CHAPTER 2
DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

A variety of methods and equipment are employed by marine seismic researchers when conducting seismic surveys, and Section 2.1 presents an overview of these methods. Section 2.2 describes the Proposed Action including a discussion of the research vessels and acoustic sources proposed for use during NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research. Section 2.3 describes the approach to analysis for this PEIS, in particular the approach to acoustic modeling. Section 2.4 discusses the alternatives carried forward for analysis and associated mitigation measures; Section 2.5 discusses adjustments to mitigation, monitoring, and reporting based on adaptive management; and Section 2.6 discusses alternatives considered but not carried forward for detailed analysis.

2.1 MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH METHODS

Research for understanding the nature of the Earth's crust and dynamic processes often begins with seismic exploration. The opportunities for research using seafloor seismic data to understand the natural forces that shape and change our planet have never been greater than they are today. Major advances in data storage and microprocessor technology have allowed the development of a new generation of instruments for conducting marine seismic research. These advances make it possible to probe deep beneath the oceans and observe Earth's interior and to carry out a whole new class of seismic research in the oceans, including discovering records of sea-level rise that are key to understanding global climate change, and mapping the deep structure and active geological processes along fault zones, which may give clues about fault behavior that lead to tsunami-generating earthquakes (Multichannel Seismic [MCS] Advisory Board 2006).

Seismic surveys use the principle of an active sound source (controlled sound source) and receiver system. The 'source' for marine seismic operations is most often a group (array) of airguns that are towed behind a research vessel moving approximately 4 nautical miles per hour (knots [kt]) (7 km per hour [km/hr]). Airguns produce low-frequency (10–50 hertz [Hz]) sound by releasing bubbles of compressed air every 5-60 seconds (sec). This sound propagates through the ocean floor, sometimes up to 19 miles (mi) (30 km) below it, and is reflected or refracted back by geological discontinuities or velocity gradients (Figure 2-1). For seismic reflection studies, the 'receiver' is usually a long (0.6-3.7 mi [1-6 km]) string of hydrophones (streamer) towed behind the research vessel to record the reflected sound (echoes). Sophisticated computer algorithms process the multiple channels of seismic data (i.e., MCS) and construct a sub-surface map of the Earth's internal structure. Depth to the structures is calculated by measuring the amount of time it takes for the sound to make its round trip from the near sea surface (airguns) to the structures and back to the hydrophones. This total time can be converted to depth below the seafloor. For seismic refraction studies, ocean bottom seismometers/hydrophones (OBS/Hs) are often used to record the seismic signals. These bottom instruments remain stationary on the seafloor and generally provide better signal-to-noise ratios for seismic signals compared to older sonobuoy technology of hydrophones suspended from a buoy floating (and drifting) at the sea surface. In the 1960s, airguns rapidly replaced the initial use of explosives as the sound source for marine seismic work and remain the most effective sound source presently available. As will be presented, variations in the typical airgun array and towed hydrophone streamer configuration exist and are used in circumstances that favor other methods.



Not to Scale

Figure 2-1
General Concept of Marine Seismic Reflection and Refraction Surveys

In addition to conventional airguns and similar systems (e.g., water guns and generator-injector [GI] guns), marine seismic researchers can utilize a variety of other seismic sources within a wide range of frequencies in order to carry out operations in a variety of environments. High frequency seismic systems provide the highest resolution, but are limited in amount of penetration below the sea floor. Low frequencies yield more penetration, but less resolution.

When selecting a system or systems to use in a prospective study, the research objectives and survey environment, or geologic setting, will dictate system choice. For example, a seismic survey might be designed to determine sediment lithologies, delineate stratigraphic boundaries, map submarine slide deposits, or find specific features (e.g., migrating gas, carbonate deposits). Often an investigator will operate multiple seismic-reflection systems simultaneously. One consideration in designing survey systems is the trade-off between range, or penetration, and resolution. In the marine, lacustrine, or estuarine environments, the best source is determined primarily by the water depth and the type of sediments/rocks in the substrate. Additionally, logistical parameters (e.g., cost, boat size, noise, time available, number of crew available, weather, environmental factors (ambient noise, ship traffic, etc.) enter into the decision as to which system(s) will be utilized for a given marine seismic survey.

The timing of surveys is dictated by seasonal sea conditions, particularly sea state and seasonal weather patterns (i.e., avoiding hurricanes, typhoons, etc.). These timing factors are further constrained by the transit times for a research vessel to travel between often widely spaced study locations, given a global demand for seismic research sites and limited number of vessels capable of conducting seismic research.

In addition to airguns or other active seismic acoustic sources, other 'non-seismic' acoustic sources are used during proposed NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research activities including MBESs, SBPs, ADCPs, fathometers, and pingers. The following sections describe the various seismic acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, GI guns, water guns, sparkers, boomers, and chirp systems) and non-seismic acoustic sources (e.g., MBESs, SBPs, etc.) that may be used by NSF-funded or USGS researchers when conducting marine seismic research.

2.1.1 Seismic Acoustic Sources Used in Marine Seismic Research

2.1.1.1 Airguns and Airgun Arrays

The most common acoustic source for marine seismic research is airguns, the first of which was introduced in the 1960s. An airgun is essentially a stainless steel cylinder charged with high-pressure air (Figure 2-2). The seismic signal is generated when that air is released nearly instantaneously into the surrounding water column. The compressed air is supplied by compressors on board the source vessel. Seismic pulses are typically emitted at intervals of 5-60 sec, and occasionally at shorter or longer intervals.



Figure 2-2. Representative Airgun

Airgun Operating Principles

An airgun is a pneumatic sound source that creates predominantly low-frequency acoustic impulses by generating bubbles of highly compressed air in water (Figure 2-3). Compressed air is fed into the main chamber while the solenoid is closed (Charge, Figure 2-3). Once the solenoid valve opens (i.e., the airgun is "fired"), the shuttle moves releasing the air into the surrounding water column (Discharge, Figure 2-3). This rapid release of highly compressed air, typically at pressures of 2,000 pounds per square inch (psi), from the airgun chamber generates an oscillating air bubble in the water. The effect is similar to popping a balloon – when the high-pressure air inside the balloon is quickly expelled into the surrounding medium (air), a pressure pulse is created, and this is perceived by a listener as a loud sound. In the case of airguns, expansion and oscillation of the air bubble(s) in the water column generates a strongly peaked, high-amplitude acoustic impulse that is useful for seismic profiling.

The main features of the pressure signal generated by an airgun are the strong primary peak and the subsequent bubble pulses or 'bubble train'. For each airgun, the amplitude of the seismic signal is a function of the volume and pressure of the air inside the airgun and the airgun's depth under the water surface. For the marine seismic researcher, the train of bubble pulses is an undesirable feature of the airgun signal because it interferes with the detection of distinct sub-bottom reflections. Therefore, in order to both increase the pulse amplitude (to see deeper into the Earth) and dampen the bubble train quickly, marine seismic researchers generally combine multiple airguns together into arrays. Airgun arrays provide several advantages over single airguns for deep geophysical surveying:

- Airgun arrays, when designed appropriately, project maximum peak levels toward the seabed (i.e., in the vertical direction) and notably lower levels in some or all near-horizontal directions.
- By utilizing airguns of many different volumes that are spaced optimally, airgun arrays may be "tuned" to increase the amplitude of the primary peak and simultaneously decrease the relative amplitude of the subsequent bubble pulses.

Types of Airguns

Geophysicists use several different kinds of airguns for seismic surveying, depending on the application. Most commonly used is an airgun that utilizes the motion of an internal shuttle to release pressurized air from the gun chamber through several venting holes (ports) on the gun casing. Conventional airguns are available with a wide range of chamber volumes, from under 5 cubic inches (in^3) to over 2,000 in^3, and are used for many different applications from shallow-hazard surveys (requiring small airguns) to deep crustal studies (requiring large airguns). Due to the high pressures involved in their operation, traditional airguns are subject to wear from significant recoil forces (due to the motion of the shuttle), which hampers their reliability. Thus modern airguns, such as "recoilless" G-guns and sleeve-guns, have been developed with improved firing mechanisms to overcome some of the reliability issues associated with conventional airguns. However, the principle of operation remains the same and the acoustic overpressure waveforms produced by these modern airguns are very similar to those of traditional airguns.

Unlike conventional airguns, a GI gun is a specialized kind of airgun that produces a different overpressure signature than conventional airguns. GI guns utilize two, independently fired air chambers (the "generator" and the "injector", respectively) to tune the air bubble oscillation and minimize the amplitude of the bubble pulse. Using one or more GI guns, the geophysicist can achieve very high peak-to-bubble amplitude ratios without an array. GI guns are often used for shallow, high-resolution seismic profiling.



Source: International Association of Geophysical Contractors 2002.

APPROXIMATE SCALE

0 *Centimeters* 12

0 *Inches* 6

Figure 2-3
Operating Principles of a Generic Airgun

For the purposes of this PEIS, the various types of airguns (e.g., traditional airgun, G-guns, and GI-guns) will all be referred to simply as 'airguns' unless it is important within the discussion to specifically state what type of seismic device is being addressed.

2.1.1.2 Water Guns

Water guns are another category of pneumatic sound source that is occasionally used for marine geophysical surveys as an alternative to airguns. Water guns generate frequencies on the order of 20-1,500 Hz depending on the size of the air chamber. The water gun is similar to the airgun, but unlike airguns, water guns are implosive rather than explosive and are more effective at collapsing the bubble pulse, thus generating a cleaner signal. The 15 in^3 water gun is an excellent source for shallow-water, high-resolution studies. The water gun is divided into two chambers: the upper firing chamber, which contains compressed air, and the lower chamber, which is filled with water. When the gun is fired, the compressed air forces the shuttle downward and this expels the water from the lower chamber. Because no air is released, there is no bubble pulse. The shot of water leaving the gun creates a void behind it and the collapse of water into this void creates an acoustic wave. High air pressure and small chamber size yield a higher frequency signal (high resolution and shallow penetration), whereas, low air pressure and large chamber size yield a low-frequency signal (low resolution and deep penetration). Water guns, like airguns, can be used individually or in arrays. The return signals are received by a towed hydrophone array.

2.1.1.3 Sparkers

Sparkers are electrical seismic sources that generate acoustic pulses by vaporizing seawater using high-voltage electrical currents. Sparkers employ large banks of capacitors to generate high voltages, which are then discharged across pairs of underwater electrodes separated by seawater. The spark generated by the electrodes creates steam bubbles in the water. The formation, oscillation, and collapse of these bubbles generate a strongly spiked acoustic pulse in the water that can penetrate several hundred meters into the seafloor, and is useful for high-resolution seismic profiling. The sparker is one of the oldest marine seismic sources, and many different kinds of sparkers are currently in use.

2.1.1.4 Boomers

Boomers are electromechanical sound sources that generate short (≤ 1 millisecond [ms]), broadband acoustic pulses in the 300-3,000 Hz range useful for high-resolution, shallow-penetration sediment profiling. The acoustic impulse from a boomer is generated when two spring-loaded plates are electrically charged causing the plates to repel, thus generating an acoustic pulse. Spatial resolution of the boomer system ranges from 1.6 to 3.2 feet (ft) (0.5 to 1 meter [m]) and penetration of the seafloor ranges from 82 to 164 ft (25 to 50 m). This system is commonly mounted on a sled and towed off the stern or alongside the ship. The reflected signal is received by a towed hydrophone streamer.

2.1.1.5 Chirp Systems

Chirp systems are a type of SBP that achieves deep bottom penetration while maintaining high resolution. They emit a 'swept'-frequency signal, meaning that the transmitted signal is emitted over a period of time and over a set range of frequencies. This repeatable (transmitted) waveform can be varied in terms of pulse length, frequency bandwidth, and phase/amplitude. A matched filter, or correlation process, collapses the swept FM received signal into a pulse of short duration, maximizing the signal-to-noise-ratio. The reflected signal is received by the same tuned transducer array that generates the outgoing acoustic energy. Chirp systems enable high-resolution mapping of relatively shallow deposits, and in

general, have less penetration than the impulse-type systems (air or water guns, sparkers, and boomers). Newer chirp systems are able to penetrate to comparable levels as the boomer, yet yield extraordinary detail or resolution of the substrate.

2.1.2 Non-Seismic Acoustic Sources Used in Marine Seismic Research

Non-seismic acoustic sources are those acoustic sources that are used in support of seismic acoustic sources (i.e., airguns, waterguns, etc. that are used to map the subsea floor) and primarily consist of bottom mapping echosounders, acoustic pingers used to detect or position equipment, current profilers, and acoustic releases.

2.1.2.1 Multibeam Echosounder (MBES) and Sub-bottom Profiler (SBP)

During marine seismic research activities, the ocean floor is usually mapped with an MBES and an SBP. Both systems are commonly operated simultaneously with the airguns. The MBES emits brief pings of medium- or high-frequency sound in a fan-shaped beam extending downward and to the sides of the ship, but not forward or aft. For operations in deep water (>3,281 ft [1,000 m]), the MBES usually operates at a frequency of 12-15 kilohertz (kHz), but for projects limited to shallow water (<328 ft [100 m]), a higher frequency MBES is often used.

The SBP is normally operated to provide information about the sedimentary features and the bottom topography that is simultaneously being mapped by the MBES. The energy from the SBP is directed downward by a 2.5-7 kHz transducer in the hull of the research vessel. The output varies with water depth from 50 watts in shallow water to 800 watts in deep water.

2.1.2.2 Pingers

Omnidirectional pingers would also be used during proposed marine seismic surveys to position or directionally locate the airgun arrays, hydrophone streamers, coring equipment, bottom cameras, or other supporting equipment. In addition, a 12-kHz pinger would normally be used only during those seismic survey cruises that have ancillary coring operations. The pinger is used to monitor the depth of the corer relative to the sea floor. It is a battery-powered acoustic beacon that is attached to the coring mechanism.

2.1.2.3 Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler (ADCP)

An ADCP can calculate speed of the water current, direction of the current, and the depth in the water column of the current. This instrument can be placed on the seafloor, attached to a buoy, or mounted on a ship. The ADCP measures water currents with sound, using a principle of sound waves called the Doppler effect and works by transmitting high frequency pings (normally 35-1,200 kHz) of sound at a constant frequency into the water.

2.1.2.4 Acoustic Releases

OBS/Hs are self-contained data acquisition devices deployed from a survey ship and anchored to the sea floor (see below for more information on OBS/Hs). Once the OBS/H is ready to be retrieved, an acoustic release transponder interrogates the OBS/H with an omnidirectional 12-kHz signal with a source output of approximately 187 decibels referenced 1 microPascal at 1 m (dB re 1 µPa-m) and a ping duration of 8 ms. The burn wire release assembly is then activated, and the instrument is released from the anchor to float to the surface. Interrogation of an acoustic release is generally done while the ship is stationary or moving at very slow speeds.

2.1.3 Acoustic Receivers Used in Marine Seismic Research

In marine seismic research, two primary instruments are used to receive the signal generated from the acoustic source (airgun array) and reflected from features in the seafloor: hydrophone streamer cables and OBS/Hs.

2.1.3.1 Hydrophone Streamer Cables

One or more hydrophone streamers 0.06–7.5 mi (0.1–12 km) long and approximately 4 inches (10 centimeters [cm]) in diameter act as receiving devices for acoustic sources (i.e., airgun array). The streamer(s) are towed behind the source vessel at a depth of 7 to >33 ft (2 to >10 m). Because they are towed, streamer cables always remain a fixed distance from the source. The streamer is constructed of a number of transducers or hydrophones that are electrically wired together to act as one receiving system (single channel) or multiple receiving systems (multichannel). This string of elements is placed in a flexible sleeve or tube that is either a liquid-filled or solid-state system. Most hydrophone arrays are digital, incorporating analog-to-digital conversion modules directly into the streamer rather than utilizing older technology in which the signal traveled back to the ship before being digitized.

2.1.3.2 Ocean Bottom Seismometers/Hydrophones (OBS/Hs)

An OBS/H is a self-contained data-acquisition system deployed from a ship that records seismic data generated by airguns and earthquakes. Typically the OBS/H is deployed from the ship and sits on ocean floor because of a weighted anchor attached to it, where it remains stationary during the seismic survey. OBS/Hs, because they are stationary on the seafloor, are at variable distances from the moving source. The OBS/H contains a seismometer and/or hydrophone. Often, the three-component seismometer device is designed to drop onto the seafloor a short distance away from the recording device housed in a watertight container. After the OBS/H has been on the bottom for a period of time (ranging from days to months), it releases from the anchor via an acoustic release and floats to the surface for recovery by a ship. Tens to hundreds of OBS/Hs may be used on a marine seismic research cruise depending on the scientific requirements and objectives of the research cruise. The deployment spacing of OBS/Hs also varies depending on the survey-specific requirements. The nominal spacing is 9 mi (15 km), but this can vary from as little as 3 mi (5 km) to as much as 15 mi (25 km). The OBS/Hs could be deployed and recovered several (2 to 4) times during a survey. Although almost always retrieved at the end of each survey cruise, on occasion, the OBS/Hs are left on the seafloor to record earthquake signals, in which case they might remain on the seafloor for up to a year (the approximate battery life). OBS/Hs are designed so that they can be deployed and recovered from almost any research vessel. Figure 2-4 depicts some examples of OBS/Hs currently used in marine seismic research.

2.1.4 Types of Marine Seismic Surveys

Marine seismic airgun surveys are capable of high-resolution imaging of the seafloor, down to tens of kilometers in depth, and are an essential tool for geophysicists studying the Earth's structure. Similar to medical ultrasound images, marine seismic surveys use a tuned sound source designed to penetrate the target (ocean seafloor) coupled with receivers (hydrophones or seismometers) that will detect complex 'echoes' as the initial pulse bounces back off different densities of ocean floor sediments and rock or is refracted back by velocity gradients.



Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Active-Source/Rapid Response OBS/H



Scripps Institution of Oceanography L-CHEAPO Active-Source/Rapid Response OBS/H

Source: U.S. National Ocean Bottom Seismograph Instrument Pool 2006.

Figure 2-4
Examples of OBS/Hs

Seismic airgun surveys may be divided into two primary types, two dimensional (2-D) and three dimensional (3-D), according to a goal to obtain a simple cross-sectional view or 3-D views of geological structures. In addition to the survey design, resolution of collected data (depth of penetration/detail) become a function of airgun output, hydrophone streamer length/receivers used, and use of reflection and refraction signals. The fundamental data acquired in a marine seismic survey are the elapsed time between the initial pulse of the active acoustic source (airgun) and reception of multiple return signals. The travel times are dependent on the elastic properties of the medium, and, with analyses, may provide information about seismic velocities, depths of interfaces, lithology, presence of free gas, and geological structures.

Reflection methods generally utilize information in the seismic waves that travel in vertical or near-vertical to wide-angle reflected ray paths, resulting in travel time images that, after processing and geometric corrections, resemble cross sections of the Earth showing the seafloor and sub-seafloor features with marked changes in elastic parameters. Reflection surveys provide very detailed information on the presence and shape of reflectors or discontinuities, though the velocity structure between reflectors is often less well constrained by this method. These data are typically collected using towed hydrophones, configured as single-channel or multichannel arrays. Refraction methods collect information from near-vertical reflected to near-horizontal refracted raypaths and are interpreted using a combination of modeling and inversion to yield results. Refraction surveys are typically designed to locate the basement layer for a marine sedimentary section, to define different layers of the crust, or to study the velocity characteristics of layered subfloor features. OBS/Hs are often used in refraction surveys. Seismic refraction surveys provide constraints on the velocity structure and can be used to image 1- , 2- and 3-D variations in seismic velocity. Generally speaking, this method can provide information on the location and shape of reflectors, though the resolution is less than that obtained by reflection data. Thus the two methods are complementary, with one being more sensitive to the shape, strength, and lateral continuity of reflectors and the other being more sensitive to both vertical and horizontal velocity gradients.

Similar techniques are used in 2-D and 3-D seismic reflection surveys, the basic difference being density of survey transects. In general, 2-D reflection surveys provide detailed images along widely spaced transects but lack information between the transects. Generally, 2-D surveys are designed over large areas to understand regional geologic framework. On the other hand, 3-D reflection surveys employ very dense line spacing, of the order of 82-328 ft (25-100 m), and provide detailed, high-resolution 3-D volumetric images of individual earth structures or layers of particular interest. Considerably less source effort (less acoustic energy) ensonifies a given area of the seafloor at any one time in a 2-D survey as compared to a 3-D survey because of the wide spacing of lines in the former compared to the latter. Marine seismic 2-D and 3-D reflection surveys require a suitable at-sea operational environment, particularly when the long hydrophone streamers are deployed. Options to use OBS/Hs and discharge over them may replace use of hydrophone arrays although both types of receivers may be used in some cases.

Similar techniques are also used in 2-D and 3-D seismic refraction surveys, the basic difference being the distribution of receivers on the seafloor and the distribution of airgun profiles. For 2-D refraction profiling, the OBS/Hs and airgun profiles are located along lines and the resulting data provides a cross-sectional view of velocity structure. For 3-D seismic refraction surveys, the ocean bottom instruments and the airgun profiles are distributed over an area in order to ensonify a volume of the Earth. The resulting tomographic data are then used to construct 3-D maps of seismic velocity structure.

Airguns are the most common acoustic source for 2-D and 3-D seismic surveys, and have completely replaced the past use of explosive charges. The volume of the chamber of an individual airgun can range in size from 10s of cubic inches to several hundred cubic inches. A combination of airguns is called an

airgun array; subsets of airguns within the overall array are called strings. Operators vary the size and geometry of the source-array among (and sometimes within) marine seismic surveys to optimize the resolution of the desired geophysical data. Under NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research, airgun sources for 2-D and 3-D seismic surveys are expected to range from 45 to 6,600 in^3, with 1 to as many as 36 airguns discharging simultaneously. These sources emit pulsed rather than continuous sounds. While the energy from a large array of airguns with multiple strings is directed downward and the short duration of each pulse limits the total energy, a portion of the sound propagates horizontally and can be detectable tens and sometimes hundreds of kilometers away (Greene and Richardson 1988; Bowles et al. 1994), and occasionally thousands of kilometers away (Nieukirk et al. 2004). The same situation exists for natural seismic events.

2.1.4.1 2-D Marine Seismic Surveys

Research vessels conducting 2-D surveys are generally 230-295 ft (70-90 m) long and tow a source array at a depth of 16 to 39 ft (5 to 12 m) and 328-656 ft (100-200 m) behind the ship. Each source array is about 66 ft (20 m) long and 79 ft (24 m) wide consisting of several strings of either identical or variable configurations of airguns. Approximately 328-656 ft (100-200 m) behind the source array is a single or multichannel hydrophone streamer from a few hundred meters long for high resolution surveys to as much as 5-7.5 mi (8-12 km) long on specially outfitted vessels, including the Research Vessel (R/V) *Marcus G. Langseth* (*Langseth*). Radar reflectors are routinely placed on tail buoys of the streamer for detection by other vessels. Typical vessel speeds for marine 2-D surveys are approximately 4-5 kt (7-9 km/hr) and most seismic surveys use only a single vessel.

An airgun array is typically discharged about every 16 sec for a seismic reflection survey; the discharge interval for refraction studies can vary from approximately 15 to 200 sec. The time between airgun discharges is dependent upon the science mission and speed of the ship. Surveys are broken into straight lines or "tracks". To complete a survey, the ship will sail down a track from a few hours (typically) to a few days (rarely), depending upon the size of the survey area and research objectives. It can take a ship 2 to 3 hours (hr) to turn around and initiate another survey track. The spacing between tracks can range from 1.2 mi (2 km) to several miles; actual track spacing depends on the scientific objectives. Survey operations may be conducted 24 hr per day and may take days to weeks to complete, depending upon research objectives.

2.1.4.2 3-D Marine Seismic Surveys

3-D seismic surveys vary greatly depending on researcher requirements, subsurface geology, water depth, and geological target. More equipment is towed in 3-D reflection surveys and more data recording capability is required onboard the vessel thus requiring a vessel larger and better equipped than one capable of conducting 2-D surveys. The R/V *Langseth* is the only U.S. academic vessel capable of conducting 3-D surveys. A 3-D source array typically consists of two to four strings of airguns towed behind the source vessel, with each string including two to nine operating airguns (Figure 2-5). The overall array is typically 39-59 ft (12-18 m) long and 52-354 ft (16-108 m) wide, depending on number and spacing of strings and airguns. The array configuration (i.e., number of strings, number of airguns per string, size of airguns, depth of airguns, and spacing between airguns or strings) depends on the acoustic energy needed to meet the research objectives. The strings of airguns comprising the airgun array are normally aligned parallel with one another and parallel to the direction of travel. The airgun array is typically towed 98-164 ft (30-50 m) behind the vessel at a depth of 6-39 ft (2-12 m).



Figure 2-5
3-D View of a Representative 2-String Array

To record the acoustic signals originating from the airguns and reflected/refracted from structures in the seafloor, one or more hydrophone streamer cables are towed with the front end 328-656 ft (100-200 m) behind the source vessel at a depth of 7-20 ft (2-6 m) (Figure 2-6). When more than 1 streamer is towed, the streamers are typically spread out laterally over a width of 492-1,968 ft (150-600 m). Each hydrophone streamer can be 0.6-3.7 mi (1-6 km) long; NSF's primary seismic vessel (R/V *Langseth*) will normally deploy 1 to 4 streamers during a 3-D survey, each 3.7 mi (6 km) long. These hydrophone streamers are passive listening devices consisting of multiple hydrophone elements that receive the airgun acoustic signals that have been reflected from the seafloor. In addition to hydrophone streamers, OBS/Hs can also be deployed from the source vessel or a support vessel; the number deployed depends on the research experiment and space limitations of the research vessel(s). Depending on survey objectives, the hydrophone streamers may or may not be deployed when OBS/Hs are being used as receivers.

The location of where the airguns are fired, the position of the streamer cables, and the depth of the streamer cables is controlled by an integrated navigation system. Streamer depth is regulated by automated depth controllers called 'birds'. The streamer cable lateral position is calculated from a network of active acoustic devices. The end of the cable is tracked using global positioning system (GPS) satellites. Radar reflectors are routinely placed on tail buoys for detection by other vessels.

Typical vessel speeds for marine 3-D surveys are approximately 4-5 kt (7-9 km/hr) and most seismic surveys use only a single vessel. A source array is discharged approximately every 10-15 sec or up to every 4 minutes (min), depending on research requirements and type of survey (e.g., reflection vs. refraction). The discharge interval is typically longer in a refraction survey, and OBS/Hs are commonly used for refraction surveys.

The 3-D survey data are acquired on a line-by-line basis in which the vessel continues down a trackline long enough to provide adequate subsurface coverage along the length of the survey area. Acquiring a single trackline may take several hours, depending on the size of the survey area. The vessel then turns 180º onto another trackline and starts acquiring data while traveling in the opposite direction along that trackline. Depending on whether streamers are being towed and on the length of the streamers, vessel turns can be quick or slow (as much as 2-3 hr). Seismic vessels may operate day and night, and a survey may continue for days or weeks, depending on the research objectives, size of the survey, data acquisition capabilities of the research vessel, and weather conditions. It should be noted, however, that during a survey, airgun discharges and data collection may not occur continuously, as streamer and source deployment, at-sea equipment maintenance, turns, and other operations are also included in the survey time.

Adjacent transit lines for a 3-D seismic survey are generally spaced within several hundred meters of one another, and are parallel to one another across the survey area. Since the hydrophone streamer cables can be 0.6-3.7 mi (1-6 km) long and spread out over a width up to 492-1,968 ft (150-600 m), this limits both the turning speed and the area a vessel covers. Therefore, it is common practice to acquire data using an offset racetrack pattern, whereby the next acquisition line is several kilometers away from and traversed in the opposite direction of the trackline just completed.



Figure 2-6
Overall View of a 4-String Array

2.1.4.1 Other Types of Marine Seismic Surveys

Vertical Seismic Profile (VSP) Surveys

VSP surveys are surveys where seismic data are recorded from sensors placed in a borehole (i.e., a hole vertical to the ocean surface or seafloor) and the active source is on a drilling vessel or on another vessel (offset or walkaway VSPs). No streamer is used and the source is typically a single gun. VSP surveys are conducted by research ocean drilling vessels to monitor drilling objectives. Although a separate Programmatic EIS/OEIS (NSF 2008b) was prepared to address the operation of the SODV (e.g., the mechanical operation of the vessel, riserless ocean drilling, core sampling, and related onboard research activities), this PEIS will address the use of acoustic sources associated with the operation of the SODV by the United States Implementing Organization (USIO), which is a member of the IODP. Acoustic sources would include the use of airguns, MBES, SBP, and ADCP (NSF 2008b).

High-Resolution or Shallow-Water Hazard Seismic Surveys

High-resolution site surveys are conducted to investigate the shallow subsurface for geohazards and soil conditions. A typical high-resolution seismic survey consists of a vessel towing a 0.6- to 1.2-mi (1- to 2-km) long hydrophone streamer cable and one or a few airguns about 82-98 ft (25-30 m) behind the ship at a depth of approximately 10-20 ft (3-6 m). A 2-D high-resolution survey usually has two strings with a single airgun on each, while a 3-D high-resolution survey usually has two or more airguns per string. The vessel travels at 3-4 kt (6-7 km/hr), and the airguns are discharged approximately every 7-10 sec. 3-D high-resolution site surveys using ships towing multiple streamer cables can also be conducted. Up to six streamers 328-656 ft (100 to 200 m) long are used with a tri-cluster of 8- to 10-in^3 GI airguns.

Use of OBS/Hs as Primary Acoustic Receivers

OBS/Hs (see Section 2.1.3.2) may be used exclusively as the receivers in some experiments with the vessel towing only an airgun array and no streamers. OBS/Hs are nearly always used as an 'array' with multiple units deployed in a pattern on the ocean floor. Collecting data during active source use is the action under analysis in this document, but these instruments would also monitor for natural seismic events in passive mode.

Time Lapse or Four-Dimensional (4-D) Marine Seismic Surveys

The purpose of 4-D surveys is to monitor the change over time of the subsurface geology below the ocean. 4-D surveys can use either seismic streamer cables or, occasionally, ocean bottom cables to house the seismic detectors. Whether the time-lapse surveys use streamer cables or seafloor cables to record the seismic signals, the procedure is similar to that described for the 3-D seismic surveys or ocean bottom cables (described below). Typically, this procedure is used in oil and gas offshore production areas and not funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS. Academic 4-D surveys would be limited to returning to a research site of interest over a scale of years to collect a new 2-D or 3-D data set to compare with the original data.

Ocean Bottom Cable (OBC) Surveys

The use of OBCs is useful for obtaining multi-component (i.e., seismic pressure, vertical, and the two horizontal motions of the water column, or seafloor) information. This multi-component information allows more information to be extracted from the seismic data and hence greater information about the characteristics in the subsurface. In addition, these surveys have the advantage of lower noise levels in the

data because the cables are stationary rather than moving through the water, as is the case with streamer cables.

OBC surveys require the use of multiple ships (i.e., usually two ships for cable deployment/retrieval, one ship for recording, one ship for towing the airgun array, and two utility boats). These ships are generally smaller than those used in streamer operations, and the utility boats can be very small. The cables are deployed off the back of the layout boat. The length of the cable depends upon the survey objectives but is typically 2.5 mi (4.2 km) and up to 7.5 mi (12 km). Groups of seismic detectors, usually hydrophones and vertical motion geophones, are attached to the cable in intervals of 82 to 164 ft (25 to 50 m). Multiple cables are laid parallel to each other using this layout method with a 164-ft (50-m) interval between cables. Cables remain connected to a surface ship where recording occurs. Dual airgun arrays can be used from two shooting vessels. When the cable is in place, a ship towing an airgun array (which is the same airgun array used for streamer work discussed above) passes between the cables, discharging at a predetermined rate. After a source line is completed, the source ship takes about 10 to 15 min to turn around and pass down between the next two cables. When a cable is no longer needed to record seismic data, it is retrieved and is moved to the next position. A cable can lay on the bottom anywhere from 2 hr to several days, depending upon research requirements.

This approach is used by industry in high interest areas associated with oil and gas exploration and production. Although academic researchers have utilized OBC surveys for specialized studies, there are no OBCs owned within the academic community, so their use depends on access to industry equipment and infrastructure. To date, OBC studies are rarely used for academic research and then on a very limited scale and are currently not used in marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by USGS. Instead, OBS/Hs are a less equipment intensive and less costly alternative used for NSF-funded and USGS-conducted marine seismic research.

2.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

2.2.1 Overview of Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by USGS

It is expected that under the Proposed Action, NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research activities would be similar in duration and extent to those conducted previously and are summarized briefly below and in Table 2-1. A more detailed summary of past NSF-funded marine seismic cruises can be found in Appendix G.

Table 2-1. NSF-funded and USGS Marine Seismic Surveys (2003-2009)*

Year/Location	*Cruise Length*	*Trackline Length (km)*	*Seismic Operations (hr)*	*Water Depth (m)*
2009				
SE Asia, TAIGER[23]	90 days	15,143	2,767	20–>6,800
NE Pacific – Oregon[24]	5 days	21	32	110–3,050
NE Pacific – Endeavour Ridge[25]	15 days	3,002	210	>1,000
SW Pacific[28]	29 days	4,784	592	>1,000
NW Atlantic[26]	15 days	1,444	197	25–200
Puerto Rico (USGS)[22]	9 days	821	125	>100
Arctic Ocean (USGS)[36]	42 days	4,062	555	>2,000
2008				
Costa Rica/Nicaragua – Caribbean[31]	14 days	2,204	264	<100–>2,500
Costa Rica/Nicaragua – Pacific[31]	27 days	4,257	540	<100–>2,500
E Tropical Pacific Ocean (southern)[32]	4 days	146	20	>2,000
E Tropical Pacific Ocean (northern)[32]	32 days	3,045	379	>2,000

Table 2-1. NSF-funded and USGS Marine Seismic Surveys (2003-2009)*

Year/Location	*Cruise Length*	*Trackline Length (km)*	*Seismic Operations (hr)*	*Water Depth (m)*
Gulf of Alaska[33]	11 days	1,633	203	40-4,000
Santa Barbara Channel[35]	12 days	1,100	53	<50-580
NE Pacific Ocean[34]	15 days	974	189	650–1,650
Arctic Ocean (USGS)[37]	42 days	2,817	454	>2,000
2007				
N Gulf of Mexico, Langseth calibration cruise[1]	14 days	865	104	<100->1,000
NE Indian Ocean[18]	55 days	2,700	245	1,600–5,100
NE Pacific[27]	2 days	21	53	110-3,050
2006				
SW Pacific Ocean, Louisville Ridge[2, 17]	21 days	1,840	168	800–2,300
S Pacific[17, 19]	5 weeks	1,930	120	3,200–5,700
Arctic Ocean, Beaufort & Chukchi Seas[3]	21 days	339	77	35–3,899
E Tropical Pacific Ocean[30]	4 weeks	8,900	466	3,900–5,200
NE Caribbean (USGS)[22]	17 days	2,550	448	>8,000
2005				
SW Pacific Ocean[4, 17]	41 days	11,000	549	4,000–5,000
Gulf of Mexico, N Yucatan[9]	23 days	1,892	205	<100
Aleutian Islands[16]	4 days	537	44	100–3,500
Alaska to Svalbard, Arctic Ocean[14]	33 days	2,273	294	223–4,873
NE Caribbean (USGS)[22]	21 days	252	63	>5,500
NE Caribbean (USGS)[38]	21 days	557	116	>1,000
2004				
SE Caribbean Sea, N of Venezuela[8]	40 days	6,605	755	15–6,000
NE Pacific Ocean, Blanco Fracture Zone[10]	7 days	988	119	1,600–5,000
E Tropical Pacific, Central America[11]	29 days	3,184	394	<100–>5,000
SE Gulf of Alaska[12]	17 days	1,111	131	30–>3,000
NW Atlantic Ocean, Newfoundland Margin[15]	23 days	3,757	419	2,400–5,400
2003				
N Gulf of Mexico, *Ewing* calibration cruise[29]	4 days	322	17	<100–1,000
E Tropical Pacific Ocean, Hess Deep[5]	12 days	1,580	192	2,000–3,400
E Tropical Pacific Ocean[39]				
MARGINS – Central America	12 days	3,321	175	Unk
Galapagos Triple Junction area	6 days	1,387	69	Unk
Norwegian Sea, Norway Margin[6]	27 days	2,566	266	<100–5,000
Atlantic Ocean, Mid-Atlantic Ridge[7]	6 days	302	37	1,500–4,500
N Gulf of Mexico (USGS)[20]	2 weeks	1,033	139	1,000–1,600

Notes: *USGS also conducts tens of cruises each year utilizing low-energy seismic sources that are not summarized here.

Sources: [1]Holst and Beland 2008; [2]SIO and NSF 2005; [3]Haley 2006, University of Texas-Austin and NSF 2006; [4]SIO and NSF 2004, SIO 2005c; [5]L-DEO and NSF 2003a, Smultea and Holst 2003; [6]L-DEO and NSF 2003b, MacLean and Haley 2004; [7]L-DEO and NSF 2003c, Holst 2004; [8]L-DEO and NSF 2003e, Smultea et al. 2004; [9]L-DEO and NSF 2003f, Holst et al. 2005a; [10]L-DEO and NSF 2004a, Smultea et al. 2005; [11]L-DEO and NSF 2004b, Holst et al. 2005b; [12]L-DEO and NSF 2004c, MacLean and Koski 2005; [13]L-DEO and NSF 2004d; [14]University of Alaska-Fairbanks (UAF) and NSF 2005, Haley and Ireland 2006; [15]Haley and Koski 2004; [16]L-DEO and NSF 2004d, Ireland et al. 2005, L-DEO and NSF 2005; [17]NSF 2006b; [18]SIO and NSF 2006b; [19]SIO 2006, SIO and NSF 2006a; [20]Hutchinson and Hart 2004; [21]Hart et al. 2006; [22]USGS 2010a; [23]Holst 2009a; [24]SIO and NSF 2009; [25]L-DEO and NSF 2009, Holst and Beland 2010; [26]Rice University and NSF 2009, Holst and Robertson 2009; [27]SIO 2007, SIO and NSF 2007; [28]L-DEO and NSF 2008b, Holst 2009b; [29]L-DEO and NSF 2003g, LGL 2003; [30]SIO 2005b, 2006; [31]L-DEO and NSF 2007b, Holst and Smultea 2008; [32]L-DEO and NSF 2007a, Hauser et al. 2008; [33]L-DEO and NSF 2008c, Hauser and Holst 2009; [34]Smultea and Holst 2008; [35]SIO and NSF 2008, SIO 2009; [36]Mosher et al. 2009; [37]Jackson & DesRoches 2008; [38]Davila et al. 2005; [39]SIO 2004.

2.2.1.1 NSF-Funded Marine Seismic Research

Under the Proposed Action, marine seismic surveys funded by NSF may take place across the world's oceans, including the Atlantic, Pacific, Indian, Arctic, and Southern Oceans, and in the Mediterranean

Sea, and may be located in the EEZ or territorial waters of the U.S. or foreign countries. About 4-7 cruises are conducted each year with cruises lasting about 1-7 weeks, are generally more than 3 nm (5.6 km) off the coast, and primarily utilize high-energy source systems such as strings or arrays of 6-36 airguns. The amount of time in which seismic operations are conducted during any specific research cruise may range from 20 to >800 hr and depends upon the objectives of the research and the requirements of the geophysical study. Seismic operations generally occur in deeper, open ocean waters but can range from <328 ft (100 m) to >26,247 ft (8,000 m). The research vessels have the capability of towing different airgun configurations, depending on the need of the research and the scientific objectives, and are described in more detail in Section 2.2.2. A variety of other research can also be conducted on NSF-funded marine seismic research cruises, including, but not limited to, mapping, water sampling, and scientific dredging, drilling, and coring. All NSF-funded seismic cruises would be permitted according to the regulations of the applicable agencies of U.S. federal and state governments, and (where appropriate) foreign governments.

2.2.1.2 USGS Marine Seismic Research

USGS seismic research for the past 3-5 years has been primarily coastal, utilizing high-resolution, low-energy source systems in primarily coastal waters. Among the USGS Coastal Centers in California (Menlo Park/Santa Cruz), Massachusetts (Woods Hole), and Florida (St. Petersburg), about 8-12 cruises are run each year, utilizing a mix of daylight and 24-hour operations. The cruises last about 1-3 weeks, are generally only within 3-5 nm (5.6-9.3 km) of the coast, and primarily utilize low-energy source systems such as chirp and sparker systems. Water depths vary by area of operations, for example, on the Pacific coast, water depths are generally <328 ft (100 m), and generally not >3,281 ft (1,000 m). On the Atlantic east coast, water depths are generally <66 ft (20 m), and generally not >328 ft (100 m). All USGS seismic cruises would be permitted according to the regulations of the applicable agencies of U.S. federal and state governments, and (where appropriate) foreign governments.

The research vessels used by USGS have the capability of towing different seismic sources and airgun configurations, depending on the need of the research and the scientific objectives, and are described in more detail in Section 2.2.2. USGS cruises have variable scientific objectives ranging from fault identification (Pacific coast) to geological habitat mapping (all coasts) to assessing methane vents in thawing permafrost regions (North Slope of Alaska). Recent mapping on the west coast has focused on multiyear systematic mapping of California state waters with multiple acoustic systems (e.g., swath mapping, side-scan sonar, and high-resolution chirp sub-bottom imaging). Similarly, the Woods Hole office is engaged in a multiyear systematic mapping of Massachusetts state waters using similar systems for overall coastal management. USGS has conducted similar studies off North Carolina, South Carolina, and New York to evaluate the geologic basis for coastal erosion. Similar systematic mapping studies are expected to continue off Oregon and Washington in future years.

Although USGS operated many large-source multichannel seismic reflection and refraction cruises in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, these kinds of cruises have been more the exception than the rule for USGS during the past decade. The only large-source cruises that USGS anticipates in the coming decade are associated with an interagency effort to identify the outer limits of the Extended Continental Shelf. The Extended Continental Shelf is that portion of a nation's continental margin beyond 200 nm (370 km) where a nation can exert sovereign rights over the seafloor and sub-seafloor as long as the nation can show it meets the criteria set forth in Article 76 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. New 2-D seismic data are required in the Arctic, Atlantic, Bering Sea, and the Gulf of Alaska. Additional 2-D seismic data may be required in the Marianas and Line Islands. While not strictly mapping for

scientific purposes, these cruises offer opportunities to collect sediment thickness, velocity measurements, and basement information in frontier continental margin regions where no data have been collected (e.g., Arctic Ocean) or in areas where legacy data and navigation are of sometimes poor quality (e.g., Atlantic margin).

2.2.2 Research Vessels Used in Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by USGS

Under the Proposed Action, a number of research vessels would be used (Table 2-2). The ships are owned by NSF, the U.S. Navy, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), NOAA, universities, or non-profit research organizations and are operated by academic or research institutions such as Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (L-DEO), Columbia University; Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI); University of Hawaii; University of Washington; or Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), University of California – San Diego. Vessels could also be leased or contracted from private sources or could involve foreign ships working in collaboration with U.S. scientists. Each vessel acts as the source vessel during seismic research activities and tows the airguns and hydrophone streamers; provides electronic data collection systems; and provides other necessary logistical support of associated research personnel; and deploys and retrieves OBS/Hs, if needed. Each vessel also serves as the platform from which vessel-based marine mammal and sea turtle observers (PSVOs, previously called Marine Mammal Observers or MMOs) would watch for animals before and during airgun operations. Occasionally a second vessel is used for logistical support (e.g., deployment and retrieval of OBS/Hs), and in that case may serve as a supplemental platform for PSVOs (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004). Seismic surveys may be conducted on only certain portions or 'legs' of a proposed cruise.

Most of the research vessels are scheduled and coordinated by the University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS), an organization of 61 academic institutions and national laboratories involved in oceanographic research. One of the primary functions of UNOLS is to ensure the efficient scheduling of scientific cruises aboard the research vessels in the UNOLS organization (UNOLS 2010).

During 2003-2009, a variety of vessels were used to conduct USGS or NSF-funded marine seismic surveys (Table 2-2 and Figure 2-7). The R/V *Maurice Ewing* (*Ewing*) was NSF's primary marine seismic survey vessel but was retired in 2005 and was replaced by the R/V *Langseth* in 2008. Under the Proposed Action, the R/V *Langseth* is the primary seismic research vessel (see following discussion) for NSF-funded seismic research, and the other vessels that have been used for seismic surveys would continue to be the secondary research vessels. In addition, any of the other vessels listed in Table 2-2 have the potential to be used for NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research under the Proposed Action, as well as research vessels operated by U.S. oceanographic institutions as part of the UNOLS research fleet, vessels operated directly by the U.S. Government, and others as needed via contract or charter.

Table 2-2. Research Vessels Used or Potentially Used in NSF-funded or USGS Marine Seismic Research

Research Vessel	*Operating Institution*	*Owner*	*Crew/ Scientists*	*Length (ft [m])*	*Marine Seismic Survey Cruises (2003-09)*
Large/Global					
Melville	SIO	U.S. Navy	23/38	279 (85)	2 (NSF)
Knorr	WHOI	U.S. Navy	24/32	279 (85)	1 (NSF)
Thompson	UW	U.S. Navy	24/36	274 (84)	2 (NSF)
Revelle	SIO	U.S. Navy	22/37	274 (84)	4 (NSF)
Atlantis	WHOI	U.S. Navy	23/24	274 (84)	
Langseth	L-DEO	NSF	20/35	235 (72)	8 (NSF)
Ewing	Retired				9 (NSF)
Hesperides	Ministry for Science & Technology, Armada Espanola		55/30	266 (81)	2 (USGS)

Table 2-2. Research Vessels Used or Potentially Used in NSF-funded or USGS Marine Seismic Research

Research Vessel	*Operating Institution*	*Owner*	*Crew/ Scientists*	*Length (ft [m])*	*Marine Seismic Survey Cruises (2003-09)*
Intermediate/Ocean					
Kilo Moana	UH	U.S. Navy	20/38	186 (57)	
Wecoma	OSU	NSF	13/18	185 (56)	2 (NSF)
Endeavor	URI	NSF	na/na	185 (56)	1 (NSF)
Oceanus	WHOI	NSF	12/18	177 (54)	
New Horizon	SIO	SIO	12/19	170 (52)	
Regional/Coastal					
Atlantic Explorer	BBSR	BBSR	na/22	168 (51)	
Sharp	UD	UD	7/16	146 (45)	
Point Sur	MLML	NSF	9/11	135 (41)	
Cape Hatteras	DU/UNC	NSF	10/13	135 (41)	
Sproul	SIO	SIO	5/12	125 (38)	
Pelican	LUMC	LUMC	5/16	116 (35)	1 (USGS)
Smith	UM	UM		96 (29)	
Gyre	No longer in UNOLS service				1 (USGS)
Global Class					
Brown	NOAA	NOAA	16/32	274 (84)	
Healy	USCG	USCG	101/35	420 (128)	2 (NSF)
Polar Star	USCG	USCG	141/20	399 (122)	
Polar Sea	USCG	USCG	180/35	399 (122)	
Louis S. St. Laurent	Canadian Coast Guard		46/20	394 (120)	2 (USGS)
Private/Commercial					
Tiki XIV	Tiki Adventures		3/12	80 (24)	1 (USGS)
Lakota	Dixon Marine Services			54 (16)	1 (USGS)
Sea Explorer	Ocean Institute			65 (20)	1 (USGS)

Notes: BBSR = Bermuda Biological Station for Research; DU/UNC = Duke Univ./Univ. of N. Carolina; HBOI = Harbor Branch Oceanographic Institution; LUMC = Louisiana Universities Marine Consortium; MLML = Moss Landing Marine Labs; na = not available; OSU = Oregon State Univ.; TAMU = Texas A&M University; UD = Univ. of Delaware; UH = Univ. of Hawaii; UM = University of Miami; URI = Univ. of Rhode Island; USCGC = USCG Cutter; UW = Univ. of Washington. USGS also conducts 10s of cruises each year utilizing a number of smaller research and privately contracted vessels that are not listed here.

Sources: Hart et al. 2006; NSF 2006b, 2008b; UNOLS 2010.

R/V *Endeavor*

R/V *Roger Revelle*

Figure 2-7. Representative Research Vessels Potentially Used in Marine Seismic Research

2.2.2.1 R/V *Langseth*

Under the Proposed Action, the primary research vessel with the greatest survey capabilities for NSF-funded marine seismic research would be the R/V *Langseth* (Figures 2-8 and 2-9). The R/V *Langseth* is owned by NSF and operated by L-DEO of Columbia University, and is discussed in detail below.

Figure 2-8. R/V *Langseth* during Modification and Outfitting

Figure 2-9. R/V *Langseth* in Gulf of Mexico during Fall 2007 Calibration Cruise

The R/V *Langseth* has a length of 235 ft (72 m), a beam of 56 ft (17 m), and displaces 2,842 tons (2,578 metric tons). It will accommodate up to 55 personnel, 35 of whom are scientists/researchers. The ship is

powered by two diesel Bergen BRG-6 engines each producing 3550 horsepower; the vessel also has an 800 horsepower bowthruster. It has two ducted, variable pitch, four-bladed Ulstein propellers. Originally designed as a commercial seismic vessel, the propulsion system was designed to be as quiet as possible to avoid interference with the acoustic signals associated with the seismic research surveys. Cruising speed (while not towing seismic survey equipment and in transit between survey sites) is 11 kt (20.3 km/hr) with a maximum speed of 13 kt (24 km/hr); the operating speed during seismic survey activities is typically 4–5 kt (7–9 km/hr). Its range is approximately 13,500 nm (25,000 km). The R/V *Langseth* will tow airgun arrays and, at times, up to four 3.7-mi (6-km) streamers containing hydrophones along predetermined lines. It would also deploy and retrieve OBS/Hs if necessary. The R/V *Langseth* would also serve as the platform from which vessel-based PSVOs would watch for marine mammals and sea turtles before and during airgun operations (L-DEO 2010).

2.2.3 Proposed Acoustic Sources and Receivers for NSF-funded and USGS Marine Seismic Research

2.2.3.1 R/V *Langseth*

Seismic Acoustic Sources – Airgun Arrays

Under the Proposed Action, the NSF-funded R/V *Langseth* would be capable of conducting a wide suite of 2-D and 3-D marine seismic surveys with airgun sources ranging from one or two GI guns towed side by side with a discharge volume of 210 in^3 (or less) to 36 airguns on four strings with a discharge volume of 6,600 in^3 (Table 2-3). Flexibility is provided by the ability to use one, two, three, or four strings at any one time, or to use two pairs of two strings in a flip-flop fashion, depending on survey requirements.

For **2-D surveys**, one to four strings would be towed as a single array, depending on seafloor penetration requirements (Figure 2-10). For 2-D reflection profiling, one, two, or four strings may be deployed as required by the study objectives. Each string would comprise a mixture of Bolt 1500LL airguns and smaller Bolt 1900LLX airguns. The survey tow depth would range from approximately 16 to 39 ft (5 to 12 m), and the arrays would be towed 98 ft (30 m) behind the source vessel. Specific details for the proposed 2-D surveys include:

- For reflection and refraction surveys, R/V *Langseth* would deploy four strings with 10 airguns each can be deployed, with a total active discharge volume of 6,600 in^3 and occupying a 79 x 52 ft (24 x 16 m) rectangular area behind the R/V *Langseth* (Figures 2-11 and 2-12). Although each string would have 10 airguns, only 9 airguns would be discharged simultaneously; the tenth would be kept in reserve as a spare, to be used in case of failure of another airgun.
- For a two-string 2-D reflection survey, R/V *Langseth* would deploy two strings with 10 airguns per string (Figure 2-13). As with the four-string array, only nine airguns would be discharged simultaneously and the tenth would be a spare for a total active discharge volume of 3,300 in^3.
- For 2-D high-resolution reflection surveys, two strings with one GI gun per string would be deployed. The maximum total active discharge volume would be 210 in^3, depending on how the GI guns are configured (Figure 2-14). The survey tow depth would be 10 ft (3 m) and the arrays would be towed 98 ft (30 m) behind the source vessel.

Table 2-3. Proposed Seismic Source Configurations Used by the R/V *Langseth* for NSF-funded Marine Seismic Research

Airgun /GI Gun Configuration	*Energy Source*	*Nominal Source Output (downward)**	*Towing Depth of Source (m)*	*Air Discharge Volume (in^3)*	*Dominant Frequency Components (Hz)*	*Objective*
2 GI guns towed side-by-side (Figure 2-14)	2 GI guns @ 45, 75, or 105 in^3** (Gun volumes configured depending on investigator needs)	0-pk = 234 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 240 dB re 1 µPa-m	3	210**	2-188	2-D high-resolution reflection
4-gun arrays (2 strings, 2 guns/string) (Figure 2-17)	4 GI guns @ 45, 75, or 105 in^3** (Gun volumes configured depending on investigator needs)	0-pk = 240 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 246 dB re 1 µPa-m	3	420**	2-188	3-D dual source high resolution
18-gun array (2 strings, 9 airguns/string & 1 spare/string) (Figures 2-13, 2-15, and 2-16)	10 Bolt 1500LL airguns @ 180-360 in^3 8 Bolt 1900LLX airguns @ 40-120 in^3	0-pk = 252 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 259 dB re 1 µPa-m	6	3,300	2-188	2-D and 3-D reflection
36-gun array (4 strings, 9 airguns/string & 1 spare/string) (Figure 2-11)	20 Bolt 1500LL airguns @ 180-360 in^3 16 Bolt 1900LLX airguns @ 40-120 in^3	0-pk = 259 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 265 dB re 1 µPa-m	6	6,600	2-188	4-string, 2-D reflection
36-gun array (4 strings, 9 airguns/string & 1 spare/string) (Figure 2-12)	20 Bolt 1500LL airguns @ 180-360 in^3 16 Bolt 1900LLX airguns @ 40-120 in^3	0-pk = 258 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 264 dB re 1 µPa-m	12	6,600	2-188	4-string, 2-D refraction

Notes: *All source level estimates are for a filtered bandwidth of approximately 0-250 Hz. dB = decibels; pk = peak.
Especially for the larger sources, the maximum level measurable at any location in the water would be lower because the sources are all distributed sources. Also, especially for the larger sources, effective source levels for near-horizontal propagation would be substantially lower than the quoted nominal source levels for downward propagation. In addition, for the 36-airgun arrays, only two strings of 9 airguns would be discharged at any one time. The paired 9-airgun strings would be discharged in a flip-flop fashion.
**Indicates generator volume.
Source: L-DEO 2005.



APPROXIMATE SCALE

0 Meters 0.5

0 Feet 2.5

Figure 2-10
Typical Airgun String Proposed for Use on the R/V *Langseth*



Figure 2-11
RV *Langseth*
4-String Airgun Array for 2-D Reflection (total active volume 6,600 in³)



Figure 2-12
RV *Langseth*
4-String Airgun Array for 2-D Refraction (total active volume 6,600 in³)



LEGEND

in³ (m) Volume in Cubic Inches / Tow Depth in Meters

Bolt 1500LL Airgun

Bolt 1900LLX Airgun

In-Water Spare

Figure 2-13

RV *Langseth*

2-String Airgun Array for Unsedimented Ocean Crust 2-D Reflection (total active volume 3,300 in^3)



Figure 2-14
RV *Langseth*
2-String GI Gun Array for 2-D High-Resolution Reflection Surveys

For **3-D surveys**, two or four strings would be towed as a single array or a pair of two-string arrays (Figures 2-15 and 2-16). Currently, it is expected that NSF would potentially fund only one 3-D survey per year. Specific details for the proposed 3-D surveys include:

- The four-string 3-D dual-source reflection surveys, like the four-string 2-D surveys, would employ 36 airguns, 10 airguns per string (9 active + 1 inactive spare), with only 18 airguns discharging at any one time. The four strings would be configured as two pairs of two-string arrays that discharge alternately (flip-flop configuration). Each string would comprise a mixture of Bolt 1500LL airguns and smaller Bolt 1900LLX airguns. The total active discharge volume would be 3,300 in^3, the survey tow depth would be approximately 20 ft (6 m), and the arrays would be towed 98-164 ft (30-50 m) behind the source vessel.
- For 3-D dual-source high-resolution surveys, two strings with two GI gun per string would be deployed with a maximum total active discharge volume of 420 in^3, depending on how the GI guns are configured (Figure 2-17). The survey tow depth would be 10 ft (3 m), and the arrays would be towed 98 ft (30 m) behind the source vessel.

The airgun arrays would discharge in 2 modes: up to every 20-60 sec along the survey lines or tracks to produce reflection data, and up to every 4 min for refraction data. During discharge, a brief (approximately 0.1 sec) pulse of sound is emitted. The 20-sec discharge spacing during reflection lines corresponds to an interval of about 164 ft (50 m) at normal shooting speed. Refraction lines would use a 4-min repetition rate to ensure complete filling of the larger 36-gun array, and to minimize the impact of water column reverberation on detection of refracted signals. Airguns would be silent during the intervening periods.

Because the actual source would be a distributed sound source (typically 2, 4, 18, or 36 airguns) rather than a single point source, the highest sound levels listed in Table 2-3 apply only to downward propagating signals. Because of the directional nature of the sound from large airgun arrays, the effective source level for sound propagating in near-horizontal directions would be substantially lower than that for downward propagation.

It is difficult to measure the actual SPL close to a full source array that is being activated due to the physical environment surrounding an active seismic array. Therefore assumptions are made that enable the response of a given source array to be modeled. The ‘far field’ assumption suggests that at some distance away from a source array, which is much greater than the dimensions of the source array, the peak energy pulses from the various individual source elements (‘near field’ signature) arrive at the same time and add together constructively to form the ‘far field’ response of the source. This response is corrected or back-projected to 1 meter from the source array to produce the ‘far field’ signature of the source at 1 meter, which is a standard modeled measure of a source array output. It is well known that the peak energy pulses from individual source elements no longer align at locations close to the seismic source array (in the ‘near field’) as a seismic source array is a ‘distributed’, rather than a ‘point’ source. Therefore, the emitted SPL close to the source array is lower than that calculated using the ‘far field’ calculation.



Figure 2-15
RV *Langseth*
4-String Airgun Array for "Standard" 3-D Reflection (total active volume 3,300 in^3)



Figure 2-16
RV *Langseth*
4-String Airgun Array for "Wide" 3-D Reflection (total active volume 3,300 in^3)



LEGEND

GI Gun

in^3 Volume in Cubic Inches

(m) Tow Depth in Meters

*May be configured as 45/105, 75/105, or 105/105.

Figure 2-17
RV *Langseth*
2-String GI Gun Array for 3-D Dual-Source High-Resolution Surveys

Non-Seismic Acoustic Sources – MBESs, SBPs, Pingers, ADCPs, and Acoustic Releases

Five additional non-seismic active acoustic sources would be operated from the R/V *Langseth* during most or all of a marine seismic research cruise: MBESs, SBPs, pingers, ADCPs, and acoustic releases. These sound sources may be operated from the R/V *Langseth* simultaneous with the airgun array.

Multibeam Echosounder (MBES). The ocean floor would be mapped with the Kongsberg EM122. The Kongsberg EM122 MBES operates at 10.5–13 (usually 12) kHz and is hull-mounted on the *Langseth*. The transmitting beamwidth is 1 or 2° fore–aft and 150° athwartship. The maximum source level is 242 dB re 1 μPa · m_{rms}. Each 'ping' consists of eight (in water >3,281 ft [1,000 m] deep) or four (<3,281 ft [1,000 m]) successive fan-shaped transmissions, each ensonifying a sector that extends 1° fore–aft. Continuous-wave signals increase from 2 to 15 ms long in water depths up to 8,530 ft (2,600 m), and FM chirp signals up to 100 ms long are used in water >8,530 ft (2,600 m). The successive transmissions span an overall cross-track angular extent of about 150°, with 2-ms gaps between the pings for successive sectors.

Sub-bottom Profiler (SBP). The ocean floor would also be mapped with the Knudsen 3260 SBP. The Knudsen 3260 SBP is normally operated to provide information about the near seafloor sedimentary features and the bottom topography that is mapped simultaneously by the MBES. The beam is transmitted as a 27º cone, which is directed downward by a 3.5-kHz transducer in the hull of the *Langseth*. The nominal power output is 10 kilowatts (kW), but the actual maximum radiated power is 3 kW or 222 dB re 1 μPa · m. The ping duration is up to 64 ms, and the ping interval is 1 s. A common mode of operation is to broadcast five pulses at 1-s intervals followed by a 5-s pause. The SBP is capable of reaching depths of 10,000 m.

Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler (ADCP). An ADCP can be placed on the seafloor, attached to a buoy, or mounted on a ship to measure the speed of the water currents. The ADCPs would operate at a frequency of 35-1,200 kHz and a maximum acoustic source level of 224 dB re 1μPa-1 m over a conically-shaped 30° beam.

Pingers. Locational and tracking pingers would be used on the airgun arrays, hydrophone streamers, coring equipment, and other instruments such as cameras. A total of 32 omnidirectional pingers would be used for multi-streamer 3-D surveys: 7 on each streamer and 1 on each source array string. The peak output for the pingers used by the *Langseth* along the streamer would be 183 dB re 1 μPa-m at 55-110 kHz, with a maximum rate of 3 pings per 10 sec per pinger; the transducers would be powered by NiCad batteries. In addition, a 12-kHz pinger would normally be used during those seismic survey cruises that have ancillary coring operations. With the ship stationary during coring operations, a pinger, a battery-powered acoustic beacon, would be attached to a coring mechanism to monitor the depth of the corer relative to the sea floor. The pinger produces an omnidirectional 12-kHz signal with a source output of approximately 192 dB re 1 μPa-m with one ping of 0.5, 2, or 10 ms duration per second.

Acoustic Releases. Once an OBS/H is ready to be retrieved, an acoustic release transponder interrogates the OBS/H at a frequency of 9–11 kHz, and a response is received at a frequency of 9–13 kHz. The acoustic release than activates the separation of the OBS/H from the sea floor anchor and the OBS/H floats to the surface to be recovered by the survey ship.

Acoustic Receivers

Depending on the requirements of the survey, acoustic data would be retrieved by the deployment of any combination of hydrophone cables or streamers, OBS/Hs on the ocean floor, or sonobuoys on the ocean's surface. The OBS/Hs and sonobuoys would usually be deployed by the source vessel.

The R/V *Langseth* would be able to deploy and tow up to four hydrophone streamers, each 3.7 mi (6 km) long and approximately 4 in (10 cm) in diameter, at the same time. Each streamer is a Thales solid-state (not oil-filled) cable in 492-ft (150-m) sections. Each section has 12 hydrophone groups, each 41 ft (12.5 m) long.

The lateral separation between adjacent streamers would vary between 164 and 656 ft (50 and 200 m). Since maximum streamer spacing is 656 ft (200 m), the maximum distance between 3-D tracklines would be 1,312 ft (400 m). For a standard streamer spacing of 328 ft (100 m), trackline spacing would be 656 ft (200 m), and for high-resolution work with a streamer spacing of 164 ft (50 m), the tracklines would need to be at least 328 ft (100 m) apart.

2.2.3.2 Other Research Vessels

Seismic Acoustic Sources – Airgun Arrays

In addition to the R/V *Langseth*, all of the other research vessels associated with marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS have the capability of towing various airgun configurations (generally relatively small), depending on the capabilities of the research vessel, need of the researcher, and the scientific objectives. In addition to the proposed acoustic source configurations of the R/V *Langseth* (Table 2-3), it is expected that under the Proposed Action, marine seismic research activities conducted on NSF-funded or USGS cruises would continue to occur using other research vessels. These projects are expected to be similar in duration and extent to those previously conducted by NSF-funded or USGS research vessels and would use source configurations similar to those used aboard research vessels in the past (Table 2-4).

In addition to the seismic surveys conducted by the R/V *Langseth* and other research vessels, the SODV would conduct VSPs to support riserless drilling operations as part of the IODP. Typically, the SODV may either perform checkshot VSP which is used to calibrate surface seismic surveys or a zero offset VSP which would be used to derive formation velocities and identify certain features such as faults and overpressure zones. From 2004 through 2006, the USIO performed a total of nine zero offset VSP surveys that were generally less than 7 hours each in duration. The VSP surveys utilized a single 210 in^3 GI airgun configured to operate with generator and injector volumes of 45 in^3 and 105 in^3, respectively, and an acoustical source output up to 191 dB re 1 µPa.

Depending upon site-specific conditions and research objectives, either a parallel cluster of two 250-in^3 generator airguns (output up to 226 dB re 1 µPa rms at the source) or a single 250 in^3 generator airgun (output up to 220 dB re 1 µPa rms at the source) would be used for future VSP experiments, with a duration up to 12 hours. Occasionally the SODV may perform a limited scope single-channel seismic survey to confirm existing site characterization geophysical data and drill site conditions. Generally, these surveys would involve the use of a single 210-in^3 GI airgun typically configured to have a displacement volume of 45 in^3, a duration of less than 12 hours, and output at the source of up to 229 dB re 1 µPa rms (NSF 2008b).

Table 2-4. Past Configurations of Seismic Sources for Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by the USGS (2003-2009)

Seismic Source	*Energy Source*	*Nominal Source Output (downward)**	*Source Tow Depth (m)*	*Air Discharge Volume (in^3)*	*Dominant Frequency (Hz)*	*Vessel/Cruise & Year*
Sparker	SIG 2mille sparker	205 dB re 1 µPa-m @ 1,500 joules	0	na	800-850	*Lakota*/San Francisco, Calif. 06[18] *Sea Explorer*/Dana Pt. Calif. 06[18]
Sparker	SIG ELC1200 sparker	205 dB re 1 µPa-m @ 1,500 joules	0	na	50-4,000	*Endeavor*/NW Atlantic 09[32]
Sparker	SQUID 2000 minisparker	209 dB re 1 µPa-m @ 2,000 joules	0	na	150-1,700	*Melville*/SB Channel 08[28]
Water gun	Water gun @ 15 in^3	204 dB re 1 µPa-m	1	na	20-1,500	*Gyre*/Gulf of Mexico 03[19]
Boomer	Huntec boomer	205 dB re 1 µPa-m	1	na		
Chirp	Edgetech 512i chirp	198 dB re 1 µPa-m	0	na	500-12,000	*Gyre*/Gulf of Mexico 03[19] *Melville*/SB Channel 08[28]
Boomer	Electromechanical boomer	219 dB re 1 µPa-m	0	na	100-2,500	*Melville*/SB Channel 08[28]
1 GI gun	GI gun @ 13 in^3** GI gun @ 24 in^3** GI gun @ 35 in^3**	204 dB re 1 µPa-m 208 dB re 1 µPa-m 208 dB re 1 µPa-m	1	13** 24** 35**		*Gyre*/Gulf of Mexico 03[19]
1 GI gun	GI gun @ 25 in^3**	0-pk = 218 dB re 1 µPa-m	2	25**	<500	*Melville*/SB Channel 08[28]
1 GI gun	GI gun @ 45 in^3**	0-pk = 225.3 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 230.7 dB re 1 µPa-m	4 2	45**	2-188	*Wecoma*/NE Pacific 07[21] & 09[16] *Endeavor*/NW Atlantic 09[32]
1 GI gun	GI gun @ 105 in^3**	0-pk = 231 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 237 dB re 1 µPa-m	3	105**	0-188	*Thompson*/Aleutians 05[12]
	GI gun @ 75 in^3**	0-pk = 230 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 236 dB re 1 µPa-m	2	75**	0-188	*Knorr*/NW Atlantic 04[14]
2 GI guns	GI airguns @ 45 in^3**	pk-pk = 235.8 dB re 1 µPa-m	6	90**	0-188	*Revelle*/ETP 03 & 04[35]
2 GI guns	GI airguns @ 45 in^3**	0-pk = 230.6 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 235.8 dB re 1 µPa-m	2	90**	0-188	*Revelle*/SW Pacific 06[1]; ETP 03[4] & 06[15]; Indian Ocean 07[22] *Endeavor*/NW Atlantic 09[32]
2 GI guns	GI airguns @ 75 in^3**	0-pk = 237 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 243 dB re 1 µPa-m	2	150**	2-188	*Thompson*/ NE Pacific 08[25]
2 GI guns	GI guns @ 105 in^3**	0-pk = 237 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 243 dB re 1 µPa-m	3	210**	0-188	*Ewing*/Norwegian Sea 03[5], Mid-Atlantic 03[5], GoA 04[11]
			2	210**	0-188	*Melville*/SW Pacific 05[3]
2 GI guns	GI guns @ 105 in^3**	0-pk = 229 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 236 dB re 1 µPa-m	6	210**	0-188	*Ewing*/GoM 03[20]
2 G guns	G guns @ 250 in^3	0-pk = 236 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 241 dB re 1 µPa-m	9	500	0-150	*Healy*/Arctic 05[13]
3 G guns	G guns @ 2 x 500 in^3 + 1 x 150 in^3=1,150 in^3	0-peak =235 dB re 1 µPa pk-pk = 225 dB re 1 µPa rms	>11	1,150	10-70	*Louis St. Laurent*/Arctic 09[33], 08[34]
3 GI guns	GI guns @ 105 in^3**	0-pk = 240.7 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 246.4 dB re 1 µPa-m	2.5	315**	30-140	*Ewing*/E. Pacific 04[10]
1 airgun	Bolt airgun @ 1,200 in^3	0-pk = 234 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 241 dB re 1 µPa-m	10	1,200	8-40	*Healy*/Arctic 05 [13]

Table 2-4. Past Configurations of Seismic Sources for Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by the USGS (2003-2009)

Seismic Source	*Energy Source*	*Nominal Source Output (downward)**	*Source Tow Depth (m)*	*Air Discharge Volume (in^3)*	*Dominant Frequency (Hz)*	*Vessel/Cruise & Year*
6-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 80-500 in^3	0-pk = 243 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 250 dB re 1 µPa-m	6 7.5	1,350	0-188	*Ewing*/Norwegian Sea 03[5] GoM 03[20]
6-airgun array	Two Bolt airguns and four G guns	Not available: assumed less than 8-airguns	9	1,840	0-150	*Healy*/Arctic 06[2]
7-airgun array	Three Bolt airguns and four G guns		9	2,340	0-150	
8-airgun array	Four G guns @ 210 in^3 Four Bolt airguns @ 500 in^3	0-pk = 246 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 253 dB re 1 µPa-m	9	2,840	0-150	
9-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 40-360 in^3	0-pk = 246 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 253 dB re 1 µPa-m	7	1,650	2-188	*Langseth*/GoM 07-08[23]
10-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 80-850 in^3	0-pk = 248 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 255 dB re 1 µPa-m	7	3,050	0-188	*Ewing*/NE Pacific 04[9]
			7.5	3,050 3,005	0-188	*Ewing*/E Tropical Pacific 03[4] GoM 03[20]
12-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 80-850 in^3	0-pk = 250 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 257 dB re 1 µPa-m	7	3,705	0-188	*Ewing*/NE Pacific 04[9]
			7.5	3,721 3,755	0-188	*Ewing*/E Tropical Pacific 03[4], GoM 03[20]
18-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 40-360 in^3	0-pk = 252 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 259 dB re 1 µPa-m	7 7.5	3,300	2-188	*Langseth*/GoM 07-08[23] ETP 08 [27]
20-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 80-875 in^3	0-pk = 255 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 262 dB re 1 µPa-m	7.5 7.5 7 7.5	8,600 8,575 6,970 6,947	0-188	*Ewing*/ GoM 03[20], Mid-Atlantic 03[6], GoM 05[8], SE Caribbean 04[17]
27-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 40-360 in^3	0-pk = 256 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 262 dB re 1 µPa-m	7	6,600	2-188	*Langseth*/ETP 08 [27]
36-airgun array	Bolt airguns @ 40-360 in^3	0-pk = 259 dB re 1 µPa-m pk-pk = 265 dB re 1 µPa-m	7-9	6,600	2-188	*Langseth*/GoM 07-08[23], C Amer 08[24], ETP 08 [27], SE Asia 09[29], GoA 08[26], SW Pacific 09[30], NE Pacific 09[31],

Notes: *All source level estimates are for a filter bandwidth of 0-250 Hz. **Indicates generator volume. C Amer = Central America, ETP = Eastern Tropical Pacific, GoA = Gulf of Alaska, GoM = Gulf of Mexico, SB = Santa Barbara.

Sources: [1]SIO & NSF 2005; [2]University of Texas-Austin & NSF 2006; [3]SIO & NSF 2004; [4]L-DEO & NSF 2003a; [5]L-DEO & NSF 2003b; [6]L-DEO & NSF 2003c; [7]L-DEO & NSF 2003e; [8]Holst et al. 2005a; [9]L-DEO & NSF 2004a; [10]L-DEO & NSF 2004b; [11]L-DEO & NSF 2004c; [12]L-DEO and NSF 2004d; [13]UAF & NSF 2005; [14]LGL 2004; [15]SIO 2005b; [16] SIO and NSF 2009; [17]Smultea et al. 2004; [18]USGS 2006; [19]Hutchinson & Hart 2004; [20]L-DEO & NSF 2003g; [21]SIO 2007, SIO & NSF 2007; [22]SIO & NSF 2006b; [23]Holst & Beland 2008; [24]Holst & Smultea 2008; [25]Smultea & Holst 2008; [26]Hauser & Holst 2009; [27]Hauser et al. 2008; [28]SIO & NSF 2008; [29]Holst 2009a; [30]Holst 2009b; [31]Holst & Beland 2010; [32]Holst & Robertson 2009; [33]Roth and Schmidt 2010; [34]Mosher et al. 2009; [35]SIO 2004.

Other Towed Seismic Acoustic Sources – Boomers, Sparkers, Water Guns, and Chirp Systems

The USGS primarily, and NSF occasionally, uses a number of towed low-energy sub-bottom profiling seismic acoustic sources for marine seismic research. These are briefly summarized below.

Boomer Systems. Although different models of boomer plates may be utilized, they generally operate at a frequency of 300-3,000 Hz, 200-300 joules per shot, with source levels of 212-215 dB re 1 µPa-m, and pulse lengths of 120-400 microsec.

Sparker Systems. The typical sparker system would normally operate at a frequency of 890-1,020 Hz, with power ranging from 300 to 1,500 joules and corresponding source levels of 200 to 208 dB re 1 µPa-m, with a pulse duration of less than 1 ms.

Water Guns. Although water guns are rarely used, when used they operate at a frequency of 20-1,500 Hz and a source level of 204 dB re 1 µPa-m.

Chirp Systems. Chirp systems are a type of SBP that are used frequently by USGS. As previously discussed for the SBP, the energy from the chirp SBP is directed downward by a 0.5-3.5-kHz transducer towed from the research vessel. Depending on frequency and power, source levels generally range from 204 to 214 dB re 1 µPa-m. The pulse repetition rate is usually 4 pulses/sec with a pulse length of 32 ms. Beam widths vary by frequency and are usually 55° at 3.5 kHz and 20° at 5 kHz.

Non-Seismic Acoustic Sources – MBESs, SBPs, and Pingers

As with the R/V *Langseth* and previous NSF-funded seismic surveys, under the Proposed Action NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic surveys may use a variety of non-seismic acoustic sources such as MBESs, SBPs, fathometers, acoustic releases, and/or pingers concurrently with seismic sources, depending on the research objectives (Table 2-5). The MBES available for use on research vessels range in frequency from 12 to 300 kHz and in source level from 225 to 242 dB re 1 µPa-m and include Kongsberg, Seabeam, Simrad, Knudsen, EdgeTech, and Krupp-Atlas models. The mid-frequency units can be used in any water depth and a high-frequency unit (e.g., at 300 kHz) may be used in shallow water (<328 ft [100 m]). The SBPs and pingers used on other vessels would be similar to those used on the R/V *Langseth* and described previously.

Table 2-5. Acoustic Parameters of MBESs, SBPs, ADCPs, Pingers, and Acoustic Releases Used by NSF-Funded or USGS Research Vessels Conducting Marine Seismic Research

Acoustic Source		*Frequency (kHz)*	*Source Level (dB re 1 µPa-m)*	*Pulse Length (ms)*	*Beam Width**	
					Fore-aft	*Athwart.*
MBESs	Seabeam 2000	12	234	7-20		
	Seabeam 2100/12	12	237	<1 - 12	2° x 2°	
	Kongsberg EM122	12	242	2-15	1° x 2°	150°
	Simrad EM 120/122	12	242	2, 5,15	1°x1°, 1°x2°	150°
	Simrad EM 300	30	237 (1°), 231 (2°)	0.7, 2,15	1°x1°, 1°x2°	
	Simrad EM 1002	95	225 (3°)	0.2, 0.7, 2	2° x 2°	
	Krupp-Atlas HydroSweep DS	15.5	237		2.3°	
SBPs		3.5	222	64	27°	
ADCPs		38-1,200	224		30°	
Pingers		55-110	183			
Pingers		12	192	0.5, 2, 10		
Acoustic Releases		9-15	187	8		

Notes: *The beams of all acoustic sources would be directed downward from the research vessel. Athwart. = athwartship.
Sources: USCG 2001; L-DEO and NSF 2003e; SIO and NSF 2003; University of Washington 2003; SIO and NSF 2004; SIO 2005a, b; UAF and NSF 2005; University of Hawaii 2005; WHOI 2005.

2.3 APPROACH TO ANALYSIS FOR THE PEIS

2.3.1 Exemplary (Representative) Analysis Areas Analyzed under the PEIS

As discussed in Section 1.5, due to the potential for NSF-funded marine seismic cruises to occur across all oceans worldwide, it was necessary to narrow the focus of the analysis presented in this PEIS to 13 exemplary or representative analysis areas: 5 DAAs and 8 QAAs (Table 2-6 and Figure 2-18). The following sections provide a brief overview of each analysis area. Due to the nature of USGS seismic survey operations (e.g., use of lower energy acoustic seismic sources and conducted predominantly in the nearshore coastal environment), the analysis areas used for the purposes of impact analysis in this PEIS do not include representative USGS cruise areas. However, three of the exemplary analysis areas cover parts of the U.S. margins where USGS is also likely to conduct future seismic work to map the outer limits of the U.S. extended continental shelf beyond 200 nm.

Based on representative survey tracks for a potential seismic survey within each detailed analysis area, a number of specific locations were selected as assumed source locations for sound propagation modeling. These locations were chosen to represent the range of bathymetry, acoustic environments, and marine mammal habitats that occur within each DAA.

2.3.1.1 Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

Western Gulf of Alaska (W Gulf of Alaska)

The proposed tracks in this region are located between Kodiak Island and the Shumagin Islands. The tracks are positioned perpendicular to the shore and cover the shelf, continental slope, Aleutian Terrace, and Aleutian Trench (Table 2-6 and Figure 2-19). The water depths vary from <328 ft (100 m) to >19,685 ft (6,000 m). The three locations used for modeling purposes are on the shelf, slope, and in deep water.

Southern California (S California)

The proposed track lines cover the Santa Barbara Basin. The depths inside the survey area vary from 328 ft (100 m) to 1,640 ft (500 m) (Figure 2-20 and Table 2-6). Based on the bathymetry, two modeling sites were assumed within the Santa Barbara Channel at water depths of 1,903 ft (580 m) and 590 ft (180 m).

Galapagos Ridge

The proposed seismic survey is located in deep water (>6,600 ft [2,000 m]) approximately 870 mi (1,400 km) west of the Galapagos Islands (Figure 2-21 and Table 2-6). It overlies a portion of the mid-oceanic ridge between the Pacific and Nazca plates.

Caribbean

The proposed tracks cover a vast variety of environments in terms of bathymetry as well as geoacoustic properties of the sea floor. The four modeling locations ranged in depth from <656 ft (200 m) to >6,562 ft (2,000 m) (Figure 2-22 and Table 2-6).

Northwestern Atlantic (NW Atlantic)

The proposed NW Atlantic survey is offshore from New Jersey over the Hudson canyon covering an area with depths varying from <328 ft (100 m) to >4,920 ft (1,500 m). The majority of the survey area lies over the shelf with water depths <656 ft (200 m). The southeastern (SE) section of the survey extends over the continental slope to the abyssal plain. Four representative sites were selected for acoustic modeling, allowing for variation in bathymetry (shelf, slope, deep water, and Hudson canyon) (Figure 2-23 and Table 2-6).

Table 2-6. Location and Source Characteristics for Assumed Seismic Surveys within the DAAs and QAAs

Site Name	*Latitude*	*Longitude*	*Longhurst Biome*	*Survey Season*	*Source*			*Source Details*	*Water Depth (m)*		
					Sm	*Med*	*Lg*		*<100*	*100–1,000*	*>1,000*
DAA											
W Gulf of Alaska	53º–55°N	151–159°W	Pacific Westerly Winds	Sum		x		3-D reflection, 2 strings of 9 airguns (18 airguns), 3,300 in^3	x	x	x
S California	35° N	120° W	Pacific Coastal	Late Spr/ Early Sum	x			High resolution 3-D, 1 pair 45/105 in^3 GI guns	x	x	
Galapagos Ridge	4°S	103.6°W	Pacific Trade Wind	Austral Sum		x		3-D reflection, 2 strings of 9 airguns (18 airguns), 3,300 in^3			x
Caribbean	12° N	65° W	Atlantic Coastal	Spr/Sum			x	2-D full refraction, 36 airguns, 6,600 in^3	x	x	x
NW Atlantic	39.5° N	73.5° W	Atlantic Coastal	Sum	x			High resolution 3-D, 1 pair 45/105 in^3 GI guns	x	x	x
QAA											
BC Coast	52° N	129° W	Pacific Coastal	Fall			x	2-D reflection, 4 strings of 9 airguns, 36 airguns	x	x	
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	26° N	40° W	Atlantic Westerly Winds	Spr, Sum, or Fall			x	2-D reflection, 4 strings of 9 airguns, 36 airguns			x
Marianas	17° N	145° E	Pacific Trade Wind	Spr			x	2-D multichannel, 18 airguns	x	x	x
Sub-Antarctic	42° S	145° W	Antarctic Westerly Winds	Austral Sum	x			2-D high resolution, reflection; 2 low-energy GI guns (45 in^3 each)			x
N Atlantic/ Iceland	59° N–65° N	33° W–25° W	Atlantic Polar	Sum			x	2-D reflection, 4 strings of 9 airguns, 36 airguns	x	x	x
SW Atlantic	5° N	45° W	Atlantic Trade Winds	Anytime			x	2-D multichannel, 18 airguns	x	x	x
W India	20° N	65° E	Indian Ocean Coastal	Late Spr or Early Fall			x	Large multichannel source		x	x
W Australia	18° S	120° E	Indian Ocean Coastal	Austral Spr or Fall	x			2-D high resolution, 1 pair 45/105 in^3 GI guns	x	x	x



Figure 2-18
Longhurst Biomes and Proposed Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas



LEGEND

- Acoustic Modeling Location (Depth)
  1 (0-200 m)
  2 (200-1,000 m)
  3 (>1,000 m)
- Ship Track
- Modeling Boundary

Water depth (m)

50 100 200 300 400 500 750 1000 1500 2000 2500 3000 4000 4500 5000 5300

Kilometers
0 100
0 *Nautical Miles* 60

Figure 2-19
Regional Location of
W Gulf of Alaska Detailed Analysis Area (D1)



LEGEND

- Acoustic Modeling Location (Depth)
  1 (0-300 m)
  2 (>300 m)
- Ship Track
- Modeling Boundary

Water depth (m)

50 100 200 300 400 500 750 1000 1500 2000 2500 3000 4000 4500 5000 5300

Kilometers
0 60
0 *Nautical Miles* 38

Figure 2-20
Regional Location of
S California Detailed Analysis Area (D2)



Figure 2-21
Regional Location of
Galapagos Ridge Detailed Analysis Area (D3)



Figure 2-22
Regional Location of Caribbean Detailed Analysis Area (D4)



LEGEND

- Acoustic Modeling Location (Depth)
  1 (1-160 m)
  2 (160-500 m)
  3 (>500 m)
  4 (>1,500 m)
- Ship Track
- Modeling Boundary

Water depth (m)

50 100 200 300 400 500 750 1000 1500 2000 2500 3000 4000 4500 5000 5300

Kilometers
0 70
0 *Nautical Miles* 40

Figure 2-23
Regional Location of
NW Atlantic Detailed Analysis Area (D5)

2.3.1.2 Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

British Columbia Coast (BC Coast)

The BC Coast site is located in the southern portion of the Queen Charlotte Basin, in approximately 656 ft (200 m) of water (Q1, Figure 2-18).

Mid-Atlantic Ridge

The Mid-Atlantic ridge is a deep-water site with water depths >9,842 ft (3,000 m) (Q2, Figure 2-18). The site is located in the vicinity of the spreading center of the ridge where the new oceanic crust is being formed.

Marianas

The site is located in the Philippine Sea near a volcanic island arc, formed above a subduction zone (Q3, Figure 2-18). The proposed survey area is located in the back-arc basin. General water depths are in the range from 6,562-13,123 ft (2,000-4,000 m) with multiple volcanic rises, some of which reach the sea surface.

Sub-Antarctic

The survey area is located in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean approximately 1,620 nm (3,000 km) east of New Zealand and 1,890 nm (3,500 km) from Antarctica (Q4, Figure 2-18). It is a typical abyssal plain with nearly flat bathymetry and water depths around 16,400 ft (5,000 m).

Southwestern Atlantic (SW Atlantic)

The site is about 325 nm (600 km) northeast of Brazil, in the abyssal part of the Atlantic Ocean, near a passive continental margin (Q6, Figure 2-18). The water depths are about 13,123 ft (4,000 m) at the site.

Western India (W India)

The proposed survey area is located approximately 270 nm (500 km) west of India in the abyssal part of the Indian Ocean, near a passive continental margin (Q7, Figure 2-18). The water depths are about 9,842 ft (3,000 m) at the site with nearly flat bathymetry.

Northern Atlantic/Iceland (N Atlantic/Iceland)

The Reykjanes Ridge is the part of the Mid-Atlantic ridge structure in the northern part of the Atlantic Ocean (Q5, Figure 2-18). A portion of the assumed survey covers the shelf part of the island. The water depths on the shelf are about 98-1,640 ft (30-500 m).

Western Australia (W Australia)

The assumed location for this seismic survey is offshore of NW Australia in the shelf environment within the outer ramp portion of the Canning Basin (Q8, Figure 2-18).

2.3.1.3 Comparison of QAAs vs. DAAs

The sound fields to which marine mammals could be exposed during a seismic program were modeled for representative sites in each DAA, but they were not modeled for each QAA. In order to qualitatively evaluate sound levels that might be received by marine mammals in each of the eight QAAs, the source configurations and factors affecting sound propagation for each QAA were compared to those for each of the DAAs described in Section 2.3.1.1 and Table 2-6. Table 2-7 shows which sound fields in a DAA were

expected to be most similar to sound fields in each QAA and summarizes the data used to make that evaluation.

2.3.2 Acoustic Impact Criteria

When evaluating potential impacts of impulsive or transient sounds, it is necessary to consider how those sounds should be measured, and what amounts of sound exposure will result in biological effects that are of concern.

2.3.2.1 Measures of Transient Sound

The "amount" of sound in an airgun pulse can be measured in a variety of ways. The units used to express these measurements, and the resulting numerical values, vary depending on the type of measurement. It is important to recognize that different measures exist, and to choose the one(s) that are most useful as predictors of biological effects. Commonly used measures of airgun pulses include:

- *Peak sound pressure*. This is the maximum instantaneous sound pressure measureable in the water at a specified distance from the airgun(s). The units of pressure are typically bars (English) or, in metric units, either Pascals (Pa) or micropascals (μPa). The metric values are commonly expressed in logarithmic form as decibels reference to 1 μPa (dB re 1 μPa).
- *Peak-to-peak sound pressure*. This is the algebraic difference between the peak positive and peak negative sound pressures. Units are the same as for peak pressure. When expressed in dB, peak-to-peak pressure is typically about 6 dB higher than peak pressure.
- *Root mean square (rms) sound pressure*. In simple terms, this is an average sound pressure over a specified time interval. For airgun pulses, the averaging time is commonly taken to be the approximate duration of one pulse, which in turn is commonly assumed to be the time interval within which 90% of the pulse energy arrives. The rms sound pressure level (in dB) is typically approximately 10 dB less than the peak level, and approximately 16 dB less than the peak-to-peak level.
- *Sound exposure level (SEL or energy flux density)*. This measure represents the total energy contained within a pulse, and is in the units dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$. For a single airgun pulse, the numerical value of the SEL measurement, in these units, is usually 5–15 dB lower than the rms sound pressure in dB re 1 μPa (Greene 1997; McCauley et al. 1998; Blackwell et al. 2007; MacGillivray and Hannay 2007; Southall et al. 2007).

Over the past decade, NMFS guidelines regarding levels of impulsive sound that might cause disturbance or injury have been based on the "rms sound pressure" metric. However, there is now scientific evidence that suggests that auditory effects of transient sounds on marine mammals are better correlated with the amount of received energy than with the level of the strongest pulse (see next subsection). Therefore, the present PEIS places considerable emphasis on the SEL metric, particularly when discussing potential injurious effects on marine mammals. However, the rms pressure metric is also considered in various situations as currently the SEL metric has not been incorporated into NMFS guidelines.

Table 2-7. Comparison of QAAs to DAAs Relative to Acoustic Characteristics, Array Configurations, and Other Factors

QAA	*Source Details*	*Water Depth (m)* <100	100-1,000	>1,000	*Sound Channel*	*Bottom Characteristics*	*DAA with Similar Source*	*DAA with Similar Acoustic Environment*	*DAA Most Similar to QAA*	*Comments*
N. Atlantic/ Iceland	4 strings of 9 airguns = 36 airguns @ 12 m depth.	X	X	X	Weak sound channel approximately 100 m deep may trap portion of acoustic energy, downward refracting near surface.	Reykjanes Ridge: 50-100 m of sediment over basalt, increasing to several hundred meters at 300 km distance from the ridge. Iceland shelf: greater sandy component, surface velocity of approximately 1,500 m/s.	Caribbean, (W GoA, Galapagos + 6 dB)	W GoA (strong sound channel at 70 m depth; 500 m of silty sediments on the shelf, approximately 600 m of clayey sediments in deeper water). However, the sound speed minimum at the GoA site is more pronounced, and the bottom is softer (thicker and/or less dense sediments).	W GoA (note the difference in source size).	Sound channel much weaker than at W GoA and bottom is more reflective.
BC Coast	4 strings of 9 airguns = 36 airguns @ 7.5 m depth.	X	X		Channeling of sound not expected either near the surface or mid-water.	Variable; on average, approximately 20 m of silty sand overlying lithified sediments.	Caribbean (W GoA, Galapagos + 6 dB).	For depths <1,000 m, S CA, Caribbean, and Galapagos SSPs are also downward refracting (this comparison is not appropriate for greater depths due to presence of sound speed minima). Sediment thickness/properties similar to Galapagos (much thicker sediment at the S. CA & Caribbean sites).	Caribbean SSP has some similarity (only for shallow sites), and a similar-sized source; S CA SSP also somewhat similar. BC Coast profile less strongly downward refracting; harder bottom. Species are also different at both these sites.	None of the DAAs is a very good match to this site.
SW Atlantic	2D multi-channel, 18 airguns.	X	X	X	Mid-water sound speed minimum near approximately 700 m depth & relatively high near-surface sound speed; thus, ducted propagation not expected to	Sedimentation influenced by riverine input. 60-80% clay, sound speed approximately 1,500 m/s at the surface.	W GoA, Galapagos	Galapagos (sound channel at approximately 1 km depth, but ducted sound propagation not expected to be significant); Caribbean sound speed also somewhat similar for shallow sites and sediments are more	Galapagos (deeper sites) / Caribbean (shallow site).	SSP similar to Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA.

Table 2-7. Comparison of QAAs to DAAs Relative to Acoustic Characteristics, Array Configurations, and Other Factors

QAA	Source Details	Water Depth (m) <100	Water Depth (m) 100-1,000	Water Depth (m) >1,000	Sound Channel	Bottom Characteristics	DAA with Similar Source	DAA with Similar Acoustic Environment	DAA Most Similar to QAA	Comments
					occur.			similar.		
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	4 strings of 9 airguns = 36 airguns @ 12 m depth.			X	Pronounced sound channel at approximately 1,000 m depth.	Approx. 100 m of abyssal sediments over basalt.	Caribbean (W GoA)	Caribbean (has pronounced sound channel at approximately 800 m depth, sound speed gradient in thermocline strongly down-refracting; thus, acoustic energy would be trapped in sound channel at deep ocean-basin locations in project area). Sediments likely different, but this is not as important for a deep-water site.	Caribbean	
W Australia	High resolution source (2D), 1 pair 45/105 in^3 GI guns.	X	X	X	Spring SSP decreases with depth from surface to shallow sea floor, favoring refraction of sound toward bottom; no significant sound channeling expected.	Shelf environment; approximately 1,200 m of gravel/ sand/silt over sedimentary bedrock. Surficial sediments wave-sorted, favoring slightly coarser materials.	NW Atlantic, S CA	For shallow sites, S CA SSP is also downward-refracting; sediments also reasonably similar.	S CA	
W India	Large multi-channel source.		X	X	Sound speed minimum at approximately 1,800 m depth; however, sound speeds below this minimum are not high enough to result in significant channeling of sound in this layer.	Approx. 2 km of detrital silty clays.	Caribbean (W GoA, Galapagos)	Galapagos has similar SSP (sound channel at approximately 1 km depth, but ducted sound propagation is not expected due to high near-surface sound speed); however, sediments much thicker at the W India site. For the 100-1000 m site, the Caribbean site SSP is also not dissimilar (once water depth is taken into account), and sediments are more similar.	Galapagos (particularly for the deeper site); possibly Caribbean for the shallower site.	If the mid-water W India site is closer to 100 m depth, the Caribbean site may be more similar; if the water depth is closer to 1,000 m, the SSP is more significant, and the Galapagos site is likely a better analogue (except for difference in source size).

Table 2-7. Comparison of QAAs to DAAs Relative to Acoustic Characteristics, Array Configurations, and Other Factors

QAA	*Source Details*	*Water Depth (m)* <100	100-1,000	>1,000	*Sound Channel*	*Bottom Characteristics*	*DAA with Similar Source*	*DAA with Similar Acoustic Environment*	*DAA Most Similar to QAA*	*Comments*
Marianas	2D multi-channel, 18 airguns	X	X	X	Minimum SSP approximately 1000 m depth; however, near-surface sound speed sufficiently high that ducted sound propagation not expected to be significant.	Approximately 100 m of sediment (approximately 60% clay) over bedrock.	W GoA, Galapagos	Galapagos (sound channel at approximately 1 km depth, but ducted sound propagation is not expected due to high near-surface sound speed); however, sediments are thicker at Marianas site, and there is no shallow Galapagos Ridge site. Caribbean site SSP is also not dissimilar once water depth is taken into account, and sediments are reasonably similar; the source is larger at the Caribbean site, however.	Galapagos (deeper sites) / Caribbean (shallowest site)	
Sub-Antarctic	2 low-energy GI airguns (45 in^3 each) @ 3 m depth.			X	Broad sound speed minimum occurs between approximately 200-1200 m during austral summer, likely resulting in channeling of sound in this layer.	Approximately 100 m of abyssal sediments over bedrock.	S CA, NW Atlantic	S CA SSP is similar (sound speed minimum at approximately 700 m depth), but all sites are much shallower. Caribbean SSP also somewhat similar.	S CA; however, given the difference in water depths this is not a very good analogue.	None of the DAAs is a very good match to this site.

Notes: Lg = large, Med = medium, Sm = small, W GoA = W Gulf of Alaska, S CA = Southern California, SSP = sound speed profile. Note that sound speed profiles vary seasonally; survey seasons are listed in Table 2-6.

2.3.2.2 Acoustic Criteria for Predicting Biological Effects

Since the mid-1990s, the NMFS has specified that marine mammals should not be exposed to pulsed sounds with received levels exceeding 180 or 190 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Since 2000, the "do-not-exceed" levels (Level A harassment) have been specified as 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) for cetaceans and 190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) for pinnipeds (NMFS 2000). NMFS also considers that cetaceans and pinnipeds exposed to pulsed sound levels ≥160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) may be disturbed (Level B harassment) (Table 2-8).

Table 2-8. Existing and Proposed Injury and Behavior Exposure Criteria for Cetaceans and Pinnipeds Exposed to Pulsed Sounds

	Level A (Injury)		*Level B (Behavior)*
Group	*Pressure[(a)] (dB re 1 µPa rms)*	*Energy[(b)] (dB re 1 µPa^2 · sec)*	*Pressure[(a)] (dB re 1 µPa rms)*
Cetaceans	180[(c)]	198	160
Pinnipeds	190[(c)]	186	160

Notes: [(a)]Existing NMFS criterion, on an rms basis averaged over duration of a pulse (NMFS 2000, 2005g).
[(b)]Proposed energy (SEL) criterion, cumulative across pulses (Southall et al. 2007). Energy criteria refer to cumulative energy from a series of impulsive sounds.
[(c)]Southall et al. (2007) concluded that exposure to a single pulse with peak pressure ≥230 dB re 1 µPa (for cetaceans) or ≥218 dB re 1µPa (for pinnipeds) might lead to PTS whether or not the proposed cumulative energy criterion is exceeded.

The 180- and 190-dB re 1 µPa (rms) criteria were determined before specific information was available about the received levels of underwater sound that would cause temporary or permanent hearing damage in marine mammals. Subsequently, data on received levels that cause the onset of temporary threshold shift (TTS) have been obtained for certain toothed whales and pinnipeds (Kastak et al. 1999; Finneran et al. 2002, 2005). A group of specialists in marine mammal acoustics, the "Noise Criteria Group", has recommended new criteria, based on current scientific knowledge (Gentry et al. 2004; Southall et al. 2007). The following summarizes their conclusions that are most relevant to the marine mammal portions of this PEIS.

2.3.2.3 Noise Criteria Group Recommendations (Southall et al. 2007)

Recently acquired data indicate that TTS onset in marine mammals is more closely correlated with the received SEL than with rms levels (Southall et al. 2007). In odontocetes exposed to impulsive sounds, the TTS can be as low as approximately 183 dB re 1 µPa^2·s. The corresponding TTS value for pinnipeds is not as well defined. There are published data on levels of non-impulse sound (Kastak et al. 1999) but not of impulse sound eliciting TTS in pinnipeds. Based on the results for non-impulse sound, plus the known tendency in other mammals for lower TTS with impulse than with non-impulse sound, the TTS for pinnipeds exposed to impulse sound may be as low as 171 dB re 1 µPa^2·s in the more sensitive species such as the harbor seal.

There are no specific data concerning the levels of underwater sound necessary to cause permanent hearing damage (permanent threshold shift or PTS) in any species of marine mammal. However, data from terrestrial mammals provide a basis for estimating the difference between the (unmeasured) PTS thresholds and the measured TTS. A conservative (precautionary) estimate of this offset between TTS and PTS, when sound exposure is measured on an SEL basis (received energy level), is 15 dB. Thus, available data indicate the lowest received sound levels that might elicit slight auditory injury (PTS) are 198 dB re 1 µPa^2·s in cetaceans (i.e., 183 + 15 dB), and 186 dB re 1 µPa^2·s in the more sensitive pinnipeds (i.e., 171 + 15 dB) (Southall et al. 2007).

The primary measure of sound used in the proposed new criteria is the received sound energy, not just in the single strongest pulse, but accumulated over time. The most appropriate interval over which the received airgun pulse energy should be accumulated is not well defined. However, pending the availability of additional relevant information, the Noise Criteria Group has suggested considering noise exposure over 24-hr periods (Southall et al. 2007), and that is what has been done in the application of the Acoustic Integration Model (AIM©) to the five DAAs considered in this PEIS (see Section 2.3.3.2 below). Those analyses were designed to estimate, among other things, the numbers of marine mammals that might be exposed to $\geq$198 dB SEL (cetaceans) or $\geq$186 dB SEL (pinnipeds) of airgun sound energy within a single 24-hr period during the exemplary seismic survey in each DAA. The Noise Criteria Group also recommends a "do not exceed" peak pressure criterion, but under field conditions the SEL criterion is the one that would be exceeded first and thus would be the operative criterion (Southall et al. 2007). These SEL values were calculated for both unweighted (flat) and M-weighted received levels. M-weighting was recommended by Southall et al. (2007) (see Section 2.3.2.4 below) but has not been adopted by NMFS. Therefore, both calculations were completed.

Southall et al. (2007) also concluded that, whether or not marine mammals have received sufficient cumulative acoustic energy to elicit TTS, exposure to even a single pulse with received peak level ≥224 dB re 1 µPa (cetaceans) or ≥212 dB re 1 µPa (pinnipeds) could elicit TTS. Similarly, exposure to even a single pulse with received peak level ≥230 dB (cetaceans) or ≥218 dB (pinnipeds) might elicit PTS.

As noted above, the existing NMFS criterion for potential disturbance to marine mammals from seismic surveys is 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) (Level B harassment). The Noise Criteria Group concluded that available data are insufficient as a basis for recommending any specific alternative disturbance criteria applicable to multiple-pulse sounds like seismic survey sounds (Southall et al. 2007).

Acoustic impact criteria applicable to other types of biota are less well developed than are the criteria for cetaceans and pinnipeds. There is an ongoing effort to develop science-based criteria for fish and sea turtles. Procedures used to evaluate acoustic impacts on resources other than marine mammals are discussed in the sections of this PEIS dealing with each of those resources.

2.3.2.4 Auditory Weighting Functions

A further recommendation from the Noise Criteria Group is that allowance should be given to the differential frequency responsiveness of various marine mammal groups (Southall et al. 2007). This is important when considering airgun sounds: the energy in airgun sounds is predominantly at low frequencies (<500 Hz), with diminishing amounts of energy at progressively higher frequencies (Greene and Richardson 1988; Goold and Fish 1998). Baleen whales (mysticetes) are most sensitive to low-frequency (LF) sounds (<1 kHz), and not very sensitive to high frequency (HF) (>10 kHz) sounds. On the other hand, odontocetes or toothed whales (including dolphins and porpoises) are quite insensitive to LF but very sensitive to HF (Richardson et al. 1995a). Porpoises, river dolphins, and the S Hemisphere genus *Cephalorhynchus* are even less sensitive to LF than are other odontocetes. Pinnipeds have frequency responsiveness intermediate between baleen and toothed whales.

The Noise Criteria Group has proposed that, in calculating the effective SELs, frequency-weighting functions should be applied (Southall et al. 2007). Based on present knowledge, cetaceans and in-water pinnipeds are divided into four "hearing groups", and there is a separate weighting curve for each of these groups. The weighting curves de-emphasize the HF energy when dealing with baleen whales (LF cetaceans), and de-emphasize the LF energy when dealing with odontocetes (mid-frequency [MF] cetaceans and HF cetaceans). For pinnipeds in water, there is some de-emphasis of both the LF and HF energy, but the LF components are weighted more heavily than for odontocetes, but less heavily than for

mysticetes. The shapes of the four M-weighting curves (i.e., M_{lf} for baleen whales, M_{mf} for most odontocetes, M_{hf} for the HF odontocetes, and M_{pw} for pinnipeds in water) are similar to those of C-weighting curves that are widely used when considering effects of strong pulsed sounds on human hearing; boundary frequencies are shown in Table 2-9. However, the M-weighting curves are shifted downward in frequency for baleen whales and upward in frequency for toothed whales (Southall et al. 2007).

Table 2-9. Lower and Upper Boundary Frequencies Used in M-Weighting of Model Results for Marine Mammal Hearing Groups

Species Group	*Low Frequency (f_{lo})*	*Low Frequency (f_{hi})*
LF cetaceans	7 Hz	22 kHz
MF cetaceans	150 Hz	160 kHz
HF cetaceans	200 Hz	180 kHz
Pinnipeds (in water)	75 Hz	75 kHz

Source: Southall et al. 2007.

The M-weighting curves have been defined in a precautionary manner that allows for the fact that, at least in terrestrial mammals, TTS and PTS are less strongly related to frequency than is audibility. Thus, M-weighting curves (and the C-weighting curve for humans) are "flatter" than the curves representing minimum detectable sound level vs. frequency (the audiogram). Use of M-weighting in some marine mammal analyses within this PEIS takes account of the fact that marine mammals vary widely in their sensitivity to the predominant LF components of airgun sounds, while also allowing for the fact that TTS and PTS are likely to be less frequency-dependent than is the audiogram.

In the marine mammal sections (Sections 3.6-3.9), both the flat (unweighted) and M-weighted energy levels were calculated. The later approach was done by applying the M-weights to the acoustic model's estimates of the received energy levels in each 1/3-octave frequency band before accumulating across bands to derive the overall received energy level. M-weighting was also applied when calculating the distances within which the received levels would diminish to 190, 180, and 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Thus, the effective 180 dB (rms) (and other) distances for the four categories of cetaceans and pinnipeds vary. For any given criterion (e.g., 180 dB rms), effective distances for LF cetaceans (baleen whales) are the largest, followed in order of decreasing distance by pinnipeds in water, MF cetaceans (most odontocetes), and HF cetaceans (porpoises, river dolphins, and *Cephalorhynchus*). Given the predominance of LF energy in airgun pulses, the M_{lf}-weighted radii applicable to mysticetes are very similar to the "traditional" unweighted radii, whereas those for pinnipeds and the MF and HF odontocetes are progressively smaller.

The M-weighting curves (analogous to C-weighting curves for humans) were proposed by Southall et al. (2007) primarily in the context of estimating onset criteria for TTS and PTS in marine mammals exposed to strong (or high-level) sounds. The onset of behavioral disturbance often occurs at lower received levels than the onset of TTS, and the most appropriate frequency weighting for behavioral disturbance may be more closely related to the shape of the audiogram of the species in question—generally analogous to A-weighting in humans (Nedwell et al. 2007). However, there has been no specific validation of the appropriateness of using audiogram-based weighting when assessing the potential of underwater sounds to cause disturbance in marine mammals. M-weighting entails less down-weighting of low and high frequencies than audiogram-based weighting would produce. Application of M-weighting in estimating behavioral disturbance criteria would therefore be a precautionary approach.

2.3.3 Acoustic Modeling

Under the Proposed Action, a variety of airgun configurations ranging from small arrays of 1-4 airguns to large arrays of 18-36 airguns, as well as other lower energy non-seismic acoustic sources including MBESs, SBPs, and pingers, would be operated. Because of the complexities and variability of sound propagation from these sources in different ocean environments, acoustic modeling is a key component in an effective scientific analysis of the extent of the potential acoustic impacts. As described in Section 2.3.1, five exemplary areas were identified for detailed acoustic analysis, and a representative seismic survey scenario using airguns as the seismic acoustic source was modeled for each area (Table 2-6 and Figures 2-18 – 2-23).

For a quantitative assessment of the potential impact of an exemplary marine seismic survey, it is necessary to integrate the predicted (modeled) seismic survey sound field with the expected distribution of marine animals. This is a three-part process:

1. Estimate the 3-D sound field while the airguns are operating at representative locations within the analysis area using an airgun array source model and a sound propagation model.
2. Estimate the 3-D locations and movements of simulated animals in space and time.
3. Integrate these two sets of model outputs to estimate the maximum and cumulative airgun sound that would be received by each simulated animal, and then assess the potential impact of the seismic survey sound source on a specific species or group.

The computer models used to develop these estimates are described briefly below and in detail in Appendix B, *Acoustic Modeling Report*. A further step in the analysis process is to assess, in a qualitative manner, how the impacts in eight additional scenarios would be expected to compare with those in the five scenarios analyzed in detail.

In this PEIS, the full process outlined above is applied for marine mammals. Marine mammals are a resource of particular concern with regard to seismic surveys. Also, marine mammals are the animals for which most progress has been made in identifying the specific sound exposure criteria that need to be defined in order to undertake a quantitative assessment of impact. Other resources are analyzed in a less detailed and more qualitative way, but taking into account specific impact criteria where available (see Chapter 3).

2.3.3.1 Estimated 3-D Sound Field

The sound field around an airgun array was predicted based on a two-stage modeling process. The first stage was to predict the sound field near the source (airgun array) taking into account the specific characteristics of that array. The second stage was to predict the sound field at longer distances using a sound propagation model. The second stage was based on the predictions from the source model plus available data on relevant characteristics of the environment through which the sound would propagate. Those environmental factors included water depth, properties of the seafloor, and temperature-salinity profiles of the water column during the season when each of the exemplary seismic cruises was assumed to occur. The following is a brief summary of the two stages; more details are provided in Appendix B.

In the first stage, the sound fields near various airgun arrays proposed for use under the Proposed Action were modeled using an airgun array source-signature model, a proprietary application developed by JASCO Research Ltd. (JASCO). The airgun model is based on the physics of the oscillation and radiation of airgun bubbles, as described by Ziolkowski (1972). The model solves, in parallel, a set of coupled differential equations that govern the airgun bubble oscillations. The model accounts for additional physical effects, including pressure interactions between airguns, port throttling, and bubble damping. To

maximize the fidelity of the model in predicting the sounds from actual airguns, a simulated annealing global optimization algorithm was used to fit the model parameters to a large library of measured airgun data (from Racca and Scrimger 1986). The output of the model is a set of notional source signatures, each corresponding to a single airgun. These were used to compute the farfield signature of the airgun array in each direction and by 1/3-octave frequency band.

In the second stage, the modeled 1/3-octave source levels for an airgun array, as a function of direction, were used as input for the acoustic propagation software Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM), which computed the attenuation of the sound as it radiated from the source. MONM is an advanced modeling package with several unique features. Its algorithmic engine is based on a parabolic equation finite differences code enhanced to handle shear as well as compressional waves in the sea floor sediment, with the capability to account for changes in shear wave speed and attenuation over different sections of a propagation traverse.

The received sound levels at any 3-D location within the region of interest are computed by attenuating the source level for each 1/3-octave band within the frequency range from 10 to 2,000 Hz (from stage 1) by the calculated transmission loss at its center frequency. This frequency range is sufficient to capture essentially all of the energy output by the array (see further discussion in Appendix B). In performing these calculations, a location within the region of interest is characterized by its range and bearing from the airguns and by its depth below the surface. The 1/3-octave received-level values are summed incoherently across all modeled frequencies to obtain a broadband unweighted received-level value for the location of interest. Alternatively, when summing across 1/3-octaves, frequency-weighting functions approximating the frequency response characteristics of animal auditory systems (e.g., Southall et al. 2007) can also be applied.

The estimated received levels, like the source levels from which they are computed, are in energy-based units normally represented as dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, and are equivalent to the SEL for a single source pulse. In cases where there is a need for the estimated received sound level averaged over the pulse duration, in dB re 1 μPa (rms), this is derived from the estimated SEL based on the typical difference between the two measures (SEL and sound pressure level [SPL]), which is about 10 dB (Appendix B). Note that estimation of the pulse duration, and hence the SPL, is currently computationally prohibitive for complex, range-dependent environments such as those input to MONM. The results from the acoustic modeling for each of the five DAAs are presented in Appendix B, *Acoustic Modeling Report* (Section 8.1 and Annexes 5 and 6).

For this PEIS, a 3-dB precautionary factor has been added to the SEL values predicted by MONM for water <1,000 m deep. This adjustment has been made in recognition that comparisons of MONM output with direct field measurements have shown that MONM sometimes underestimates actual SEL in shallow water, particularly where the bottom type is not well known (e.g., Blackwell et al. 2007; MacGillivray and Hannay 2007). This +3 dB adjustment reduces the likelihood of underestimating received SEL values near an actual seismic operation.

As an example of the acoustic modeling results, the predicted sound field during the exemplary seismic survey in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA is described here. (Comparable information for the other four DAAs appears in Appendix B, Section 8.1 and Annexes 5 and 6.) The assumed seismic survey in the W Gulf of Alaska involves an 18-airgun array of total volume 3,300 in^3 operating during summer at a depth of 20 ft (6 m) in water ranging from 328 ft (100 m) to 19,685 ft (6,000 m) deep. The sound speed profile (SSP) in the area during summer shows a strong sound channel at 230 ft (70 m) depth. This channel is expected to

trap much of the acoustic energy from an airgun array, resulting in ducted propagation and relatively efficient sound propagation.

Sound field maps for airgun array operations at three representative sites (shallow [<656 ft {<200 m}], intermediate, and deep [>6,562 ft {>2,000 m}]) in the W Gulf of Alaska area are shown in Figures 2-24, 2-25, and 2-26. In addition, Figure 2-27 shows an expanded view of the area close to each of the three representative sites. At each point, the color coding depicts the maximum unweighted SEL value predicted for any depth between the surface and the lesser of 6,562 ft (2,000 m) or the seafloor. Raw model output (i.e., without a 3-dB precautionary factor or frequency weighting) is shown in all maps.

Inspection of these sound field maps reveals several features of the sound fields that are evident not only for the W Gulf of Alaska, but often in other areas as well (*cf.* Appendix B). The predicted received sound levels:

- diminish more rapidly with increasing distance at the deep site than at the intermediate-depth or (especially) the shallow site;
- diminish more rapidly with increasing distance in some directions than in other directions from each of the sites, depending on aspect relative to the airgun array orientation and on environmental features such as water depth;
- at the shallow- and intermediate-depth sites, diminish much more rapidly with increasing distance shoreward (i.e., into shallow water) than seaward;
- are ≥120 dB SEL (and thus detectable above natural ambient levels most of the time) out to long distances—often >100 km (Figures 2-24 and 2-25);
- are ≥150 dB SEL and thus ≥ approximately 160 dB re 1 μPa (rms), to much shorter distances, on the order of 2–10 km (Figure 2-26);
- are ≥170 dB SEL and thus ≥ approximately 180 dB re 1 μPa (rms), to distances on the order of a few hundred meters, varying with site and aspect (Figure 2-26).

The acoustic levels plotted on the maps represent the SEL metric, which summarizes the energy content of a given pulse as it arrives at a given location. In order to determine the rms SPLs that have been used for regulatory purposes in recent years, a pulse duration of 0.1 s was assumed, resulting in a conversion factor of +10 dB. Thus, rms levels (in dB re 1μPa) are taken to be approximately 10 dB higher than SEL values in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$. The distances within which the rms received levels could exceed 190 dB, 180 dB, or other rms levels of interest were determined in a precautionary way, allowing for aspect dependence (see Appendix B). Also, the aforementioned 3-dB safety factor was applied in areas <3,280 ft (1,000 m) deep.

Based on these procedures, the predicted unweighted (flat-weighted) 190 and 180 dB (rms) distances for the exemplary W Gulf of Alaska cruise are shown in Table 2-10. Table 2-10 also shows alternative estimates of the effective 190 and 180 dB (rms) distances that apply when one takes account of the lower sensitivity of pinnipeds and (especially) odontocetes to LF sound, which is the predominant part of seismic pulses. The "M-weighting" procedure used to derive these alternative estimates is described in Section 2.3.2.3.

Table 2-10. Summary of Predicted 180- and 190-dB Radii (Unweighted and M-weighted) for the W Gulf of Alaska Sites

Site	*Water Depth (m)*	*Weighting*	*Radius (m)**	
			180 dB (rms)	*190 dB (rms)*
1	<100	Unweighted	1,012	206
		LF cetaceans	1,012	209
		MF cetaceans	478	139
		HF cetaceans	398	63
		Pinnipeds	885	196
2	100-1,000	Unweighted	595	155
		LF cetaceans	541	152
		MF cetaceans	262	76
		HF cetaceans	202	63
		Pinnipeds	390	114
3	>1,000	Unweighted	347	104
		LF cetaceans	342	103
		MF cetaceans	177	54
		HF cetaceans	139	45
		Pinnipeds	264	76

Notes: *Radii shown are the more conservative (larger) of the values for each site from the tables of Appendix B, Annex 6. They represent the maximum over all modeled depths, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or seafloor depth, with a 3-dB precautionary factor added to the raw model output for sites with a water depth less than 1,000 m. Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3), at a tow depth of 6 m.
MF = mid-frequency, HF = high frequency.



Figure 2-24. Predicted Unweighted/Flat Frequency SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites 1 and 3

Notes: In order to avoid overlap, the sound field for site 2 is shown separately in Figure 2-25 below. Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3) at a tow depth of 6 m. Modeling boundary outside of field of view due to the scale of figure.



Figure 2-25. Predicted Unweighted/Flat Frequency SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Site 2
Notes: In order to avoid overlap, the sound fields for sites 1 and 3 are shown separately in Figure 2-24 above. Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3) at a tow depth of 6 m. Modeling boundary outside of field of view due to the scale of figure.



Figure 2-26. Predicted Unweighted/Flat Frequency SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figures 2-24 and 2-25).
Note: Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3) at a tow depth of 6 m.

2.3.3.2 R/V *Langseth* Acoustic Calibration Study

During late 2007/early 2008, a calibration study of the R/V *Langseth's* 36-airgun array took place in the Gulf of Mexico. The main purpose of the calibration study was to obtain acoustic measurements to better understand the sound fields around various configurations of the R/V *Langseth*'s 36-airgun array during seismic operations in different water depths. One of the fundamental motivations for the calibration effort was the need to assess and verify the accuracy and applicability of L-DEO's model of received sound levels. The model has been used to predict the safety radii within which mitigation may be necessary in order to avoid exposing marine mammals to airgun sounds at received levels exceeding established limits (180 and 190 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} for cetaceans and pinnipeds, respectively, as set forth by NMFS) during L-DEO operations.

Propagation measurements of pulses from the 36-airgun array were obtained in two water depths (5,200 and 164 ft [1,600 and 50 m]) during the calibration study. The results showed that radii around the airguns for various received levels were larger in shallow water (Tolstoy et al. 2009). Comparison of the modeling and calibration results for deep water showed that the model represents the actual produced levels, particularly within the first few kilometers, where the predicted safety radii lie. At greater distances, local oceanographic variations begin to take effect, and the model tends to overpredict. The safety radii previously used for shallow water, as based on model results, are conservative (i.e., precautionary). A more detailed discussion of the R/V *Langseth* calibration results can be found in Appendix H.

2.3.3.3 Acoustic Integration Model (AIM©)

AIM is a four-dimensional, individual-based, Monte Carlo statistical model designed to predict the exposure of moving receivers to any stimulus (sound or acoustic energy) propagating through space and time (Frankel et al. 2002). AIM is centered upon the animat movement engine, described below, which moves the assumed stimulus source and assumed animal receivers through four dimensions (time and space) according to user inputs. AIM uses external range-dependent stimulus propagation models (e.g., Parabolic Equation and Bellhop) and additional propagation models such as MONM (see above) can be integrated to accommodate any class of propagation stimuli. In this application, MONM was used to predict received levels of airgun sound in relation to bearing and distance from the airgun source (Figure 2-27).

Animat is the term used to refer to any object (i.e., source, receiver, or animal) in the model. Animats are moved through space and time according to animat-specific rules. These rules are very flexible and fall into two categories. The first are waypoint animats. As the name implies, these animats are moved in a deterministic fashion, based upon time and space waypoints. Sound sources are typically waypoint animats. AIM inputs include movement parameters for the sound source. Source parameters include its movement pattern and duty cycle.



Not to Scale

Figure 2-27
Relationship of Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM)
and Acoustic Integration Model (AIM)

The second class of animats are the stochastic animats—here marine mammals. For each category of stochastic animats (e.g., each species or species group), appropriate ranges of values are specified for speed of movement, direction changes, depth ranges, and duration for each behavioral state. Marine mammal animats have at least two behavioral states, the surfacing and the dive. When more specific information is available, additional dive behavioral states can be added to the animat to increase the fidelity of its behavior. For example, spinner dolphin animats are typically programmed to have 50% shallow dives, 40% moderately deep foraging dives, and 10% very deep foraging dives, reflecting the distribution of their diving behavior over a 24-hr period. Furthermore, stochastic animats can have their behavior modified by environmental conditions. For example, animats can be programmed to 'reflect' off a depth contour, simulating the tendencies of many species to remain inshore or offshore of some depth contour. Once the animats are programmed, the model moves them through space and time at user-specified time intervals (e.g., 10 sec), and the received level of the stimulus is recorded for each animat at each time step.

AIM uses external range-dependent propagation models to produce the estimated received level of the stimulus at the location and depth of each animat. For the purposes of this PEIS, AIM used JASCO's MONM, which is specialized to correctly handle the propagation of signals from airgun arrays of specific design that are operating in environments with complex propagation conditions.

AIM assumes that the environmental databases adequately represent the actual environment being modeled. The database of sound velocity profiles contains monthly averages, and may not accurately predict profiles in an area at all times, since unexpected environmental conditions (e.g., surface ducts) can occur. AIM also assumes that the behavioral input parameters are representative of the movement patterns of the animals.

For the assessment of impacts of the representative seismic operations on marine mammals in five DAAs, the maximum received sound level (on an rms basis) and the integrated sound energy level was calculated for each simulated animal. The latter was calculated for the 24-hr period centered on the time when the simulated animal was exposed to the strongest sound. Either measure can be weighted by a user-specified weighting function, and we have applied the M-weighting functions of Southall et al. (2007) to allow for assumed frequency-dependence in the sensitivity of different marine mammal groups (see Section 2.3.2.3). Calculations were made using the M-weighted received sound levels as well as the flat (unweighted) received levels. For each species or species-group, the ratio of estimated animal density in the analysis area to modeled animat density was used to convert the predicted number of animat exposures exceeding relevant regulatory standards to the actual number of animals that might be exposed to such levels during the assumed seismic operation.

2.4 ALTERNATIVES CARRIED FORWARD FOR ANALYSIS

2.4.1 Alternative A: Conduct Marine Seismic Research Using Cruise-specific Mitigation Measures

Under Alternative A, academic and U.S. government scientists supported with funds provided by NSF or USGS, respectively, would conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by, or on behalf of, U.S. academic institutions, research institutions, or government agencies. These seismic cruises would be conducted in various study areas throughout the world's oceans including the Atlantic, Pacific, Indian, and Southern Oceans, as well as peripheral seas such as the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea, Bering Sea, and Mediterranean Sea. There might typically be seismic research cruises in four to seven areas annually, but with considerable variation possible. Seismic research cruises use a variety of airgun

array configurations, and often use other non-seismic acoustic sources as well, including MBESs, SBPs, pingers, ADCPs, and acoustic releases. Seismic sources would include high-energy source arrays of 18-36 airguns (up to a discharge volume of 6,600 in^3) and low-energy source arrays of 1-4 airguns (up to a discharge volume of 425 in^3). Sources used in NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research include those on the R/V *Langseth*, the primary vessel used to support high-energy source seismic research, as well as airguns and other seismic acoustic sources (e.g., sparkers, water guns, etc.) on UNOLS vessels operated directly by the U.S. Government, such as USGS, and others as needed via contract or charter. All NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic cruises would be conducted according to applicable U.S. federal and state laws and regulations, and as applicable, foreign laws and regulations recognized by the U.S. Government.

Numerous species of marine mammals and sea turtles are expected to be encountered during marine seismic research activities. Permission for incidental 'take' of marine mammals and ESA-listed species will be sought under the MMPA and the ESA through NMFS and the USFWS, and, seismic survey operations would be conducted in accordance with the resulting regulations and terms and conditions from NMFS and the USFWS. The following subsections describe mitigation measures that are an integral part of NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research activities under Alternative A. The procedures described here are based on protocols used on previous seismic research cruises and on recommended best practices in Richardson et al. (1995a), Pierson et al. (1998), and Weir et al. (2006), as well as dialogue with NMFS and input from past public comment and local meetings for seismic cruises conducted to date.

2.4.1.1 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would apply in general to all proposed NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research cruises. However, for those cruises that may be conducted within the EEZ and territorial waters of another nation, additional or different mitigation measures may be required by that nation. In addition, the following proposed mitigation measures are identified for NEPA purposes. While similar mitigation and monitoring may be required for incidental take authorizations under the MMPA, such mitigation would be developed in coordination with NMFS or the USFWS on a case-by-case basis for specific cruises during the processing of the incidental take authorization.

Mitigation during Planning Phases

Research proposals submitted to NSF undergo a competitive, merit review process which typically includes external expert review by an *ad hoc* panel and/or mail review. After scientific, technical, and programmatic review and consideration of appropriate factors, the NSF Program Officer recommends to the Division Director whether the proposal should be declined or recommended for award. After Division approval has been obtained, the proposals recommended for funding are forwarded to the Division of Grants and Agreements for review of business, financial, and policy implications and the processing and issuance of a grant or other agreement. NSF strives to make funding decisions within 6 months of proposal receipt. Awardees that require time on research vessels are typically scheduled a minimum of 1 year in advance of the desired cruise date.

Considerable planning is required to schedule a marine seismic research cruise. In scheduling a seismic survey, NSF and the entities that propose to conduct the cruise would consider potential environmental impacts including seasonal, biological, and weather factors; ship schedules; and equipment availability. This preliminary assessment of potential environmental impacts would be part of the NSF proposal review and cruise scheduling processes, with a full assessment completed prior to cruise departure.

A preliminary assessment would include identifying within a proposed seismic survey area the occurrence, level and type of use (e.g., breeding, feeding, migrating, etc.), and seasons of use by marine mammals, sea turtles, and other ESA-listed species; potential occurrence of commercial, local, and subsistence fishing activities; and other site-specific concerns. This preliminary information would be used to assess the feasibility of conducting an NSF-funded marine seismic study at a specific location; specific times or locations within an area where potential impacts would be avoided or minimized; and to identify any additional mitigation and/or monitoring measures that would be implemented to avoid or minimize potential impacts.

For each proposed research cruise, NSF and the project applicants would consider whether the research objectives could be met with a smaller source and a survey design that minimizes seismic operations. If there is concern about exposure of sensitive biota, NSF and the project proponents would also consider whether a different survey time would reduce those effects. Through pre-cruise planning, areas and seasons where there are expected concentrations of marine mammals and sea turtles would be identified and avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Special consideration would be given to marine biota engaged in sensitive activities such as breeding, rearing of young, and feeding. If appropriate, NSF and the project proponents would also implement mitigation measures to address potential impacts to fishing activities. NSF currently has a guidance document for scientists interested in marine seismic research and is available at: http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/pubs/Seismic_Reflection_Permitting_Procedures.pdf. NSF and USGS accept MMC's offer to provide assistance with improving existing pre-cruise planning procedures (see Appendix J). NSF will work with MMC to update NSF's pre-cruise seismic survey guidelines.

USGS marine seismic research projects are conducted to support approved programs of the USGS for which the agency has direct or reimbursable funding. The potential environmental impact of such marine seismic projects is considered throughout the planning process. Like NSF, the USGS also considers whether research objectives can be attained using smaller seismic sources or alternative survey design and, to the extent possible, surveys are planned to reduce the potential impact of seismic sources on sensitive marine biota and human activities (e.g., fishing).

Visual Monitoring for Marine Mammals and Turtles

Under Alternative A, PSVOs would be based aboard the seismic source vessel, and would watch for marine mammals and turtles near the vessel during daytime airgun operations and start-ups of airguns at night. PSVOs would also watch for marine mammals and turtles near the seismic vessel for at least 30 min prior to the start of airgun operations after an extended shutdown. When feasible, PSVOs would also make observations during daytime periods when the seismic systems are not operating for comparison of animal abundance and behavior during seismic and non-seismic periods. Based on PSVO observations, airguns would be powered down (see below) or, if necessary, shut down completely, when marine mammals are observed within or about to enter a designated mitigation zone (MZ) (see below). The MZ is a region in which a possibility exists of effects on animal hearing or other physical effects (Level A harassment). PSVOs also monitor for species to the full mitigation zone (FMZ) which includes the area identified for potential behavioral harassment (Level B harassment).

PSVOs would be appointed by the academic institution conducting the research cruise in the case of NSF-funded research and by USGS in the case of USGS marine seismic research, with NMFS Office of Protected Resources concurrence after review of their qualifications. At least one PSVO would monitor the MZ during daytime airgun operations and any nighttime startups. PSVOs would normally work in

shifts of 4-hr duration or less and work no more than three shifts in a 24-hr period. The vessel crew would also be instructed to assist in detecting marine mammals and turtles.

All vessels conducting NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would be required to have suitable platforms for marine mammal and turtle observation. On the observation platform, the eye level of the PSVO would be sufficiently above sea level, and the observer would have a clear view around most of the vessel. During daytime operations, the PSVO would scan the area around the vessel systematically with reticule binoculars, "Big-eye" 25x power binoculars (on the R/V *Langseth* only), and with the naked eye. Night vision devices (NVDs) would be available for their use. Laser rangefinding binoculars would be available to assist in distance estimation.

Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM)

Passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) involves towing hydrophones that detect frequencies produced by vocalizing marine mammals. Ideally, two or more hydrophones are used to allow some localization of the bearing (direction) of the animal from the vessel. A key component of PAM which allows more effective use is the computer signal processing to detect and localize marine mammal vocalizations. Several prototype systems are under development.

During some cruises, PAM would be used during seismic operations in conjunction with visual monitoring. PAM would normally be used for high-energy source surveys unless in the rare and unlikely circumstances that, (1) it is damaged and rendered unoperable during a survey and back-up systems fail; (2) it is deemed to be ineffective in detecting animals under the circumstances of the cruise; or (3) safety of operations prevent its use. When implemented, PAM would typically be used during both daytime and nighttime seismic operations as well as when the vessel is underway in the survey area with the airguns silent. During a seismic survey, PAM can be effective at detecting some animals before they are detected visually (Smultea and Holst 2003; Smultea et al. 2004). Its value can be limited, however, by bottom configuration (water depth) and other environmental factors, and in some cases towing the PAM equipment is not practicable. Because of present limitations to determine range of acoustic contacts, the value of PAM is to detect acoustic cues that alert PSVOs of the presence and general direction of marine mammals.

Inclusion of PAM does not reduce the need for visual observations, and it is expected that PAM operation would require additional personnel beyond those aboard as PSVOs, including at least one with previous PAM experience. NMFS would need to provide concurrence on the use of PAM personnel after review of their qualifications. When PAM is used, PAM procedures and results would be included in post-cruise reports submitted to NMFS and/or USFWS in accordance with MMPA and ESA regulatory requirements.

PSVO Data and Documentation

PSVOs would record data to estimate the numbers of marine mammals and turtles exposed to various received sound levels and to document the behavior of the animal upon sighting. These data would be included in the report submitted to NMFS and/or USFWS and would be used to help estimate numbers of marine mammals potentially 'taken' by harassment (as defined in the MMPA). PSVOs would also provide information needed to order a power down or shutdown of airguns when marine mammals or turtles are within or near the MZ.

When a sighting is made, the following information would be recorded:

1. Species, group size, age/size/sex categories (if determined), behavior when first sighted and after initial sighting, heading (if consistent), bearing and distance from seismic vessel, sighting cue,

swimming behavior relative to the airguns or vessel (e.g., stationary, directed away, approaching, paralleling, etc.), and behavioral pace.
2. Time, location, heading, speed, activity of the vessel, sea state, wind speed, water depth, visibility, and sun glare.

The data listed under (2) would also be recorded at the start and end of each observation watch and during a watch whenever there is a change in one or more of the variables.

All observations, as well as information regarding airgun power down and shutdown, would be recorded in a standardized format. Data accuracy would be verified by the PSVOs at sea, and preliminary reports would be prepared during the field program and summaries forwarded to the operating institution's shore facility and to the respective federal funding agency weekly or more frequently if necessary. PSVO observations would provide the following information:

1. The basis for decisions about powering down or shutting down airgun arrays.
2. Information needed to help make estimates of marine mammals and turtles potentially 'taken by harassment.' These data would be reported to NMFS and/or USFWS per terms of MMPA authorizations and ESA ITSs.
3. Data on the occurrence, distribution, and activities of marine mammals and turtles in the area where the seismic study is conducted.
4. Data on the behavior and movement patterns of marine mammals seen at times with and without seismic survey activity.

A report would be submitted to NMFS and/or USFWS after the cruise in compliance with terms of authorizations for marine mammal or endangered species takes. The report would describe the seismic operations and include a complete description of the data collected about marine mammals, turtles, and any other threatened or endangered species observed.

NSF, NMFS, and USGS recognize situations where low-energy sources and/or limited duration of use in locations of deeper water and expected low-density of marine mammals/turtles, coupled with PSVO efforts and shut-down measures represent a no-take situation. While NSF would not request, and NMFS would not issue, MMPA authorizations in these situations, NSF would still require information from the seismic survey operator before the cruise regarding airgun operation plans, including plans for PSVO observations, and a report after the cruise discussing the actual usage of airguns and marine mammal observations. The USGS already follows and would continue to follow similar procedures for seismic research cruises it conducts.

In response to a public comment on the Draft PEIS regarding the effectiveness of current monitoring methods during seismic surveys, NSF and USGS believe that the described visual monitoring program, which is consistent with current practices, will be sufficient to visually detect, with reasonable certainty, most marine mammals within or entering identified MZs. At present, NMFS views the combination of visual and passive acoustic monitoring as the most effective mitigation techniques available for detecting marine mammals within or entering the MZ. The action agencies are receptive to incorporating proven technologies and techniques to enhance the monitoring and mitigation program. In this vein, NSF, in collaboration with other federal agencies have offered a funding opportunity through the National Oceanographic Partnership Program to improve the technologies and existing capabilities to detect, classify and locate marine mammals in survey areas during seismic operations. Results from this funding opportunity may push the boundaries of current technologies and methodologies for monitoring exclusion zones. Until proven technological advances or enhancements are made for visual observation practices, the action agencies will continue to provide the current visual observation services during surveys.

Proposed Safety Radii or MZ: Operations for Which Incidental Take of Marine Mammals is Anticipated

For operations under an IHA or LOA under Alternative A, detection of marine mammals within a specified distance around the airguns (the MZ) would be followed by an immediate power down or shutdown of the airguns. The mitigation radii under Alternative A would normally be the distances at which the effective received sound level would diminish below 190 or 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Radii were calculated for both M-weighted as well as flat (unweighted) levels. These radii are determined by acoustical modeling that considers site-specific acoustic characteristics (water depth, in particular), the airgun configurations to be used, and the hearing characteristics of expected marine mammals in the study area. Modeling would incorporate the most current data on airgun output and species hearing characteristics as it becomes available. However, for certain cetaceans of special concern, more precautionary criteria would apply (see "*Special Mitigation Measures*" below).

Table 2-11 shows the estimated mitigation radii under Alternative A for the seismic surveys that are assumed to occur in the five DAAs (from Appendix B). In DAAs where airguns would operate in both deep (>3,281 ft [>1,000 m]) and shallower areas, mitigation radii are shown separately for the two depth strata. For cetaceans, the mitigation distances are the unweighted and M_{lf}-, M_{mf}- and M_{hf}-weighted 180 dB rms distances. For pinnipeds, they are the unweighted and M_{pw}-weighted 190 dB rms distances. The acoustic modeling methods by which these distances were calculated are described in Appendix B.

Table 2-11. Summary of Level A Flat- and M-weighted Mitigation Radii under Alternative A for DAAs

DAA	*Source*	*Shallow/Deep Mitigation Radii (m)**				
		Weighting	*LF Cetaceans*	*MF Cetaceans*	*HF Cetaceans*	*Pinnipeds*
Caribbean	2-D full refraction 36 airguns, 6,600 in^3, 4 strings, 12-m tow depth	Flat-wt	1,379/806	1,379/806	1,379/806	380/252
		M-wt	1,338/741	533/234	447/182	262/102
NW Atlantic	High resolution 3D, 1 pair of 45/105 in^3 GI guns, 2.5-m tow depth	Flat-wt	64/36	64/36	64/36	14/14
		M-wt	64/36	28/14	28/14	14/<10
S California	High resolution 3D, 1 pair 45/105 in^3 GI guns, 2.5-m tow depth	Flat-wt	64/NA	64/NA	64/NA	20/NA
		M-wt	64/NA	30/NA	30/NA	14/NA
Galapagos	3-D reflection, 2 strings of 9 airguns (18 guns), 3,300 in^3, 6-m tow depth	Flat-wt	NA/360	NA/360	NA/360	NA/110
		M-wt	NA/345	NA/180	NA/140	NA/81
W Gulf of Alaska	3-D reflection, 2 strings of 9 airguns (18 guns), 3,300 in^3, 6-m tow depth	Flat-wt	1,012/347	1,012/347	1,012/347	206/104
		M-wt	1,012/342	478/177	398/139	196/76

Notes: *NA = not applicable. Cetacean radii are estimated at 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). For cetaceans of particular concern, more precautionary procedures would be employed (see *Special Mitigation Measures*). Pinniped radii are estimated at 190 dB re 1 µPa (rms).

Proposed Safety Radii or MZ: Operations for Which Incidental Take of Marine Mammals is not Anticipated or Authorized

Shutdowns or power downs would be required whenever marine mammals or turtles are detected within an FMZ, defined as an extended MZ encompassing the full region in which NMFS estimates behavioral disturbance (≥160 dB re 1 µPa [rms]), also called 'Level B harassment', might occur. The FMZ must be clearly visible and PSVOs available to monitor it throughout any period of seismic source use. These operations would use low-energy seismic sound sources in which 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) is not exceeded or within close proximity to the source, and the extent of 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) sound levels are within 200 m of the source.

While technically the FMZ may be an overestimation of the area potentially ensonified to 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms), it must be within a range that can be effectively monitored. Proposed use of sources would be on the order of hours or short-duration shooting over several days (not extensive track-lines). Examples of proposed actions would be use of 1-2 GI-guns for bore-hole testing (e.g., VSP). The small number of

airguns in these situations limits application of ramp-ups and power-downs. Immediate shut-down for a marine mammal or turtle approaching the FMZ would be the primary mitigation response.

With mitigation, no takes would be expected. When proposed research cannot avoid an area of particular sensitivity, the action would require additional considerations and potentially an incidental take authorization. In general, surveying with small sources as well as VSP carried out in the vicinity of drill sites (stationary vessel sources) that have habitat sensitivity or other issues that might require a specific incidental take authorization (e.g., IHA or LOA) would be determined in consultation with NMFS OPR.

Mitigation during Operations

Operational measures to mitigate the impact of sound on marine mammals and turtles include:

1. Vessel speed or course alteration;
2. Airgun array power down;
3. Airgun array shutdown;
4. Airgun array ramp-up; and
5. Special mitigation measures for circumstances of particular concern.

Speed or course alteration. If a marine mammal or turtle is detected outside the MZ but is likely to enter it based on relative movement of the vessel and the animal, then if safety and scientific objectives allow, the vessel speed and/or course would be adjusted to minimize the likelihood of the animal entering the MZ. It should be noted that major course and speed adjustments are often impractical when towing long seismic streamers and large source arrays; thus for surveys involving large sources, alternative mitigation measures would often be required.

Power down procedures. A power down involves reducing the number of airguns operating to a single airgun in order to minimize the size of the MZ. The continued operation of one airgun is intended to alert marine mammals and turtles to the presence of the seismic vessel nearby.

If a marine mammal or turtle is detected within, or is likely to enter the MZ of the array in use, and if vessel course/speed changes are impractical or would not be effective to prevent the animal from entering the MZ, then the array would be powered down to ensure the animal remains outside the smaller MZ of the single airgun. If the size of the MZ for the single airgun would not prevent the animal from entering it, then a shutdown would be required, as described below.

Following a power down, airgun activity would not resume until the marine mammal or turtle is outside the MZ for the full array. The animal would be considered to have cleared the MZ if it:

- is visually observed to have left the MZ;
- has not been seen within the MZ for 15 min in the case of small odontocetes, pinnipeds, and sea otters;
- has not been seen within the MZ for 30 min in the case of mysticetes and large odontocetes, including sperm, pygmy sperm, dwarf sperm, and beaked whales; or
- the vessel has moved outside the applicable MZ in which the animal in question was last seen.

Following a power down and subsequent animal departure as noted above, the airgun array would resume operations following ramp-up procedures described below.

Shutdown procedures. If a marine mammal or turtle is within or about to enter the MZ for a single airgun, or for a single airgun following a power down, all operational airguns would be shut down immediately.

Airgun activity would not resume until the animal had cleared the MZ for the full array of airguns to be used, as described above.

Ramp-up procedures. A ramp-up procedure would be followed when an airgun array begins operating after a specified period without operations. The period would vary depending on the speed of the source vessel and the size of the airgun array being used (i.e., number and size of airguns). The specified period is defined as the time taken for the source vessel to travel the radius of the MZ specified for the array to be used.

Ramp-up would begin with the smallest airgun in the array. Airguns would be added in a sequence such that the source level of the array would increase in steps not exceeding 6 dB per 5-min period. A 36-airgun array would take approximately 30 min to achieve full operation via ramp-up. For smaller, low-energy source arrays (e.g., 2 GI-guns), ramp up would begin with the turning on of the first GI-gun then the second. During ramp-up, the PSVOs would monitor the MZ, and if marine mammals or turtles are sighted, decisions about course/speed changes, power down, and shutdown would be implemented as though the full array were operational.

Initiation of ramp-up procedures from shutdown requires that the FMZ must be visible by the PSVOs for 30 min, whether conducted in daytime or nighttime. This requirement would often preclude startups under nighttime or poor-visibility conditions except for small sources with restricted MZs. Ramp-up is allowed from a power down under reduced visibility conditions, but only if at least one airgun has operated continuously with a source level of at least 180 dB re 1 μPa-m (rms) throughout the survey interruption. It is assumed that the single airgun would alert marine mammals and turtles to the approaching seismic vessel, allowing them to move away if they choose. Ramp-up procedures would not be initiated if a marine mammal or turtle is observed within the MZ of the airgun array to be operated.

Special mitigation measures. Airgun arrays would be shut down (not just powered down) if any of the following four species is sighted from the vessel, even if outside the MZ, due to their rarity and sensitive status: N Pacific right whale, N Atlantic right whale, Northeast Atlantic bowhead whale, and W Pacific gray whale. In case of confirmed sightings of any of these species, airgun operations would not resume until 30 min after the last documented whale visual sighting and the PSVO is confident that the whale is no longer in the vicinity of the vessel. Other species can be designated for special measures when appropriate.

Special measures would also apply over continental slopes, especially regions with submarine canyons, where beaked whales are believed to concentrate. Extra mitigation would be implemented there to minimize potential impacts on these species. Where possible, NSF-funded and USGS seismic surveys would minimize operations near submarine canyons. Extra vigilance, including use of extra PSVOs, would be maintained where such approaches are unavoidable. These special monitoring and mitigation requirements would be established in advance in consultation with NMFS for each cruise that would conduct seismic survey operations over slopes and canyon regions.

In addition to the mitigation efforts described above, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research operations would take special precautions to avoid impacting migrating, breeding, and nursing congregations of marine mammals; waters proximal to nesting sites and feeding areas of sea turtles; and waters important to juvenile or adult listed salmon and other protected species.

2.4.1.2 Effectiveness of Previous Mitigation and Monitoring Measures

As indicated in Table 2-1, from 2003 through 2009, NSF funded 30 academic marine seismic surveys in various oceans. A marine mammal monitoring and mitigation program was implemented during each of

these cruises, and as applicable, for sea turtles as well (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Haley and Koski 2004; Holst 2004; MacLean and Haley 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, b, 2006; Smultea et al. 2004, 2005; MacLean and Koski 2005). A summary of the effectiveness and limitations of the mitigation measures undertaken during L-DEO seismic surveys is summarized briefly below.

The primary objective of the monitoring and mitigation program is to minimize exposure of marine mammals and sea turtles to strong sound pulses. Incidental disturbance in response to received levels below 180 and 190 dB re 1 µPa rms (for cetaceans and pinnipeds, respectively) has been allowed under the IHA process, provided the numbers of animals involved are small and effects are considered negligible, as determined by NMFS. The procedures rely (in part) on avoidance responses by some mammals as one means of reducing risk of exposure to high sound levels. For example, there is evidence that baleen whales will often show avoidance of a small airgun source, suggesting that they will also show avoidance upon onset of a ramp-up when just one airgun is firing (Malme et al. 1985, 1986, 1988, Richardson et al. 1986, McCauley et al. 1998, 2000, 2003 in McCauley and Hughes 2006).

In general, no one monitoring or mitigation measure is entirely effective for every species of marine mammal or sea turtle (e.g., Barlow and Gisiner 2006; LGL Ltd., unpublished data). Thus, a combination of measures is applied during NSF-funded seismic surveys. During NSF-funded surveys since 2003, monitoring and mitigation measures were implemented as described above for Alternative A. These included pre-cruise planning, power/shutdowns when animals were sighted within or approaching the MZ, ramp-ups, and special measures on occasion as required for site-specific concerns. Monitoring efforts included visual observations by trained and NMFS-approved PSVOs, as well as PAM during certain cruises.

Pre-cruise planning, which evaluated and implemented seasonal restrictions and reduced acoustic source size, appears to have been effective during previous L-DEO surveys (LGL Ltd., unpublished data). Areas where concentrations of breeding and calving marine mammals occur were avoided as practicable, as were sea turtle nesting areas. Reducing source sizes, when possible, decreased the source level and also reduced the distances within which specified levels were exceeded.

Even with the most restrictive provisions, some mammals and turtles were seen within the safety radius when first detected and thus were 'taken' according to the existing criteria as specified by NMFS at the time. Power/shutdowns were implemented during surveys when marine mammals or sea turtles were detected within the applicable safety radius (LGL Ltd., unpublished data), thus reducing the cumulative energy exposure; the total sound exposure is important when discussing effects on marine animals (Southall et al. 2007; see Appendix B and Section 2.3.3).

Preliminary analyses of data from the large-source L-DEO surveys show that sighting rates of cetaceans were typically greater during non-seismic than during seismic periods, indicating that some marine mammals did avoid the vessel; results from small-source surveys are less conclusive (Holst et al. 2006). The effectiveness of ramp-up procedures remains uncertain. However, it is assumed that ramp-ups provide animals the chance to leave the ensonified area before the full airgun array is in operation. Marine mammals were seen during ramp-ups on occasion, causing a power/shutdown of the airgun array.

Although injured or dead marine mammals or sea turtles were occasionally seen during NSF-funded seismic surveys, there was no evidence that deaths or injuries were associated with the seismic operations. Dead animals seen from the seismic vessel were often in an advanced state of decomposition and were determined to have died long before they were approached by the seismic vessel.

Visual observations have been an effective monitoring tool as evidenced by the numbers of individual marine mammals and sea turtles observed during L-DEO's past seismic surveys (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004, 2005; MacLean and Koski 2005; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008). However, there are limitations to the effectiveness of visual observations, especially at night, even when NVDs are used (summarized in Smultea and Holst 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Barlow and Gisiner 2006; LGL Ltd., unpublished data). PAM has also been an effective monitoring tool during some NSF-funded surveys, particularly during darkness (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004; LGL Ltd., unpublished data). During various cruises, PAM has been used to detect vocalizing animals not seen by PSVOs (and vice versa), though again there are limitations. Non-vocalizing animals cannot be detected using PAM (e.g., Barlow and Gisiner 2006; LGL Ltd., unpublished data). Also, it is usually not possible (with available PAM techniques) to accurately determine the distance or location of a vocalizing marine mammal.

The preliminary results from completed NSF-funded L-DEO academic seismic surveys indicate that monitoring and mitigation measures have been effective in reducing the potential exposure of marine mammals and sea turtles to high-level seismic sounds and, presumably, of biologically significant effects (LGL Ltd., unpublished data). Various monitoring and mitigation methods and measures can be combined to complement one another. Additional information is needed on the effects of various levels of airgun and vessel sounds on marine mammals and sea turtles to better assess the effectiveness of monitoring and mitigation measures. NSF-funded mitigation and monitoring efforts to date have contributed to knowledge on the occurrence, density, and behavior of marine mammals and sea turtles during periods with and without seismic operations. This information can be used to provide animal density estimates to assess potential impacts of past and future seismic (and other) projects, including estimated numbers of animals exposed to various underwater sound levels. Such data are particularly useful in areas where there has been little previous systematic study of marine mammal (or sea turtle) occurrence. Data collected during these NSF-funded cruises have also contributed to assessments of the impacts of seismic survey activities on the distribution, density, and behavior of marine mammal and sea turtle species.

2.4.2 Alternative B: Conduct Marine Seismic Research using Cruise-specific Mitigation Measures with Generic Mitigation Measures for Low-energy Acoustic Sources (Preferred Alternative)

Alternatives A and B differ in how the proposed safety radii or MZs are determined. For operations with no request for MMPA incidental take authorization, the MZs are the same in Alternative A and Alternative B. Where take is expected and authorization is requested, Alternative A would require a specific calculation of MZs and FMZs for every proposed cruise, whereas Alternative B introduces a generic set of MZ conditions that would be applied to low-energy seismic operations (as defined below in Section 2.4.2.1) proposed in water depths greater than 328 ft (100 m).

As seen in Table 2-12, the use of small numbers of GI guns and other acoustic sources for low-energy seismic survey work in waters >328 ft (100 m) in depth, most often conducted on UNOLS and USGS vessels or in support of ocean-drilling operations, have modeled MZs of <328 ft (100 m). Therefore, in Alternative B, NSF and USGS would conservatively apply the use of a 328-ft (100-m) MZ for all low-energy acoustic sources (as defined below in Section 2.4.2.1) in water depths >328 ft (100 m).

Table 2-12. Summary of Modeled Level A Mitigation Radii for Low-Energy Sources used in Previous Seismic Survey Cruises or Proposed in this PEIS

DAA or Previous Cruise	*Source*	*Tow Depth (m)*	*Est. Max. Mitigation Radii (m) at RL of 180 dB** Depth (m) *100-1,000*	*>1,000*
DAA in this PEIS				
NW Atlantic DAA[1]	1 pair 105-in^3 GI guns	2.5	57	36
S California DAA[1]	1 pair 105-in^3 GI guns	2.5	64	
Previous Cruises				
2004, NW Atlantic	1 80-in^3 GI gun	3		36
2004, NW Atlantic 2005, SW Pacific	1 pair 105-in^3 GI guns	3		54
2004, Gulf of Alaska	1 pair 105-in^3 GI guns	3	81	54
2004, E Trop. Pacific	1 105-in^3 GI gun	2.5	41	27
2005, Aleutians	1 105-in^3 GI gun	3	41	27
2006, Louisville Ridge 2006-07, S Pacific 2007, NE Indian Ocean	1 pair 45-in^3 G guns	2	60	40 40 40
2006, E Trop. Pacific	1 pair 105-in^3 GI guns	2		54
2007, NE Pacific; 2008, NE Pacific; 2008, SB Channel 2009, NE Pacific	1 45-in^3 GI gun	2.5	35 35 35 35	23 23 23 23
2009, NW Atlantic	1 pair 45-in^3 G guns 1 45-in^3 GI gun	3 2.5	60 35	
Previous Cruise	*Source*		*Est. Max. Mitigation Radii (m) at RL of 180 dB**	
2008, Santa Barbara Channel	BOOMER			
	SL = 203 dB re 1 µPa (rms)		2 (measured) 16 (modeled)	
	SL = 188.8 dB re 1 µPa (rms)		2.3 (measured) 2.7 (modeled)	
	SL = 209 dB re 1 µPa (rms)		28 (modeled)	
Dana Point & Point Reyes, California[2] (USGS)	SIG 2 mille sparker @ 1,500 joules		25	
Gulf of Mexico[3] (USGS)	Huntec boomer		17	
	Edgetech 5121 chirp		8	
	15 in^3 water gun		15	
	13 in^3 GI gun		15	
	24 in^3 GI gun		25	
	35 in^3 GI gun		25	

Notes: *Cetacean radii are estimated at 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). For cetaceans of particular concern, more precautionary procedures would be employed (see *Special Mitigation Measures*). Pinniped radii are estimated at 190 dB (rms).

Sources: [1] This PEIS; [2] Hart et al. 2006; [3] Hutchinson and Hart 2003.

For proposed seismic research utilizing higher numbers of guns and energy levels, NSF and USGS would continue to utilize cruise-specific MZs based on acoustic modeling detailed under Alternative A. The mitigation and monitoring measures (e.g., PSVOs, power downs, etc.) proposed for use under Alternative A would also be implemented under Alternative B for both low- and high-energy acoustic sources.

2.4.2.1 Low-Energy Acoustic Sources for Seismic Research

For the purposes of this PEIS, a low-energy source is defined as a towed acoustic source whose received level is ≤180 dB at 328 ft (100 m) (Table 2-13). Based on this definition and previous modeling results of various acoustic sources previously assumed to be low-energy sources, the following categories of acoustic sources are defined as low-energy seismic sources:

- GI Guns:
  - Any single or any two GI guns.
  - Three or four GI guns, within the allowable range of tow depths and element separations listed in Table 2-13 and explained in detail in Appendix F.
- Generic single-chamber airguns:
  - A tuned array of four airguns (volumes between 25 and 160 in^3 each) within the allowable range of tow depths and element separations listed in Table 2-13 and explained in detail in Appendix F.
  - A single pair of clustered airguns with individual volumes of 250 in^3 or less.
  - Two small 2-clusters (four airguns) with maximum volumes of 45 in^3.
  - Any single airgun 425 in^3 or smaller, at any tow depth.
- Any sparker, boomer, water gun, or chirp system towed from the research vessel at any depth and with a source level <205 dB re 1µPa-m.

Table 2-13. Defined Low-Energy Towed Sources under Alternative B

Acoustic Source	*Volume*	*Tow Depth*	*Spacing*
GI GUNS			
1-2 GI Guns	Any	Any	Any
3-4 GI Guns	See Appendix F	See Appendix F	See Appendix F
GENERIC SINGLE CHAMBER AIRGUNS			
Tuned array of 4	25-160 in^3 each	See Appendix F	See Appendix F
1 clustered pair	≤250 in^3 each	Any	Any
2 small clustered pairs	≤45 in^3 each	Any	Any
1 single	≤425 in^3	Any	Not applicable
Acoustic Source	*Source Level*	*Tow Depth*	
BOOMER, SPARKER, WATER GUN, AND CHIRP	≤205 dB re 1µPa-m	Any	

Under Alternative B, for any seismic survey cruise that proposes a low-energy source as defined above, there would be a standard MZ of 328 ft (100 m) for all marine mammals and turtles. For acoustic sources not defined as low-energy sources, cruise-specific MZs would need to be modeled to determine the effective MZs for marine mammals and turtles.

2.4.3 Comparison of Alternative A and Alternative B

Table 2-14 provides a summary of the MZs proposed under Alternative A and Alternative B.

Table 2-14. Comparison of Alternatives A and B

Stipulation	*Alternative A*	*Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)*
200-m FMZ for expected no-take situations	X	X
100-m MZ for defined low-energy sources		X
Cruise-specific calculations of MZs for all sources defined as low energy	X	
Cruise-specific calculations of FMZs for all sources defined as low or high energy	X	X

2.4.4 Alternative C: No-Action Alternative

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF would not fund and USGS would not conduct marine seismic research using airguns and other acoustic sources (e.g., MBES, SBP, pingers, etc.). The seismic data from the proposed surveys have important implications for scientific research and, in some cases, human safety and well-being. The No-Action Alternative, through the loss of geophysical seismic research funding, would result in a loss of important scientific data and knowledge relevant to a number of research fields (e.g., detection of gas hydrate deposits and offshore freshwater aquifers; understanding of geohazards such as earthquake faults, the potential for submarine slide development and tsunami generation; and/or information about marine habitats and offshore cultural features). For geohazard or resource issues, this lack of further data acquisition could have a potentially harmful effect on marine or human populations. While the No-Action Alternative is not considered a reasonable alternative because it does not meet the purpose and need for the Proposed Action, as required under CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.14[d]), the No-Action Alternative is carried forward for analysis.

2.5 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

Adaptive management principles consider appropriate adjustments to mitigation, monitoring, and reporting as the outcomes of the proposed actions and required mitigation are better understood. NMFS includes adaptive management principles in the incidental take authorizations for the implementation of the proposed action, and any adaptive adjustments of mitigation and monitoring would be led by NMFS via the MMPA process and developed in coordination with NSF, including for subsequent tiered or supplemental NEPA documents following this PEIS. Continued opportunity for public input would be included via the MMPA process, as appropriate. The intent of adaptive management here is to ensure the continued proper implementation of the required mitigation measures, to conduct appropriate monitoring and evaluation efforts, and to recommend possible adjustments to the mitigation/monitoring/reporting to accomplish the established goals of the mitigation and monitoring which include:

1. Mitigation
    a) Avoidance or minimization of behavioral disturbance, injury, serious injury, or death of marine mammals wherever possible (goals b, c, and d may contribute to this goal).
    b) A reduction in the numbers of marine mammals (total number or number at biologically important time or location) exposed to received levels of acoustic sources used in marine seismic research or other activities expected to result in the take of marine mammals (this goal may contribute to a, above, or to reducing harassment takes only).
    c) A reduction in the number of times (total number or number at biologically important time or location) individuals would be exposed to received levels of acoustic sources used in marine seismic research or other activities expected to result in the take of marine mammals (this goal may contribute to a, above, or to reducing harassment takes only).
    d) A reduction in the intensity of exposures (either total number or number at biologically important time or location) to received levels of acoustic sources used in marine seismic research or other activities expected to result in the take of marine mammals (this goal may contribute to (a), above, or to reducing the severity of harassment takes only).
    e) A reduction in adverse effects to marine mammal habitat, paying special attention to the food base, activities that block or limit passage to or from biologically important areas, permanent destruction of habitat, or temporary destruction/disturbance of habitat during a biologically important time (*Note*: implementation of the Proposed Action is not anticipated to result in adverse effects to habitat).

f) For monitoring directly related to mitigation - an increase in the probability of detecting marine mammals, thus allowing for more effective implementation of the mitigation (shutdown zone, etc.).

2. Monitoring
   a) An increase in the probability of detecting marine mammals, both within the FMZ (thus allowing for more effective implementation of the mitigation) and in general to generate more data to contribute to the effects analyses.
   b) An increase in our understanding of how many marine mammals are likely to be exposed to levels of acoustic sources used in marine seismic research that we associate with specific adverse effects, such as behavioral harassment, TTS, or PTS.
   c) An increase in our understanding of how marine mammals respond (behaviorally or physiologically) to acoustic sources used in marine seismic research (at specific received levels) or other stimuli expected to result in take and how anticipated adverse effects on individuals (in different ways and to varying degrees) may impact the population, species, or stock (specifically through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival).
   d) An increased knowledge of the affected species.
   e) An increase in our understanding of the effectiveness of certain mitigation and monitoring measures.
   f) A better understanding and record of the manner in which the authorized entity complies with an incidental take authorization.

Generally speaking, adaptive management supports the integration of NEPA's principles into the ongoing implementation and management of the Proposed Action, including a process for improving, where needed, the effectiveness of the identified mitigations. Note that any adjustment of mitigation and monitoring would be evaluated to determine whether it would be within the scope of the environmental analyses and considerations presented in this PEIS.

2.6 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

No other action alternatives have been identified that would meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. Although there are "standard" mitigation measures and radii in place for other agencies and jurisdictions (e.g., Australian Department of Environment and Heritage [ADEH] 2001; Joint Nature Conservation Committee 2004; Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada [DFOC] 2005b; New Zealand Department of Conservation 2006; Minerals Management Service [MMS] 2007), these measures are not based on site- or source-specific acoustic modeling and also do not take into account the known or expected hearing abilities of the different groups of marine mammals. For example, DFOC (2005b) and MMS (2007) require a standard 1,640-ft (500-m) mitigation radius around all seismic survey operations using airguns irrespective of the number or size of airguns being used, water depth, or marine mammal species. Both action alternatives would utilize the most current, scientifically accurate predictive mitigation radii based on acoustical modeling that considers site-specific acoustic characteristics, the cruise-specific airgun arrays and their acoustic and operational parameters. Alternatives A and B were modeled in two ways, using both the unweighted (flat) and M-weighted received levels, which reflect the expected hearing capabilities of specific marine mammal groups.

Due to the potential impacts on marine mammals and other marine resources from the predominantly LF sound generated from airguns, alternatives to the use of airguns as the primary acoustic source in marine seismic surveys have been proposed, including, but not limited to:

- As an alternative to airguns, a quieter marine vibrator has been developed with significantly less energy above 100 Hz (Deffenbaugh 2002; Weilgart 2010). However, with the constant movement of the vibrator in the marine environment, spatial resolution of the received acoustic signal is significantly degraded. Therefore, at this time, this technology is not capable of addressing the needs of NSF-funded or USGS-conducted marine geophysical science.
- In terms of measuring the physical properties of the deep earth, the use of a controlled electromagnetic source has been proposed (Weilgart 2010). The resolution and capabilities of this technique are greatly limited at this time, and its use is dependent on the electrical properties of the sedimentary materials, which are very different than the seismic properties. For example, it cannot map sedimentary layering or fault surfaces, and cannot accurately delineate the boundary between the crust and the mantle (or the moho). The mapping of these subsurface characteristics is an important purpose of marine seismic surveys. The use of an electromagnetic source would be considered a supplement to current marine seismic techniques using airguns.
- Additional controlled sources that have been proposed include a low-frequency acoustic projector (e.g., Low-Impact Seismic Array or LISA), a solid-state piezo-ceramic Helmbolz resonator (e.g., Deep-Towed Acoustic/Geophysics System or DTAGS), and other non-impulsive, oscillating sound sources (Weilgart 2010).
- Other alternatives that have been proposed include a mobile sea floor source with trawled surface receivers and a highly sensitive optical fiber hydrophone (Dolman et al. 2006; Weilgart 2010). There have also been discussions regarding the development of "suppressor" or "silencer" devices to reduce an airgun's higher frequency output (Dolman et al. 2006; Weilgart 2010).

None of these alternative technologies are currently at a state of development in terms of resolution, efficiency, and overall capability to meet the purpose and need of current marine seismic research objectives. As these and other technologies become more advanced and capable of meeting the needs of researchers, they would be considered for use in future NSF-funded and USGS-conducted marine seismic research after further environmental review.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

CHAPTER 3
AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This chapter describes the existing environmental conditions in and around the five DAAs and eight QAAs for resources potentially affected by implementation of Alternative A or B as described in Chapter 2. Information presented in this chapter represents baseline conditions against which the alternatives are evaluated to identify potential impacts.

In compliance with NEPA, CEQ regulations, and EO 12114, the description of the affected environment focuses only on those resources potentially subject to impacts. Accordingly, the discussion of the affected environment (and associated environmental analyses) focuses on marine biological resources, cultural resources, and socioeconomics within the DAAs and QAAs. Several additional resources that are generally evaluated in the preparation of an PEIS were not evaluated in this PEIS because it was determined that implementation of Alternative A or B would be unlikely to have any effect on these resources: transportation and circulation, air quality, land use, safety, hazardous materials and management, geological resources, water resources, terrestrial biological resources, environmental justice, and visual resources. A brief explanation of the reasons why each resource has been excluded from analysis in this PEIS is provided below.

Transportation. Generally, only a single research vessel is used during a marine seismic survey cruise within a given area. Therefore, projected increases in vessel traffic due to implementation of Alternative A or B would constitute a negligible portion of the total existing vessel traffic in the analysis areas.

Air Quality. The emissions from research vessels conducting marine seismic surveys across the world's oceans is expected to have a negligible impact on the air quality within any analysis area.

Land Use. Since all proposed marine seismic research activities would occur within the marine environment, there would be no impacts to land use or associated land use policies.

Safety and Hazardous Materials Use and Management. All safety and hazardous materials concerns would be restricted to activities occurring on the research vessel and would only have potential impacts on the crew and personnel of the research vessel. Each research vessel has standard safety and hazardous material management guidelines and procedures that must be followed by all crew members, personnel, and visiting scientists while aboard the vessel.

Geological Resources. Implementation of Alternative A or B would not adversely affect geological resources as only minor impacts would occur (e.g., use of OBS/Hs on the ocean bottom).

Water Resources. Activities conducted during proposed marine seismic surveys would not introduce any materials or substances into the marine environment that would adversely affect marine water quality. Therefore, there would be no impacts to water resources with implementation of Alternative A or B.

Terrestrial Biological Resources. All proposed marine seismic research activities would occur within the marine environment and would not impact terrestrial biological resources.

Environmental Justice. Implementation of Alternative A or B would comply with EO 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority and Low-income Populations* and EO 13045, *Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*. Alternative A or B would occur within the offshore marine environment and no impacts to schools, children, or minority populations would occur.

Visual Resources. Generally, only a single research vessel is used during a marine seismic survey cruise within a given area. Therefore, implementation of Alternative A or B would have a negligible effect on visual resources within the analysis areas. The proposed marine seismic surveys would not adversely impact any scenic and visual qualities or coastal viewsheds in the analysis areas.

3.1 ACOUSTIC ENVIRONMENT

3.1.1 Ambient Noise

Unwanted sound – sound that clutters and masks other sounds of interest – is known as ambient noise or environmental background noise (Richardson et al. 1995a). Ambient noise comes from natural, both physical and biological, and anthropogenic sources.

3.1.1.1 Wind and Waves

The dominant physical mechanisms of naturally occurring sound in the ocean occur at or near the ocean surface. Wind and waves are common and interrelated sources of ambient noise in the ocean. Other factors being equal, ambient noise levels tend to increase with increasing wind speed and wave height. Surf noise is a form of wave noise localized near the land-sea interface and can raise underwater sound levels by more than 20 dB a few hundred meters outside the surf zone within a frequency of 10 Hz to 10 kHz. At a distance of 5.3 mi (8.5 km), the received sound level in the 100-700 Hz band was approximately 10 dB higher from directions toward the beach. Surf noise may be prominent near shore even in calm wind conditions (Urick 1984; Richardson et al. 1995a; National Research Council [NRC] 2003a).

3.1.1.2 Precipitation

Precipitation on the ocean surface also contributes sound to the ocean. In general, noise from rain or hail is an important component of total noise at frequencies >500 Hz during periods of precipitation. Rain can increase natural ambient noise levels by up to 35 dB across a broad band of frequencies from several hundred Hz to more than 20 kHz (Richardson et al. 1995a; NRC 2003a). Heavy precipitation associated with large storms can generate noise at frequencies as low as 100 Hz and significantly affect ambient noise levels at a considerable distance from the storm's center (U.S. Navy 2001). In addition, thunder and lightning are loud, explosive events that have a short-term local effect on ambient noise. Underwater recordings of received sound of thunder from a storm 3-6 mi (5-10 km) away have been measured up to 15 dB above background levels at peak frequencies between 50 and 250 Hz (NRC 2003a). The source level of lightning strikes on the water surface has been estimated to be 260 dB (Urick 1984; Hill 1985).

3.1.1.3 Geological Noise

Noise from earthquake, volcanic, and hydrothermal vent activity can contribute significantly to ambient noise at low frequencies, particularly in geologically active areas. Movement of sediment by currents across the ocean bottom can also be a significant source of ambient noise at frequencies from 1 to >200 kHz (NRC 2003a).

3.1.1.4 Sea Ice Noise

Although the levels of sea ice noise are highly variable, sea ice noise can be significant at high latitudes. The impact from ice cover varies according to the type and degree of ice cover, whether it is shore-fast pack ice, ice floes and moving pack ice, or at the marginal ice zone (NRC 2003a). Noise from sea ice arises from two mechanisms: thermal stress and mechanical stress. Thermal stress occurs when temperature changes induce cracking. Mechanical stress occurs when pressure from wind and currents causes ice deformation and produces significant noise at low frequencies. Noise from ice deformation has

been measured at frequencies of 4-200 Hz with source levels for 4- and 8-Hz tones ranging from 124 to 137 dB re 1 μPa-m (Urick 1984; Richardson et al. 1995a).

3.1.1.5 Biological Noise

Biological sources of underwater noise are sounds created by animals and can contribute significantly to the ambient noise levels in certain areas of the ocean. Marine mammals are major contributors, but some Crustacea (e.g., snapping shrimp) and fish (e.g., drumfish) can also be significant. Frequencies of biological noises range from approximately 12 Hz to over 100,000 Hz (Richardson et al. 1995a; NRC 2003a).

3.1.1.6 Shallow Water Ambient Noise

Shallow water is often defined as water <656 ft (200 m) deep. There is a wider range of ambient noise levels and frequency in shallow water than in deep water under similar wind and wave conditions. The primary sources of noise in shallow water regions are shipping, industrial, or seismic-survey activities; wind and waves; and biological noise. Sound propagation in shallow water is strongly influenced by bottom conditions, including depth, slope, and type of bottom (e.g., sand, rock). Ambient noise levels tend to be high where the bottom is reflective and low where it is absorptive (Urick 1984; Richardson et al. 1995a).

3.1.1.7 Deep Water Ambient Noise

The primary sources of deep-water ambient noise include shipping, geologic activity, and weather (e.g., precipitation, wind). From 20-300 Hz, noise from shipping usually exceeds noise from wind. Depending on the level of wind-dependent ambient noise, shipping may or may not be significant above 300 Hz. From 500 Hz to 50 kHz, wind, wave, and precipitation dominate the ambient acoustic environment (Urick 1984; Richardson et al. 1995a).

3.1.1.8 Anthropogenic Noise

Most man-made noises that may affect marine mammals or other marine animals come from a few general types of activities that occur on or beneath the ocean: transportation (surface vessels and aircraft), recreation, dredging, construction, hydrocarbon and mineral exploration and extraction, seismic surveys, sonars, explosions, and ocean acoustic studies. Surface vessels are a major contributor to ocean ambient noise, especially at frequencies between 5 and 500 Hz (Richardson et al. 1995a; NRC 2003a; Bradley and Stern 2008).

3.1.2 Factors Affecting Sound Propagation in the Marine Environment

3.1.2.1 Geology, Bottom Topography, and Bottom Substrates

The topography and physical properties of the ocean bottom have a significant influence on the propagation of sound, particularly in shallow water. Sound penetrates sediments easily, particularly at low frequencies and steep angles of incidence (Clay and Medwin 1977; Hamilton 1980). Sound speed and absorption within various sediment layers and underlying bedrock determine travel paths and transmission loss within the sub-bottom, and possibly back into the water column. For example, a smooth, relatively dense bottom (e.g., compacted sand or bedrock) or sub-bottom layers will result in greater reflection of sound back into the water column; more absorptive sediments (e.g., mud) will result in greater bottom loss (Clay and Medwin 1977; Hamilton 1980; Medwin 2005).

3.1.2.2 Temperature and Salinity

The speed of sound in seawater depends on temperature, salinity, and pressure (depth). Vertical gradients in sound speed result in refraction, and thus determine the paths followed by propagating sound. Near the surface, variations in temperature with season and time of day (e.g., from solar heating and wind mixing) produce large variations in sound speed. For example, if the wind has mixed the water to a constant temperature near the surface, then the increase in speed with depth will result in upward refraction (see Section 3.1.2.4). In a temperate or tropical thermocline, temperature and sound speed decrease with depth, but below this, the temperature is constant and sound speed begins to increase again with depth (Pickard and Emery 1990). The resulting sound speed minimum can result in refraction of sound toward the depth at which the minimum occurs (see Section 3.1.2.3). In cold polar waters, the minimum sound speed is usually at the surface, and below that the sound speed increases with depth (Pickard and Emery 1990; Medwin 2005; Bradley and Stern 2008; International Association of Oil & Gas Producers [OGP] 2008).

3.1.2.3 Deep Water Propagation and Acoustic Ducting

As described in Section 3.1.2.2, where the vertical SSP features a mid-water minimum (from the combined effects of temperature and pressure on sound speed), sound will tend to be refracted toward the depth at which this minimum occurs. In deep water (>6,562 ft [2,000 m]), the deep sound channel allows refracted sounds to travel long distances without losses from reflection at the bottom due to the upward-refracting SSP below the deep sound channel. The depth of this channel is around 1,000 m at mid-latitudes and at the surface at high latitudes (Pickard and Emery 1990; Medwin 2005; OGP 2008).

3.1.2.4 Shallow Water Propagation

In shallow water (less than 200 m), SSPs tend to be downward refracting or nearly constant with depth (due to the combined effects of solar heating and wind mixing, as discussed above), resulting in repeated bottom interaction. The intensity of this effect depends on surface temperature (higher near-surface temperatures result in higher surface sound speeds and so greater downward refraction), and thus on season. In well-mixed surface waters or cold polar waters, sound speed increases with depth (see Section 3.1.2.2), and sound will tend to be channeled in a surface duct formed by downward reflection from the sea surface and upward refraction by the positive vertical sound speed gradient (Medwin 2005). Because of the considerable spatial and/or temporal variation in water and bottom properties, as well as the likelihood of multiple bottom reflections (particularly in downward-refracting situations), long-range propagation in shallow water can be complicated and difficult to predict.

3.1.2.5 Winds and Waves

Similar to the effect of bottom topography, wave-related "roughness" of the ocean surface determines how sound is reflected at or transmitted through the air-sea interface. As such, propagation may be reduced when the sea surface is rougher (Weston and Ching 1989). As with bottom roughness, this effect is frequency-dependent. In addition, near-surface wind mixing produces a more constant temperature profile, tending to result in a mildly upward-refracting sound-speed profile, as discussed above.

3.1.2.6 Absorption

As sound waves propagate, they interact at a molecular level with the constituents of seawater through a range of mechanisms, resulting in absorption of sound energy. This occurs even in completely particulate-free waters, and is in addition to scattering that may occur from particulates such as zooplankton or suspended sediments. The absorption of sound energy by water contributes to the transmission loss linearly with range from the source and is given by an attenuation coefficient in units of dB/km. This absorption is computed from empirical equations and increases with the square of frequency from

thousandths of a dB/km at 100 Hz to a few tens of dB/km at 100 kHz (Francois and Garrison 1982a, b; Medwin 2005). Thus, low frequencies are preferentially favored for long-range propagation.

3.1.2.7 Shallow Source and Receiver Effects

Near the sea surface, the sound field includes reflections from the sea-air interface. These reflections, or "ghosts", create interference patterns (maxima and minima in the sound field) with sound traveling directly from the source. In particular, if both the source and the receiver are very shallow, this "Lloyd's mirror interference" may result in the receiver recording a different value than would be expected from spherical spreading from the source in the absence of the surface ghosts (Medwin 2005; OGP 2008).

3.2 MARINE INVERTEBRATES

Marine invertebrates have considerable ecological and economic importance in the world's oceans. They provide the basis of the marine food web, along with phytoplankton (i.e., plant plankton), and support the survival of other marine invertebrates and vertebrates. They also play important roles in nutrient recycling. Marine invertebrate species number in the hundreds of thousands and exhibit considerable variability in form and function. They range in size from microscopic free-swimming and suspended animals known as zooplankton to macro-benthic animals, such as crabs and polychaetes, to enormous giant squids that range up to 1,980 pounds (lbs) (900 kg) in weight and 59 ft (18 m) in length. Various life stages of marine invertebrates occur throughout the water column, as well as on and within the bottom substrate. The distribution and abundance of marine invertebrates is closely tied with the biological productivity of marine waters, which in turn influences the distribution and abundance of higher tropic level species, such as fish, sea turtles, seabirds, and marine mammals.

Of relevance to marine seismic activities are those invertebrates potentially sensitive to low-frequency seismic noise. Limited studies suggest that a few invertebrate groups are capable of detecting seismic noise. Among invertebrates, only decapods (lobsters, crabs and shrimps, including prawns [e.g., Offutt 1970]), and mollusks (cephalopods such as octopuses, squids, cuttlefishes, and nautiluses [e.g., Budelmann and Williamson 1994]) are known to sense low-frequency sound.

No decapod crustaceans or cephalopod species of invertebrates are listed as vulnerable, threatened, or endangered within the 13 analysis areas (Table 3.2-1) (NOAA Fisheries 2006a; Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species [CITES] 2010; International Union for the Conservation of Nature [IUCN] 2010). The white abalone is a non-cephalopod mollusk listed as endangered under the ESA and is found in the S California DAA. U.S.-designated EFH for invertebrates occurs in three of the analysis areas as indicated below (see Chapter 1 for regulations associated with EFH).

Table 3.2-1. Summary of the Status, Economic Importance, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species/Group	*Status[a] ESA/MSA/ IUCN/CITES*	*Economic Importance[b]*	*General Ecology, Depth, Habitat, Prey[c]*	*Horizontal Distribution, Migratory Movement[d]*
DECAPOD CRUSTACEANS				
Lobsters	-/-/-/-	M	S, B, BII/BIE	ICS, NS/IO
Crabs	-/EFH/-/-	M	S, B, BII/BIE	ICS, NS/IO
Shrimps	-/-/-/-	H	S/I, D/P, BIE/PI	ICS/OCS, IO
CEPHALOPOD MOLLUSCS				
Octopuses	-/-/-/-	L	S/I, B/D, BII/BIE	ICS/OCS/BCS, IO
Squids	-/EFH/-/-	H	S/I/D, P, BIE/PI/DF/PF	ICS/OCS/BCS, HM
Cuttlefishes	-/-/-/-	L	S, D/P, BIE	ICS/OCS, IO
Nautiluses	-/-/-/-	L	S, D/P, BIE/PI/DF	OCS/BCS, IO

Notes: [a] - = no species listed.
[b] Relative ratings of economic importance: H = high, M = medium, L = low; based on recent landings values in relevant Large Marine Ecosystems and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Areas.
[c] Typical water depth: S = shallow (< 100 m), I = intermediate (100-1,000 m), D = deep (>1,000 m); Habitat Type: B = benthic, D = demersal, P = pelagic; Typical Prey: BII = benthic invertebrate infauna, BIE = benthic invertebrate epifauna, PI = pelagic invertebrates, DF = demersal fish, PF = pelagic fish.
[e] Horizontal Distribution: ICS = inner continental shelf (<50 m), OCS = outer continental shelf (50-200 m), BCS = beyond continental shelf (>200 m); Migratory Variability: NS = negligible shift, IO = slight inshore-offshore movement, HM = highly migratory.
Sources: Barnes 1980; Sea Around Us Project (SAUP) 2010; U.S. Navy 2005; CephBase 2006; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010; NOAA Fisheries 2010.

In terms of commercial value worldwide, shrimps are the most economically important crustaceans, followed by lobsters and crabs. Among cephalopods, squids are the most economically important, followed by octopuses, cuttlefishes, and nautiluses.

This chapter provides an overview of the taxonomic characteristics of decapods and cephalopod mollusks due to their sensitivity to low-frequency sounds. A summary of their economic importance with respect to fisheries, general ecology, and typical distribution and migratory movements is provided in Table 3.2-1. The review section is followed by a general summary of the known occurrence, abundance, and ecology of these groups in the five DAAs and the eight QAAs.

3.2.1 Overview of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks

3.2.1.1 Decapods (Lobsters, Shrimp, and Crabs)

The order Decapoda includes the largest and some of the most highly specialized crustaceans. With over 8,500 species, Decapoda is the largest order of crustaceans, representing approximately one-third of the known species of crustaceans. Most decapod crustaceans are marine, and they occur in all of the world's oceans. Benthic decapods including lobsters and 'true' crabs are adapted for crawling on the bottom substrate. Both lobsters and crabs are found on all types of substrate over a range of water depths. Many shrimps (including the peneaid shrimps better known as prawns) are also benthic, but some species are better adapted to swimming and have a more pelagic lifestyle. Shrimps occur in both coastal and oceanic waters. Although pelagic shrimps occur at all water depths, most are found in epipelagic (0-653 ft [0-200 m] depth) and mesopelagic waters (656-3,281 ft [200-1,000 m] depth). Pelagic shrimps typically exhibit diel vertical migration, occurring near bottom during the day and migrating up in the water column at night. Most decapods obtain their food by both predation and scavenging. Female decapods generally brood their eggs attached to the underside of their abdomens. One exception to this are penaeid shrimp (i.e., prawns; *Penaeus* spp.). Penaeids disperse their fertilized eggs into the water where development occurs. Decapod larvae are typically planktonic.

3.2.1.2 Cephalopods (Squid, Octopus, Cuttlefish, and Nautilus)

Cephalopods occur in all of the world's oceans and include over 780 known living species of octopus, squid, cuttlefish, and nautilus. The largest marine invertebrates are cephalopods. Cephalopods have well-developed senses and large brains and are generally considered the most intelligent of all invertebrates. Adapted to a pelagic or demersal existence, these predators typically swim using a water jet produced by expelling water from their body cavities. Nautiluses tend to be slower swimmers than octopuses, squids, and cuttlefishes. Octopuses usually crawl in benthic habitat but still use jet propulsion to escape. Fertilized eggs are typically encased and either deposited or shed into the seawater. Cephalopod eggs generally develop directly into adults, although some cephalopod species do have pelagic larval/juvenile stages.

3.2.1.3 Acoustic Capabilities

Most available information on acoustic abilities as they relate to marine invertebrates pertains to crustaceans, specifically lobsters, crabs, and shrimps. Fewer acoustic-related studies have been conducted on cephalopods, as summarized below.

<u>Sound Production</u>

Many invertebrates are capable of producing sound, including barnacles, amphipods, shrimp, crabs, and lobsters (Au and Banks 1998; Tolstoganova 2002). Invertebrates typically produce sound by scraping or rubbing various parts of their bodies, although they also produce sound in other ways. Sounds made by

marine invertebrates are primarily associated with territorial behavior, mating, courtship, and aggression. A summary of what is known about the function of sound production in decapod crustaceans is presented below. Details on the characteristics of these sounds in terms of frequency range, source levels, etc. are summarized in Table 3.2-2.

Table 3.2-2. Summary of Underwater Acoustic Capabilities of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks

	Sound Production		Detection		
Group	*Frequency Range (Hz)*	*Source SPL (dB re 1 µPa-m)*	*Frequency Range (Hz)*	*Dominant Frequency (Hz)*	*Minimum Threshold SPL (dB re 1 µPa)*
Decapods					
Lobsters (*Homarus*)	87-261[a, b]	18.5$_{(?)}$[a, b]		20-5,000[a]	
Lobsters (*Panulirus*)	3,300-66,000[c]	50.1-143.6$_{(?)}$ [c]			
Lobsters (*Nephrops*)				20-200[j]	
Crabs	100-18,000[d]				
Shrimps	2,000-200,000[e]	166-172$_{(rms)}$[e]	100-3,000[f]	100[f]	105$_{(rms)}$[f]
Cephalopods					
Octopuses			1-100[g] 400-1,000[k] 50-150[l] 50-283[m]		120$_{(rms)}$[l]
Squids			1-100[g] 400-1,500[l]		
Cuttlefishes			20-9,000[h, i]		

Notes: (?) = unspecified.

Sources: [a]Pye and Watson III 2004; [b]Henninger and Watson 2005; [c]Latha et al. 2005; [d]Tolstoganova 2002; [e]Range provided is transformed from 183-189 $_{(Peak\text{-}Peak)}$, as reported in Au and Banks (1998); [f]Lovell et al. 2005a; [g]Packard et al. 1990; [h]Komak et al. 2005; [i]Rawizza 1995; [j]Goodall et al. 1990; [k]Hu et al. 2009; [l]Kaifu et al. 2007; [m]Kaifu et al. 2008.

Both male and female American lobsters produce a buzzing vibration with their carapace when grasped (Pye and Watson III 2004; Henninger and Watson III 2005). Larger lobsters vibrate more consistently than smaller lobsters, suggesting that sound production is involved with mating behavior. Sound production by other species of lobsters has also been studied. Among deep-sea lobsters, sound intensity was more variable at night than during the day, with the highest intensities occurring at the lowest frequencies.

While feeding, king crabs produce pulsed sounds that appear to stimulate movement by other crabs receiving the sounds, including approach behavior (Tolstoganova 2002). King crabs also appeared to produce 'discomfort' sounds when environmental conditions were manipulated. These discomfort sounds differ from the feeding sounds in terms of frequency range and pulse duration.

Snapping shrimp are among the major sources of biological sound in temperate and tropical shallow-water areas (Au and Banks 1998). By rapidly closing one of its frontal chela (claws), a snapping shrimp generates a loud click and produces a forward jet of water. Both the sound and the jet of water function as weapons in the territorial behavior of alpheidae shrimp. Measured source SPLs for snapping shrimp ranged from approximately 166-172 dB (rms) re 1 µPa-m (peak-to-peak = 183-189 dB), and extended over a frequency range of 2-200 kHz (Table 3.2-2).

Sound Detection

There is considerable debate about the hearing capabilities of aquatic invertebrates. Whether they are able to hear or not depends on how underwater sound and underwater hearing are defined. In contrast to fish

and aquatic mammals, no physical structures have been discovered in aquatic invertebrates (except aquatic insects) that are stimulated by the pressure component of sound. However, vibrations (i.e., mechanical disturbances of the water) characterize sound waves as well. Rather than being pressure-sensitive, invertebrates appear to be most sensitive to the vibrational component of sound or particle motion (Breithaupt 2002). Particle motion is a measure of the back and forth motion of particles within a medium (e.g., water) relative to their static positions. Localized motion within a medium caused by the energy from a sound wave is called 'acoustic particle velocity'. When an aquatic animal is ensonified, the sound energy creates forces and motions inside the animal's body just as it does in a fluid medium. The role of particle motion in underwater sound is rapidly becoming a high-profile issue with respect to potential effects on aquatic invertebrates. Units for particle velocity are typically nanometers per second. Particle motion can also be expressed as particle displacement in nanometers and particle acceleration in nanometers per second squared (Hastings and Popper 2005; Hawkins 2006; Popper et al. 2006). Sensory organs called statocysts may provide one means of vibration detection for aquatic invertebrates (Popper and Fay 1999).

More is known about the acoustic detection capabilities of decapod crustaceans than any other marine invertebrate group. Crustaceans appear to be most sensitive to sounds of low frequencies (i.e., <1,000 Hz) (Table 3.2-3) (Budelmann 1992; Popper et al. 2001). A study by Lovell et al. (2005a) showed that one species of shrimp was sensitive to frequencies as low as 100 Hz (Table 3.2-2). Studies on American lobster suggest that some marine invertebrates are more sensitive to higher frequency sounds than previously thought (Pye and Watson III 2004).

It is likely that cephalopods also use statocysts to detect low-frequency aquatic vibrations (Budelmann and Williamson 1994; Budelmann 1996; Kaifu et al. 2008). Studies by Packard et al. (1990), Rawizza (1995), Komak et al. (2005), Kaifu et al. (2007), and Hu et al. (2009) have quantified some of the optimally detected sound frequencies for various octopus, squid, and cuttlefish species (Table 3.2-2).

3.2.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific use and unique habitat features for the decapod crustacean and cephalopod mollusk groups potentially occurring within the five DAAs (refer to Figure 2-18). The economic and cultural importance of these two groups of marine invertebrates, including fisheries, are also presented. Discussion is limited to those species or species groups that possibly occur within each DAA during the period when the exemplary marine seismic surveys might be conducted (Table 3.2-3).

3.2.2.1 NW Atlantic

The NW Atlantic DAA occurs within the Northeast U.S. Continental Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) (refer to Figure 2-23) (Sea Around Us Project [SAUP] 2010). Various crustacean, 17 squid, and 6 octopus species are listed as occurring in the Northeast U.S. Continental Shelf LME (CephBase 2006) (Table 3.2-3). EFH occurs in or proximate to the NW Atlantic Analysis Area and pertains to the following species and life stages: red deepsea crab (eggs, larvae, juveniles, adults, spawning adults); longfin squid (juveniles, adults); and northern shortfin squid (juveniles, adults) (U.S. Navy 2005).

Table 3.2-3. Potential Occurrence of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks within the DAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Group	*NW Atlantic (Sum)*[(a-c)]*	*Caribbean (Spr or Sum)*[(b, c)]*	*S Calif. (Late Spr or Early Sum)*[(b, c)]*	*W Gulf of Alaska (Sum)*[(b, c, d)]*	*Galapagos Ridge (Win)*[(b, c)]*
Decapods					
Lobsters	B F E a	B F E a	B F E a	-	-
Crabs	B F E a	B F a	B F E a	B F E a	B F c
Shrimps	B F E a	B F E a	B F E a	B F E a	B F E a
Cephalopods					
Octopuses	B F u	B F c	B F c	B F u	B F c
Squids	B F E a	B F a	B F E a	B F c	B F c
Cuttlefishes	-	-	-	-	-
Nautiluses	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: *(Season) = Northern hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Spr = spring, Sum = summer, Win = winter. **B** = breeds within the area; **E** = economically important fishery within the area; **F** = feeds within the area; **M** = migrates through the area but unlikely to breed. **a** = abundant: the species group is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more; **c** = common: the species group is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species group is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area; **-** = species group does not occur there.

Sources: [(a)]U.S. Navy 2005; [(b)]CephBase 2006; [(c)]SAUP 2010; [(d)]L-DEO and NSF 2004.

Important decapods and cephalopods harvested recently during commercial fisheries in the NW Atlantic Analysis Area include lobsters, crabs, shrimps, and squids (Table 3.2-3). These include the following six species: American lobster, blue crab, red deepsea crab, northern shrimp, longfin squid, and northern shortfin squid. Fisheries for five of these six invertebrate species may occur in the NW Atlantic DAA during the summer months. Only the northern shrimp is typically fished outside of the season for the exemplary seismic survey (U.S. Navy 2005; SAUP 2010).

Of relevance for EFH is the timing of reproductive events relative to the summer timing of the exemplary seismic research survey identified for the NW Atlantic DAA. Blue crabs typically spawn during the late spring to early fall months. American lobsters generally begin spawning as early as late spring but have completed spawning by mid-to-late summer. The fertilized eggs are carried by the female at the sea bottom and the larvae subsequently move up into surface waters. Red deepsea crabs spawn primarily on the upper slope (656 to 1,312 ft [200 to 400 m]) of the continental shelf. Summer spawning by this crab species is followed by larval hatch during January to June, with peak hatch between April and June. As is the case with most lobsters and crabs, the fertilized eggs are carried by the female at the substrate and the larvae move up into the surface waters after hatching. Longfin squid typically spawn between April and November, peaking in May. Demersal egg masses are attached to hard substrate features. Peak hatching time for longfin squid is around July; the resultant pelagic larvae/juveniles occur near the water surface. Northern shortfin squid are thought to spawn in August and September. Their primary spawning location is likely south of the survey area near Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. Both the eggs and larvae/juveniles of the northern shortfin squid are believed to be pelagic. Northern shrimp typically spawn during the late summer months in offshore waters. The fertilized eggs are carried by the females until hatching occurs the following winter/early spring in inshore waters (U.S. Navy 2005).

3.2.2.2 Caribbean

The Caribbean DAA occurs within the Caribbean Sea LME, primarily on the shelf region north of Venezuela (refer to Figure 2-22). A number of commercially important decapod species as well as 21

squid and 17 octopus species are listed as occurring in this LME (CephBase 2006) (Table 3.2-3). According to commercial fisheries records, the most important crustaceans landed in the Caribbean Sea LME include lobsters and penaeid shrimps/prawns, particularly the Caribbean spiny lobster (Table 3.2-3) (SAUP 2010). Spiny lobsters tend to occur in relatively shallow waters, while the shrimp fishery off Venezuela is conducted by midwater fleets (i.e., on the continental shelf). These two fisheries could spatially and temporally overlap a seismic survey such as the exemplary Caribbean survey where water depths are < 328 ft (100 m) deep.

The exemplary spring-summer seismic survey overlaps with the reproductive events of some invertebrates in the Caribbean. Spiny lobsters typically spawn during the late spring to early summer period. The fertilized eggs are carried by the female at the sea bottom until larval hatch, at which time the larvae become pelagic. Spiny lobster larvae exhibit diel vertical migration, moving higher in the water column during the night. Prawn spawning is typically timed so that the larval hatch coincides with peak phytoplankton blooms. Prawn nursery areas are most often located nearshore where water temperatures are highest and food sources are common. It is likely that both spiny lobster and penaeid shrimp reproduce inshore of the Caribbean DAA.

3.2.2.3 S California

The S California DAA occurs within the California Current LME (refer to Figure 2-20) (SAUP 2010). Numerous crab and shrimp species and at least 18 squid and 13 octopus species likely occur in the California Current LME (CephBase 2006). Penaeid shrimps are the single most important invertebrate species landed during recent commercial fisheries within this LME (SAUP 2010) (Table 3.2-3). Other crustacean and cephalopod species that are harvested include spiny lobsters, Dungeness crab, and California market squid. Shrimp harvesting in the analysis area occurs between April and October. Shrimps along the California coast typically occur in waters 230-755 ft (70-230 m) deep. They tend to exhibit diel vertical migration, moving into the upper water column at night. The commercial invertebrate fishery occurs after the timing suggested for the exemplary seismic operation off S California. The spiny lobster fishing season typically occurs between mid-fall and late winter (October-March), peaking from early October to early January. The Dungeness crab commercial fishery in the analysis area typically occurs between mid-November and late-June. California market squid are typically harvested between late October and the following spring.

With respect to timing of the exemplary late spring or early summer seismic survey, the shrimp breeding season occurs in September and October, followed by hatching in late March/early April. California spiny lobsters spawn during spring and summer and then move slightly offshore in the fall to mate. The fertilized eggs are carried by the female lobsters until hatching occurs in the spring and summer. Larvae are pelagic and remain in the water column for 18 months before settling to the bottom. Adult spiny lobsters may occur in water depths as great as 246 ft (75 m) deep. Dungeness crabs mate in nearshore coastal locations between March and July. Larval hatch occurs approximately 3 months after the eggs are fertilized (i.e., June-October). The larvae of this crab species are planktonic. California market squid tend to spawn in semi-protected bays between October and April.

3.2.2.4 W Gulf of Alaska

The W Gulf of Alaska DAA occurs within the East Bering Sea LME (refer to Figure 2-19) (SAUP 2010). Various shrimp and crab, 17 squid, and 1 octopus species, and EFH occur in this LME (CephBase 2006) (Table 3.2-3). The most valuable invertebrate species landed during recent commercial fisheries conducted in the East Bering Sea LME are northern shrimps (SAUP 2010). Other important commercial crustacean species include king crabs and tanner crabs. It is unlikely that any crab fishing would be

conducted in the analysis area during the time of year when a seismic survey would be conducted. Crab species are typically targeted in the fall–winter months (L-DEO and NSF 2004d).

Six crab species have EFH in the W Gulf of Alaska Analysis Area: golden king crab, red king crab, and scarlet king crab and grooved tanner crab, triangle tanner crab, and tanner crab (L-DEO and NSF 2004d). Crab life stages associated with the EFH within the analysis area are as follows: golden king crab (eggs, late juveniles and adults); red king crab (eggs, larvae, late juveniles and adults); scarlet king crab (eggs and adults); grooved tanner crab (eggs and adults); triangle tanner crab (adults); and tanner crab (eggs, late juveniles and adults). Relative to the summer period when the exemplary seismic survey would be conducted in the W Gulf of Alaska, king and tanner crabs typically mate in winter/early spring months; larval hatch generally occurs during late spring/summer months, coinciding with plankton blooms and ensuring optimal food supply for the larvae.

3.2.2.5 Galapagos Ridge

The Galapagos Ridge DAA occurs in pelagic open seas within the SE Pacific Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Area (refer to Figure 2-21) (SAUP 2010). It is likely that lobsters, crabs and shrimps as well as 36 squid and 13 octopus species occur in the SE Pacific FAO Area (CephBase 2006). However, pelagic species spawn closer to shore, which is outside of the analysis area, and benthic species are a considerable distance from the water surface (i.e., > 3,280 ft [1,000 m] depth). Characteristics of spawning by decapods and cephalopods in the analysis area are unknown.

Since commercial fisheries for either crustaceans or cephalopods are conducted closer to shore, it is unlikely that significant invertebrate fisheries occur in this DAA. The most valuable decapod and cephalopod landed recently during commercial fisheries in the general SE Pacific FAO Area near shore include jumbo flying squid and marine crabs. Other decapods and cephalopods historically landed in the general SE Pacific FAO Area include squat lobsters, common squids, Chilean nylon shrimp, octopuses, and softshell red crab (SAUP 2010).

3.2.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific use and unique habitat features for the decapod crustacean and cephalopod mollusk groups potentially occurring within the eight QAAs. The economic and cultural importance of these two groups of marine invertebrates, including fisheries, are also presented. Discussion is limited to those species or species groups that possibly occur within each QAA during the period when the exemplary marine seismic surveys might be conducted (Table 3.2-4).

3.2.3.1 N Atlantic/Iceland

The N Atlantic/Iceland QAA occurs within the Iceland Shelf LME (refer to Figure 2-17). Various crustaceans and 36 squid and 13 octopus species are listed as occurring in this LME (CephBase 2006; SAUP 2010). The most notable decapod landed during the recent commercial fisheries within the Iceland Shelf LME is the northern shrimp. The Norway lobster and the European lobster also occur in this LME (SAUP 2010).

3.2.3.2 BC Coast

The BC Coast QAA occurs within the southern part of the Gulf of Alaska LME (refer to Figure 2-17) (SAUP 2010). Various crustacean and 17 squid species occur in Canada's Pacific coastal waters and most of these are common in nearshore and inshore waters throughout their ranges (Table 3.2-4). Seven species of octopus are known to occur in the Gulf of Alaska LME (CephBase 2006). The northern giant Pacific

octopus is one octopus species that is distributed along the rocky areas of the Pacific coast from the intertidal zone to depths of > 330 ft (100 m) (L-DEO and NSF 2006a).

The most valuable decapods and cephalopods landed during recent commercial fisheries in the QAA include Dungeness crab, shrimps, penaeid shrimps, opal squid, and krill (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). A modest fishery also occurs on octopuses. Dungeness crab and shrimp are important recreational and First Nations fisheries within the BC Coast QAA. First Nations subsistence fisheries along the BC Coast have significant food, social, and ceremonial value in addition to their commercial value. Many First Nations participate in the general commercial fisheries and also rely heavily on their traditional fisheries for these same species.

3.2.3.3 SW Atlantic

The SW Atlantic QAA occurs within the North Brazil Shelf LME (refer to Figure 2-17) (SAUP 2010). Various crustaceans and 30 squid and 13 octopus species are listed as occurring in the North Brazil Shelf LME (CephBase 2006). The most notable decapod crustaceans historically landed during commercial fisheries within the North Brazil Shelf LME are lobsters and shrimps (SAUP 2010) (Table 3.2-4). They include Caribbean spiny lobster, penaeid shrimps, various crabs, and Dana's swimming crab.

3.2.3.4 Mid-Atlantic Ridge

The Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA occurs proximate to the border shared by the W Central Atlantic and the E Central Atlantic FAO Areas (refer to Figure 2-17) (SAUP 2010). While there are some invertebrate data associated with both of these FAO areas, both include nearshore areas (i.e., eastern North America and western Africa), and it is not possible to accurately extract data relevant to the pelagic conditions of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA. It is likely that crabs and shrimps occur in the analysis area. In terms of cephalopods, 6 octopus, 20 squid, and 1 cuttlefish species occur in both the E and W Central Atlantic FAO Areas (CephBase 2006) (Table 3.2-4). Given its mid-ocean location, it is unlikely that any significant invertebrate fishery occurs in this analysis area.

3.2.3.5 W Australia

The W Australia QAA occurs within both the NW Australian Shelf and W Central Australian Shelf LMEs (refer to Figure 2-17) (SAUP 2010). Various decapod crustacean species and nine squid, six octopus, and five cuttlefish species are listed as occurring in these two LMEs (CephBase 2006) (Table 3.2-4). The most notable decapods and cephalopods historically landed during commercial fisheries within the two LMEs are lobsters, crabs, penaeid shrimps, octopuses, squids, and cuttlefishes (SAUP 2010). They include the Australian spiny lobster, blue swimming crab, other crabs, penaeid shrimps, octopuses, common squid, and other squids, and cuttlefishes.

3.2.3.6 W India

The W India QAA occurs within the Arabian Sea LME (refer to Figure 2-17) (SAUP 2010). Various decapod species and 17 squid, 13 octopus, and 11 cuttlefish species are listed as occurring in this LME (CephBase 2006). The most valuable decapods and cephalopods historically landed during commercial fisheries within the Arabian Sea LME are shrimps, penaeid shrimps, and cuttlefishes (SAUP 2010) (Table 3.2-4).

Table 3.2-4. Potential Occurrence of Decapod Crustaceans and Cephalopod Mollusks within the Qualitative Analysis Areas during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Group	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (Sum)*[a, b]*	*BC Coast (Fall)*[a-c]*	*SW Atlantic (Any)*[a, b]*	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (Spr, Sum, or Fall)*[a, b]*	*W Australia (Spr or Fall)*[a, b]*	*W India (Late Spr, Sum, or Early Fall)*[a, b]*	*Marianas (Spr)*[a, b]*	*Sub-Antarctic (Win)*[a, b]*
Decapods								
Lobsters	B F c	-	B F E a	-	B F E a	B F d	B F d	B F E a
Crabs	B F c	B F E a	B F E a	B F d	B F E a	B F c	B F E a	B F E a
Shrimps	B F E a	B F E a	B F E a	B F d	B F E a	B F E a	B F E a	B F c
Cephalopods								
Octopuses	B F u	B F E a	B F u	B F d	B F E c	B F E c	B F c	B F c
Squids	B F M c	B F E M a	B F M c	B F M d	B F E M c	B F E M c	B F E M a	B F E M a
Cuttlefishes	-	-	-	B F d	B F E c	B F E a	B F E a	B F c
Nautiluses	-	-	-	-	-	-	B F c	-

Notes: *(Season) = Northern hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Spr = spring, Sum = summer, Win = winter (N hemisphere winter is S hemisphere summer).

B = breeds within the area; E = economically important fishery within the area; **F** = feeds within the area; **M** = migrates through the area but unlikely to breed there. **a** = Abundant: the species group is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more; **c** = common: the species group is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species group is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area; **d** = degree of occurrence not known: the species group occurs but degree of occurrence not known; **-** = species group does not occur there; **?** = not known whether species group occurs or not

Sources: [a]SAUP 2010; [b]CephBase 2006; [c] L-DEO and NSF 2006a.

3.2.3.7 Marianas

The Marianas QAA occurs within the W Central Pacific FAO Area (refer to Figure 2-17) (SAUP 2010). Various decapod crustaceans and 44 squid, 13 octopus, 18 cuttlefish, and 3 nautilus species are listed as occurring in this FAO Area (CephBase 2006). The most notable decapods and cephalopods historically landed during the commercial fisheries within the W Central Pacific FAO Area are peneaid shrimps, blue swimming crab, common squids, other squids, and cuttlefishes (SAUP 2010).

3.2.3.8 Sub-Antarctic

The Sub-Antarctic QAA occurs within the SW Pacific FAO Area (refer to Figure 2-17) (SAUP 2010). Various species of decapods and 35 squid, 10 octopus, and 4 cuttlefish species are listed as occurring in this FAO Area (CB 2006). The most notable decapods and cephalopods historically landed during commercial fisheries within the SW Pacific FAO Area are red rock lobster, various crabs, Wellington flying squid, and other squids (SAUP 2010).

3.2.4 Environmental Consequences – General

The existing body of published and unpublished scientific literature on the impacts of seismic survey sound on marine invertebrates is limited, and there are no known systematic studies of the effects of sonar sound on invertebrates. Furthermore, it has not been specifically documented that invertebrates are capable of detecting the acoustic sources proposed for use in NSF's and USGS's marine seismic research, although limited data suggests this may be possible. The available information involves studies of individuals of only a few species and/or developmental stages; there have been no studies at the population scale. Recent work by André et al. (2011) purports to present the first morphological and ultrastructural evidence of massive acoustic trauma (i.e., permanent and substantial alterations of statocyst sensory hair cells) in four cephalopod species subjected to low-frequency sound. The cephalopods, primarily cuttlefish, were exposed to continuous 50–400 Hz sinusoidal wave sweeps (100% duty cycle and 1-sec sweep period) for 2 hours while captive in relatively small tanks (one 2,000 L and one 200 L tank). The received SPL was reported as 157±5 dB re 1µPa, with peak levels at 175 dB re 1µPa. As in the McCauley et al. (2003) paper on sensory hair cell damage in pink snapper as a result of exposure to seismic sound, the cephalopods were subjected to higher sound levels than they would be under natural conditions, and they were unable to swim away from the sound source.

The most important aspect of potential impacts concerns how exposure to seismic survey sound ultimately affects invertebrate populations and their viability, including availability to fisheries and to species that prey on marine invertebrates. There are currently no data indicating that the types of activities proposed under marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by USGS would result in any population-level effects, and no such effects are expected. Extrapolation from a few studies suggests that an insignificant number of some species or developmental stages of individual invertebrates could theoretically sustain injurious effects within very close range (several meters) of an operating source; however, numbers potentially impacted would not exceed numbers experiencing injury under natural conditions. The following sections provide a synopsis of available information on the effects of seismic survey sounds, MBES, and SBP on decapod crustacean and cephalopod species. These are the two taxonomic groups of invertebrates on which most acoustic studies have been conducted. A more detailed review of the literature on the effects of underwater anthropogenic sound on invertebrates is provided in Appendix D.

There are three types of potential effects on marine invertebrates with exposure to seismic surveys: pathological, physiological, and behavioral. Pathological effects involve lethal and temporary or

permanent sub-lethal injury. Physiological effects involve temporary and permanent primary and secondary stress responses, such as changes in levels of enzymes and proteins. Behavioral effects refer to temporary and (if it occurs) permanent changes in exhibited behavior (e.g., startle and avoidance behavior). The three categories are interrelated in complex ways. For example, it is possible that certain physiological and behavioral changes could potentially lead to an ultimate pathological effect on individuals (i.e., mortality). Based on what is known about the physical structure of their sensory organs, marine invertebrates appear to be specialized to respond to particle displacement components of an impinging sound field rather than the pressure component (Popper et al. 2001; also see review in Section 3.2.1.3). The amplitude of particle velocity is proportional to the associated pressure.

Pathological Effects. Very few specific data are available on levels of seismic signals that may result in pathological effects on invertebrates and such studies are limited to a small number of invertebrate species and life stages (reviewed in Appendix D). Some studies indicate no documented effects of exposure to seismic while others indicate limited pathological effects at close range on some species and developmental stages (see Section 3.2.4.3 below). For the types and source levels of seismic airguns and arrays proposed, the pathological (mortality) zone for some species or developmental stages of crustaceans and cephalopods is expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source. This premise is based on the peak pressure and rise/decay time characteristics of seismic airgun arrays currently in use. However, the number of individual invertebrates potentially affected in this manner are expected to be insignificant compared to overall population sizes and pathological effects that occur under natural conditions (e.g., predation, environmental, etc.).

Some studies have suggested that seismic survey sound has a limited pathological impact on early developmental stages of crustaceans (Pearson et al. 1994; Christian et al. 2003; DFOC 2004b; Payne et al. 2007; Boudreau et al. 2009). Controlled field experiments on adult crustaceans (Christian et al. 2003, 2004; DFOC 2004b) and adult cephalopods (McCauley et al. 2000a, b) exposed to seismic survey sound have not resulted in any significant pathological impacts on the animals. It has been suggested that exposure to commercial seismic survey activities has injured giant squid (Guerra et al. 2004), but there is no scientific evidence to support such claims.

Physiological Effects. Physiological effects refer mainly to biochemical responses by marine invertebrates to acoustic stress. Such stress could potentially affect invertebrate populations by increasing mortality or reducing reproductive success. Any primary and secondary stress responses (i.e., changes in levels of enzymes, proteins, etc. in the haemolymph or circulatory system) of crustaceans after exposure to seismic survey sounds appear to be temporary (hours to days) in studies done to date (Payne et al. 2007). The periods necessary for these biochemical changes to return to normal are variable and depend on numerous aspects of the biology of the species and of the sound stimulus. Payne et al. (2007) noted more deposits of material, possibly glycogen, in the hepatopancreas of some of the exposed American lobsters during histological analysis conducted 4 months post-exposure. Accumulation of glycogen could be due to stress or disturbance of cellular processes.

Behavioral Effects. Direct and indirect effects of seismic and other sounds on invertebrate behavior, particularly in relation to the consequences for fisheries are also important. Changes in behavior could potentially affect reproductive success, distribution, susceptibility to predation, and catchability by fisheries. Studies investigating the possible behavioral effects of exposure to seismic survey sound in crustaceans and cephalopods have been conducted on both uncaged and caged animals. In some cases, invertebrates exhibited startle responses (e.g., squid in McCauley et al. 2000a, b) and changes in respiratory activity (e.g., octopus in Kaifu et al. 2007). In other cases, no behavioral impacts were noted

(e.g., snow crab in Christian et al. 2003; DFOC 2004b). Increased food consumption by lobsters exposed to airgun noise was noted by Payne et al. (2007). Price (2007) observed that blue mussels closed their valves upon exposure to 10 kHz pure tone continuous sound.

There have been anecdotal reports of reduced catch rates of shrimp shortly after exposure to seismic survey sound; however, other studies have not observed significant changes in shrimp catch rate (Andriguetto-Filho et al. 2005). Analysis of data related to rock lobster commercial catches and seismic surveying in Australia between 1978 and 2004 did not suggest any significant effect on lobster catches (Parry and Gason 2006). Any adverse effects on crustacean and cephalopod behavior or fisheries due to seismic survey sound are likely specific to the species in question and the nature of its fishery (season, duration, fishing method).

3.2.4.1 Criteria

It is theoretically possible that the seismic and sonar sounds associated with the proposed action may adversely affect invertebrates. However, there is insufficient knowledge to establish objective criteria for determining the potential for and the level at which adverse effects on invertebrates and related fisheries may occur. Generally, adverse effects on a particular invertebrate species can be considered significant if they result in a reduction in the overall health and viability of a population or significantly impact fisheries targeting that population. These are the general criteria used to determine significance of effect in this assessment. However, on the ocean-basin or regional scale, determining whether or not there is a reduction in the overall health (or abundance) of an invertebrate population is problematic and is typically confounded by a number of factors which include the general lack of pre-impact information, the multitude of environmental or non-project related factors influencing marine invertebrate populations, and often the large or unknown extent of the habitat in which the invertebrates reside relative to the impact area.

3.2.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

It is theoretically possible that individual invertebrates within several meters of a sound source operating at high levels could potentially be harmed by the energy of the sound. The airguns and airgun arrays, MBES, SBP, and/or ship hull and engine sounds produced by project activities overlap the known sound detection or sound production range of some invertebrates but do not overlap that of other invertebrate species. However, it is theoretically possible that the energy of sound outside of detection and production ranges might also be harmful to the animals. The sound characteristics of each of the project sound sources are described below relative to the minimal information known on sound detection and sound production of invertebrates (also see Table 3.2-2).

The airguns and airgun arrays have dominant frequency components of 2-188 Hz (Table 2-3) and zero-to-peak nominal source outputs ranging from 240-265 dB re 1 µPa-m. This frequency range overlaps with the frequencies detectable by one crustacean species (prawn) for which frequency sensitivity has been studied (Lovell et al. 2005a) (Table 3.2-2). However, that study was conducted with a sound source in air and not underwater; thus, the applicability to the underwater environment is unknown. Overall, the full degree of overlap between the dominant frequencies in airgun sounds and the frequencies detectable by invertebrates is unknown.

The Kongsberg EM122 MBES proposed for use on the R/V *Langseth* operates at 10.5-13 (usually 12) kHz. Other types of MBES used for deep-water operations aboard other research vessels associated with the proposed action operate at similar or higher frequencies (see Table 2-5). These frequencies are above the frequency ranges known to be detectable by some crustaceans and cephalopods (Table 3.2-2). The

frequencies of sounds produced by certain crustaceans do overlap with the sonar frequencies. However, the functionality of these relatively high-frequency crustacean sounds remains unknown.

The SBP operates at 3.5 kHz. This is within the known detection range of some invertebrate species (Table 3.2-2). The SBP has a maximum source output of 222 dB re 1 μPa-m, which is well above the detection thresholds of some marine invertebrates (Table 3.2-2), indicating that those invertebrates could detect the SBP if close enough to the source.

Ship engines, propulsion systems, and the vessel hull itself also emit sounds into the marine environment with frequencies that overlap with the frequencies and thresholds associated with marine invertebrate sound detection. However, virtually nothing is known about the possible effects of vessel noise on invertebrates. The source level of vessel noise would be considerably less than source levels of the pulsed sound sources associated with the seismic research activities (see Chapter 2). Further, vessel sounds would be at levels expected to cause only possible localized, short-term behavioral changes. Thus, potential effects of vessel noise on invertebrates are not further discussed in detail.

3.2.4.3 Acoustic Effects

Table 3.2-5 summarizes the known general effects or lack thereof of seismic and other project-related sound on crustaceans, cephalopods, and associated fisheries based on the small number of available studies. For most of these invertebrates, airguns represent the project sound source most likely to affect invertebrates. Other project sound sources (i.e., MBES, SBP, pingers, and ship) are considered to have considerably less potential to interfere with sound production or detection by crustaceans and cephalopods. This assessment is based on the narrow beams and intermittent nature of the MBES and SBP, and the frequency range and/or source level relative to what is known regarding the sensitivity of invertebrates to these aspects (see Section 3.2.4.2 and Chapter 2).

In general, effects of sound on invertebrates are considered unknown or are based on only a small number of studies on a few species and developmental stages. Known effects are limited primarily to short-term, (i.e., lasting minutes to hours) non-lethal effects. The possible exception is that a relatively small number of invertebrates inhabiting near-surface waters and occurring within several meters of an active, high-energy sound source could be lethally affected or physiologically impaired or injured. Notwithstanding that exception, for many crustacean and cephalopod species throughout the world, the greatest potential for acoustic impacts from NSF's or USGS's marine seismic research activities involve masking, changes in behavior (e.g., disturbance), and impacts on fisheries. Each of these is described briefly below. A more detailed review of these effects is presented in Appendix D. In general, none of these effects would be expected to exceed what already occurs under normal, natural environmental conditions.

Table 3.2-5. Summary of Known or Suggested Effects of Seismic Survey Sound on Marine Invertebrates (Crustaceans and Cephalopods) and Associated Fisheries*

*Groups of Concern***	*Pathological Effects*	*Physiological Effects*	*Behavioral Effects*	*Sound Detection Impairment*	*Fishery Effects*
Crustaceans	• Evidence of sub-lethal effects on snow crab embryos and larvae (e.g., delayed but normal development); supportive data are minimal. • No evidence of effects on adult snow crabs, adult lobster, or adult shrimp; supportive data are minimal.	• Evidence of effects on adult lobster (e.g., decreased levels of enzymes and calcium ions in haemolymph, accumulation of glycogen in hepatopancreas tissue, and increased feeding). • No evidence of effects on adult snow crab.	• Evidence of temporary disturbance effects on adult shrimp (e.g., avoidance) and adult lobster (e.g., decreased feeding). • No evidence of disturbance effects on adult snow crab • Masking effects unknown.	Unknown – no relevant data available.	• No evidence of effects on snow crab and shrimp.
Cephalopods	• No evidence of effects on squid.	• No evidence of effects on squid and cuttlefish.	• Evidence of disturbance effects on adult squid and cuttlefish (e.g., startle, alarm, and avoidance). • Evidence of respiratory suppression by octopus.	Unknown – no relevant data available.	Unknown – no relevant data available.

Notes: See Appendix D for detailed literature review of the potential effects of exposure to sound on crustaceans and cephalopods, including available details of exposure.
*Effects of sonar sounds are not included because there are no known systematic studies of the effects of sonar sound on invertebrates.
**No invertebrate species that may occur in any of the 13 Analysis Areas are listed under the ESA; however, EFH occurs in the NW Atlantic and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs—see Table 3.2-6.

Masking

Masking is defined as interference with the detection of a signal of biological relevance by another signal. Although not demonstrated in the literature, masking can be considered a potential effect of anthropogenic underwater sound on marine invertebrates. Some invertebrates are known to produce sounds (Au and Banks 1998; Tolstoganova 2002; Latha et al. 2005). The functionality and biological relevance of these sounds are not understood (Jeffs et al. 2003, 2005; Lovell et al. 2005a; Radford et al. 2007). Masking of produced sounds and received sounds (e.g., conspecifics and predators), at least the particle displacement component, could potentially have adverse effects on marine invertebrates.

It has not been specifically documented that invertebrates are capable of detecting the acoustic sources proposed for use in NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research. Furthermore, masking is extremely unlikely due to the low duty-cycle of the sources as well as the short duration of the moving seismic vessel at a given location. Airgun, MBES, SBP, and pinger sounds are intermittent with low duty cycle, and thus would not mask other sounds for more than a small percentage of the time. Masking due to acoustics sources is not expected to impact invertebrate species at the population level.

Disturbance

For the purposes of this analysis, disturbance to crustacean and cephalopod species from acoustic sources refers to any change in behavior that would not occur in the absence of the acoustic source. Of primary

importance is any change in behavior that increases mortality, results in reduced reproductive success, or has substantial effects on commercial species.

Airguns and airgun arrays could potentially disturb a proportionally small number of certain invertebrates within close range of the airgun sources (see Section 3.2.4 and Appendix D). To be significant, such behavioral changes would need to result in an overall reduction in the health, abundance, or catchability of a species of concern. Thus, adverse effects to individuals are not considered significant unless a significant portion of the population is affected. In general, the temporal and spatial scale of disturbance effects on invertebrates would likely be short-term and limited to the localized area immediately surrounding an active airgun. Further, effects would be limited to the relatively small portion of the local invertebrate populations that would be closely approached by the active acoustic source as it moves along the survey lines. Associated potential disturbance, if detectable above the normal background environmental changes, would be insignificant given the small spatial and temporal scales, transience of the proposed activities, and results of available studies summarized in Appendix D. None of the proposed activities are expected to result in adverse effects at the population level.

The potential disturbance effects of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers on the few invertebrate species that may detect sound within the relevant frequency ranges are unknown. However, for reasons described above, such effects would be insignificant given the even smaller area exposed by the narrow beams of these acoustic sources compared to that of the airguns.

Detection Impairment

There is no scientific evidence that exposure to airgun or sonar sounds can result in temporary impairment of the abilities of marine invertebrates to detect sound. However, the received particle velocity level required to induce temporary detection impairment in marine invertebrates has never been studied. If any such effects did occur as a result of proposed activities, they are expected to be limited to areas very near the active acoustic source(s) and would not result in any significant effects at the population level given the small spatial and temporal scales of the proposed activities.

Injury

As described in Section 3.2.4, the acoustic sounds produced by the airguns and airgun arrays could cause acute injury and perhaps mortality of an insignificant number of some crustacean and mollusk species, particularly larval and egg stages if they were in extreme proximity to the seismic source (i.e., a few meters; see Appendix D). However, no population-level effects are expected to marine invertebrates as the result of proposed seismic research activities.

While it is known that the airguns and airgun arrays could theoretically result in injury to some individual invertebrates (see Appendix D), the effects of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers on marine invertebrates are unknown. However, given their acoustic characteristics, potential impacts from MBESs, SBPs, and pingers would be expected to be even less than those of airguns.

3.2.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Effects on Fisheries

As stated in Section 3.2.4 and Appendix D, there is the potential for certain crustacean and cephalopod fisheries to be temporarily affected by the proposed seismic surveys in one of two ways: (1) acoustic disturbance to crustaceans and cephalopods near the seismic survey lines resulting in changes in behavior or distribution and a reduction in catchability (e.g., displacement from traditional fishing grounds), and (2) direct interference with the act of fishing (e.g., physically displacing fishing vessels or entanglement

with fishing gear). Minimizing potential impacts to fisheries may, at times, require adjustments to tracklines and timing of surveys as well as communication with fishers during the surveys (see mitigation discussed in Chapter 2).

3.2.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

3.2.5.1 Acoustic Effects

Under Alternatives A and B, the proposed marine seismic research activities would include mitigation and monitoring measures as described in Chapter 2. Site-specific mitigation and monitoring measures are considered for implementation before and during the seismic survey, depending on the resources of concern that could potentially be impacted. Alternatives A and B would include provisions to plan the seismic surveys to avoid EFH and to avoid and minimize any potential effects on any listed species to the maximum extent practicable. With these mitigation measures in place, no significant impacts to crustacean and cephalopod populations or to EFH are expected in any of the exemplary DAAs and QAAs with implementation of Alternatives A or B (Table 3.2-6).

Airguns

Under Alternative A or B, the airguns and airgun arrays may theoretically impact crustacean and cephalopod species as described above, although predicted effects are extrapolated from a few limited studies (see Appendix D). Most potential effects involve changes in behavior and other non-lethal, short-term temporary impacts. A relatively small and insignificant number of individuals within several meters of an active airgun(s) might be injured; however, there would be no significant impacts on any invertebrate population. Some invertebrates might indirectly benefit from mitigation measures implemented for marine mammals under Alternatives A and B (e.g., ramp-ups, power downs, and shutdowns). Specific invertebrate avoidance and mitigation measures will be evaluated on a site-specific basis under Alternative A in situations where commercially important fisheries are known to occur (e.g., by siting or timing the surveys to avoid specific locations). In summary, with implementation of Alternative A or B, there would be no significant impacts to crustacean and cephalopod populations or to EFH in exemplary DAAs and QAAs from the use of airguns or airgun arrays (Table 3.2-6).

Table 3.2-6. Summary of Potential Impacts to Crustaceans, Mollusks (Cephalopods), and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternatives A and B

Analysis Area	*Alternatives A and B**
DAAs	
NW Atlantic W Gulf of Alaska Caribbean Sea S California Galapagos Ridge	• Potential short-term behavioral or possibly physiological effects on individuals. • Potential adverse but not significant impacts to individuals < several m from the active sound source. • No significant impacts at the population level.
QAAs	
BC Coast Marianas Sub-Antarctic N Atlantic/Iceland SW Atlantic W India W Australia Mid-Atlantic Ridge	• Potential short-term behavioral or possibly physiological effects on individuals. • Potential adverse but not significant impacts to individuals < several m from the active sound source. • No significant impacts at the population level.

Note: *Impacts under Alternatives A and B assume that provisions would be made to plan the seismic surveys to avoid EFH and commercially important fisheries to the maximum extent practicable.

MBESs, SBPs, and Pingers

Impacts to cephalopod and crustacean populations from the use of MBESs, SBPs, and pingers are expected to be even less than those previously described for airguns (Table 3.2-5). Effects of the MBES will impact a smaller area due to the narrow beam as discussed previously and in Chapter 2. The effects of the SBP would be even smaller in scale than for the MBES given the small beam and lower source level. Furthermore, any potential impacts would be restricted to those few crustaceans and cephalopods that produce and/or detect high-frequency sounds that overlap the frequencies of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers. Therefore, no significant impacts to crustacean and cephalopod populations or to EFH are expected with the use of MBESs, SBPs, and pingers under Alternative A or B (Table 3.2-6).

3.2.5.2 Other Potential Effects

Effects on Fisheries

Under Alternative A, the airgun arrays, MBESs, SBPs, and pingers may impact invertebrate fisheries that are important in all of the analysis areas. In addition, the seismic vessel itself may interfere with fisheries. Alternative A includes measures to avoid impacting these fisheries by siting or timing the surveys appropriately. Therefore, no significant impacts to fisheries are anticipated with implementation of Alternative A or B.

3.2.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research surveys using various acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, MBESs, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to marine invertebrates with implementation of Alternative C.

3.2.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Invertebrates

Under Alternative A and B, some decapod crustaceans and cephalopods might detect the sound from the airguns and airgun arrays. The MBESs, SBPs, and pingers might be similarly detectable by fewer invertebrate species. For those invertebrate species capable of detecting such sounds, there would theoretically be potential for adverse pathological and physiological effects at extremely close range, and for behavioral effects extending to somewhat greater ranges. These effects could temporarily change the catchability of some crustacean and mollusk fisheries in localized areas. The likelihood of each of these effects depends on the sound level received by the individual. As described in Chapter 2, the received sound level is generally related to proximity to the source but is influenced by other factors as well (e.g., water depth, sound velocity profile of the water, bottom conditions, airgun array size, etc.). The potential for pathological effects is expected to be limited to those individual invertebrates within several meters of an active source operating at high levels and producing sounds within the frequency range to which the animals are sensitive. On a population level, the potential effects are considered insignificant.

In summary, based on the limited available information about the effects of airgun and sonar sounds on invertebrates, there would be no significant impacts to marine invertebrate populations, fisheries, and associated EFH with implementation of Alternative A or B.

3.3 MARINE FISH

3.3.1 Overview of Fish Groups

Fish addressed in this section are those of ecological or economical concern that occur in or near the 13 analysis areas during the exemplary seismic survey periods. These include fish species or groups that are listed under the ESA, are associated with U.S.-designated EFH, or are considered the basis of important fisheries. Fish are further addressed and discussed relative to their known sensitivity to low-frequency impulse sound associated with seismic surveys. The status, general ecology, and general distribution and migratory movements of these fish are summarized in Table 3.3-1 and discussed briefly below.

Table 3.3-1. Summary of the Status, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Higher Fish Groups Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Higher Group[a]	*Status*[b] *ESA/IUCN/CITES*	*General Ecology*[c-e]	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*[f, g]
Hagfishes & Lampreys (Agnatha)	0/0/0	S, PS	ICS/OCS/BCS, ICS, OCS
Sharks, Skates, Rays, & Chimeras (Chondrichthys)	0/43/3	S/I/D, D/P, PV/PN	ICS/OCS/BCS; HM
Sturgeons (Acipenseriformes)	3/3/2	S, D/P, PV	ICS/OCS; HM
Herring-likes (Clupeiformes)	0/0/0	S, P, PV	ICS; HM
Salmon, Smelts, etc. (Salmoniformes)	7/1/0	S, P, PV/PN	ICS/OCS/BCS; HM
Cod-likes (Gadiformes)	0/2/0	S/I, P, PV	ICS/OCS; HM
Pipefishes & Seahorses (Gasterosteiformes)	0/7/6	S/I, P, PV/PN	ICS/OCS/BCS; NS
Scorpionfishes (Scorpaeniformes)	0/3/0	S/I/D, D/P, PV	ICS/OCS/BCS;NS/IO
Perch-likes (Perciformes)	0/32/1	S/I/D, P, PV	ICS/OCS/BCS; NS
Tuna & billfishes (Perciformes)	0/3/0	S/I; P, PV	ICS/OCS/BCS; HM
Flatfishes (Pleuronectiformes)	0/2/0	S/I, D, PV	ICS/OCS/BCS; NS/IO
Coelacanths (Coelacanthiformes)	0/1/1	I/D, P, PN	ICS/OCS/BCS; NS

Notes: [a] Higher groups as defined by SAUP (2005). The names of the relevant orders have been added except in the case of the cartilaginous fishes (Class Chondrichthys) which contains several orders.
[b] Number of species listed as critically endangered, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable under each status type (see Table 3.3-2 for species status by analysis area and species). Federally designated EFH occurs in 5 of the 13 analysis areas as indicated in Tables 3.3-3 and 3.3-4.
[c] Typical water depth: S = shallow (<100 m), I = intermediate (100-1,000 m), D = deep (>1,000 m).
[d] Habitat Type: D = demersal; P = pelagic.
[e] Feeding behavior: PV = piscivorous, PN = planktivorous, PS = parasitic, S = scavenger.
[f] Horizontal Distribution: ICS = inner continental shelf (<50 m water depth), OCS = outer continental shelf (50-200m), BCS = beyond continental shelf (>200m).
[g] Distribution Variability: NS = negligible shift, IO = slight inshore-offshore movement, HM = highly migratory.
Sources: CITES 2010; IUCN 2010; NOAA Fisheries 2010; SAUP 2010.

3.3.1.1 Taxonomic Groups of Fish

There are thousands of species of marine fish, so for the purposes of this PEIS, fish are organized into 12 "higher" taxonomic groups (higher groups) following the SAUP classification system initiated at the University of British Columbia (SAUP 2010) (Table 3.3-1). This classification system revolves around

commercially exploited species based on catch data for the entire world; however, it excludes many species of fish that are not exploited and might not fall into any of these higher groups. The 12 higher groups generally follow major taxonomic groupings based on Superclass and/or Class but do not exactly match current thought on fish taxonomy and evolution (see Nelson 2006). Species with special status (i.e., listed under ESA, IUCN, or CITES) occur within 10 of these 12 higher groups and are discussed below. Only the higher groups of hagfishes and lampreys (Superclass Agnatha) and the herring-likes (Order Clupeiformes) do not include special-status species. Of the approximate 29,000 extant fish species in the world, only a few are agnathans – some 800 are sharks, skates, and rays; the rest are bony fishes (Helfman et al. 1997). General information on the 12 higher groups of fish addressed in this section is summarized below.

3.3.1.2 Distribution and Movements

Table 3.3-1 presents some generalizations about the ecology, distribution, and movements of fish groups. Marine fish occupy a wide variety of water depths and habitats. The vast majority of marine fishes are free-swimming pelagic forms. Other diverse and sometimes abundant fish species inhabit the near-bottom and demersal (bottom) habitats of much of the world's oceans, including flatfishes (Order Pleuronectiformes including soles, halibuts, and allies); sharks, skates, and rays; hagfishes; sturgeons; cods; rat-tails; and many others (Nelson 2006). In general, sturgeons (Order Acipenseriformes), the herring-like fishes, and the cod-like fishes (Order Gadiformes) tend to dwell only within the confines of the continental shelf. Other higher groups of fish are more widely dispersed throughout the world's oceans. Some are highly migratory (e.g., tunas, lampreys, herrings, salmons) while others are much more sedentary (e.g., lingcod, some rockfishes, tropical reef fishes). Table 3.3-1 illustrates these ecological diversities among the higher groups of fish.

Most marine fish are piscivorous, meaning they primarily eat other fish. A few, from anchovies to whale sharks and basking sharks, are predominantly or exclusively planktivorous, consuming primarily small invertebrates (e.g., krill, zooplankton). Relatively few are primarily dependent on phytoplankton or macroalgae as food for much of their life cycle.

3.3.1.3 Important Ecological Considerations

Important ecological considerations for fish resources of concern with respect to seismic activities considered in this analysis are the life-history and reproductive characteristics. These are important determinants of population-scale vulnerability or robustness to disturbance. However, the reproductive strategies of marine fishes vary significantly, including those that bear live young, those that disperse their young as larvae, those that fertilize externally and broadcast their eggs, those that spawn into bottom-attached egg masses or the nests (redds) of river spawners. More fecund fishes that have large ranges and high rates of dispersal tend to be more resilient to exploitation, disturbance, or other population-level stressors than those that are restricted to smaller areas and specific microhabitats.

In terms of commercial value world-wide, the herring-like fishes (e.g., herrings, sardines, shads, and anchovies) and cod-like fishes (e.g., cods, haddocks, hakes, pollocks, and whitings) are the most economically important. Next are perch-like fishes (the most modern, diverse, and speciose order, the Perciformes). The salmons and smelts (Order Salmoniformes) are also of great commercial importance.

3.3.1.4 Special-Status Species

Nine ESA-listed fish species potentially occur within three DAAs in U.S. waters (Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3-2). The majority (seven) are salmonid species (six of which occur in the North Pacific Ocean) and two are sturgeons. For Pacific salmon, the seven listed species are further divided into 27 Distinct Population

Segments (DPSs) or Evolutionary Significant Units (ESUs). In addition, EFH occurs in 4 of the 13 analysis areas located within U.S. waters and is discussed in more detail by analysis area as appropriate. EFH within these four analysis areas is designated for the life or developmental stages of 11 of the 12 higher groups of fish addressed in this analysis (the one exception is the Coelacanths Higher Group).

3.3.1.5 Acoustic Capabilities

Marine fishes are a diverse group and, relative to the total number of species, few species have been studied for audiology. However, there is good understanding of fish hearing in general. For the most part, as compared to mammals, fish hearing is restricted to rather low frequencies (Table 3.3-3). Reviews of fish-hearing mechanisms and capabilities can be found in Fay and Popper (2000) and Ladich and Popper (2004).

All fish species have hearing and skin-based mechanosensory systems (inner ear and lateral line systems, respectively). Research indicates that fish detect, and sometimes respond to, sound in their environment (Fay and Popper 2000). These sounds may be produced by other fish, or they may be sounds of other organisms (e.g., snapping shrimp, marine mammals), or they may be environmental sounds such as waves breaking on the shore, rain on the water surface, etc. The growing consensus is that fish (as virtually all animals) use the sounds in their environment (the "acoustic scene") to get a sense of the world around them, and especially the environment beyond the detection range of their other senses, such as vision. In effect, sound provides fish (and other aquatic animals) with a much larger view of the surrounding environment than does any other sense. And, while fish get a broad sense of their environment from sound, it is also clear that fish are probably able to detect prey and predators by 'listening' to the environmental cues (e.g., Hawkins 1981; Popper et al. 2003). Anthropogenic sounds that affect fish hearing or other sensory systems may have important consequences for fish survival and reproduction. Potential negative effects include masking of important environmental sounds or social signals, displacing fish from their habitat, or interfering with sensory orientation and navigation.

Sound consists of two components – pressure and particle motion (see Kalmijn 1988, 1989; Rogers and Cox 1988). While both are present in air, the particle motion attenuates (drops off) very quickly and so most terrestrial vertebrates do not have adaptations to detect this. In contrast, in water, which is much denser than air, the particle motion component of sound travels much further from the source, and its detection is a very critical part of the hearing system of fish. Indeed, it is thought that the original hearing system in fish (and all vertebrates) probably was to detect particle motion, and only later in evolution did some fish start to detect sound pressure. However, it must be understood that both particle motion and pressure are ultimately detected by the sensory hair cells of the inner ear. The difference in detection of pressure and particle motion are the pathways by which the signals get to the inner ear.

Sound detection in fish involves an inner ear which is, in most ways, very similar to the inner ears found in mammals. However, fish, unlike most terrestrial vertebrates, do not have external openings to the ear. The ear in fish is located in the brain cavity, somewhat behind the eyes. The regions of the ear associated with hearing in fish are called otolithic organs (separately known as the saccule, lagena, utricle) (see reviews in Popper et al. 2003; Ladich and Popper 2004). Each otolithic organ has a sensory tissue, or epithelium, that contains many sensory hair cells, each of which is surrounded by supporting cells. The lumen (or space) of each otolithic organ contains a very dense structure made of calcium carbonate called the otolith.

Table 3.3-2. Potential Occurrence of Special-Status Fish Species within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status*** *ESA/IUCN/CITES*	*Analysis Areas with Potential for Occurrence* *DAA*	*QAA*
SHARKS, SKATES, RAYS, AND CHIMERAS			
Whale shark	-/V/II	S California, Galapagos Ridge	SW Atlantic, W India, W Australia, BC Coast, Marianas
Sand tiger shark	-/V/-	NW Atlantic	SW Atlantic, W India, W Australia, Marianas
Basking shark	-/V/II	NW Atlantic, S California, Galapagos Ridge, Caribbean	Marianas, BC Coast, N Atlantic/Iceland, SW Atlantic, W India, W Australia
Great white shark	-/V/II	NW Atlantic, S California, Galapagos Ridge, Caribbean	BC Coast, SW Atlantic, W India, W Australia, Marianas
Southern sawtail catshark	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Lizard catshark	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
New Caledonia catshark	-/V/-		Marianas
Pondicherry shark	-/CR/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Smoothtooth blacktip	-/V/-		W India
School shark	-/V/-	S California, Galapagos Ridge	N Atlantic/Iceland, SW Atlantic, W India, W Australia, Marianas, BC Coast
Striped dogfish	-/CR/-		SW Atlantic
Deepwater spiny dogfish	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas, N. Atlantic/Iceland
Gulper shark	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Dumb shark	-/CR/-		W Australia
Fossil shark	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Tawny nurse shark	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Sharptooth lemon shark	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Shorttail nurse shark	-/V/-		W India
Smoothnose wedgefish	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Leopard shark	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Smoothback angel shark	-/E/-		SW Atlantic
Eastern angel shark	-/V/-		Marianas
Angular angel shark	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Dwarf sawfish	-/E/I		W Australia, Marianas
Largetooth sawfish	C/CR/I		SW Atlantic, Galapagos Ridge
Smalltooth sawfish	-/E/I		SW Atlantic, W India, W Australia
Green sawfish	-/E/I		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Freshwater sawfish	-/E/I		W Australia, Marianas
Knifetooth sawfish	-/E/I		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Brazilian blind electric ray	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Brazilian guitarfish	-/CR/-		SW Atlantic
White-spotted guitarfish	-/V/-		W Australia, Marianas
White-spot giant guitarfish	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Onefin skate	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Spotback skate	-/E/-		SW Atlantic
Common skate	-/E/-		N Atlantic/Iceland
Barndoor skate	-/E/-	NW Atlantic	

Table 3.3-2. Potential Occurrence of Special-Status Fish Species within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status*** *ESA/IUCN/CITES*	*Analysis Areas with Potential for Occurrence* *DAA*	*QAA*
Mud skate	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Brown stingray	-/V/-		Marianas
Common shovelnose ray	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Brazilian crownose ray	-/E/-		SW Atlantic
Porcupine ray	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Banded eagle ray	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
STURGEONS			
Atlantic sturgeon	C/-/II	NW Atlantic	
Shortnose sturgeon DPS	E/V/I	NW Atlantic	
Baltic sturgeon	-/E/I		N Atlantic/Iceland
SALMON, SMELTS, ETC.			
Chinook salmon ESUs	T/-/-	S California, W Gulf of Alaska	BC Coast
Chum salmon ESUs	T/-/-	W Gulf of Alaska	BC Coast
Coho salmon ESUs	T/-/-	S California, W Gulf of Alaska	BC Coast
Steelhead DPSs	E/-/-	S. California, W Gulf of Alaska	BC Coast
Sockeye salmon ESUs	E/-/-	W Gulf of Alaska	BC Coast
Atlantic salmon DPSs	E/-/-	NW Atlantic	
Bulltrout DPSs	T/V/-	S California	BC Coast
COD-LIKES			
Atlantic cod	-/V/-	NW Atlantic	N Atlantic/Iceland
Haddock	-/V/-	NW Atlantic	N Atlantic/Iceland
PIPEFISHES AND SEAHORSES			
Big-belly seahorse	-/V/II		W Australia
Tiger tail seahorse	-/V/II		W Australia, Marianas
Lined seahorse	-/V/II	NW Atlantic, Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Pacific seahorse	-/V/II	S California	
Common seahorse	-/V/II		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Hedgehog seahorse	-/V/II		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Flat-faced seahorse	-/V/II		W India, W Australia, Marianas
Hardwicke's pipefish	-/V/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas
SCORPIONFISHES			
Shortspine thornyhead	-/E/-	S California	BC Coast
Redfish	-/E/-	NW Atlantic	N Atlantic/Iceland
Bocaccio rockfish	-/CR/-	S California	BC Coast
PERCH-LIKES			
Giant sea bass	-/CR/-	S California	
Marbled grouper	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Masked hamlet	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Hogfish	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Mutton snapper	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Cubera snapper	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic

Table 3.3-2. Potential Occurrence of Special-Status Fish Species within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status*** *ESA/IUCN/CITES*	*Analysis Areas with Potential for Occurrence* *DAA*	*QAA*
White-edged rockcod	-/V/-		W India
Dusky grouper	-/E/-		W India, SW Atlantic
Snowy grouper	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Nassau grouper	-/E/-	SW Atlantic, Caribbean	
Speckled hind	-/CR/-	SW Atlantic, Caribbean	
Goliath grouper	-/CR/-	SW Atlantic, Caribbean	
Giant grouper	-/V/-	Galapagos Ridge	W India, W Australia, Marianas
Warsaw grouper	-/CR/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Leopard grouper	-/V/-	S California	
Venezuelan grouper	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Gulf grouper	-/V/-	S California	
Gag grouper	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Sailfin grouper	-/V/-	Galapagos Ridge	
Sawtail grouper	-/V/-	S California	
Red porgy	-/E/-	NW Atlantic	SW Atlantic
Protemblemaria punctata	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Pale dottyback	-/V/-		W India
Rainbow parrotfish	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Humphead wrasse	-/E/II	Galapagos Ridge	W India, W Australia, Marianas
Brownstriped grunt	-/E/-		SW Atlantic
Anthias regalis	-/V/-	Galapagos Ridge	
Anthias salmopunctatus	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Yellow-crowned butterflyfish	-/V/-		Marianas
Chaetodon obliquus	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
Tayrona blenny	-/V/-	Caribbean	SW Atlantic
Stegastes sanctipauli	-/V/-		SW Atlantic
TUNA AND BILLFISHES			
Southern bluefin tuna	-/CR/-		W India, W Australia, Marianas, SW Atlantic
Bigeye tuna	-/V/-	NW Atlantic, Caribbean	W India, W Australia, Marianas, SW Atlantic
Monterrey Spanish mackerel	-/E/-	S California	
SMELT			
Pacific eulachon (Southern DPS)	T/-/-		BC Coast
FLATFISHES			
Atlantic halibut	-/E/-	NW Atlantic	N Atlantic/Iceland
Yellowtail flounder	-/V/-		N Atlantic / Iceland
COELACANTHS			
Coelacanth	-/CR/I		W India

Notes: *C = Candidate, CR = Critically Endangered, E = Endangered, PT = Proposed Threatened, T = Threatened, V = Vulnerable.
Sources: CITES 2010; IUCN 2010; NOAA Fisheries 2010; SAUP 2010.

Table 3.3-3. Summary of Underwater Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Fish

Species or Group	*Sound Production*[a]			*Hearing*	
	Frequency Range (Hz)	*Dominant Frequency (kHz)*	*Source Level (dB re 1 µPa-m)*	*Frequency Range*	*Threshold (dB re 1 µPa)*
Hagfishes & lampreys	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sharks and Rays	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
Sturgeons	<100 – >1,000[1]	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Herring-likes	Unknown	Unknown	120 – 130[5]	30 Hz – 4 kHz[2-8]	110 @ 1 – 1.2 kHz[6-8]
Alosine herrings (shads and allies)	Unknown	Unknown	About 130 - 180[5]	200 Hz – 180 kHz[5] or 200 kHz[8]	About 155 @ 40 kHz[5]
Salmon, smelts, etc.	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	< 1 – 800 Hz[9, 10]	94 @ 100 – 120 Hz[9, 10]
Cod-likes		50 – 1 kHz[11]		< 1 Hz – 1 kHz[10, 12 – 16]	74 @ 200 Hz[10, 14]
Pipefishes & seahorses	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Scorpionfishes	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
Perch-likes	30 – 5,000[16, 17]	100 – 3,000[16, 17]	127[16]	85 Hz– > 2 kHz[12 - 20]	
Tuna and billfishes	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	50 Hz– 1.1 kHz[22, 23]	89 – 111 @ 500 Hz[22, 23]
Flatfishes	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown		
Coelacanths	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Notes: * - Values given are, at best, examples from published and unpublished sources. Sound production and hearing of most fishes in most groups have not been studied. Frequency bins in this table sometimes bracket the low ends of some species and the high ends of other species within a given group. This is particularly true of the very anatomically, behaviorally, ecologically, and bioacoustically diverse Order Perciformes (perch-like fishes) which includes over 9,000 species in 148 families world-wide (fresh and salt water combined), or over one-third of all fish species (Helfman et al. 1997). It includes, besides the tunas and billfishes (listed separately here) basses, tilefishes, remoras, jacks, snappers, grunts, sculpins, porgies, and many other groups.

- There is little known about elasmobranch hearing sensitivities and the mechanisms thereof. With the inevitable ambiguities of the relevant stimulus, such as particle motion vs. sound pressure, describing hearing or other mechanosensory thresholds may be meaningless. Some of the problems inherent in making generalizations involving different data sets collected in different ways on different or even the same fishes are reviewed by Hawkins (1981).
- In cases where cells are left blank it is the opinion of the preparers that the group represented is so species diverse and/or the available data sets are so different in nature as to make such a brief description meaningless or misleading. A more complete treatment is available in U.S. Navy (2005b).
- Due to the physical limitations of recording and measurement equipment and environments wherein fish will produce natural sounds, source levels are often difficult or impossible to obtain and are usually not available.

Sources: [1]Johnstone and Phillips 2003; [2]Denton et al. 1979; [3]Schwartz and Greer 1984; [4]Enger 1967; [5]Mann et al. 2001; [6]Mann et al. 2005; [7]Akematsu et al. 2003; [8]Gregory and Claburn 2003; [9]Hawkins and Johnstone 1978; [10]U.S. Navy 2007; [11]Hawkins and Rasmussen 1978; [12]Sand and Karlsen 1986; [13]Chapman and Hawkins 1973; [14]Chapman 1973; [15]Tavolga and Wodinsky 1963; [16]Luczkovich et al. 1999; [17]Gilmore 2003; [18]Ramicharitar et al. 2001; [19]Ramicaritar and Popper 2004; [20]Tavolga and Wodinsky 1965;[21]Iverson 1967; [22]Iverson 1969; [23]Chapman and Sand 1974; [24]Zhang et al. 1998; [25]Fujeida 1996.

The sensory hair cells are virtually identical to those found in all other vertebrate ears (and in the fish lateral line). Each sensory hair cell has a series of cilia (which have some resemblance to hairs – hence the name of the cell) that project upwards into the lumen of the otolithic organ. The tips of the cilia contact the overlying otolith. When the otolith moves relative to the sensory epithelium on which the sensory hair cells sit, the cilia bend, and this activates the cells (reviewed in Popper et al. 2003).

Most fish have two pathways for sound to the ear. One, referred to as the "direct pathway", responds to the particle motion component of the sound field. When the fish moves in a sound field, the denser otoliths lag slightly behind. This differential movement of fish and otolith results in the bending of the cilia on the sensory hair cells, as described above (Popper and Fay 1993; Popper et al. 2003).

The second, or indirect, pathway is for detection of sound pressure and for converting the pressure to a signal that can stimulate the ear. Most frequently, the detector is the swim bladder[(1)] or some other bubble of air in the body of the fish. The air in the swim bladder is of a different density than the rest of the fish and the surrounding water. Any such gas chamber, being more compressible and expandable than either water or fish tissue, will contract and expand in response to the pressure signal. This vibrating bubble can be considered as a secondary source of the sound, and this energy is re-radiated from the bubble to the ear. This re-radiated energy has a large particle motion component, and this directly stimulates the ear (see Popper et al. 2003; Ladich and Popper 2004).

A third mechanosensory pathway, the lateral line system, is found in most bony fishes and elasmobranchs (i.e., sharks) (see Coombs and Montgomery 1999 for a review of the structure and function of the lateral line). The lateral line is sensitive to water motions. The basic sensory unit of the lateral line system is the same sensory hair cell that is found in the ear, but in the lateral line these are organized into structures called neuromasts. Neuromasts may sit on the surface of the fish (call free neuromasts) or be embedded in canals within the skin (canal neuromasts). The lateral line detects the motion of the water. For example, when fish are swimming in a current, the lateral line detects the movement of the current and helps the fish orient so that it can swim against or with the current, whichever is appropriate. Fish also use the lateral line to detect low frequency acoustic signals (1-200 Hz, depending upon the species) over a distance of one to two body lengths. Typically, the lateral line is used in conjunction with other sensory information, including hearing (Sand 1981; Coombs and Montgomery 1999).

Although studies of fish hearing capabilities are limited to very few of the more than 29,000 existing fish species,[(2)] there are data on representative species of a number of diverse fish taxa (see Fay 1988; Popper et al. 2003; Ladich and Popper 2004). Thus, what is known about hearing capabilities across the very diverse fish taxa is based on a rather sparse sampling of species. Although a few species can hear at high frequencies (see below), for the majority of fish species hearing is restricted to rather low frequencies (Table 3.3-3). Most fish species can hear sounds from a few cycles per sec (Hz) up to 300-1,000 Hz. Fish of a few species are known to detect sounds less than 1 Hz[(3)] (Sand and Karlsen 1986, 2000; reviewed in Popper et al. 2003).

There are several recent reviews on fish hearing that provide a detailed discussion of the issues raised here; most notably, see Fay and Simmons (1999), Fay and Popper (2000), Popper et al. (2003), and

---

[(1)] The swim bladder is a large structure in the abdominal cavity of the vast majority of fish, but it is not found in flatfish or sharks and their relatives. The major role of the swim bladder is to help the fish maintain neutral buoyancy at any depth in the water. By adjusting the amount of air in the swim bladder, fish can be neutrally buoyant, and thus do not have to expend energy to stay at a desired depth.

[(2)] See www.fishbase.org.

[(3)] Sounds below about 30 Hz are often referred to as *infrasound* in the literature.

Ladich and Popper (2004). Webb et al. (2008) provide a broad overview of all aspects of fish hearing. A recent paper by Popper and Fay (2010) discusses the designation of fishes based on sound detection capabilities. They suggest that the designations 'hearing specialist' and 'hearing generalist' no longer be used for fishes because of their vague and sometimes contradictory definitions, and that there is instead a range of hearing capabilities across species that is more like a continuum, presumably based on the relative contributions of pressure to the overall hearing capabilities of a species.

According to Popper and Fay (2010), one end of this continuum is represented by fishes that only detect particle motion because they lack pressure-sensitive gas bubbles (e.g., swim bladder). These species include elasmobranchs (e.g., sharks) and jawless fishes, and some teleosts including flatfishes. Fishes at this end of the continuum are typically capable of detecting sound frequencies less than 1.5 kHz.

The other end of the fish hearing continuum is represented by fishes with highly specialized otophysic connections between pressure receptive organs, such as the swim bladder, and the inner ear. These fishes include some squirrelfish, mormyrids, herrings, and otophysan fishes (freshwater fishes with Weberian apparatus, an articulated series of small bones that extend from the swim bladder to the inner ear). Rather than being limited to 1.5 kHz or less in hearing, these fishes can typically hear up to several kHz. One group of fish in the anadromous herring subfamily Alosinae (shads and menhaden) can detect sounds to well over 180 kHz (Mann et al. 1997, 1998, 2001). This may be the widest hearing range of any vertebrate that has been studied to date. While the specific reason for this very high frequency hearing is not totally clear, there is strong evidence that this capability evolved for the detection of the ultrasonic sounds produced by echolocating dolphins to enable the fish to detect and avoid predation (Mann et al. 1997; Plachta and Popper 2003).

All other fishes have hearing capabilities that fall somewhere between these two extremes of the continuum. Some have unconnected swim bladders located relatively far from the inner ear (e.g., salmonids, tuna) while others have unconnected swim bladders located relatively close to the inner ear (e.g., Atlantic cod). There has also been the suggestion that Atlantic cod can detect 38 kHz (Astrup and Møhl 1993). However, the general consensus was that this was not hearing with the ear, but probably the fish responding to exceedingly high pressure signals of the 38-kHz source through some other receptor in the skin, such as touch receptors (Astrup and Møhl 1998).

Fish ears respond to changes in pressure and particle motions (van Bergeijk 1967; Schuijf 1981; Kalmijn 1988, 1989; Schellert and Popper 1992; Hawkins 1993; Fay 2005). Sound amplitude generally attenuates (decreases) with increasing distance from the sound source (exceptions can occur in water that is shallow relative to the sound's wavelength). Thus, even very powerful and low-frequency sound sources are unlikely to have profound effects at anything but rather short ranges (Kalmijn 1988, 1989). On the other hand, sound propagation is more efficient at lower frequencies, assuming boundary conditions, especially water depth, are adequate for sound propagation (Rogers and Cox 1988). As a result, low-frequency sound may be propagated over a considerable distance. Because seismic surveys are characterized by low-frequency sounds, this aspect needs to be considered with respect to potential impacts on fish and their auditory functions, the acoustic environments they inhabit, and their associated ecology.

3.3.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

This section summarizes region-specific use and habitat features relative to fishes, with particular emphasis on ESA-listed species, occurring within the five DAAs. Discussion is limited to those species or higher groups that potentially occur within each DAA during the season of the exemplary marine seismic survey (Table 3.3-4). Critical habitat, as designated under the ESA, and EFH, as designated under the MSA, are also discussed.

Table 3.3-4. Potential Occurrence of Higher Fish Groups and EFH within the DAAs during the Season of the Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Higher Group and EFH	*NW Atlantic (Sum)*	*Caribbean (Spr or Sum)*	*S Calif (Spr or Sum)*	*W Gulf of Alaska (Sum)*	*Galapagos Ridge (Win)*
HIGHER GROUP*					
Hagfishes and Lampreys	B F M	-	B F M	B F M	B F M
Sharks, Skates, Rays, & Chimeras	B E F	E F M	B F M	B F M	B F M
Sturgeons	F M	-	B F M	-	-
Herring-likes	E F M	B E F	B E F M	B E F M	B E F M
Salmon, Smelts, etc.	B F M	-	B E F M	EFM	B E F M
Cod-likes	B E F M	-	-	B E F M	B E F M
Pipefishes and Seahorses	-	-	B F	-	B E F M
Scorpionfishes	F M	-	B E F M	B E F M	B E F M
Perch-likes	B E F	B E F	B E F M	B E F M	B E F M
Tuna and Billfishes	E F M	E F M	B E F M	-	B E F M
Flatfishes	B E F	-	B E F	B E F M	B E F M
EFH**					
Hagfishes and lampreys	E L J A		E L J A	E L J A	
Sharks, Rays, and Chimeras	N J A		E J A	E J A	
Sturgeons	-		E N J A	-	
Herring-likes	J A		E L J A	E L J A	
Salmon, Smelts, etc.	-		J A	A	
Cod-likes	E L J A		-	E L J A	
Pipefishes and Seahorses	-		E J A	-	
Scorpionfishes	-		E L J A	E L J A	
Perch-likes	E L J A		E L J A	E L J A	
Tuna and Billfishes	J A		E L J A	-	
Flatfishes	E L J A		E L J A	E L J A	

Notes: *(Season) = N hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Spr = spring, Sum = summer, Win = winter; B = breeds within the area, E = economically important fishery within the area, F = feeds within the area, M = migrates through the area, - = does not occur.
**EFH occurs only within the U.S. EEZ; analysis areas with shaded cells do not occur within the U.S. EEZ; E = eggs, L = larvae, N = neonates, J = juveniles, A = adults.
Sources: U.S. Navy 2005; SAUP 2010.

3.3.2.1 NW Atlantic

The NW Atlantic DAA occurs within the Northeast U.S. Continental Shelf LME (refer to Figure 2-23) (SAUP 2010). Two fish species in this analysis area are listed as endangered under the ESA: shortnose sturgeon and Atlantic salmon. An additional 11 species are identified as "At Risk" under IUCN or CITES (Table 3.3-2).

Shortnose Sturgeon. The shortnose sturgeon was listed as endangered in 1967. Its known distribution extends from the Indian River, Florida, to the Saint John River, New Brunswick, Canada. Although it is endangered rangewide, NMFS recognizes 19 DPSs, 4 of which occur within states in the vicinity of the DAA: Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware (NMFS 1998c). Shortnose sturgeon are generally confined to freshwater, estuarine, and nearshore areas. They inhabit the main stems of their natal rivers, migrating between freshwater and mesohaline river reaches, and sometimes to sea. They do not appear to make long offshore migrations. To date, there has been no critical habitat designated for the shortnose sturgeon.

Atlantic Salmon. The Gulf of Maine DPS of Atlantic salmon has been designated as endangered under the ESA. This DPS includes all naturally reproducing wild populations and those river-specific hatchery

populations of Atlantic salmon having historical, river-specific characteristics found north of and including tributaries of the lower Kennebec River to, but not including, the mouth of the St. Croix River at the U.S.-Canada border (Fay et al. 2006).

Atlantic salmon reproduce in coastal rivers of northeastern North America, Iceland, Europe and northwestern Russia and migrate through various portions of the North Atlantic Ocean. Stocks originating from North America range from the Ungava area of northern Quebec, southeast to Newfoundland and southwest to Long Island Sound. The North American group of Atlantic salmon includes Canadian populations (e.g., St. Lawrence River Basin, outer Maritimes, Bay of Fundy and Newfoundland-Labrador) and U.S. populations. The Gulf of Maine DPS is known to migrate as far north as the Labrador Sea where it mixes with Atlantic salmon stocks of Canadian origin. To date, there is no designated critical habitat for the Gulf of Maine Atlantic salmon DPS (NMFS 2005d).

Essential Fish Habitat. EFH for various life stages of numerous fish species, including Atlantic cod, Atlantic salmon, Atlantic halibut, flounder, hake, herring and other pelagic species, occurs in or proximate to the analysis area extending out to the limit of the U.S. EEZ (Table 3.3-4) (U.S. Navy 2005; New England Fishery Management Council 1998). Unless otherwise indicated, these life stages of the various species can occur anywhere in the water column. Designated EFH for adult Atlantic salmon represents all 26 rivers where Atlantic salmon are currently present and includes those bays and estuaries that support Atlantic salmon adults at the "abundant", "common" or "rare" level. No offshore marine areas have been designated as EFH for Atlantic Salmon (New England Fishery Management Council 1998).

Fisheries of the western North Atlantic Ocean are historically and currently fundamental to northeastern North American populations and economies, and were a primary reason for European settlement and success there. The presence and richness of fisheries in relatively shallow-water areas ("banks") in the western North Atlantic have been a source of tremendously successful and important fisheries, especially for codfishes. Current commercial fisheries identified in this analysis area include those for bluefish, black sea bass, silver hake, monkfish, tunas, striped bass, menhaden, Atlantic mackerel, Atlantic cod, haddock, and yellowtail flounder. Skates, spiny dogfish, Atlantic herring, and other large pelagic fishes such as sharks and swordfish are also fished commercially in the region. In addition, there is a fairly recent hook-and-line fishery for wreckfish which lands on the order of 100 metric tons from the "Charleston Bump" (off the SE U.S.), well south of the analysis area. However, the wreckfish population extends well north and across the North Atlantic to Europe (Vaughan et al. 2001).

According to the U.S. Navy's Marine Resource Assessment of the Northeast Operating Areas (U.S. Navy 2005), a recreational fishing hotspot occurs immediately west of the analysis area. The primary target species include bluefish, Atlantic mackerel and Atlantic cod in federal waters, and striped bass in state waters. Sport fishing tournaments occur in the analysis area in spring, summer, and fall.

3.3.2.2 Caribbean

The Caribbean DAA occurs within the Caribbean Sea LME, primarily on the shelf region north of Venezuela (refer to Figure 2-22) (SAUP 2010). No ESA-listed fish species or EFH occur in this analysis area, but 17 species of fish have been identified as 'At Risk' by IUCN or CITES (Table 3.3-2).

The current commercial fisheries identified in this analysis area include those for yellowfin tuna, swordfish, coralline reef fishes, round sardinella, sea catfishes, bigeye scad, grunts (Haemulidae), jacks, and weakfishes (SAUP 2010; FishBase 2006) (Table 3.3-4). Sport fishing occurs inshore of the analysis

area. It is likely that some of the fisheries carried out within this analysis area would coincide with the season proposed for the Caribbean DAA exemplary seismic survey.

3.3.2.3 S California

The S California DAA (refer to Figure 2-20) is a diverse and seasonally productive marine system area (SAUP 2010). The region is strongly influenced by wind-driven upwelling, topography, currents (Nishimoto and Washburn 2002), and anthropogenic influences. Deep, nearshore canyons bring deepwater conditions and species near the coast, and structures associated with considerable offshore oil development serve as attractive and productive habitat, especially for rockfishes (family Scorpaenidae) (Love and York 2005; Love et al. 2005).

Nine ESA-listed fish species occur in this analysis area: four threatened or endangered salmon ESUs (3 Chinook, 1 coho), four steelhead DPSs, and the threatened southern green sturgeon DPS (Table 3.3-2). An additional 12 IUCN- and/or CITES-listed 'At Risk' fish species occur in the analysis area in the California Current-Southern-California Bight.

Salmon and Steelhead. ESA-listed salmon and steelhead ESUs originating in California all undertake northerly migrations along the west coast of North America upon leaving their natal rivers as juveniles. For this reason, their occurrence in the S California DAA is likely to be rare. Critical habitat designations for ESA-listed salmon and steelhead originating from rivers in California are restricted to freshwater and estuarine habitats (NOAA Fisheries 2005).

Green Sturgeon. Green sturgeon spend the majority of their lives in coastal waters between northern Baja California and the Aleutian Islands, Alaska (Moyle 2001). Green sturgeon are very migratory and data suggest they inhabit coastal areas within the 328-ft (110-m) bottom contour. Little is known about the specific migration pathways and oceanic distribution of the southern green sturgeon DPS but they are believed to migrate northward to Alaska (NMFS 2005e). This suggests that occurrences of green sturgeon in the S California DAA would be rare. Critical habitat has not been designated for the green sturgeon (NMFS 2005e).

Essential Fish Habitat. EFH has also been designated by the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) for various non-listed species known to occur in California waters including northern anchovy, Pacific sardine, Pacific mackerel, jack mackerel, common thresher shark, pelagic thresher shark, bigeye thresher shark, shortfin mako shark, blue shark, albacore tuna, bigeye tuna, northern bluefin tuna, skipjack tuna, yellowfin tuna, striped marlin, swordfish, dorado, and for as many as 80 species of groundfish. Salmon EFH is broad, covering freshwater, estuarine, and marine environments. Salmon EFH extends from the nearshore and tidal submerged environments within state territorial waters out to the full extent of the EEZ offshore of California north of Point Conception (PFMC 1998, 2006, 2007).

Fishing has been an important part of the life of western North America for thousands of years, from indigenous subsistence fisheries to industrialized net and hook-and-line fisheries. The seasonal wind-driven upwelling, a spring phenomenon, replenishes nutrients in the upper ocean and drives, along with longer day length, a spectacular spring bloom in productivity. Current commercial and sport fisheries are important and diverse (see Schroeder and Love 2002), and have been very important to the development of the region. However, many of these fisheries have recently been in decline, particularly the salmon fisheries. A high-seas yellowfin tuna seine fishery, mostly out of San Diego, California, still exists but has declined. Bottom trawling and, more recently, midwater trawling, have been very important but have recently been restricted. The central California sardine fishery was very productive while it lasted and it is slowly rebuilding. Gillnetting has been important both near-shore and offshore. Offshore trolling for

albacore is important. Near-shore sport fishing, from both private and for-hire boats, is mostly for salmon, rockfishes, and sometimes albacore.

3.3.2.4 W Gulf of Alaska

The nearest LME to the W Gulf of Alaska DAA is the East Bering Sea LME (SAUP 2010). This region is a bathymetrically diverse and abrupt basin. Important natural bathymetric features include the Emperor Seamount Chain extending south roughly along the International Date Line, the Aleutian Trench running parallel with and south of the Aleutian Island Chain, the Aleutian Islands, and the Patton and Gilbert seamounts to the east. These features constrain circulation and serve as attraction points for marine fish (Mecklenberg et al. 2002). A few of the eastern seamounts, some as far west as Umiak Island, are Alaska Seamount Marine Reserves. The climate is sub-Arctic and productivity is governed by currents, temperature, and day length in winter. Sea ice and its effect on light penetration as well as that of many associated organisms are important determinants of productivity.

Twenty-seven ESA-listed threatened or endangered DPSs of anadromous salmon and steelhead potentially occur within the Gulf of Alaska: 16 salmon ESUs (2 sockeye, 9 Chinook, 3 coho, and 2 chum) and 11 steelhead ESUs (Table 3.3-2). The only other ESA-listed marine species that could occur within the W Gulf of Alaska is the southern green sturgeon DPS. There is no ESA-designated critical habitat in the waters of Alaska (Table 3.3-4) (NMFS 2005a).

Salmon and Steelhead. All W Coast salmon species (and associated ESUs) currently listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA originate in freshwater habitat in Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and California. Although some of the listed species migrate as adults into marine waters off Alaska, no stocks of Pacific salmon or steelhead originating from freshwater habitat in Alaska are listed under ESA. Only one Chinook salmon and three steelhead ESUs are thought to range into marine waters off Alaska during the ocean migration portion of their life history. In the Gulf of Alaska, ESA-listed salmon ESUs are mixed with hundreds to thousands of other salmon stocks originating from the Columbia River in Washington and Oregon and river drainages in British Columbia, Alaska, and Asia; ESA-listed fish are visually indistinguishable from these unlisted stocks (NMFS 2005a).

Green Sturgeon. Green sturgeon spend the majority of their lives in coastal waters between northern Baja California and the Aleutian Islands, Alaska (Moyle 2001). Green sturgeon are very migratory and data suggest they inhabit coastal areas within the 328-ft (110-m) bottom contour. Little is known about the specific migration pathways and oceanic distribution of the southern green sturgeon DPS but they are believed to migrate northward to Alaska; occurrences in the Gulf of Alaska are thought to be rare. Critical habitat has not been designated for the green sturgeon (NMFS 2005e).

Essential Fish Habitat. EFH for several species and life stages of marine fish, including Alaskan stocks of Pacific salmon and approximately 25 species of groundfish is designated in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA (Table 3.3-4). EFH for Alaskan stocks of Pacific salmon extends from the mean higher tide line to the 200-nm limit of the U.S. EEZ (NMFS 2005a).

Fisheries have always and necessarily been important to the people inhabiting this region and to others, from indigenous subsistence fishers to very large-scale industrial fishing efforts by Canada, the U.S., or the nations of Asia. The severity of the climate and sea has largely limited exploitation until the last half-century, and winters are especially severe. The commercial fisheries of the W Gulf of Alaska are important and diverse involving both anadromous fishes (salmonids) and marine fishes (halibut and other flatfishes, Pacific herring, rockfishes, cods, and pollocks). Bottom trawling for groundfish is especially important.

3.3.2.5 Galapagos Ridge

The Galapagos Ridge DAA is comprised of a tectonic spreading ridge running roughly parallel to the western coastline of South America. Its location is approximately 1,864 mi (3,000 km) offshore (refer to Figure 2-21) and thus well west of the nearest LME, the highly productive Humboldt Current. The Humboldt Current carries cold, low-salinity, nutrient-rich Antarctic water north along the western coast of South America. However, the offshore deep ocean waters of the tropical Pacific Ocean are more nutrient poor, similar to mid-ocean tropical seas around the world. No ESA-listed species are identified for the analysis area, although eight IUCN-listed fish species may be encountered there (Table 3.3-2). Since this DAA is outside the U.S. EEZ, EFH is not present within this analysis area.

The eastern tropical Pacific Ocean is the site of a very large and important international pelagic seine fishery for yellowfin and other tunas. Some pelagic long lining for tunas and billfishes also occurs. Large-scale industrial over-fishing is considered an ongoing problem. Sportfishing is usually confined to waters near islands or larger landmasses.

3.3.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

This section summarizes region-specific use and habitat features relative to fishes occurring within the eight QAAs. Discussion is limited to those species or higher groups that potentially occur within each QAA during the season of the exemplary marine seismic survey (Table 3.3-5). Since all the QAAs are outside the U.S. EEZ, designated critical habitat for ESA-listed species and EFH are not present within any of the QAAs.

Table 3.3-5. Potential Occurrence of Higher Fish Groups within the QAAs during the Season of the Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Higher Group	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (Sum)*	*BC Coast (Fall)*	*SW Atlantic (Any)*	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (Spr, Sum, or Fall)*	*W Australia (Spr or Fall)*	*W India (Spr or Fall)*	*Mariana Islands (Spr)*	*Sub-Antarctic (Jan-Feb)*
Hagfishes & Lampreys	-	B F M	B F	B F	B F	B F	B F	-
Sharks, Skates, Rays, & Chimeras	E F M	-	E F M	E F M	E F M	E F M	-	B F M
Sturgeons	B F M	F M	-	-	-	-	-	-
Herring-likes	E F M	M	B E F	-	E F M	E F M	-	-
Salmon, Smelts, etc.	E F M	M E	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cod-likes	B E F	B F M	-	-	-	-	B F M	B E F M
Pipefishes & Seahorses	-	-	-	-	-	-	B F M	-
Scorpionfishes	E F M	B F M E	E F	-	-	-	-	B F M
Perch-likes	-	B F M	B E F	-	B E F	B E F	B F M	B E F M
Tuna & Billfishes	-	-	E F M	E F M	E F M	E F M	B E F M	B F M
Flatfishes	B E F	B F M E	-	-	-	B E F	-	B E F M
Coelacanths	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: *(Season) = N hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Spr = spring, Sum = summer. B = breeds within the area; E = economically important fishery within the area; F = feeds within the area; M = migrates through the area.
Source: SAUP 2010.

3.3.3.1 N Atlantic/Iceland

The N Atlantic/Iceland QAA occurs within the Iceland Shelf LME (refer to Figure 2-18) (SAUP 2010). Although no ESA-listed species occur within this analysis area, nine fish species do occur that have been identified as 'At Risk' by IUCN or CITES (Table 3.3-2).

The current commercial fisheries identified in the LME of this analysis area include those for capelin, Atlantic cod, blue whiting, Atlantic herring, Greenland halibut, saithe or pollock, haddock, redfish, ocean perch, Atlantic wolffish, and European plaice. The most important species group in terms of shelf catches is the pelagic fishes followed by the demersal (or benthic) groundfishes (SAUP 2010).

3.3.3.2 BC Coast

The BC Coast QAA is located at the southern part of the Gulf of Alaska LME (refer to Figure 2-18) (SAUP 2010). Twenty-seven ESA-listed threatened or endangered species or DPSs of anadromous salmon and steelhead and the ESA-listed green sturgeon originating in U.S. waters potentially migrate along the BC Coast QAA during their seaward or river-ward migrations. An additional seven species of fish have been identified as 'At Risk' by the IUCN or CITES within the BC Coast QAA.

Although Canada has no EFH-equivalent designation for various life stages of marine fish species along the BC Coast, DFOC uses regulatory power to open and close fisheries and fishing areas in Canadian waters to protect stocks of fish, either temporarily or permanently. Species of fish with such area closures are rockfish, herring, and salmon. In particular, inshore rocky reefs, kelp beds, and estuaries are commonly identified as important habitat for these species by DFOC.

An extensive commercial fishery occurs along the BC Coast throughout the year. This fishery is distributed across the entire continental shelf and beyond. Groundfish species (including rockfishes, halibut, and sablefish) make up the majority of the landed value, followed by herring and salmon. There are lesser fisheries on other species such as sardine. The BC Coast is renowned for its sport fishing that primarily targets salmon. This is, for the most part, a spring to late-winter fishery that occurs in near-coastal waters. Sport fishers also target halibut and inshore rockfish species. First Nations traditional and food fisheries along the BC Coast have significant food, social, and ceremonial value to the local communities. In addition, many First Nations people participate in the general commercial fisheries.

3.3.3.3 SW Atlantic

The SW Atlantic QAA along coastal Brazil occurs within the North Brazil Shelf LME (refer to Figure 2-18) (SAUP 2010). No ESA-listed fish species occur within this analysis area while 42 species do occur that have been identified as 'At Risk' by IUCN or CITES (Table 3.3-2).

The current commercial fisheries identified in the LME of this analysis area include those for wreakfishes, drums or croakers (Sciaenidae), Atlantic seabob, jacks, sea catfishes, round sardinella, and Brazilian sardinella. Fisheries in the North Brazil Shelf LME are dominated by artisanal fishing methods (SAUP 2010). Therefore, fish catches are relatively low when compared to other areas with larger-scale and industrialized fishing methods.

3.3.3.4 Mid-Atlantic Ridge

The Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA occurs proximate to the border shared by the West Central Atlantic and the East Central Atlantic FAO Areas (refer to Figure 2-18) (SAUP 2010). While there are substantial fish data associated with both of these FAO areas, both areas include primarily nearshore areas (i.e., eastern North America and western Africa) that are more productive than the mid-ocean waters of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA. Thus, it is not possible to accurately extract the data relevant only to the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA. The limited fish information provided in this section is in the context of these broader FAO Areas.

No ESA-listed fish species are identified for this analysis area. There are no data on any IUCN- or CITES-listed fish species specific to this area in the mid-Atlantic; however, it is likely that any listed fish

species occurring in this analysis area belong to either the tunas/billfishes or sharks/rays Higher Group classifications.

It is unlikely that many commercial fisheries are conducted in the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA given its distance from shore. Medium to large pelagic fishes and sharks most likely dominate the pelagic fish assemblage in the analysis area; deepwater benthic and bathypelagic fish species also occur.

3.3.3.5 W Australia

The W Australia QAA occurs within both the Northwest Australian Shelf and West Central Australian Shelf LMEs (refer to Figure 2-18) (SAUP 2010). Some fish information provided in this section is in the context of these LMEs. No ESA-listed fish species occur within this analysis area while there are 36 species that are IUCN- or CITES-listed (Table 3.3-2).

The current commercial fisheries identified in the LMEs of this analysis area include those for goldstripe sardinella, bigeyes, threadfin breams, torpedo scad, Indo-Pacific anchovies, squirefish, southern bluefin tuna, yellowfin tuna, smelt-whitings, silky shark, Australian ruff, mullets, and barrelfishes (SAUP 2010).

3.3.3.6 W India

The W India QAA occurs within the Arabian Sea LME (refer to Figure 2-18) (SAUP 2010). Some fish information provided in this section is in the context of this LME. No ESA-listed fish species occur within this analysis area, but 36 species are CITES- or IUCN-listed (Table 3.3-2).

The current commercial fisheries identified in the LME of this analysis area include those for Indian oil sardine, drums or croakers, sea catfishes, threadfin breams, Bombay duck, cutlassfishes, slimys, slipmouths or ponyfishes, anchovies, Indian mackerel, skipjack tuna, and yellowfin tuna (SAUP 2010).

3.3.3.7 Marianas

The Mariana Islands are a bathymetrically extreme region. The Marianas Ridge runs northward and separates the Philippine Sea from the North Pacific Ocean (Figure 2-18). To the east and running parallel to the ridge is the Marianas Trench, which includes the Challenger Deep that is the deepest part of all the world's oceans. No ESA-listed fish species are identified for this analysis area while there are at least 27 species of cartilaginous fishes that are IUCN- and CITES-listed (Table 3.3-2).

The largest and most profitable fisheries-related component of the economies of the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands involves the fishery for tunas and its care, preparation, and transportation (usually by air) to market. This is due to the abundance of tunas in the region and the proximity to the very profitable market for fresh tuna in Japan. This fishery is primarily based on the catch of foreign-owned vessels licensed by the island governments. There are both private-sector and government long-line fisheries as well. Aquaculture is growing in the region. In some places, small-scale and artisanal fisheries persist. On many islands, especially those with inter-island air service, boat-based big game sportfishing and diving (spear fishing) is a growing component of the island economies.

3.3.3.8 Sub-Antarctic

The Sub-Antarctic QAA occurs within the Southwest Pacific FAO Area (refer to Figure 2-18) (SAUP 2010). There are no ESA-, IUCN-, or CITES-listed fish species identified for this analysis area. The sub-Antarctic oceans are productive with long day lengths in the austral summers. As a result, they have long been the target of international fisheries for fish, whales, and invertebrates. Due to the remote and harsh nature of the southern oceans, these are all high-seas industrial fisheries. For the last 60 years very diverse

landings have come from the Southwestern Pacific Ocean, including the blue grenadier, a deepwater (2,625 ft [800 m]) demersal fish. The Inca scad, a jack, comprises the major fraction of landings in the SE Pacific Ocean.

3.3.4 Environmental Consequences – General

There are three types of potential effects on fish from exposure to underwater seismic and other anthropogenic sounds: pathological, physiological, and behavioral. These effects were previously defined in Section 3.2.4. The specific received sound levels at which permanent adverse effects to most fish species could potentially occur are little studied and largely unknown and information on the impacts of seismic surveys on marine fish populations is limited (Table 3.3-6 and Appendix D). Furthermore, available information on the potential impacts of seismic surveys on marine fish involves studies of a limited number of species and individuals and thus portions of a population; there have been no such studies at the population scale. This makes drawing conclusions about impacts to fish problematic since ultimately, the most important aspect of potential impacts relates to how exposure to seismic survey sound affects marine fish populations and their viability, including their availability to fisheries.

The following sections provide a general synopsis of available information on the effects of exposure to seismic and other anthropogenic sound as relevant to fish. The information comprises results from scientific studies of varying degrees of rigor plus, given the paucity of available data, some anecdotal information. Some of these data sources may have serious shortcomings in methods, analysis, interpretation, and reproducibility which must be considered when interpreting their results (see Hastings and Popper 2005). Criteria used to assess effects are first described, followed by a comparison of the frequencies of sounds from each source vs. sound frequencies detected and produced by fish, insofar as known. The types of potential impacts on fish resulting from the proposed seismic survey activities are then discussed. A more detailed review of the literature on the effects of seismic survey sound on fish is presented in Appendix D.

Pathological Effects. The potential for pathological damage to hearing structures in fish depends on the energy level of the received sound and the physiology and hearing capability of the species in question. For a given sound to result in hearing loss, the sound must exceed, by some specific amount, the hearing threshold of the fish for that sound (Popper 2005). The consequences of temporary or permanent hearing loss in individual fish or a fish population is largely unknown. However, it likely depends on the number of individuals affected and whether critical behaviors involving sound (e.g., predator avoidance, prey capture, orientation and navigation, reproduction, etc.) are adversely affected.

Rather little is known about the mechanisms and characteristics of potential injury to fish from exposure to seismic survey sounds. Few data have been presented in the peer-reviewed scientific literature. There are few papers with proper experimental methods, controls, and careful pathological investigation implicating that sounds produced by actual seismic survey airguns cause adverse anatomical and hearing effects. McCauley et al. (2003) found that exposure to airgun sounds (600 pulses with peak-to-peak source SPL just below 223 dB re 1 µPa) caused observable anatomical damage to the auditory maculae of pink snapper (see Appendix D for more details on the McCauley (2003) study). This damage in the ears did not repair in fish examined almost 2 months after exposure.

Table 3.3-6. Summary of Known Effects of Seismic Survey Sound on Marine Fish and Related Fisheries

Higher Group	*Masking or Disturbance**	*Hearing or Detection Impairment**	*Auditory Tissue Damage**	*Non-Auditory Injury or Mortality**	*Physiological Effect(stress)*	*Fishery Effects**
Hagfishes & lampreys	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sharks, rays, & chimeras	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Sturgeons	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Herring-likes	• Limited evidence of short-term behavioral effects for caged herring (Engås et al. 1995).	Unknown	Unknown	• Limited evidence of increased mortality of eggs (anchovy) at close range (<10 m) to multiple exposures to airguns (Holliday et al. 1987).	Unknown	Herring, no significant effect on distribution (Slotte et al. 2004).
Salmon, Smelts, etc.	• Negligible behavioral response of Atlantic salmon to small airgun array (Thomsen 2002).	No evidence in one salmonid species (Popper et al. 2005).	Unknown	• Some evidence of swim bladder damage to young Arctic cisco to pulsed airgun sound at <2 m but no mortality observed (Falk and Lawrence 1973). • No evidence of lethal effects to caged coho salmon (Weinhold and Weaver 1972).	Unknown	Unknown
Cod-likes	• Evidence of short-term behavioral effects for hake with evidence of habituation (Chapman and Hawkins 1969). • No behavioral response observed for pollock, saithe, juvenile cod (Wardle et al. 2001).	Unknown		• Evidence of injury to caged cod and plaice from continuous near-field exposure (<4 m) (Matishov 1992). • Evidence of injury and mortality to eggs and larvae of cod, turbot, plaice (Booman et al. 1996).	Unknown	• Blue whiting – no significant effects on distribution, moved deeper (Slotte et al. 2004). • Evidence of reduced catch rates for cod, haddock (Engås et al. 1996).
Pipefishes & seahorses	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Scorpionfishes	• Evidence of short-term behavioral effects for rockfish (Pearson et al. 1992)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	• Evidence of reduced catch rates for rockfish (Skalski et al. 1992)
Perch-likes	• Evidence of short-term behavioral effects for sea bass (Santulli et al. 1999). • Short-term behavioral response in sandeels (Hassel et al. 2003, 2004). • No behavioral response observed for mackerel (Wardle et al. 2001).	Unknown	• Evidence of permanent structural change in pink snapper from many exposures to airguns (McCauley et al. 2003).	• No evidence of injury to sea bass (Santulli et al. 1999). • Evidence of increased mortality of eggs (red mullet, blue runner) at close range (<10 m) to multiple exposures to airguns (Kostyvchenko 1973).	• Evidence of short-term increase in stress levels (cortisol) of sea bass (Santulli et al. 1999).	• No evidence of reduced catch rates for bass (Pickett et al. 1994).
Tuna & billfishes, Flatfishes, Coelacanths	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

*Unknown indicates no studies. See text and Appendix D for further details and citations for the studies summarized in this table.

Popper et al. (2005) documented TTS (as determined by auditory brainstem response) in two of three fishes (northern pike and lake chub in the Mackenzie River Delta). This study found that broad whitefish that received an SEL of 177 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ showed no TTS. In both cases, the repetitive exposure to sound was greater than would be expected in a typical seismic survey. Fishes involved in the study by Popper et al. (2005) were examined for damage to the sensory cells of the inner ear as a result of exposure to seismic sound and no damage was observed (Song et al. 2008). Besides these two studies, at least with airgun-generated sound treatments, most contributions rely on rather subjective assays such as 'fish alarm' or 'startle response', or changes in catch rates by fishers. While these experiments are relevant in that they attempt to use the levels of exposures that are likely to be encountered by most free-ranging fish in actual seismic survey areas, the associated sound stimuli are often poorly described and the biological assays are varied (Hastings and Popper 2005).

Wardle et al. (2001) suggest that acute injury and death of organisms exposed to seismic energy in water depends primarily on two features of the sound source: the received peak pressure and the time required for the pressure to rise and decay. Generally, as received pressure increases the period for the pressure to rise and decay decreases and the chance of acute pathological effects increases. According to Buchanan et al. (2004), for the types of seismic airguns and arrays involved with the proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research, the pathological (mortality) zone for fish would be expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source. Numerous other studies provide examples of no fish, fish egg, or fish larvae mortality upon exposure to seismic sources (Falk and Lawrence 1973; Holliday et al. 1987; La Bella et al. 1996; Santulli et al. 1999; McCauley et al. 2000a, b; Thomsen 2002; Hassel et al. 2003; McCauley et al. 2003; Popper et al. 2005; Payne et al. 2009).

Other studies have reported, some equivocally, that mortality of fish, fish eggs, or larvae can occur close to seismic sources (Kostyvchenko 1973; Dalen and Knutsen 1986; Booman et al. 1996; Dalen et al. 1996). Some of these investigated seismic effects from treatments quite different from actual seismic survey sound stimuli or even reasonable surrogates. Saetre and Ona (1996) applied a 'worst-case scenario' mathematical model to investigate the effects of seismic energy on fish eggs and larvae. They concluded that mortality rates caused by exposure to seismic surveys are so low as compared to natural mortality rates that the impact of seismic surveying on recruitment to a fish stock must be regarded as insignificant.

Physiological Effects. Physiological effects refer to cellular and/or biochemical responses by fish to acoustic stress. Such stress could potentially affect fish populations by increasing mortality or reducing reproductive success. Primary and secondary stress responses of fish after exposure to seismic survey sound appear to be temporary (Sverdrup et al. 1994; McCauley et al. 2000a, b). The periods necessary for these biochemical changes to return to normal are variable and depend on numerous aspects of the biology of the species and of the sound stimulus (see Appendix D).

Behavioral Effects. Behavioral effects include changes in the distribution, migration, mating, and catchability of fish populations. Studies investigating the possible effects of sound (including seismic survey sound) on fish behavior have been conducted on both uncaged and caged individuals (Chapman and Hawkins 1969; Pearson et al. 1992; Santulli et al. 1999; Wardle et al. 2001; Hassel et al. 2003; Boeger et al. 2006). In these studies, fish typically exhibited a sharp 'startle' response at the onset of a sound followed by habituation and a return to normal behavior after the sound ceased. Investigation by Jorgenson and Gyselman (2009) indicated that behavioral characteristics of arctic riverine fishes were generally unchanged by exposure to airgun sound.

Although reduced catch rates have been reported in some marine fisheries during seismic surveys, in a number of cases the findings are confounded by other sources of disturbance (Dalen and Raknes 1985; Dalen and Knutsen 1986; Løkkeborg 1991; Skalski et al. 1992; Engås et al. 1996). In other airgun experiments, there was no change in catch per unit effort of fish when airgun pulses were emitted, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the seismic survey (Pickett et al. 1994; La Bella et al. 1996). For some species, reductions in catch may have resulted from a change in behavior of the fish such as a change in vertical or horizontal distribution (Slotte et al. 2004).

In general, any adverse effects on fish behavior or fisheries due to seismic surveys may depend on the species in question and the nature of the fishery (season, duration, fishing method). It may also depend on the age of the fish, its motivational state, its size, and numerous other factors that are difficult, if not impossible, to quantify, particularly under realistic at-sea conditions.

3.3.4.1 Criteria

Sounds associated with the proposed seismic survey activities could impact some individual fish, at least behaviorally and perhaps physiologically. Pathological effects are also potentially possible for the relatively small numbers of individual fish that could occur in close proximity to an operating, high-energy sound source (i.e., within several meters). However, there is insufficient knowledge to establish objective criteria for determining the potential for adverse effects on fish and fisheries, let alone the sound level at which such effects may occur. Generally, adverse effects on a particular species can be considered significant if they result in a reduction in the overall health and viability of a population or significantly impact fisheries targeting that population. This is the general criterion used to determine significance of effect on fish in this PEIS. On the ocean-basin or regional scale, determining whether or not there is a reduction in the overall health (or abundance) of a fish population is problematic. Such assessments are typically confounded by the general lack of pre-impact information, the multitude of environmental or non-project-related factors influencing marine fish populations, and often the large or unknown extent of the habitat in which they reside relative to the potential impact area. However, given the localized and transient spatial scale of no more than a few NSF-funded seismic vessels operating at any one time as presented in this PEIS relative to the generally large-scale distribution of fish populations, no population-level effects are expected as a result of project implementation as described later in this section (also see Table 3.3-6).

3.3.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

Determining the potential behavioral or ecological effect of project sound sources on marine fish populations requires identification of overlap in the frequencies detected or produced by these species as compared with the frequencies of the acoustic sources proposed for use. The behavior and ecology of fish whose hearing and emitted sounds do not overlap those of the project acoustic sources would not, in most cases, be expected to be affected by those sources. A possible exception would be that those individuals within several meters of a sound source operating at high levels could still potentially be harmed by the energy of the sound to an unknown extent. Sounds from airguns and ships overlap in frequency with the frequencies at which many fish are known to detect or produce sound. In contrast, the frequencies of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers do not overlap the frequencies at which most marine fishes are known to detect or produce sound. The sound characteristics of each of the project acoustic sources are described below relative to what is known about sounds produced and detected by fish.

Airguns and Airgun Arrays

The airguns and airgun arrays have dominant frequency components of 2-188 Hz (Table 2-3) and zero-to-peak nominal source outputs of 240-265 dB re 1 µPa-m. This frequency range overlaps with the frequencies detected by many fish species in all the higher groups for which hearing ranges have been studied or surmised (Table 3.3-3). This frequency range also overlaps with the likely hearing of ESA-listed salmonids and sturgeons (see Table 3.3.2 for ESA-listed species in the analysis areas). The hearing capability of Atlantic salmon indicates a rather low sensitivity to sound (Hawkins and Johnstone 1978). Laboratory experiments yielded responses only to 0.58 kHz and only at high sound levels. Poor hearing by salmon is likely due to the lack of a link between the swim bladder and inner ear (Jorgensen et al. 2004).

There are limited data on hearing in sturgeon, and none in the published literature. However, initial studies suggest that sturgeon may be able to detect sounds from below 100 Hz to perhaps 1,000 Hz (Meyer and Popper 2002; Popper 2005). Lovell et al. (2005b) tested the sound reception and hearing abilities of the lake sturgeon (*Acipenser fulvescens*) using a combination of morphological and physiological approaches and found that it was responsive to sounds with frequencies from 100 to 500 Hz.

The nominal source outputs of individual airguns (as well as airgun arrays) are substantially higher than the hearing thresholds for those species studied. Thus, there is potential for acoustic effects on some individuals of some fish species, including ESA-listed salmonids and sturgeon.

MBESs, SBPs, and Pingers

The Kongsberg EM122 MBES proposed for use on the R/V *Langseth* operates at 10.5-13 (usually 12) kHz. Other types of MBESs used for deep-water operations aboard other research vessels associated with the proposed action operate at similar or higher frequencies (see Table 2-5). These frequencies are above the known hearing ranges of most marine fish species (Table 3.3-3) and above the known hearing ranges of ESA-listed salmonids and sturgeon. An exception to this is that some of the herring-like fishes (of the Clupeoid subfamily Alosinae, the shads, river herrings, and near-shore menhadens) can detect ultrasonic (>20 kHz) signals (Mann et al. 2001). As far as is known, non-alosine Clupeoids (sea herrings, sardines, and anchovies, among others) do not hear above 4 or 5 kHz (Mann et al. 2001, 2005). For those fishes in the Alosine subfamily of herrings that can hear at these frequencies, exposures of most individual fish (those not very close to the MBES) would be very brief. Therefore, use of the MBES is extremely unlikely to result in population-level effects on any marine fish species.

The SBP operates at 2-5 kHz. These frequencies are within the hearing range of some species in the order Clupeiformes (herring-like species). The Pacific herring, for example, showed an auditory brainstem response up to 5 kHz (Mann et al. 2005). No other marine fish are currently known to hear as high as 2.5 kHz (Table 3.3-3).

The SBP on the R/V *Langseth* has a maximum source output of 204 dB re 1 µPa-m, which is well above the hearing threshold of most fish species. However, these sounds are higher than most marine fish species are likely to hear. Furthermore, for those Clupeiformes that can hear at these frequencies, the exposures of most individual fish (those not very close to the SBP) would be brief. Therefore, the use of the SBP is not expected to result in population-level effects on any marine fish species.

There is considerable literature devoted to the avoidance by fish of fisheries survey vessels utilizing depth sounders (Gerletto and Fréon 1992; Misund et al 1996; Fernandez et al. 2003; Handegard et al. 2003; Mitson and Knudsen 2003; Gerletto et al. 2004). These investigators have reported varying degrees of

horizontal and/or vertical avoidance but correlating avoidance with such acoustic sources is confounded by the presence of vessel noise. The lone exception is Fernandez et al. (2003) who reported no avoidance by fish to a relatively small (223 ft [68 m]) vessel specially designed for quietness. Furthermore, in the aforementioned studies, the assessment methods and the types and frequencies of fisheries sonars that were used have varied, as have the contexts and environments in which they occurred. Regardless, no population-level effects on marine fish populations have been demonstrated.

Pingers proposed for use would have a peak output of 183 dB at 55-110 KHz. These sounds are at frequencies higher than most marine fish species are likely to hear. Furthermore, for those Clupeiformes that can hear at these frequencies, the exposures of most individual fish (those not very close to the pingers) would be brief. Therefore, the use of pingers is not expected to result in population-level effects on any marine fish species.

Vessel Sound

Ship engines, propulsion systems, and the vessel hull itself also emit sounds into the marine environment with frequencies that overlap with frequencies and thresholds associated with sound production and detection in marine fish. Richardson et al. (1995a) present a helpful discussion of vessel-generated sounds. Ship-generated sound is an important component of background sound at sea (Urick 1983; Popper 2003) and the magnitude of that component is growing (Andrew et al. 2002; McDonald et al. 2006). Recent research by Vasconcelos et al. (2007) and Wysocki et al. (2006) suggests that ship noise may affect fish auditory sensitivity or cortisol levels for the species studied but for the most part effects of vessel noise on fish are largely unknown. The source level of vessel sound would be considerably less than source levels of the pulsed sound sources associated with the proposed action. Further, vessel sounds would be at levels expected to cause only possible localized, short-term behavioral changes. Thus, potential effects of vessel sounds on marine fish are not further discussed in detail.

3.3.4.3 Acoustic Effects

Table 3.3-6 summarizes the known general effects of seismic survey (airgun) sound on fish and related fisheries. Based on the limited studies of a small number of species, acoustic energy from seismic airguns could cause adverse effects to individual fish at a localized spatial and temporal scale, though no significant effects are expected to fish populations (reviewed in Appendix D). Available information indicates that most effects would be limited to short-term non-lethal impacts, such as changes in behavior or short-term stress reactions. This assessment is related to the pulsed nature of the airgun operations, vessel speed, and distance between the source and most fish. The seismic vessel is underway at 4-5 kt (7-9 km/hr) while emitting short (<1 sec duration) airgun sound pulses typically spaced >20 sec apart is highly unlikely to expose individual fish to more than 1 or 2 pulses that could result in potential impacts. For the MBES and SBP, although some fish species are potentially capable of hearing at the frequencies of these systems, no population-level effects are expected due to the extreme short duration of the transmissions and narrow beamwidth. For fish species, the greatest potential for adverse impacts related to project sounds is related to changes in behavior (e.g., masking, disturbance, fisheries). Each of these is described briefly below.

Masking

Currently there are no studies documenting that seismic surveys result in masking effects on any fish species (Table 3.3-6). Masking is the effect of an acoustic source interfering with the reception and detection of an acoustic signal or other sound of biological importance to a receiver. For a discussion of

the biological relevance of ambient and signal sounds to fish, see Fay and Popper (2000). Any sound within an animal's hearing range can mask relevant sounds.

Theoretically, the airguns or airgun arrays, MBESs, SBPs, pingers, and vessel sound could contribute minimally to localized short-term and transitory masking of sound detection by some marine fishes, at least those species whose sound detection capacities are in the frequency range of the seismic survey sound source(s). Based on the known or presumed hearing ranges of ESA-listed salmonids and sturgeon, the airguns or airgun arrays could contribute to localized short-term and transitory masking of sound detection by these species. However, in general, the potential for masking effects would be limited and localized in extent given the brief, pulsed nature of the seismic survey sounds and the transiting seismic vessel relative to individual fish; related effects would be insignificant at the population scale. Sound detection by marine fishes of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers, and hence masking, is unlikely to occur due to the much higher frequencies of these instruments relative to fish hearing capabilities.

Disturbance

For the purposes of this analysis, disturbance to marine fish from proposed sound sources refers to any change in behavior resulting from the presence of a sound or of the vessel. Of primary importance is any change in behavior that increases mortality or results in reduced survival or reproductive success. To be significant, such behavioral changes would need to cause an overall reduction in the abundance of the population for the species of concern. Thus, adverse effects to individuals are not considered significant unless the sum of these effects adversely affects a significant portion of the population.

While it is known that acoustic impulses from airguns and airgun arrays may disturb some species of fish, this disturbance is generally brief with some evidence of habituation (Table 3.3-6, Section 3.3.4, and Appendix D). The temporal and spatial scale of these effects would be short-term and localized to the area ensonified at the sound level causing the disturbance response (see Chapter 2 for a review of distances to various sound levels for the proposed airgun arrays). For most marine fish populations, including ESA-listed salmonids and sturgeon, disturbance from the seismic airguns and arrays would be limited to the relatively small portion of the population near the active sound source (see Table 3.3-6 and Appendix D for specifics). Such effects would be considered insignificant at the population level.

The potential disturbance effects of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers on the few fish species that detect sound within the frequency ranges of those sources are unknown. For alosine herrings, there could be some disturbance from the MBES and SBP. However, for reasons described previously, such effects, if they even occur, would be considerably less than the potential effects of seismic survey sound. Therefore, potential impacts to fish as a result of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers would not be considered significant at the population level. Sound detection by marine fishes of the pingers, and hence disturbance, is unlikely to occur due to the much higher frequencies of these instruments relative to fish hearing capabilities.

Hearing or Detection Impairment

Although some studies have documented acoustically induced auditory damage and its biological repair, nearly all involved laboratory conditions, acoustic sources dissimilar to those proposed under the proposed action, and/or freshwater fishes with specialized connections between the swim bladder and the inner ear that may be more vulnerable to sound-induced damage than those fishes without the specialized connections (Scholik and Yan 2002; Amoser et al. 2004; Smith et al. 2004a, b; Smith et al. 2006) (Appendix D). Furthermore, the few studies documenting such effects were on caged fish that could not avoid the sound source. Two important exceptions are studies by McCauley et al. (2003) and Popper et al.

(2005) wherein physiological damage from airgun sources was documented among a few fish species in very shallow water (<7 ft [2 m] and approximately 30 ft [9 m]). Popper et al. (2005) found that resulting TTS disappeared in two freshwater species of fish within 24 hr. In contrast, McCauley et al. (2003) reported no recovery within approximately 2 months for pink snapper in Australian marine waters. However, the inherent shallow-water boundary conditions in these two studies are quite unrealistic to those of an actual seismic survey. This indicates that generalizing from a small number of study results under specific conditions to different species, sounds, and environments is inconclusive.

It is largely unknown what level and duration of TTS or PTS are required to affect survival and reproduction in an individual of any fish species. Temporary hearing impairment is often considered an insignificant effect for fish if it does not adversely affect orientation, predator avoidance, prey capture, or communication for the purposes of mating, and does not result in a reduction of overall population health. Experiments conducted with a small number of captive marine fish species should not be considered representative models of what free-ranging fish of multiple species would experience from an actual seismic survey and the associated acoustic sources. Furthermore, a wide range of fish taxa is likely to be exposed in any oceanic seismic survey. Based upon the best available data, population-scale impacts to wide-ranging and abundant marine fish populations are considered highly unlikely as a result of proposed seismic survey activities. However, to the extent threatened or endangered populations of a marine fish species might be adversely affected by a marine seismic survey, such surveys should be planned on a site-specific basis in consultation with the responsible agencies (e.g., NMFS) as required to avoid designated critical habitat and/or localized sensitive periods.

The potential for hearing impairment by the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers on the few fish species that detect sounds within the frequency range of these sources is unknown. However, given their considerably narrower beam characteristics, related effects would be even more localized than those of the airguns, with no significant impacts on marine fish populations. Sound detection by marine fishes of the pingers, and hence hearing impairment, is unlikely to occur due to the much higher frequencies of these instruments relative to fish hearing capabilities.

Non-auditory Injury or Mortality

As with auditory damage, few data support the possibility of non-auditory injury or mortality of fish close to an airgun(s) (Table 3.3-6). However, theoretically, airguns and airgun arrays could potentially result in acute injury and mortality of a minimal number of individuals of some species of fish, their larvae, and/or eggs when in very close proximity (a few meters) to a high-energy acoustic source (Table 3.3-6 and Appendix D). This would be most probable and potentially severe in fish with trapped gas pockets such as swim bladders, which expand and contract in concert with the ambient pressure changes. However, given the small area exposed to such levels (within several meters of the source), the transience of the moving seismic source relative to the ocean scale, and the small number of fish potentially within this localized area, the chance of non-auditory injury or mortality would be limited to an insignificant number of individual fish. Such effects on a small number of individual fish would be insignificant at the population scale and would be considerably smaller than the natural mortality rate. Therefore, based on the limited best available science, seismic surveys are not expected to result in significant non-auditory injury or mortality impacts on marine fish at the population scale.

Effects of the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers on the few marine fish species that hear within the frequency range of these sources are unknown. However, given the considerably narrower beam characteristics of the MBES and SBP combined with the brief period the transiting seismic vessel would pass individual fish, potential effects would be even more localized than those of the airguns, with no anticipated

significant impacts on marine fish populations. Sound detection by marine fishes of the pingers, and hence injury or mortality, is unlikely to occur due to the much higher frequencies of these instruments relative to fish hearing capabilities.

3.3.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Effects on Fisheries

There is the potential for fisheries to be temporarily affected by the proposed seismic surveys. This could happen in a number of ways besides actual physiological damage or stress to fish. Disturbance to fish population structures and distributions could result in reduced catch. An example would be temporary displacement of fish from traditional fishing grounds. Direct interference with the act of fishing is possible (e.g., displacing fishing vessels or entanglement with fishing gear), as well as simply putting target fish 'off the bite' for hook fisheries or changing fish distributions so as to reduce catch in net fisheries. However, research seismic surveys are not prolonged or repeated annually in the same locations.

Hirsh and Rodhouse (2000) reviewed studies investigating the hypothesis that seismic survey sounds have a deleterious effect on (usually commercial) fishing success. In most cases, these studies (e.g., Pearson et al. 1992; Skalski et al. 1992; Engås et al. 1996) found that fishing catch of one or more target species declined with the onset of seismic survey operations and remained depressed throughout this activity and for some time thereafter. As with vessel avoidance, it is problematic to predict a sustained effect on fisheries. Minimizing potential adverse effects on fisheries can generally be accomplished through adjustments to tracklines and timing of surveys as well as communication with fishers during the surveys. In summary, potential effects of seismic survey sounds on fisheries would be temporary and localized during the period of seismic survey operations.

Other Activities

The proposed seismic research surveys may include other activities that could result in physical disturbance to fish and fish habitat such as coring, dredging, sediment sampling, and the deployment of OBS/Hs (see Chapter 2). However, these activities would be very limited in scope and size compared to the surrounding area. The size of disturbed areas at the bottom of the sea would be limited to the short term in roughly the footprint size of the equipment involved. These activities would temporarily directly disturb bottom substrate inhabited by demersal (living on or near the bottom substrate) fish species. There would be no long-term effects to habitats or populations of demersal fish because disturbed areas of the sea bottom substrate are typically re-colonized by benthic invertebrates in the short term (e.g., less than 1 year) (Pranovi et al. 2005). Furthermore, the size of the area disturbed would be very small in size and insignificant in proportion to the availability of surrounding habitat; thus, direct and indirect impacts to individual fish species would also be insignificant and no impacts would occur at the population level. Dredging also typically results in suspension of bottom matter in the water column in a small area over the very short term (i.e., less than 24 hours) (Wilber and Clarke 2001). This increase in turbidity could temporarily displace a small number of demersal and deep-water pelagic fish species. However, these effects would be insignificant in the small, limited scope of time and area affected by proposed project activities and would have no individual or population-level effects.

3.3.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Short-term behavioral effects potentially resulting in short-term, localized displacement or disturbance of individual fish are the most likely effects expected under Alternative A or B as a result of exposure to airgun and airgun array sounds (see Section 3.3.4 and Table 3.3-7). The small number of individual fish

that could potentially experience injurious or mortal impacts when within a few meters of a high-energy acoustic source is considered insignificant on a population scale.

The potential for impacts upon exposure of fish to the MBES and SBP is considerably less for two reasons. First, few fish species are capable of detecting or hearing the high-frequency sounds produced by these two acoustic sources. Secondly, the narrower along-track beam of these two acoustic sources would affect a considerably smaller area than the broader areas affected by the airguns and arrays; as a result, a given fish location near the transiting source would be ensonified for only one brief ping at most. The potential for impacts upon exposure of fish to the pingers is not likely given the much higher frequency of this instrument relative to fish hearing capabilities.

For any ESA-listed species of fish whose hearing is within the frequency range of the airguns, there may be short-term impacts to a small number of individuals that are very close to an airgun (a few meters), but these effects are not likely to adversely affect these populations. Furthermore, impacts to ESA-listed fish species or EFH are not anticipated to occur as implementation of Alternatives A or B include provisions to plan the seismic surveys to avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, federally designated critical habitat for threatened or endangered fish populations. With these mitigation measures in place, no significant impacts on threatened or endangered fish populations or to EFH are anticipated in any of the exemplary DAAs or QAAs due to any of the proposed sound sources (Table 3.3-7).

Table 3.3-7. Summary of Potential Impacts to Fish Species of Special Concern, EFH, and Related Fisheries with Implementation of Alternatives A or B

Analysis Area	*Species, EFH, or Fisheries*	*Alternative A or B**
DAAs		
NW Atlantic	• ESA-listed species: shortnose sturgeon, Atlantic salmon • EFH for numerous species • Important fisheries	• May affect but would not adversely affect ESA-listed species. • Primarily short-term behavioral or possibly physiological impacts to small numbers of individuals of most higher groups. • No significant impacts to fisheries. • No adverse effects on EFH. • No significant impacts at the population level.
W Gulf of Alaska	• Important fisheries • EFH for numerous species including salmon and groundfish	
Caribbean Sea Galapagos Ridge	• Important fisheries	
S California	• ESA-listed species: green sturgeon, Chinook & coho salmon, steelhead, bull trout • EFH for numerous species • Important fisheries	
QAAs		
BC Coast	• ESA-listed species: green sturgeon; bull trout; steelhead; sockeye salmon; Chinook, chum, and coho salmon • Important fisheries	• May affect but would not adversely affect ESA-listed species. • Primarily short-term behavioral or possibly physiological impacts to small numbers of individuals of most higher groups. • No significant impacts to fisheries. • No adverse effects to EFH. • No significant impacts at the population level.
Mid-Atlantic Ridge Marianas Sub-Antarctic N Atlantic/Iceland	• Important fisheries	
SW Atlantic	• EFH for numerous species • Important fisheries	
W India W Australia	• Important fisheries	

Note: *Impacts under Alternative A assume that provisions would be made to plan the seismic surveys to avoid, to the maximum extent practicable, critical habitat for federally listed species

3.3.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research surveys using airguns and other acoustic sources (e.g., MBESs, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to marine fish, ESA-listed species, EFH, and associated fisheries with implementation of Alternative C.

3.3.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Fish

Based on the available information, the potential impacts of NSF-funded or USGS geophysical exploration and scientific research using seismic surveys on marine fish populations are predicted to be not significant under Alternatives A and B (Preferred Alternative). In survey areas where commercially important fisheries or critical habitat for ESA-listed fish species are known to occur, pre-survey planning would be conducted to the greatest extent practicable as required to minimize adverse impacts to the associated populations.

3.4 SEA TURTLES

Among the approximately 64 species of marine reptiles and sea turtles that potentially occur in some of the analysis areas, the seven sea turtle species are of most relevance and concern. Six of the seven species of sea turtles are ESA-listed: green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, Kemp's ridley, and leatherback; the flatback is not listed (Table 3.4-1). Three groups of marine (or estuarine) reptiles could occur within some of the exemplary analysis areas: saltwater or estuarine crocodile, marine iguana, and approximately 55 species of sea snakes. However, these reptiles are considered extralimital and highly unlikely to occur within the analysis areas. However, they are addressed briefly below with discussion limited to this introduction.

The saltwater crocodile may occur thousands of kilometers from shore and has a range that encompasses northern Australia, much of Southeast Asia, Sri Lanka, and the eastern coast of India (IUCN 1992). Individuals have been found as far north as Japan and as far west as islands in the Indian Ocean. The two exemplary seismic surveys off W India and W Australia in the Indian Ocean have a slight chance of encountering saltwater crocodiles; however, they are expected to be extralimital in those areas and as such are not discussed further in this PEIS.

The marine iguana is found only on the Galapagos Islands and does not range beyond the nearshore zone (Burghardt and Stanley 1982). Since the exemplary Galapagos Ridge seismic survey does not approach closer than approximately 870 mi (1,400 km) of the Galapagos Islands, the marine iguana is not considered further in this PEIS.

The 55 species of sea snakes account for 86% of the marine reptile species alive today. Sea snakes are found primarily in warm tropical waters of the Indo-West Pacific but are absent from the Atlantic Ocean and Caribbean Sea. Approximately 22 species are known to occur in W Australian waters. Because of the largely coastal distribution of sea snakes, and the limited data available on sea snake acoustics, sea snakes are not considered further in this PEIS.

The remainder of this section focuses on the seven species of sea turtles, with at least one species occurring in each of the 13 analysis areas. The status, general ecology, and general distribution and migratory movements of these species are summarized in Table 3.4-1 and discussed below.

3.4.1 Overview of Sea Turtle Species

Sea turtles primarily inhabit tropical and subtropical seas throughout the world, with several species ranging well into temperate zones (Ernst et al. 1994). Sea turtles are morphologically adapted to spend almost their entire lives in the water. They can remain underwater for 30-40 min when resting, but when actively swimming they must swim to the surface to breathe every 5-10 min (Keinath 1993). Sea turtles possess powerful modified forelimbs used for continuous swimming as well as compact streamlined bodies that help reduce drag (Wyneken 1997). These adaptations are important as sea turtles often travel long distances between their feeding grounds and nesting beaches (Meylan 1995). Sea turtles have also evolved physiological traits and behavioral patterns that allow them to spend as little as 3-6% of their time at the water's surface (Lutcavage and Lutz 1997).

Table 3.4-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Sea Turtles Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status[a] ESA/IUCN/CITES*	*Global Population*	*Size/Trend General Ecology*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Green	T & E[b]/E/I	108,761-150,521	Coastal, seagrass beds; feeds primarily on seagrasses, macroalgae, and reef-associated organisms.	Commonly found between 15°N and 90°W between the Galapagos and C American coast & as far N as BC.
Hawksbill	E/CR/I	21,212–28,138	Coral reefs, mangroves, hard bottom habitats, oceanic; feeds primarily on coral-reef-associated sponges, anemones, squid, shrimp, corals, tunicates, and algae.	Worldwide tropical and subtropical waters in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian oceans; range from 30°N to 30°S.
Loggerhead	T/E/I	43,320–44,560	Oceanic, coastal estuaries; carnivorous, feeds primarily on benthic mollusks, crustaceans, and coelenterates, jellyfish.	Temperate, tropical, and subtropical waters of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian oceans.
Olive ridley	T & E[c]/V/I	2,000,000	Oceanic; feeds primarily on crabs, clams, mussels, shrimp, but also fish, sea urchins, squid, and jellyfish.	Worldwide tropical and warm temperate waters.
Kemp's ridley	E/CR/I	5,000	Temperate and tropical coastal; feeds primarily on crabs, shrimp, gastropods, clams, urchins, jellyfish, squid eggs, and fish.	Gulf of Mexico; W North Atlantic.
Leatherback	E/CR/I	35,860	Oceanic, continental shelf, nearshore; feeds primarily on jellyfish.	Global between 71°N and 47°S.
Flatback	- /DD/I	8,050–32,520	Soft-bottomed, nearshore; feeds primarily on sea cucumbers, jellyfish, mollusks, and other invertebrates.	Nearshore Australia, migrates between feeding and breeding areas.

Notes: [a] E = endangered, T = threatened, CR = Critically Endangered, DD = Data Deficient, I = Appendix I; V = Vulnerable.
[b] Endangered along Florida and Pacific Coast of Mexico.
[c] Mexican population endangered.
Sources: NMFS and USFWS 2007a, b; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010; NOAA Fisheries 2010.

3.4.1.1 General Distribution and Movements

Sea turtle distribution is mostly limited to between 40° N and 35° S longitude; however, during warmer seasons, this range is substantially expanded (Davenport 1997). Some species are circumglobally distributed within their latitudinal range (e.g., the hawksbill), whereas others are very limited in distribution (e.g., the flatback occurs only in nearshore Australia) (Table 3.4-1). Distribution is dependent

on ocean temperature, currents, turbidity, salinity, and food availability. Water temperature appears to be especially important for sea turtles (Lutcavage and Musick 1985; Epperly et al. 1995; Coles and Musick 2000). Many species of sea turtles become lethargic if temperatures rise to >40 degrees Celsius (ºC) or fall to <10ºC (Spotila et al. 1997). Coles and Musick (2000) note that sea turtle distribution is regulated by the specific temperature preferences of the species with the majority of species preferring a range of 13.3-28ºC; however, range varies with age class and season. Leatherback sea turtles inhabit the widest range of water temperatures because of their greater ability to maintain a constant body temperature (Spotila et al. 1997).

All turtle species nest on land; however, other than females returning to shore to nest, sea turtles spend little time on land (Musick and Limpus 1997). Males in particular rarely appear to return to land, whereas females may return to lay their eggs on the same beach where they were hatched. Nesting seasons occur at different times around the world, depending on the latitude and species concerned (Miller 1997). Female sea turtles may lay several egg clutches during a single nesting season, with each clutch containing between 50 and 180 eggs, depending on the species (Ehrhart 1995). Females of most species (except possibly for Kemp's ridley) do not nest in consecutive years, but typically have a gap of 2 to 3 years between breeding cycles. Male sea turtles generally breed every 1 to 2 years (Miller 1997). The concentration of turtles during nesting and hatching are events of particular vulnerability to sea turtles. Conservation and protection of nesting beaches is considered vital for survival of endangered species.

When hatchlings emerge from the terrestrial nest, they use visual cues such as light intensity and wavelength to orient themselves toward the sea (Lohmann et al. 1997). Hatchlings have a strong tendency to crawl toward the brightest light present; this strategy usually takes them towards the horizon over the ocean (Ernst et al. 1994). Hatchlings can become disoriented by lights from beachfront houses leading them away from the water, increasing the danger of predation and injury (Lutcavage et al. 1997). Hatchlings that successfully reach the ocean spend the first few years of their lives drifting with ocean currents and feeding along convergence zones where food and debris collect (Carr 1987). Once hatchlings have reached the juvenile stage, they begin to reappear in nearshore feeding areas where they are more easily studied (Musick and Limpus 1997). After transitioning from oceanic hatchlings to nearshore juveniles and finally adults, most species also modify their foraging behavior from surface to benthic, preying on larger organisms such as fish, crustaceans, mollusks, coelenterates, and seagrasses (prey selection is species-specific) (Bjorndal 1997). Table 3.4-1 summarizes foraging preferences of the seven sea turtles species.

3.4.1.2 Important Ecological Considerations

Important ecological considerations for sea turtles with respect to activities considered in this analysis are the periods, duration, and proximity of nesting and hatchling emergence as well as coastal feeding concentrations. Another important ecological consideration is that many sea turtle species are known to regularly dive at depth for extended periods of time. Deep prolonged dives could expose them to seismic survey sounds for sustained periods at potentially higher intensities (see Appendix B for a discussion of the relationship between water depth and underwater sound properties including pressure-release effects near the water surface). Depth and length of dives appear to vary by species, depth of prey type, and turtle age, as well as water temperature.

Leatherbacks are the deepest-diving sea turtle (3,937 ft or 1,200 m) with variable dive depths and dive times depending on the geographic location and time of day (Eisenberg and Frazier 1983; Davenport 1988; K.L. Eckert et al. 1989; Eckert et al. 1996; Eckert 2002). Typical dive durations averaged 6.9 to 14.5 min per dive, with a maximum of 42 min (Eckert et al. 1996). In contrast, green sea turtles typically

dive less than 98 ft (30 m) (Hochscheid et al. 1999; Hays et al. 2000) to a maximum known depth of 240-361 ft (73-110 m) (Berkson 1967). Maximum dive time can be up to 66 min, with routine dives ranging from 9 to 23 min (Brill et al. 1995). Dive habits vary seasonally (Southwood et al. 2003). Hawksbill, loggerhead, and olive ridley turtles are considered shallow or intermediate divers. Typical dive depths range from <80 ft (24 m) for hawksbills, <98 ft (30 m) for loggerheads (Sakamoto et al. 1990; Polovina et al. 2003), and 490 ft (150 m) for olive ridleys (Eckert et al. 1986). Routine dives last approximately 4-172 min (Byles 1988; Sakamoto et al. 1990; Renaud and Carpenter 1994; Hawkes et al. 2007). Recent satellite-tagging studies of loggerheads during winter in the western North Atlantic off the U.S. east coast found that female loggerhead turtles made long resting dives of up to 7 hr 24 min, indicating that some turtles remain in cold waters by apparently hibernating instead of migrating to warmer waters (Hawkes et al. 2007).

Primary threats to sea turtles include entanglement in fishing gear and debris, vessel collisions, dredging operations, increased coastal development on nesting beaches including artificial lights at night, and illegal harvesting of turtles and eggs.

3.4.1.3 Special-Status Species

Six species of sea turtles are listed under the ESA, on the IUCN Red List, or in Appendix I of CITES (Table 3.4-1). Under the ESA, the hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, and leatherback turtles are listed as endangered; the loggerhead turtle is listed as threatened; and the green and olive ridley turtles are listed as threatened in most of their range but endangered in parts of their range. Furthermore, the global populations for all seven sea turtle species addressed in this analysis are declining.

3.4.1.4 Acoustic Capabilities

Little is known about sea turtle sound production and hearing or their dependency on sound for survival (Croll et al. 1999; Bartol and Ketten 2006) (Table 3.4-2). While light and visual cues are clearly important to hatchlings, the relative importance of hearing is less understood. The majority of studies have looked at green (Ridgway et al. 1969) and loggerhead sea turtles (Bartol et al. 1999). More recently, auditory brainstem response hearing studies have been conducted on captive juvenile and subadult green and juvenile Kemp's ridley sea turtles (Bartol and Ketten 2006). These studies indicate that some species hear low-frequency sounds (Ridgway et al. 1969; Lenhardt et al. 1983; Bartol et al. 1999), and that sensitivity appears to vary with age (Bartol and Ketten 2006). The measured range of best hearing for sea turtles is approximately 200-700 Hz (Table 3.4-2). Hearing below 80 Hz is apparently less sensitive but still potentially of use (Lenhardt 1994). Green turtles are most sensitive between 200 and 700 Hz, with peak sensitivity at 300-400 Hz with slight variation for juveniles and subadults, the latter based on a few individuals (Ridgway et al. 1969; Bartol and Ketten 2006) (Table 3.4-2). The overall range of green sea turtle hearing is reported at 50-1,600 Hz (Dow et al. 2008). Juvenile loggerheads were reported to have a hearing range of 250-1,000 Hz (Bartol et al. 1999). Loggerheads avoid sources of low-frequency sound in the 25-1,000 Hz range (O'Hara and Wilcox 1990). Two juvenile Kemp's ridley turtles generally had a lower upper range and lower range of sensitivity compared to what is known for green and loggerhead sea turtles (Table 3.4-2). Sounds emitted by nesting female leatherback turtles had a peak frequency range of 300-500 Hz (Mrosovksy 1972; Cook and Forrest 2005).

Table 3.4-2. Summary of Underwater Sound Production and Hearing Characteristics of Sea Turtles

Species	*Sound Production* *Frequency Range (Hz)*	*Hearing* *Range (Hz)*	*Hearing* *Most Sensitive Frequency (Hz)*
Green	NA	100-500[a] 100-800[b] 60-1,000[c] 50-1,600[d]	200-400[a] 600-700[b] 300-400[c] 50-400[d]
Hawksbill	NA	NA	NA
Loggerhead	NA	250-1,000[e] 25-1,000[f]	250[e]
Olive ridley	NA	NA	NA
Kemp's ridley	NA	100-500[g]	100-200[g]
Leatherback	300-500[h] 300-4,000[i]	NA	NA
Flatback	NA	NA	NA

Notes: NA – No specific data available.
Sources: [a]six subadults (Bartol and Ketten 2006); [b]two juveniles (Bartol and Ketten 2006); [c]Ridgway et al. 1969; [d]Dow et al. 2008; [e]juveniles (Bartol et al. 1999); [f]O'Hara and Wilcox 1990; [g]two juveniles (Bartol and Ketten 2006); [h]Mrosovksy (1972); [i]Cook and Forrest 2005.

3.4.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific use and unique habitat features relative to the seven sea turtles occurring within the DAAs (refer to Figure 2-18). Discussion is limited to those species occurring during the period of the exemplary marine seismic surveys. One to six species of sea turtles are likely to be uncommon to common in three DAAs: NW Atlantic, Caribbean, and S California (Table 3.4-3). Data from monitoring conducted during previous NSF-funded geophysical surveys are included as relevant. Because six species of sea turtles that occur in the analysis areas are ESA-listed, they are further described in separate subsections in each analysis area where they are likely to occur.

3.4.2.1 NW Atlantic

Five species of sea turtles potentially occur in the NW Atlantic DAA during the exemplary summer seismic survey: loggerhead, green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, and leatherback turtle. Among these, the loggerhead and leatherback are most likely to be encountered there during the summer months. Of the remaining three species, green turtles are rarely seen in the open ocean except as pelagic hatchlings, and are considered rare in temperate waters characteristic of the analysis area. The hawksbill is the most tropical of all sea turtles; hatchlings are believed to be pelagic, whereas juveniles, subadults, and adults reside in coral reef foraging grounds (NMFS 2002). Only juvenile Kemp's ridleys are likely to occur in the analysis area along the mid-Atlantic coast from spring to fall (Lazell 1980; Lutcavage and Musick 1985; Weber 1995). Juveniles of this species are known to range between the tropics and temperate coastal areas of the northwest Atlantic, and have been seen as far north as Nova Scotia. Adult Kemp's ridleys usually remain in the Gulf of Mexico.

Table 3.4-3. Potential Occurrence of ESA-listed Sea Turtles within the DAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Species	*NW Atlantic (N Sum)(*, a)*	*Caribbean (N Spr or Sum)(*, b)*	*S California (N Spr or Sum)(*, c)*	*W Gulf of Alaska (N Sum)(*, d)*	*Galapagos Ridge (N Win/ S Sum)(*, e)*
Green	r?	c? B F	u F	r?	r?
Hawksbill	r?	c? B F	r M	-	r?
Loggerhead	u? F M	u? B F	u M	r?	r?
Olive ridley	-	u? F	r M F	r?	u M
Kemp's ridley	r?	u F M	-	-	-
Leatherback	c F M	u B	u M F	r M	u M

Notes: *(Season) = Northern (N) and southern (S) hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Spr = spring, Sum = summer, Win = winter. **B** = Breeds/nests within the area, **F** = feeds within the area, **M** = migrates through the area, **?** = unknown/possible, **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s, **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area; **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years; **-** = species does not occur there.

Sources: (a)Kenney 1996; Gaywood 1997; Musik and Limpus 1997; Godley et al. 1998; Witzell 1998; Bjorndal et al. 2000; NMFS 2002; Avens et al. 2003; Frick et al. 2003; Haley and Koski 2004; USFWS 2005a; EuroTurtle 2006.

(b)Márquez 1990; Horrocks 1992; Sybesma 1992; Barmes et al. 1993; d'Auvergne and Eckert 1993; Scott and Horrocks 1993; EuroTurtle 2006.

(c)Stinson 1984; Clifton et al. 1995; NMFS and USFWS 1998a, b, c, d, e, f; Nichols et al. 2000a; NMFS 2003a; Parker et al. 2004.

(d)Hodge 1979; Márquez 1990; Green et al. 1992, 1993; Bowlby et al. 1994; NMFS and USFWS 1998a; Buchanan et al. 2001; Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) 2005.

(e)Smultea and Holst 2003; EuroTurtle 2006.

During the July-August 2004 Atlantic Deep Western Boundary Current seismic cruise in the NW Atlantic Ocean, 26 sea turtles were observed (Haley and Koski 2004). Two of the 26 turtles were identified as leatherbacks, but identifications were not possible for the other 24 turtles. Further detail is provided below on the loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles because they are considered most likely to occur in the NW Atlantic seismic survey. The other three species are considered rare if they occur there at all (Table 3.4-3)

Loggerhead Turtle. The loggerhead sea turtle is a widely distributed species and is expected to feed and migrate in the NW Atlantic DAA during the summer (Table 3.4-3). It prefers to feed in coastal bays and estuaries, and in the shallow waters along the continental shelf. Loggerheads typically undertake long migrations that take them far from their breeding grounds and may be seen in the open seas during migration. After leaving their pelagic stage, loggerheads originating from the east coast of the U.S. return there to forage in inshore waters such as sounds, bays, and estuaries (Avens et al. 2003). Some demersal juveniles make seasonal foraging migrations into temperate latitudes as far north as Long Island, New York. Most (936 of 1,337) loggerhead captures off the east coast by the U.S. longline fleet during 1992-1995 were in the northeast distant NMFS pelagic fishing area, mostly on the Grand Banks, whereas 108 of the captures were in the mid-Atlantic Bight NMFS pelagic fishing area (Witzell 1999), which includes the NW Atlantic DAA.

Major nesting areas for loggerheads in the western North Atlantic occur in the SE U.S., Yucatan Peninsula of Mexico, Columbia, Cuba, South Africa, eastern Australia, and Japan (EuroTurtle 2006). They typically nest from May to August (USFWS 2005a). In the North Atlantic, post-hatchling loggerheads are known to migrate from their rookery beaches in the SE U.S. to oceanic development habitats in waters of the eastern North Atlantic (Frick et al. 2003). They spend at least 6 years (Bjorndal et

al. 2000) or approximately their first 10 years (Avens et al. 2003) inhabiting the North Atlantic Gyre, which extends roughly from Bermuda to the Azores. Such movements of pelagic-stage turtles are substantiated by recaptured tagged turtles (Bolten et al. 1994, 1996) and by incidental capture in longline fisheries around the Azores and Madeira (e.g., Brongersma 1995). Recent studies indicate that some loggerheads remain in U.S. mid-Atlantic waters during winter, hibernating in deep waters where food productivity remains high, with potentially large aggregations occurring in and around North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida (Hawkes et al. 2007).

Leatherback Sea Turtle. Leatherbacks feed and migrate during summer in the NW Atlantic DAA (Table 3.4-3). These individuals nest during January-July in the Caribbean islands, Costa Rica, Panama, Columbia, Surinam, and French Guiana. Hatchling leatherbacks are pelagic, but nothing is known about their distribution for their first 4 years (Musik and Limpus 1997). Off northeastern North America, including the analysis area, leatherbacks are commonly taken incidentally in the longline fishery (Brady and Boreman 1994). Many (593 of 1,264) leatherback captures off the east coast by the U.S. longline fleet during 1992-1995 were in the northeast distant NMFS pelagic fishing area; the second-ranked area (at 252 captures) was the mid-Atlantic Bight (Witzell 1998), which includes the analysis area. There are two peaks in occurrence of leatherback turtles in temperate waters of the North Atlantic. The first peak occurs off the northeastern U.S. in late summer (Kenney 1996); the second peak occurs off the United Kingdom between August and October (Gaywood 1997; Godley et al. 1998). Leatherbacks are thought to follow the Gulf Stream because jellyfish, their main prey, are concentrated where this current meets the cold Labrador Current. Non-nesting leatherbacks in the North Atlantic have been found as far north as the North Sea, Norwegian Sea, Barents Sea, Newfoundland, and Labrador.

3.4.2.2 Caribbean

Six species of sea turtles are likely to occur in the Caribbean DAA during the exemplary spring or summer seismic period: loggerhead, green, hawksbill, leatherback, Kemp's ridley, and olive ridley turtles. The green and hawksbill turtles are the only common species in the analysis area (Table 3.4-3). Four turtle species nest in the region, and the other two feed and/or migrate there. The natural history of these species relative to the analysis area is described below, mainly based on information from Márquez (1990) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) technical reports (Horrocks 1992; Sybesma 1992; Barmes et al. 1993; d'Auvergne and Eckert 1993; Scott and Horrocks 1993).

Green Turtle. Green turtles nest and feed in the analysis area during the spring and summer. The major nesting beaches in the Atlantic Ocean occur in Mexico, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and Surinam. Known nesting areas in the Caribbean Sea, including the analysis area, are coastal Venezuela, the Netherland Antilles, Barbados, Aruba, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, and St. Lucia. Peak breeding in the Caribbean generally occurs from April to October (EuroTurtle 2006). Nonetheless, adult green turtles are present in these areas year-round. They live in bays and along protected shorelines, and feed during the day on seagrass and algae (Bjorndal 1995). Juvenile and sub-adult green turtles travel extensively and may travel thousands of kilometers before they return to breeding and nesting grounds (Carr et al. 1978).

Hawksbill Turtle. Hawksbill turtles nest in the analysis area during all months except February and March, peaking in June and August. Known documented nesting areas in the Caribbean include St. Vincent, the Grenadines, Dominica, Trinidad, St. Lucia, Aruba, Barbados, and the Netherland Antilles. Hawksbills are the most tropical of all sea turtles, with nesting confined to areas with water temperatures 25-35ºC. Hawksbill turtles also feed year-round in the analysis area. They inhabit shallow waters with seagrass or algal meadows and clear littoral waters of mainland and island shelves; they are most common where reef formations occur. Hawksbill turtles commonly make short-distance movements between

nesting beaches and offshore feeding areas. Non-nesting hawksbill turtles are known as far north as Cape Cod.

Loggerhead Turtle. Loggerheads nest and feed in the Caribbean DAA during the exemplary spring or summer seismic period; however, their distribution and seasonal occurrence there are poorly documented (Table 3.4-3). In the analysis area, loggerheads have been documented to nest from mid-May to mid-July at minor sites in Venezuela, Aruba, the Netherland Antilles, and (rarely) Barbados. During, or shortly after the breeding season, females disperse to distant feeding grounds via poorly-delineated migration routes. Loggerheads occasionally have been observed feeding in waters near Venezuela, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, and Barbados. In the Atlantic, major nesting areas include the SE U.S., the Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico, Columbia, Cuba, and the Atlantic coast from Venezuela to Brazil (EuroTurtle 2006).

Olive Ridley Turtle. Olive ridley turtles feed regularly in the analysis area during the spring and summer near Isla Margarita and Trinidad, but they rarely penetrate further west. They typically forage in offshore surface waters or dive to depths of 500 ft (150 m) to feed on bottom-dwelling crustaceans. Some nesting sites are located along the north coast of Venezuela; however, no nesting occurs there during the exemplary seismic period. Olive ridley turtles are pantropical, occurring in waters with temperatures of at least 20ºC. They travel between breeding and feeding grounds in continental coastal waters, and are rare around oceanic islands. Olive ridleys nest annually, and nesting concentrations occur in the W Atlantic near Surinam; some nesting also occurs in NW Guiana, French Guiana, and along the N coast of Venezuela (Sternberg 1981).

Kemp's Ridley Turtle. Only feeding and/or migrating juvenile Kemp's ridley turtles are expected to occur in the analysis area, as other life stages tend to remain in the Gulf of Mexico year-round. Kemp's ridleys have a more restricted distribution than other sea turtles. Juveniles range between the tropics and temperate coastal areas of the W Atlantic, as far as New England. Adults that remain in the Gulf of Mexico migrate along the coast between nesting beaches and feedings areas. Occasionally, individuals may be carried by the Gulf Stream as far as northern Europe, although those individuals are considered extralimital and probably lost to the breeding population.

Leatherback Turtle. Leatherbacks nest and mate in the analysis area in Venezuela and the Caribbean islands (St. Lucia, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, the Netherland Antilles, and Barbados). They are only found in the Caribbean during the mating and nesting period from March to July; their feeding areas are in more northern temperate waters (Eckert and Eckert 1988). They also nest in Columbia, Surinam, French Guiana, Costa Rica, and Panama.

3.4.2.3 S California

Five species of sea turtles are considered rare to uncommon in the S California DAA during the exemplary spring or summer seismic period: green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, and leatherback turtles. Although uncommon, the most likely species to be encountered are the green, loggerhead, and leatherback (Table 3.4-3). In the eastern North Pacific Ocean, sea turtles are not particularly common north of Mexico. Sea turtles are much less abundant off S California than they are in more tropical/subtropical areas of the U.S. such as off southern Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands. The distribution of sea turtles off S California (and further north) is strongly affected by seasonal changes in water temperature. In general, sea turtle sightings off S California peak during summer (July through September) coinciding with the exemplary seismic cruise; they would also potentially occur in the analysis area during abnormally warm-water years or El Niño years. During El Niño years, changes in

ocean currents bring warmer waters north to S California, which in turn brings more sea turtles (and their preferred prey) to the region (NMFS 2003a).

For a number of reasons, it is highly unlikely that any sea turtles nest along the California coast. Throughout much of the year, the Pacific coast of North America experiences cool water temperatures (<20°C), well down to Baja California because of strong upwelling and the southward flow of the California current. Because of cool water temperatures, sea turtles are not known to nest on S California beaches (NMFS and USFWS 1998a, b, c, d, e). Regular nesting by leatherbacks and olive ridley turtles occurs along the Pacific coast of Baja California Sur, which is the northernmost known nesting site in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (Fritts et al. 1982; Sarti-M. et al. 1996; López-Castro et al. 2000).

Green Turtle. Green turtles are considered locally uncommon feeders in the S California DAA during the summer, mainly in continental shelf waters; however, they are rare in the analysis area in other habitats and at other times of the year (Stinson 1984; Dutton et al. 2002) (Table 3.4-3). Ocean waters shoreward of the 328-ft (100-m) isobath off S California and northern Baja California are designated as areas of secondary occurrence because they provide benthic (e.g., rocky ridges and channels) and pelagic (e.g., kelp beds) habitats suitable for green turtle foraging and resting. Green turtles are occasionally sighted near kelp beds off Point Loma and Scripps Pier in June and July; others have been observed around the Channel Islands, where eelgrass provides beds for feeding and submarine caves for resting (Airame et al. 2003). Nearshore waters are not designated as areas of primary occurrence because they are often at temperatures below the thermal preferences of this primarily tropical species. Green turtles are much more common in the subtropical waters off of southern Baja California, located several hundred kilometers south of the analysis area (NMFS and USFWS 1998c).

Stinson (1984) reviewed sea turtle sighting records from northern Baja California to Alaska, and determined that the East Pacific green turtle was the most commonly observed hard-shelled sea turtle on the U.S. Pacific coast. Most of the sightings (62%) were reported from northern Baja California and S California. The northernmost reported resident population occurs in San Diego Bay (Stinson 1984; Dutton and McDonald 1990a, b, 1992; Dutton et al. 2002). Green turtles are sighted year-round in the waters of S California, with the highest frequency of sightings occurring during the warm summer months of July-October (Stinson 1984). In waters south of Point Conception, Stinson (1984) found this seasonal sighting pattern to be independent of inter-year temperature fluctuations. North of Point Conception, more sightings occurred during warmer years.

The resident San Diego population of green turtles occurs year-round in south San Diego Bay. Eelgrass beds and marine algae are particularly abundant in the southern half of the bay, and green turtles are frequently seen foraging on these items in the southern bay's many channels (U.S. Navy 2000; Dutton et al. 2002). Green turtles inhabit these waters throughout the year because they are sheltered from strong currents and are continually warmed by the Duke Energy power plant effluent (Dutton and McDonald 1990a, b). Ultrasonic tracking studies have shown that green turtles in south San Diego Bay have relatively small home ranges (Dutton et al. 2002). During summer months, green turtles may venture into the northern part of the bay, or out of it entirely, as water temperatures rise.

Loggerhead Turtle. Loggerhead turtles migrate through the analysis area during the spring and summer in offshore waters. They primarily occur in deep oceanic waters southwest of Guadalupe Island associated with fronts comprising the northern edge of the Subtropical Frontal Zone. Scientists believe that this frontal area, which is frequently occupied by juvenile loggerheads throughout the year, is situated along the 17° and 20°C isotherms (Polovina et al. 2000). Large aggregations (thousands) of mainly juvenile and subadult loggerheads are found off the southwestern coast of Baja California in a band starting about 19

mi (30 km) offshore and extending out at least another 19 mi (30 km) with maximum abundance at Bahia Magdalena (NMFS and USFWS 1998b; Nichols et al. 2000b). Concentrations ranged from one to five turtles per km² at peak sightings in good weather. Some loggerheads also enter the Gulf of California; Seminoff et al. (2004) recorded them at Bahía de los Angeles and the Infiernillo Channel, but the low capture per unit effort suggested that the Gulf of California may not provide important habitat for loggerhead turtles in the eastern Pacific.

Satellite-tracking data indicate that loggerhead turtles can also be found in S California waters during their transoceanic crossings to adult nesting and foraging areas in the western Pacific Ocean (Nichols et al. 2000b; Parker et al. 2004). There have been a number of loggerhead turtle sightings, strandings, and incidental bycatches in the nearshore waters of S California, notably during the warm-water period. During El Niño events, loggerheads that regularly occur off Baja California Sur, where they are highly abundant, may expand their nearshore range north into S California waters.

Leatherback Turtle. Leatherbacks regularly migrate and feed off S California during the spring and summer (Table 3.4-3). The seasonal presence of leatherbacks off S California is believed to coincide with the summer arrival of the 16-17°C isotherm, which moves north from Mexico during May and June (Stinson 1984). Satellite-tracking studies show that deep oceanic waters are the most preferred habitats of leatherbacks off S California. Aerial surveys off the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington have shown that most leatherback turtles occur in continental slope waters, with fewer occurring over the continental shelf. Although leatherbacks regularly enter nearshore waters off central and northern California (e.g., Monterey Bay), they do not enter the coastal waters off S California as often, except during an El Niño event. There were 96 sightings of leatherbacks within 31 mi (50 km) of Monterey Bay from 1986 to 1991 (Starbird et al. 1993).

Stinson (1984) noted that two-thirds of the leatherback sightings in the northeastern Pacific Ocean were from waters north of Point Conception, and that leatherbacks are only found south of Point Conception during the warmest months of the year (July through September). Data suggest that leatherbacks begin to appear in ocean waters off central California and further north in the late summer and fall (Benson et al. 2003). The current northernmost nesting sites in the Eastern Pacific Ocean are located in the Mexican states of Baja California Sur and Jalisco (Fritts et al. 1982).

Olive Ridley Turtle. On rare occasions, olive ridleys migrate and feed in the analysis area during spring-summer, although they are much less common there than loggerheads (Table 3.4-3). Olive ridleys prefer oceanic habitat, primarily waters located far beyond the continental shelf break. Sighting, stranding, and incidental fisheries bycatch records are scarce in the S California region. A few stranding records are from S California, and some infrequent opportunistic sightings have been reported off San Diego, San Clemente Island, and Baja California; the latter occurrence records are described in Stinson (1984).

Hawksbill Turtle. Hawksbill turtles are rare throughout the year in S California. Individuals were observed off the coast of Baja California as recently as 20-30 years ago (Clifton et al. 1995). Thus, the potential exists for this species to occur in the analysis area, albeit in extremely low numbers. If hawksbills were to occur there, it would most likely be during migration during an El Niño event, as they are a highly tropical species.

3.4.2.4 W Gulf of Alaska

The leatherback turtle is expected to be encountered only rarely in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA during the exemplary summer seismic cruise period (Márquez 1990; Alaska Department of Fish and Game [ADFG] 2005). Although even more rare, the green, olive ridley, and loggerhead turtles have also been recorded in

Alaskan waters, with the green turtle the mostly likely among them to occur there. The leatherback is most likely because it regularly inhabits relatively cold water; the other three species are considered warm-water species and would be extralimital (ADFG 2005). All sea turtles potentially occurring in the analysis area would be non-nesting individuals.

Leatherback Turtle. Migrating leatherbacks may occur in small numbers in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. Leatherback turtles have occasionally been documented off the coasts of Oregon and Washington (Green et al. 1992, 1993; Bowlby et al. 1994; Buchanan et al. 2001) and British Columbia (MacAskie and Forrester 1962). Sightings and incidental capture data indicate that leatherbacks are found in Alaska as far north as 60.34ºN, 145.38ºW, and as far west as the Aleutian Islands (Hodge 1979).

3.4.2.5 Galapagos Ridge

Five sea turtle species occur in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean (ETP): leatherback, green, loggerhead, hawksbill, and olive ridley turtles. At the pelagic, open-ocean location of the Galapagos Ridge DAA, approximately 870 mi (1,400 km) west of the Galapagos Islands (see Figure 2-21), all five species could be encountered during the exemplary winter seismic period, especially the primarily pelagic leatherback and olive ridley turtles. During the Hess Deep survey in 2003 in the ETP approximately 620 mi (1,000 km) west of the analysis area, a total of six sea turtles of three species were sighted (Smultea and Holst 2003). Two were positively identified as leatherback turtles, two were probable green turtles, one was positively identified as an olive ridley, and one was a probable olive ridley.

Leatherback Turtle. The leatherback turtle is one of the species most likely to be encountered in the Galapagos Ridge DAA because of its preference for pelagic habitat. During the exemplary winter seismic period, some leatherbacks would be nesting in Central America. In the ETP, leatherbacks nest along the west coast of Mexico and Central America. In Guatemala, they nest in limited numbers from November to December (NMFS 2002); in El Salvador, they nest sporadically in the dry months between November and February (Hasbún and Vásquez 1999); and in Costa Rica, leatherback nesting activity increases gradually from October to December, and then gradually declines until February (Lux et al. 2003).

Hatchling leatherbacks are pelagic, but nothing is known about their distribution for the first 4 years (Musick and Limpus 1997). Post-nesting adult leatherbacks appear to migrate along bathymetric contours from 656 to 11,483 ft (200 to 3,500 m) (Morreale et al. 1994), and most of the ETP nesting stocks migrate south (NMFS 2002). There is evidence that leatherbacks are associated with oceanic front systems, such as shelf breaks and the edges of oceanic gyre systems where their prey is concentrated (Lutcavage 1996).

Loggerhead Turtle. Non-breeding adult or juvenile loggerheads might be encountered in the Galapagos Ridge DAA. The loggerhead is a widely distributed species, occurring in coastal tropical and subtropical waters around the world. Loggerhead turtles undertake long, open-ocean migrations that take them far from their breeding grounds. Loggerheads prefer to feed in coastal bays and estuaries, and in the shallow waters along continental shelves. Adult loggerheads feed on a variety of benthic fauna like conchs, crabs, shrimp, sea urchins, sponges, and fish. During migration through the open sea, they eat jellyfish, pteropods, floating mollusks, floating egg clusters, flying fish, and squid.

There are no reported loggerhead nesting sites in the eastern or central Pacific (NMFS 2002). Most of the loggerheads in the eastern Pacific are believed to originate from beaches in Japan, where the nesting season is late May-August (NMFS and USFWS 1998b). The size structure of loggerheads in coastal and nearshore waters of the E and W Pacific suggest that Pacific loggerheads have a pelagic stage similar to that in the Atlantic (NMFS 2002); loggerheads spend the first 2-6 years of their lives at sea. When mature, they return to breed at the beaches where they were hatched.

Green Turtle. It is possible that small numbers of green turtles would be encountered in the analysis area. Some green turtles would be nesting in Mexico and the Galapagos Islands during the exemplary northern winter/southern summer seismic period. The green turtle is widely distributed in tropical and subtropical waters near continental coasts and around islands. Green turtles typically migrate along coastal routes from rookeries to feeding grounds, although some populations conduct trans-oceanic migrations (e.g., Ascension Island, Brazil). Hatchlings are epipelagic (surface dwelling in the open sea) for approximately 1–3 years before moving to nearshore areas. Adults live in bays and along protected shorelines, and feed during the day on seagrass and algae (Bjorndal 1995). Juvenile and sub-adult green turtles may travel thousands of kilometers before they return to breeding and nesting grounds (Carr et al. 1978).

Major nesting beaches for green turtles are found throughout the western and eastern Atlantic, Indian Ocean, and western Pacific (EuroTurtle 2006). In the eastern Pacific, the primary nesting grounds are located in Michoacán, Mexico, and the Galapagos Islands, Ecuador (NMFS and USFWS 1998c). Nesting occurs in Michoacán between August and January with a peak in October and November, and on the Galapagos Islands between December and May with a peak in February (Alvarado and Figueroa 1995).

Hawksbill Turtle. It is unlikely that hawksbill turtles would be found in the deep, offshore waters near the Galapagos Ridge DAA, except for perhaps post-hatchlings. Adult hawksbill turtles are observed in shallow waters with seagrass or algal meadows, and are most common where reef formations are present. They live in clear, littoral waters of mainland and island shelves. Posthatchlings are believed to be pelagic, taking shelter in weed lines around convergence zones; they re-enter coastal waters after attaining a length of 8-10 inches (20-25 cm). Hawksbill turtles most commonly perform short-distance movements between nesting beaches and offshore feeding banks, although long-distance movements are also known. No major nesting sites for hawksbill turtles occur on the Pacific coast of Central America (EuroTurtle 2006). The nesting season of the hawksbill turtle is approximately 6 months in duration and generally occurs from June to December, preceded by courtship and mating.

Olive Ridley Turtle. The olive ridley turtle is one of the species most likely to be encountered in the Galapagos Ridge DAA, albeit in small numbers, because of its preference for pelagic habitat. Juveniles from the nursery/feeding area off Colombia and Ecuador likely would be present, whereas breeding adult olive ridleys would be nesting in Central America during the exemplary northern winter/southern summer seismic period. The olive ridley has a large range in tropical and subtropical regions in the Pacific, Indian, and south Atlantic oceans, and is generally found between 40ºN and 40ºS. Most olive ridley turtles lead a primarily pelagic existence. The Pacific population migrates throughout the Pacific, from their nesting grounds in Mexico and Central America to the North Pacific (NMFS 2002). The post-nesting migration routes of olive ridleys tracked via satellite from Costa Rica traversed thousands of kilometers of deep oceanic waters ranging from Mexico to Peru, and more than 1,864 mi (3,000 km) out into the central Pacific (Plotkin et al. 1994a). The olive ridley is the most abundant sea turtle in the open ocean waters of the ETP (Pitman 1990).

Olive ridleys nest throughout the year in the eastern Pacific with peak months, including major nesting aggregations known as *arribadas*, occurring from September through December (NMFS and USFWS 1998e). Females and males begin to aggregate in "reproductive patches" near their nesting beaches 2 months before the nesting season, and most mating is generally assumed to occur near the nesting beaches (NMFS 2002). Most olive ridleys nest synchronously in arribadas, with several thousand females nesting at the same time; others nest alone, out of sequence with the arribada (Kalb and Owens 1994).

Although most mating is generally assumed to occur near nesting beaches, Pitman (1990) observed olive ridleys mating at sea, as far as 1,150 mi (1,850 km) from the nearest mainland, during every month of the

year except March and December. However, there was a sharp peak in offshore mating activity during August and September, corresponding with peak breeding activity in mainland populations. Of the 324 olive ridleys observed and captured during NMFS dolphin surveys from July-December 1998 and 1999, 50 were involved in mating (Kopitsky et al. 2002).

Outside of the breeding season, olive ridleys disperse, but little is known of their behavior. Neither males nor females migrate to one specific foraging area, but exhibit a nomadic movement pattern and occupy a series of feeding areas in the oceanic waters (Plotkin et al. 1994a, b). Sightings of large aggregations of ridleys at sea (e.g., Oliver 1946) have led to unconfirmed speculation that turtles travel in large flotillas between nesting beaches and feeding areas (Márquez 1990). Aggregations of turtles (75% of which were olive ridleys), sometimes >100 individuals, have been observed as far offshore as 120°W, 1,864 mi (3,000 km) from shore (Arenas and Hall 1991).

Tagged turtles nesting in Costa Rica were recovered as far south as Peru, as far north as Oaxaca, Mexico, and offshore to a distance of 1,243 mi (2,000 km) (Cornelius and Robinson 1986). Data collected during tuna fishing cruises from Baja California to Ecuador and from the coast to almost 150ºW indicated that the two most important areas in the Pacific for the olive ridley are the central American coast and the nursery/feeding area off Colombia and Ecuador; both adults (mostly females) and juveniles are often seen in this area (NMFS and USFWS 1998e). Several sources of data (e.g., Green and Ortiz-Crespo 1995; Meylan 1995) suggest that the large numbers of ridleys that occur (or formerly occurred) off Ecuador and Colombia are comprised of seasonal migrants from nesting populations to the north. Over two-thirds of all small individuals were seen in the feeding area off Ecuador and Colombia during July through December. In the offshore region, both males and females were observed, but only during May through June (NMFS and USFWS 1998e).

3.4.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific use of sea turtles occurring within the eight QAAs (refer to Figure 2-18). Two to five species of sea turtles are considered uncommon to common in six of the eight QAAs: BC Coast, SW Atlantic, W Australia, W India, Marianas, and Sub-Antarctic. In the remaining two QAAs (N Atlantic/Iceland and Mid-Atlantic Ridge), three to six sea turtle species could possibly occur on rare occasions (Table 3.4-4).

3.4.3.1 N Atlantic/Iceland

This QAA is significantly north of the range of most sea turtle species. The leatherback is known to occur regularly in the Norwegian Sea, and the loggerhead turtle has been seen in the Barents Sea. In summer, leatherbacks and loggerheads may move northwards to high latitudes. The leatherback record is held by an individual taken alive off the Norwegian coast at 69º18’ N (Brongersma 1995). The loggerhead record is held by an individual taken alive at Murmansk (68º55’ N) (Brongersma 1995). No breeding areas occur close to this analysis area, and only migrating individuals would be rarely encountered (Table 3.4-4).

Table 3.4-4. Potential Occurrence of Sea Turtles within the QAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Species	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (N Sum)*[a]*	*BC Coast (N Fall)*[b]*	*SW Atlantic (Any)*[c]*	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (N Spr – Fall)*[a]*	*W Australia (N/S Spr or Fall)*[d]*	*W India (N Spr or Fall)*[a]*	*Mariana Islands (N Spr)*[a, f]*	*Sub-Antarctic (N Sum/ S Win)*[e]*
Green turtle	-	u M	c? BF	r M	c FM	c? B,M	u? MF	c M
Hawksbill	-	-	u? BF	r	c? BFM	u? B,M	u? MF	c M
Loggerhead	r M	r M	u? BF	r	u FM	u? M	u? MF	u? M
Olive ridley	-	r M	u? BF	r	c? MF	c B,M	u? MF	c MF
Kemp's ridley	-	-	-	r M	-	-	-	-
Leatherback	r M	u M	u? BF	r M	u? MF	u? M	u? MF	u? MF
Flatback	-	-	-	-	u BF	-	-	-

Notes: *(Season) = Northern (N) and southern (S) hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Spr = spring, Sum = summer, Win = winter; **B** = known to breed or calve within the area, **F** = known to feed within the area, **M** = known to migrate through the area; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s, **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area, **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years; **-** = species does not occur there; ? = uncertain.

Sources: [(a)]Caribbean Conservation Corporation (CCC) 2003; EuroTurtle 2006.
[(b)]Márquez 1990; ADFG 2005; MacLean and Koski 2005.
[(c)]CCC 2003; Parente et al. 2006.
[(d)]Prince 1993, 1994a, b; Limpus 1995a; Whiting 1997; CCC 2003; ADEH 2005; EuroTurtle 2006.
[(e)]Pitman 1990; Arenas and Hall 1991; Balazs et al. 1995; NMFS 2002; CCC 2003; USFWS 2005a; EuroTurtle 2006.
[(f)]Eldredge 2003.

3.4.3.2 BC Coast

No sea turtles are considered regular inhabitants of the BC Coast QAA during the exemplary northern fall seismic period, and any sightings would be non-nesting migrating turtles. The leatherback is the most likely to occur in small numbers in the relatively cold water of this analysis area, and possibly green turtles in even smaller numbers (Márquez 1990; ADFG 2005) (Table 3.4-4). The other two species that have been recorded occasionally in BC waters, the loggerhead and olive ridley, are considered rare and extralimital (ADFG 2005). No sea turtles were observed during a vessel survey conducted in BC waters in fall 2005 (LGL 2005) or during monitoring in transit through the area to Alaska during seismic programs conducted by L-DEO in 2004 and 2008 (MacLean and Koski 2005; Hauser and Holst 2009). However, one leatherback turtle was sighted far offshore Vancouver Island, BC, during an L-DEO seismic program in 2009 (Holst and Beland 2010).

3.4.3.3 SW Atlantic

The SW Atlantic QAA located northeast of the Amazon River delta is within the range of five species of sea turtles, all of which nest in the region: green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, and leatherback turtles (Table 3.4-4). The green turtle is considered most likely to occur in the analysis area. However, information on sea turtle abundance at sea is lacking for this region.

Green Turtle. Juvenile green turtles are common along the Brazilian coast in the analysis area. This species prefers to nest on ocean islands, such as Fernando de Noronha in the state of Pernambuco, Atol das Rocas in the state of Rio Grande do Norte, or Trinidade in the state of Espírito Santo (Projecto TAMAR 2006). As many as 3,000 females may nest in Brazil (EuroTurtle 2006). During seismic surveys conducted off northeastern Brazil in 2002 and 2003, the green turtle was the most commonly sighted turtle (Parente et al. 2006).

Hawksbill Turtle. Juvenile or subadult hawksbill turtles are found all along the coast of northeastern Brazil in the region of the analysis area (Projecto TAMAR 2006); however, they nest mostly on the north coast of Bahia and Sergipe. A minor nesting area has been identified near the Amazon fan region (Caribbean Conservation Corporation [CCC] 2003).

Loggerhead Turtle. The loggerhead is found throughout the Brazilian coastal region of the analysis area. Nesting sites are located in northern Rio de Janeiro, Espirito Santo, Bahia, and Sergipe (Projecto TAMAR 2006). Nesting loggerheads may also be present in the Amazon River Delta (CCC 2003). During seismic surveys conducted off northeastern Brazil in 2002 and 2003, only one sighting of a loggerhead turtle was noted (Parente et al. 2006).

Olive Ridley Turtle. The largest concentration of nesting olive ridley turtles in Brazil is in the state of Sergipe (Projecto TAMAR 2006). The species also nests to the north in Surinam (CCC 2003; EuroTurtle 2006). During seismic surveys conducted off northeastern Brazil in 2002 and 2003, only one sighting of an olive ridley turtle was noted (Parente et al. 2006).

Leatherback Turtle. The only location in Brazil where leatherbacks are known to nest is the state of Espirito Santo far to the south of the analysis area (Projecto TAMAR 2006). However, other nesting areas are present further north in Trinidad, Guyana, and Surinam (EuroTurtle 2006). Leatherback nesting is concentrated between October and January.

3.4.3.4 Mid-Atlantic Ridge

The Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA is within the range of several sea turtle species: loggerhead, green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, and leatherback turtles. Because of the largely coastal nature of most of these species, only the leatherback turtle is likely to occur in most of the analysis area. However, loggerhead, Kemp's ridley, green, and hawksbill turtles may occur, particularly in waters surrounding the Azores. None of these species breed near the analysis area. During a fall 2003 seismic program, no sea turtles were observed in the analysis area (Holst 2004).

Green Turtle. Green sea turtles typically migrate along coastal routes from rookeries to feeding grounds (CCC 2003; EuroTurtle 2006). However, a few individuals may migrate through the mid-ocean analysis area, as some populations conduct trans-oceanic migrations (e.g., Ascension Island, Brazil) (Hays et al. 2002). The most important nesting beaches in the northern hemisphere Atlantic are in the Caribbean and the coast of South America (CCC 2003; EuroTurtle 2006).

Hawksbill Turtle. Hawksbill turtles most commonly perform short-distance movements between nesting beaches and offshore feeding banks, although long-distance movements are also known. Post-hatchlings are believed to be pelagic, taking shelter in weed lines around convergence zones; they re-enter coastal waters once attaining a length of 8-10 inches (20-25 cm). A juvenile hawksbill tagged in Brazil was captured 6 months later in Dakar, Senegal (Eckert 1995b). Non-nesting hawksbill turtles are known as far north as Cape Cod and Ireland (Eckert 1995b), but they are considered extremely rare outside of tropical waters. They have been found in the Azores, Madeira, and at numerous locations along the entire western coast of Africa (Brongersma 1995).

Kemp's Ridley Turtle. Juvenile and immature Kemp's ridley turtles could occasionally occur in the analysis area. Adults are generally restricted to the Gulf of Mexico. Juveniles and immatures range between the tropics and temperate coastal areas of the northwest Atlantic, as far as New England (Lazell 1980; Lutcavage and Musick 1985; Weber 1995). Occasionally, individuals may be carried by the Gulf Stream as far as northern Europe and the Atlantic coast of West Africa (EuroTurtle 2006), although those individuals are considered lost to the breeding population. There are only a few sightings from the Azores

and Madeira (Brongersma 1995), and they have been captured occasionally in waters near there (Bolton and Martins 1990).

Loggerhead Turtle. In the North Atlantic, post-hatchling loggerhead turtles are known to migrate from their rookery beaches in the SE U.S. to oceanic development habitats in the waters of the eastern North Atlantic (Frick et al. 2003). They spend at least 6 years (Bjorndal et al. 2000), or approximately their first 10 years (Avens et al. 2003), inhabiting the North Atlantic Gyre, which extends roughly from Bermuda to the Azores. Such movements of pelagic-stage turtles are substantiated by recaptures of tagged turtles (Bolten et al. 1994, 1996) and by incidental capture in longline fisheries around the Azores and Madeira (Brongersma 1995). In the eastern Atlantic Ocean, loggerheads have been reported from numerous locations throughout the European Atlantic. Loggerheads occur in large numbers around the Azores and in the sea north of there to 42º N (Brongersma 1995). In summer, they may move northwards to high latitudes.

Leatherback Turtle. Leatherbacks may migrate through the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA. They are highly pelagic and approach coastal waters only during the reproductive season (EuroTurtle 2006). They appear to migrate along bathymetric contours ranging from depths of 656 to 11,484 ft (200 to 3,500 m) (Morreale et al. 1994). In the North Atlantic, leatherback turtles are found in the North Sea, Barents Sea, and coastal Newfoundland and Labrador. In the northern-hemisphere Atlantic, leatherbacks nest in the Caribbean islands, Costa Rica, Panama, Columbia Surinam, and French Guiana (CCC 2003; EuroTurtle 2006). In the eastern Atlantic, leatherbacks have been reported from numerous locations throughout the European Atlantic (Brongersma 1995), the Azores, Madeira, the Canary Islands, and West Africa (Fretey 2001). A tagged adult female traveled 3,666 mi (5,900 km) to Ghana, West Africa, after nesting in Surinam (Pritchard 1973). In summer, leatherbacks may move northwards to high latitudes (Brongersma 1995). Nesting has been reported in a number of countries from Senegal south to Angola (Eckert 1995a).

3.4.3.5 W Australia

The W Australia coastal region is within the range of six species of sea turtles: green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, leatherback, and flatback turtles. Of these six species, at least three (green, hawksbill, and flatback) nest in the region. The green turtle is expected to be the most common sea turtle species in the analysis area, followed by the hawksbill and olive ridley.

Green Turtle. Green sea turtles commonly feed and nest in the analysis area. One of four major breeding units for green turtles in Australia occurs on the NW Shelf in W Australia (Limpus 1995a). This area includes major nesting on the Lacepede Island, Monte Bellow Island, Barrow Island, the islands of the Dampier Archipelago, Browse Island, and the North West Cape (Prince 1993, 1994a, b). Nesting also occurs in moderate numbers on Ashmore Reef and Cartier Island in the Indian Ocean (Guinea 1995; Whiting et al. 2000). Nesting occurs in summer in W Australia (Prince 1994a). The W Australia population estimate is 20,000 (ADEH 2005).

Hawksbill Turtle. Australia has two nesting populations of hawksbill turtles, at the Great Barrier Reef/Arnhem Land and the NW Shelf. These populations are genetically distinct from each other, indicating little interbreeding between populations (Broderick et al. 1994). Australia may support the largest breeding populations of hawksbills in the world following serious declines in stocks in other countries. Australia also holds the last remaining large rookeries for this species in the world (Limpus 1995b). In W Australia, major nesting occurs at Varanus Island and Rosemary Island (Prince 1993, 1994b). The current estimate of the number of annually nesting females in W Australia is 2,000 (Limpus 1995a). Nesting occurs year round with a peak between October to January (Robinson 1990 in Limpus 1995a). Limited studies have shown that this species migrates up to 1,491 mi (2,400 km) between

foraging areas to nesting beaches (Miller et al. 1998). No migration records are known for the Indian Ocean.

Olive Ridley Turtle. Olive ridley turtles are expected to feed and migrate in the W Australia QAA (Table 3.4-4). Breeding individuals may also occur there based on low-density nesting sites in the Northern Territories. However, no nesting has been recorded in W Australia, or further west than Fog Bay, Darwin, Northwest Territories (Whiting 1997). Because there is limited nesting of this species in the western Pacific Ocean and Southeast Asia, the Australian population may represent an isolated breeding population. The breeding season appears to peak in the dry season of northern Australia between May and August (Cogger and Lindner 1969; Guinea 1990; Whiting 1997). In Australia, there are no records of this species forming large synchronous nesting aggregations (arribadas) that are typical of the species in Mexico, Costa Rica, Surinam, and India (Hirth 1980; Marquez 1990). Detailed information on the size of nesting and foraging populations is unknown, although the nesting population is estimated at between 500 and 1,000 (Limpus 1995a). Over 100 turtles were killed by set netting in Fog Bay, Northern Territories, in one incident in 1994 (Guinea and Chatto 1992), which indicates that this species can forage in large aggregations. Reproductive migrations have not been recorded for this species in Australia because no ongoing tagging program exists. However, studies in the eastern Pacific and Atlantic Ocean show long-distance reproductive migratory behavior similar to other sea turtle species (Meylan 1995).

Loggerhead Turtle. Loggerheads may feed and migrate in the analysis area but are not expected to nest there. They typically inhabit coral reefs, bays, and estuaries of W Australia. Loggerheads tagged in W Australia have been recaptured in the Northern Territories, W Australia, and Indonesia. Nesting areas in W Australia include Murion Island and further south near Shark Bay. Loggerheads nest from late October to late February or early March, peaking in late December. Hatchlings emerge from nests between December and April, peaking from February to early March (ADEH 2006).

Flatback Turtle. Flatback turtles nest, breed, and feed in coastal areas of the W Australia QAA. However, they rarely leave the shallow waters of the continental shelf and nest only in northern and northeastern Australia. Nesting occurs from October to February in Queensland's Northern Territory, but may extend for the entire year in NW Australia. Important nesting beaches are located in the Kimberley region of W Australia, extending through the Gulf of Carpentaria to the Torres Strait. Flatbacks nest on both inshore islands and the mainland. They feed around the northern half of Australia, and in the seas between northern Australia and the southern parts of Indonesia and Papua New Guinea (ADEH 2006).

Leatherback Turtle. Migrating and feeding leatherbacks are expected to occur in the analysis area during the austral spring or fall (Table 3.4-4). This species makes reproductive migrations from foraging areas to nesting beaches (Lazell 1980). Limited data exist on nesting leatherbacks in Australia because of low numbers observed and tagged. Nesting in W Australia is still unknown or unconfirmed (Prince 1994b). However, limited nesting occurs from December to January in scattered isolated nests (1-3 nests per annum) in the adjacent Northern Territory (Limpus and McLachlan 1994) and southern Queensland (Limpus and McLachlan 1979, 1994; Limpus et al. 1984). Nesting is mainly confined to tropical beaches although some nesting occurs on subtropical beaches (Marquez 1990).

3.4.3.6 W India

The W India QAA in the Arabian Sea is within the range of five sea turtle species (CCC 2003; EuroTurtle 2006): the loggerhead, green, hawksbill, olive ridley, and leatherback. Although all five species nest in the general region, either on the west coast of India or on the Arabian Peninsula, only the green, hawksbill, and olive ridley are known to nest in the W India QAA proper (Table 3.4-4). The olive ridley is the most numerous among the sea turtles found in India, and as such is described separately below. The

remaining four species occur in smaller numbers in the analysis area. Green turtle nesting occurs near the analysis area and is reported near Malvan in Maharashtra, the Gulf of Kutch, near Junagardh on the Gujarat coast, on the Arabian Peninsula in Oman and Yemen, and on select islands in Lakshadweep, far to the south of the analysis area. Sporadic nesting has been recorded elsewhere along the coastline. Hawksbill sea turtles nest on coral reefs of Lakshadweep to the south of the analysis area and along the Arabian Peninsula. Loggerheads migrate in the Indian Ocean, although no nesting has been reported in the W Indian QAA or along any of the Indian coastline; loggerheads are known to nest on the Arabian Peninsula at Masirah, Oman.

Olive Ridley Turtle. The olive ridley is common in the W India QAA. In the Indian Ocean, Gahirmatha, located in the Bhitarkanika Wildlife Sanctuary of India's east coast, supports perhaps the largest nesting population with an average of 398,000 females nesting in a given year (NMFS and USFWS 1998e; NMFS 2006c). Nesting along the west coast of India consists of far fewer turtles and usually occurs during November-March, but in some areas it occurs during June-September (CCC 2003). Olive ridleys also nest on the Arabian Peninsula. Populations of olive ridleys have been observed in large flotillas traveling between feeding and nesting grounds in the Eastern Pacific and Indian Oceans (EuroTurtle 2006).

3.4.3.7 Marianas

The loggerhead, green, hawksbill, olive ridley, and leatherback turtles that may inhabit waters around the Mariana Islands are likely foraging and migrating, although small numbers of green turtles have been documented to nest in the Marianas. The hawksbill turtle may also nest there in extremely low numbers. Hawksbills, olive ridleys, and leatherbacks are considered rare in the area. The green turtle is the most widespread sea turtle species in the Marianas and is described separately below. Very little is known about populations of sea turtles near the Mariana Islands (Eldredge 2003).

Green Turtle. Some foraging green turtles could be encountered in the Marianas QAA. Nesting occurs mostly on beaches around Tinian (late January-mid July, with a peak in May) and Saipan (April-August). Aggregations of foraging and resting turtles have been observed around the larger islands of Guam, Tinian, Saipan, and Rota, concentrated in waters <164 ft (50 m) deep. Approximately 1,500 individuals (including juveniles, immature adults, and adults) have been estimated to forage in the waters around the southern islands of Rota, Tinian, and Saipan, based on surveys carried out in August 1999 and March 2001 (Kolinski et al. 2001; Eldredge 2003).

3.4.3.8 Sub-Antarctic

Five species of sea turtles could occur in the Sub-Antarctic QAA, including the green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, and leatherback sea turtles (Table 3.4-4). Among these, migrating and/or feeding green, hawksbill, and olive ridley turtles would be the most common during the exemplary austral spring or fall analysis period, as described below. No sea turtle nesting occurs in the region.

Green Turtle. Some migrating green turtles could be encountered in the Sub-Antarctic QAA. However, foraging animals would not occur there because they are benthic feeders, and the waters in the analysis area do not provide suitable foraging habitat given their deep, mid-ocean depths (>3,281 ft [1,000 m]). Individual green turtles that may migrate through the Sub-Antarctic QAA nest primarily between October and December in tropical and sub-tropical waters of the western Pacific, including French Polynesian waters where they are considered common though in decline; however, nesting also occurs in small numbers throughout the year (Balazs et al. 1995). With the exception of Scilly Atoll, no other known nesting sites of any magnitude for sea turtles occur throughout the 130 islands and atolls that comprise

French Polynesia (Balazs et al. 1995). Nesting can occur throughout the year, but peaks between October and December.

Hawksbill Turtle. Some migrating hawksbill turtles could be encountered in the Sub-Antarctic QAA, although this area is south of its typical range and the hawksbill is the least likely among all sea turtle species to occur in temperate waters; hawksbill turtles generally inhabit tropical waters with coral reefs (Perrine 2003). Foraging hawksbills are not likely to occur in the QAA because they tend to be shallow benthic feeders, and the waters in the analysis area do not provide suitable foraging habitat given their deep, mid-ocean depths (>3,281 ft [1,000 m]). Several nesting sites occur west of the analysis area, including approximately 3,000 animals that nest in the Pacific east of Australia (SIO and NSF 2005). However, nesting occurs more commonly in waters of French Polynesia (Perrine 2003).

Olive Ridley Turtle. Migrating or foraging olive ridley turtles likely would occur in the Sub-Antarctic analysis area. No nesting colonies of olive ridley turtles occur in the analysis area. The closest nesting locations are to the west near Papua New Guinea. Outside of the breeding season, the turtles disperse, but little is known of their behavior. Neither males nor females migrate to one specific foraging area, but exhibit a nomadic movement pattern and occupy a series of feeding areas in the oceanic waters (Plotkin et al. 1994a, b). Aggregations of turtles (75% of which were olive ridleys), sometimes >100 individuals, have been observed as far offshore as 120°W, 1,864 mi (3,000 km) from shore (Arenas and Hall 1991).

Loggerhead Turtle. Some migrating loggerheads could be encountered in the Sub-Antarctic QAA. However, foraging loggerheads would not occur there because they are benthic feeders, and the waters in the analysis area do not provide suitable foraging habitat given their deep, mid-ocean depths (>3,281 ft [1,000 m]). The size structure of loggerheads in coastal and nearshore waters of the eastern and western Pacific suggest that hatchling loggerheads in the Pacific have a pelagic stage similar to that in the Atlantic (NMFS 2002), and thus could occur in the analysis area; loggerheads spend the first 2-6 years of their lives at sea. There are no reported loggerhead nesting sites in the eastern or central Pacific (NMFS 2002). The closest nesting beaches to the analysis area are in eastern Australia. The major nesting areas for loggerheads include the SE U.S., Yucatan Peninsula of Mexico, Columbia, Cuba, South Africa, eastern Australia, and Japan (EuroTurtle 2006). Most of the loggerheads in the eastern Pacific are believed to originate from nesting beaches in Japan where nesting typically occurs from May to August (USFWS 2005a).

Leatherback Turtle. Migrating or foraging leatherbacks likely would be the most frequently encountered sea turtle in the analysis area because of their tolerance of cold water. No nesting occurs in the general region. In the Pacific, leatherbacks nest along the west coast of Mexico and Central America from September to March, and in Irian Jaya and New Guinea. No leatherback turtles nest in French Polynesian waters, although non-breeding animals are seen in the region.

3.4.4 Environmental Consequences – General

Existing data on the impacts of seismic and other underwater sound on sea turtles are limited to a small number of individual turtles and species. Furthermore, most of these studies have been conducted on captive sea turtles, under constrained experimental conditions, and/or to sounds presented in air rather than in water. Studies of free-ranging sea turtles exposed to seismic sounds are also limited. Existing evidence of potential effects of underwater sound on sea turtles involves temporary or short-term behavioral effects, localized displacement, and temporary hearing impairment.

The following sections and Table 3.4-5 provide a general summary of available information on the effects of exposure of seismic surveys and other anthropogenic sounds (e.g., sonar) on sea turtles. This synopsis

provides the basis for assessing effects of the alternatives. The three types of potential effects of exposure to underwater seismic and other anthropogenic sounds on sea turtles are pathological, physiological, and behavioral as defined earlier in Section 3.2.4. Criteria used to assess effects are first described, followed by a comparison of the overlap between the sound frequency ranges of each source with what is known about sea turtle hearing and sound production.

Table 3.4-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Noise and Other Project-Related Noise on Sea Turtles*

*Species***	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*Temporary Hearing Impairment*	*Injury*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Green	Unknown	Possible – Short-term	Possible if close to high-energy acoustic source	Unknown	Unknown	Potential for limited adverse effects due to overlapping frequency of seismic source and green sea turtle hearing based on airborne sounds not measured behaviorally (Ridgway et al. 1969; Bartol and Ketten 2006; Dow et al. 2008)
Hawksbill	Unknown	Possible – Short-term	Possible if close to high-energy acoustic source	Unknown	Unknown	No studies available
Loggerhead	Unknown	Possible – Short-term	Possible if close to high-energy acoustic source	Unknown	Unknown	Potential for limited adverse effects due to overlapping frequency of seismic source and a study indicating that loggerhead avoided low-frequency sound (O'Hara and Wilcox 1990)
Olive Ridley	Unknown	Possible – Short-term	Possible if close to high-energy acoustic source	Unknown	Unknown	No studies available
Kemp's Ridley	Unknown	Possible – Short-term	Possible if close to high-energy acoustic source	Unknown	Unknown	Potential for limited adverse effects due to overlapping frequency of seismic source and juvenile Kemp's ridley sea turtle hearing (Bartol and Ketten 2006)
Leatherback	Unknown	Possible – Short-term	Possible if close to high-energy acoustic source	Unknown	Unknown	Potential for limited adverse effects due to overlapping frequency of seismic source and leatherback vocalizations (Mrosovksy 1972)
Flatback	Unknown	Possible – Short-term	Possible if close to high-energy acoustic source	Unknown	Unknown	No studies available

Notes: *No known systematic studies of the effects of sonar similar to the MBES and SBP proposed for use during the marine seismic surveys. Limited available data on sea turtle hearing sensitivity indicate that they are not capable of hearing the higher frequencies associated with these acoustic sources (see Table 3.4-2).
**All sea turtle species listed except for the flatback have ESA status (see Table 3.4-1).

3.4.4.1 Criteria

As indicated in Section 3.4.1.4, little is known about the acoustic capabilities of sea turtles, either in terms of hearing ability or sound production (see Table 3.4-2). With such limited data, it is currently not possible to determine how far away a particular airgun array may be audible to a sea turtle. Thus, it is not possible to identify specific sound criteria for sea turtles above which TTS, PTS, or injury could occur based on empirical

data. However, as a conservative measure, NMFS has identified two levels of sound exposure criteria for sea turtles during NSF-funded seismic research surveys (see Table 2-1) in areas where sea turtles were anticipated to be numerous (e.g., L-DEO and NSF 2003e, 2003f, 2007a, 2007b, 2008a, 2008b). The most recent (through 2009) of these two criteria correspond to a conservative Level A safety radius of 180 dB re 1 µPa above which TTS or PTS is considered possible and should thus be avoided. The second is a conservative Level B radius of 166 dB re 1 µPa above which behavioral "harassment" changes may occur. These criteria were identified to precautionarily limit the potential risk of physical injury and to address behavioral disturbance, respectively, since the associated limits were unknown. NMFS (2004b, 2005f, 2008a) indicated that sea turtles exposed to received levels at 166 dB re 1 µPa or higher are likely to be harassed. NMFS (2004b) also indicated that the 166 dB re 1 µPa criterion was considered a "conservative threshold", given the paucity of relevant data. The latter criterion is based on captive studies indicating that some sea turtles have shown changes in behavior to sounds at 166 dB re 1 µPa (see below).

Limited new data have become available since NMFS first implemented the threshold criteria (reviewed below). These data suggest that considerably higher sound levels (closer to approximately 175 dB re 1 µPa) would be needed to induce behavioral avoidance. Presumably, even higher (though still unknown) thresholds would correspond to levels at which PTS or injury could occur. However, as a precautionary measure for the purposes of this analysis, the same exposure criteria previously used by NMFS are assumed for ESA-listed sea turtles. Thus, a precautionary threshold of 180 dB re 1 µPa would be implemented as the safety exposure mitigation radii for this analysis, above which exposure should be avoided. The 166 dB re 1 µPa is used herein to identify the distances from the various exemplary arrays at which behavioral disturbance may occur. The limited, largely captive studies of sea turtles upon which these criteria have precautionarily been based, as well as additional newer studies, are discussed in Section 3.4.4.3.

3.4.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

To assess potential effects of project sound sources on sea turtles, it is important to identify any overlap in their known hearing range with the characteristics of the sound sources that would be used. In general, sea turtles whose hearing or sound production overlap those of the sound sources would be expected to hear those sound sources. In addition, it is plausible that a sea turtle sufficiently close to and for a sufficient duration to a sound source operating at high levels could potentially be harmed by the energy of the sound, even if the sound's frequencies are outside the hearing sensitivity range of the animal. The degree of frequency overlap between the airguns, MBESs, SBPs, pingers, and vessel sounds associated with proposed activities are described below relative to what is known for hearing among sea turtles (see Table 3.4-2).

Based on available data, the range of best hearing sensitivity for sea turtles is probably roughly 200-700 Hz based on auditory data from limited studies of three species of varying ages (see Table 3.4-2); the possible upper hearing limit is 1,600 Hz (Dow et al. 2008). Hearing below 80 Hz is apparently less sensitive but still potentially of use. In general, sensitivity decreases at lower or higher frequencies. In one study, loggerheads have been shown to avoid sources of low-frequency sound in the 25-1,000 Hz range (O'Hara and Wilcox 1990). Finally, sensitivity even within the optimal hearing range is apparently low: threshold detection levels are relatively high at 160-200 dB re 1 µPa (Lenhardt 1994). See Section 3.4.1 and Table 3.4-2 for further information on sea turtle hearing.

Airguns have dominant frequency components of 2-188 Hz and zero-to-peak nominal source outputs ranging from 234 to 265 dB re 1 µPa-m (Table 2-3). This dominant frequency range overlaps the lower frequency range of the known hearing capabilities of sea turtles. Although this range appears to be below

what is known about peak hearing sensitivity for green and loggerhead sea turtles, it is within the peak hearing sensitivity of 100-200 Hz documented for two juvenile Kemp's ridley sea turtles (Bartol and Ketten 2006). Furthermore, since most energy from airguns occurs at frequencies <500 Hz (see Chapter 2), there is substantial overlap in the frequencies that sea turtles detect vs. the frequencies in airgun pulses. In addition, the nominal source outputs of the project airguns are likely substantially higher than and thus well within the sound detection thresholds of sea turtles (Table 3.4-2).

The Kongsberg EM122 MBES proposed for use on the *Langseth* operates at 10.5-13 (usually 12) kHz with a maximum source level of 242 dB re 1 µPa. Other types of MBESs used for deep-water operations aboard other research vessels associated with the proposed action operate at similar or higher frequencies (see Table 2-5). These frequencies are well above the known detection ranges of sea turtles (Table 3.4-2). Thus, the known frequency sensitivity range of sea turtles does not overlap with the frequencies of the MBES and sea turtles are not expected to be capable of hearing these sounds.

The SBP operates at 3.5 kHz with a maximum source output of 222 dB re 1 µPa-m. Thus, the frequency range of the SBP is outside the known detection range of sea turtles based on available data. As a result, sea turtles are not expected to be capable of hearing the higher frequency sounds produced by SBPs. Furthermore, the intermittent and narrow downward-directed nature of the MBES and SBP as emitted from the transiting seismic vessel would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures.

Pingers are small omnidirectional acoustic transponders proposed for use to obtain locations of hydrophone arrays with respect to each other in multi-streamer 3-D seismic survey mode (see Chapter 2). The R/V *Langseth* will deploy up to 32 such pingers: 7 on each streamer and 1 on each source array string. Their peak output is 183 dB at 55-110 KHz, with a maximum ping-set rate of 3 pings per 10 sec. In addition, other pingers are proposed for use only during those seismic survey cruises that have ancillary coring operations. A battery-powered pinger (i.e., acoustic beacon) is attached to each coring mechanism to monitor the depth of the corer relative to the sea floor. The pinger produces an omnidirectional 12-kHz signal with a source output of approximately 192 dB re 1 µPa-m with one ping of 0.5, 2, or 10 ms duration per second.

Ship engines and the vessel hull itself also emit sounds into the marine environment (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a). These frequencies and amplitudes overlap with the frequencies and thresholds associated with sea turtle hearing. However, only anecdotal reports are available regarding the possible effects of vessel sound on sea turtles. These observations indicated that turtles exposed to vessel sound may respond by exhibiting a startle response and moving away from the sound, producing a temporary stress response (NRC 1990). A free-ranging leatherback's response to the sound of a boat motor suggests that leatherbacks may be sensitive to low-frequency sounds, but the response could have been to mid- or high-frequency components of the sound (Advanced Research Projects Agency 1995). The source level of vessel sound would be considerably less than the airgun, MBES, and SBP sound sources (see Chapter 2 and review in Richardson et al. 1995a). Vessel sounds would be at levels expected to potentially cause only localized, short-term behavioral changes. In addition, in all oceans of the world, large vessel traffic is currently so prevalent that it is commonly considered a usual source of ambient sound. Based on the above, potential effects of vessel sound on sea turtles are considered to be short-term behavioral in nature and are not discussed further.

In summary, based on what is known regarding sea turtle hearing, airgun transmissions would be detectable but the MBES, SBP, and pingers would not be detectable by sea turtles. Potential adverse effects on sea turtles from exposure to airgun sounds are discussed below.

3.4.4.3 Acoustic Effects

Masking

Masking occurs when interfering sounds obscure sounds of biological importance to the animals of interest. Biological sounds include those produced by conspecifics as well as natural sounds used by sea turtles for orientation or other purposes. It is unknown how dependent sea turtles are on underwater sound for their survival. For example, underwater hearing (reviewed in Section 3.4.1) may aid turtles with migration, navigation, predator avoidance, etc.

The little information available on the hearing abilities of sea turtles means that it is not possible to determine whether masking presents a significant problem to these animals. Masking is known to occur in birds, a group with ears similar to turtles. Based on the limited available sea turtle hearing data, it is assumed that masking would only be possible during the actual brief, intermittent airgun pulse emissions. The brief emissions by the MBES, SBP, and pingers would not mask turtle hearing because their frequencies do not overlap those known to be used by sea turtles.

Disturbance

Most studies of the biological effects of airgun pulses have occurred during the past two decades on marine mammals (Richardson et al. 1995a; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Southall et al. 2007) and fish (Thomson et al. 2001; Herata 2007; Payne et al. 2008). There have been far fewer studies of the effects of airgun or other sound on sea turtles. Four studies focused on short-term behavioral responses of sea turtles in enclosures to single airguns. In addition, data on reactions of free-swimming turtles to seismic pulses have been collected during multiple monitoring and mitigation programs conducted during NSF-funded seismic geophysical studies (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005b; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008) and other studies. Comparisons of results among studies are difficult because experimental designs and reporting procedures have varied greatly, and few studies provided specific information about the levels of the airgun pulses received by the turtles. Another provided estimates of the received levels near sea turtles based on results of acoustic modeling. There have been no studies on the potential long-term or population-level effects of seismic survey or other anthropogenic sounds on sea turtles.

The most recent study of caged sea turtles exposed to airgun pulses was conducted by McCauley et al. (2000a, b) off Western Australia. This is apparently the only such study in which received sound levels were estimated carefully. McCauley et al. (2000b) exposed one caged green and one loggerhead sea turtle to pulses from an approaching and then receding 20-in^3 airgun firing every 10 sec at 1,500 psi at a depth of 16 ft (5 m). There were two trials separated by 2 days: the first trial involved approximately 2 hr of airgun exposure and the second trial approximately 1 hr of airgun exposure. The results from these two trials showed that above a received level of 166 dB re 1 µPa (rms)[4] the turtles noticeably increased their swim speed relative to periods when no airguns were operating. The behavior of the sea turtles became more erratic when received levels were >175 dB re 1 µPa (rms). The authors suggested that the erratic behavior exhibited by the caged sea turtles would likely, in unrestrained turtles, be expressed as an avoidance response (McCauley et al. 2000a, b).

[4]This measure represents the average received sound pressure over the duration of the pulse, with duration being defined in a specific way (i.e., from the time when 5% of the pulse energy has been received to the time when 95% of the energy has been received). The rms received level of a seismic pulse is typically about 10 dB less than its peak level, and about 16 dB less than its peak-to-peak level (Greene 1997; Greene et al. 2000; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000b).

In another study, O'Hara and Wilcox (1990) tested the reactions of nine loggerhead sea turtles to airguns. For each experiment, a single turtle was held in a 984 ft x 148 ft (300 m x 45 m) enclosed area within a 33-ft (10-m) deep canal in Florida. The nine turtles were tested at different times and some turtles were used in more than one experiment with at least 10 days between tests. The sound source consisted of one 10-in^3 airgun plus two 0.8-in^3 "poppers" operating at 2,000 psi[(5)] at a depth of 7 ft (2 m) for periods of 20-36 hr. Combined results indicated that turtles maintained a stand-off range of approximately 98 ft (30 m) when exposed to airgun pulses every 7.5 or 15 sec. It was also possible that some turtles remained on the bottom of the enclosure when exposed to airgun pulses. O'Hara and Wilcox (1990) did not measure the received airgun sound levels. McCauley et al. (2000a, b) estimated that "the level at which O'Hara saw avoidance was around 175-176 dB re 1 µPa (rms)." The sound levels received by the turtles in this Florida study probably were actually a few dB less than 175-176 dB. This is because the calculations by McCauley et al. (2000a, b) apparently did not allow for the shallow 7-ft (2-m) airgun depth in the Florida study. The effective source level of airguns is less when they are near 7 ft (2 m) depth than at 16 ft (5 m) (Greene et al. 2000).

In a third study, Moein et al. (1994) investigated the avoidance behavior and physiological responses of 10 loggerhead turtles exposed to an operating airgun, as well as the effects on their hearing. The turtles were held in a netted enclosure approximately 59 ft x 200 ft (18 m x 61 m) at a depth of 12 ft (3.6 m), with an airgun of unspecified size at each end of the enclosure. Only one airgun was operated at any one time; the firing rate was one shot every 5-6 sec. Ten turtles were tested individually, seven of which were retested several days later. The airgun was initially discharged when the turtles were near the center of the enclosure and the subsequent movements of the turtles were documented. The turtles exhibited avoidance during the first presentation of airgun sounds at a mean range of 79 ft (24 m); however, the avoidance response waned quickly. Additional trials conducted on the same turtles several days later did not show statistically significant avoidance reactions; however, there was an indication of slight initial avoidance followed by rapid waning of the avoidance response. The authors described the rapid waning of the avoidance response as "habituation." Their auditory study indicated that exposure to the airgun pulses may have resulted in temporary hearing impairment (i.e., TTS). Reduced hearing sensitivity may also have contributed to the waning response upon continued exposure. There was some evidence of increased stress in the sea turtles based on physiological measurements; however, this stress could also have resulted from handling of the turtles.

Inconsistencies in reporting procedures and experimental design prevent direct comparison of this study with either McCauley et al. (2000b) or O'Hara and Wilcox (1990). Moein et al. (1994) stated, without further details, that "three different decibel levels (175, 177, 179) were utilized" during each test. These figures probably are received levels in dB re 1 µPa, and probably relate to the initial exposure distance (mean 79 ft [24 m]); however, these details were not specified. Also, it was not specified whether these values were measured or estimated, or whether they were expressed in peak-to-peak, peak, rms, SEL, or some other units. Given the shallow water in the enclosure (12 ft [3.6 m]), any estimates based on simple assumptions about propagation would be suspect.

Lenhardt (2002) exposed captive loggerhead sea turtles while underwater to seismic airgun (Bolt 600) sounds in a large net enclosure. At received levels of 151–161 dB re 1 µPa, turtles were found to increase swim speeds. Similar to the McCauley et al. studies (2000a, b), near a received level of approximately

[5] There was no significant reaction by five sea turtles during an initial series of tests with the airguns operating at the unusually low pressure of 1,000 psi. The source and received levels of airgun sounds would have been substantially lower when the air pressure was only 1,000 psi than when it was at the more typical operating pressure of 2,000 psi.

175 dB re 1 μPa, an avoidance reaction was common in initial trials, but habituation then appeared to occur. A TTS of over 15 dB was found in one animal, with recovery 2 weeks later. Lenhardt (2002) suggested that exposure of sea turtles to airguns at water depths >33 ft (10 m) may result in exposure to more energy in the low frequencies with unknown biological effects.

In addition to the above studies on caged turtles, at-sea data on responses, distribution, and sighting rates of sea turtles have been collected during marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring and mitigation programs associated with various seismic operations around the world (Holst et al. 2006; Parente et al. 2006; Weir 2007). Results generally suggest that sea turtles showed localized avoidance during large- and small-source surveys when the airgun arrays were operating (Holst et al. 2006; Weir 2007). During NSF-funded academic seismic surveys from aboard the R/V *Ewing* from 2003-2005 (Holst et al. 2006) and aboard the R/V *Langseth* (e.g., Richardson et al. 2009) visual observations and various types of mitigation similar to those proposed under Alternative A were conducted. These included ramp ups, power downs, and shutdowns of the seismic source if marine mammals or turtles were detected in or about to enter designated safety radii. The most recent (2009) NMFS-designated safety radius for sea turtles during these surveys was the 180 dB re 1 μPa isopleth. Visual observations for marine mammals and turtles have taken place during all 11 L-DEO surveys from 2003 through 2005 on the R/V *Ewing* and all surveys on the R/V *Langseth*. During six large-source surveys (10 to 20 airguns; 3,050 to 8,760 in^3) from the R/V *Ewing*, the mean closest point of approach (CPA) for turtles was closer during non-seismic (456 ft [139 m]) than seismic (748 ft [228 m]) periods. During small-source surveys (up to six airguns or three GI guns; 75 to 1,350 in^3) from the R/V *Ewing*, the mean CPA for turtles was 394 ft (120 m) during non-seismic and 935 ft (285 m) during seismic periods.

During a large-source L-DEO seismic survey off the Pacific coast of Central America in 2008 from the R/V *Langseth*, the turtle sighting rate during non-seismic periods was seven times greater than that during seismic periods (Holst and Smultea 2008). In addition, distances of turtles seen from the seismic vessel were significantly farther from the airgun array when it was operating (mean 159 m, n = 77) than when the airguns were off (mean 118 m, n = 69; Mann-Whitney U test, P<0.001) (Holst and Smultea 2008). During another L-DEO survey in the Eastern Tropical Pacific in 2008 from the R/V *Langseth*, the turtle sighting rate during non-seismic periods was 1.5 times greater than that during seismic periods; however, turtles tended to be seen closer to the airgun array when it was operating, but this difference was not statistically significant (Hauser et al. 2008).

Weir (2007) reported on the behavior of sea turtles near industrial seismic exploration off Angola, West Africa. A total of 240 sea turtles were seen during 676 hr of vessel-based monitoring, mainly for associated marine mammals mitigation and monitoring observations. Airgun arrays with total volumes of 5,085 or 3,147 in^3 were used at different times during the seismic program. Sea turtles tended to be seen slightly closer to the seismic source during airguns off vs. full-array periods, and turtle sighting rate during airguns off was double that during periods when the full array was operating. However, there was no significant difference in the median distance of turtle sightings from the array during airguns off (mean = 743 m, n = 112) vs. full-array on (mean = 779 m, n = 57). Weir (2007) indicated that these results should be interpreted cautiously due to potential biases in data collection. It was not possible to differentiate turtle responses to airgun sounds vs. the vessel and towed equipment. Sea turtles often exhibited a startle response to the vessel or towed surface floats during both airguns on and off periods, usually at close range (<33 ft [10 m]) to approaching objects, apparently based mainly on visual cues. However, most turtles continued basking at the surface as the vessel and towed equipment passed by, remaining visible at the surface well behind the vessel. Weir (2007) suggested that the apparent observed lack of movement by turtles away from operating airguns may indicate that turtles only detected airguns

at close range or were not mobile enough to move away from the approaching arrays, particularly if basking at the surface.

Results of another recent biota monitoring program were reported in association with seismic operations conducted off northeastern Brazil (Parente et al. 2006). A total of 46 sea turtles were seen during 2,028 hr of vessel-based monitoring of seismic surveys that utilized four to eight GI airguns of 1,410 psi each. No evidence of adverse impacts on sea turtles from seismic operations was apparent, although there was considerable variability in the data set (Parente et al. 2006). In both the Parente et al. (2006) and Weir (2007) studies, sea turtle sighting rates decreased with increasing Beaufort sea state, with Weir (2007) reporting significantly more turtles seen than expected in Beaufort sea states 0 and 1 compared to sea states 2 to 4. Both studies indicated that lowered effectiveness for sighting sea turtles in higher Beaufort sea states reduces effectiveness of associated monitoring and mitigation measures during seismic operations.

There is a consistent trend among the captive and at-sea studies, including the results of previous NSF-funded seismic cruises. This trend indicates that, at some received level, sea turtles show avoidance of an operating airgun, despite the inherent problems in comparing some of these studies. McCauley et al. (2000a, b) found evidence of behavioral responses when the received level from a single small airgun was 166 dB re 1 μPa (rms), and avoidance responses at 175 dB re 1 μPa (rms). Based on these data, McCauley et al. (2000b) estimated that, for a typical airgun array (2,678 in^3, 12 elements) operating in water 328-394 ft (100-120 m) deep, sea turtles may exhibit behavioral changes at approximately 1.2 mi (2 km) and avoidance at approximately 0.6 mi (1 km). These estimates are subject to significant variation, depending on the seismic source and local propagation conditions.

Three other related studies involving stimuli other than airguns may also be relevant. Two loggerhead turtles resting on the bottom of shallow tanks responded repeatedly to low-frequency (20-80 Hz) tones by becoming active and swimming to the surface (Lenhardt 1994). They remained at the surface or slightly submerged for the remainder of the 1-min trial. No detailed data on sound levels at the bottom vs. surface were reported. However, the surfacing response probably reduced the levels of underwater sound to which the turtles were exposed (Lenhardt 1994). In a separate study, a loggerhead and Kemp's ridley sea turtle responded similarly when 1-sec vibratory stimuli at 250 or 500 Hz were applied to the turtle's head for 1 sec (Lenhardt et al. 1983). There appeared to be rapid habituation to these vibratory stimuli. In the third study, sea turtles in tanks showed agitated behaviour when exposed to simulated boat noise and recordings from the U.S. Navy's Low Frequency Active (LFA) sonar (Samuel et al. 2005, 2006). The tones and vibratory stimuli used in these three studies were quite different from airgun pulses. However, it is possible that resting sea turtles may exhibit a similar "alarm" response, possibly including surfacing or alternatively diving, when exposed to any audible sound, regardless of whether it is a pulsed sound or tone.

In summary, in captive enclosures as well as during NSF-funded at-sea seismic monitoring programs, sea turtles generally respond to seismic survey sound with behavioral changes such as startling, increasing swimming speed, swimming away from, and/or locally avoiding the source. In captivity, animals resting on the bottom often become active and move toward the surface where received sound levels normally would be reduced. Based on available results of the at-sea studies to date, free-ranging sea turtles appear to show localized avoidance of seismic airguns and airgun arrays (Holst et al. 2006; Weir 2007). Thus, combined available studies indicate that exposure to seismic sounds results in short-term behavioral changes and localized avoidance by sea turtles. Available evidence suggests that the zone of avoidance

around seismic sources is a few kilometers or less (McCauley et al. 2000a, b; Holst et al. 2006; Weir 2007).

We are not aware of any information indicating that sea turtles show more than localized short-term avoidance of airguns. For example, during the NSF-funded seismic surveys summarized above, sea turtles continued to be seen in the seismic survey area throughout each cruise. Whether potentially displaced individual turtles would return quickly after seismic survey activities ended is unknown; no tagging studies of sea turtles have been conducted relative to seismic surveys to allow re-identification or tracking of movements of individual turtles. Theoretically, avoidance reactions over an extended period in a localized area could prevent sea turtles from using an important coastal area or bay if there was a prolonged seismic operation in the area, particularly in shallow water (see Pendoley 1997); however, this is not a situation anticipated for research use of airguns under the Proposed Action. Sea turtles might be excluded from the area for the duration of the seismic operation, or they might remain but exhibit abnormal behavioral patterns (e.g., lingering longer than normal at the surface where received sound levels are lower). However, potential impacts could be minimized through mitigation measures such as avoiding sensitive nesting or foraging areas used by ESA-listed sea turtles and by using PSVOs and implementing power down and shutdown measures, etc.

The Proposed Action is not expected to adversely affect populations of ESA-listed nesting sea turtles because seismic surveys would be planned in coordination with NMFS to minimize and avoid disturbance of their known active nesting areas. It is unclear whether exclusion from a particular nesting beach by seismic operations, if it occurred, would prevent or decrease reproductive success. It is believed that females migrate to the region of their birth and select a nesting beach. The degree of site fidelity varies between species and also intra-seasonally by individuals. If a sea turtle is excluded from a particular beach, it may select a more distant, undisturbed nesting site in the general area (Miller 1997). Under apparently undisturbed conditions, sea turtles naturally vary the intra-seasonal distance between nesting sites. For example, Bjorndal et al. (1983) (in Miller [1997]) reported a maximal intra-seasonal distance between nesting sites of 180 mi (290 km), indicating that sea turtles use multiple nesting sites spaced up to a few hundred kilometers apart. Also, it is unknown whether a turtle that failed to go ashore because of seismic survey activity would abandon the area for that full breeding cycle, or would simply delay going ashore until the seismic survey activities moved to a different area.

In comparison, results of experiments and monitoring studies on responses of marine mammals and fish to seismic surveys show that responses or lack thereof can be related to species, time of year, activity of the animal, and other unknown factors. The same species may show different kinds of responses at different times of year or even on different days (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995a; Thomson et al. 2001). It is reasonable to expect similar variability in the case of sea turtles exposed to the airgun sounds. For example, sea turtles of different ages vary in size, behavior, feeding habits, preferred water depths, and hearing sensitivity. Nothing specific is known about the ways in which these factors may be related to the effects of airgun sound. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to expect reduced effects in young turtles concentrated near the surface (where levels of airgun sounds are attenuated) as compared with older turtles that spend more time at depths where airgun sounds are generally stronger.

Temporary Hearing Impairment

Moein et al. (1994) used an "evoked potential method" to test the hearing of 11 loggerhead sea turtles exposed to a few hundred pulses from a single airgun. Turtle hearing was tested before and within 24 hr and 2 weeks after exposure to pulses of airgun sound. Levels of airgun sound to which the turtles were exposed were not specifically reported. The authors concluded that: (1) five turtles tested exhibited some

change in their hearing when tested within 24 hr after exposure relative to pre-exposure hearing, and (2) hearing had reverted to normal for turtles when tested 2 weeks after exposure. The results are consistent with the occurrence of TTS upon exposure of the turtles to airgun pulses. Unfortunately, the size of the airgun used or the received sound levels at various distances were not reported and the distances of the turtles from the airgun were also variable during the tests. A turtle was approximately 98 ft (30 m) from the airgun at the start of each trial but could then either approach the airgun or move away to a maximum of approximately 213 ft (65 m) during subsequent airgun pulses. Thus, the levels of airgun sounds that apparently elicited TTS are unknown. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that there was evidence of TTS from exposure to pulses from a single airgun. However, the turtles were confined and unable to move more than approximately 213 ft (65 m) away. Similarly, Lenhardt (2002) exposed loggerhead turtles in a large net enclosure to airgun pulses. He noted TTS of >15 dB in one loggerhead turtle, with recovery occurring in 2 weeks. Turtles in the open sea might move away from an airgun operating at a fixed location, and in the more typical case of a towed airgun or airgun array, very few shots would occur at or near a single location. Thus, sea turtle reactions to exposure to underwater sound during net-enclosure experiments is not considered typical of that expected during an operational seismic survey.

Overall, in the absence of relevant absolute threshold data, we cannot estimate how far away an airgun array might be audible to a sea turtle. TTS apparently occurred in loggerhead turtles exposed to many pulses from a single airgun ≤213 ft (65 m) away (Moein et al. 1994). This suggests that sounds from an airgun array might cause temporary hearing impairment in sea turtles if they do not avoid the (unknown) radius where TTS occurs. However, exposure duration during the exemplary surveys analyzed for this PEIS would be much less than during the study by Moein et al. (1994). This is based on the transitory nature of the seismic vessel (i.e., the vessel travels considerably faster than a sea turtle) and other factors described later in this section.

Injury

Noise-induced hearing damage can be either temporary or permanent. In general, the received sound must be strong (i.e., at a high level) for either to occur, and must be especially strong and/or prolonged for permanent impairment to occur. There have been few studies that have directly investigated hearing or sound-induced hearing loss in sea turtles. Moein et al. (1994) studied the effect of sound pulses from a single airgun of unspecified size on loggerhead sea turtles (see above). Apparent TTS was observed after exposure to a few hundred airgun pulses at distances ≤213 ft (65 m). The hearing capabilities had returned to "normal" when the turtles were re-tested 2 weeks later. Similarly, Lenhardt (2002) noted recovery of TTS in a loggerhead turtle within 2 weeks.

Behavioral avoidance and hearing damage are related. If sea turtles exhibit little or no behavioral avoidance, or if they acclimate to seismic survey sound to the extent that avoidance reactions cease, sea turtles might sustain hearing loss if they are close enough to seismic sources. Furthermore, sea turtles in the area of seismic operations prior to start-up may not have time to move out of the area even if standard ramp-up (i.e., soft-start) procedures are in effect. Eckert (2000) proposed that sea turtles require a longer ramp-up period because of their relatively slow swimming speeds. However, it is unclear at what distance (if any) from a seismic source sea turtles could sustain hearing impairment, and whether there would ever be a possibility of exposure to sufficiently high levels for a sufficiently long period to cause permanent hearing damage. In summary, there are many unknowns with respect to potential injurious effects of airgun or other anthropogenic sound on free-swimming sea turtles.

In theory, a reduction in hearing sensitivity, either temporary or permanent, may be harmful for sea turtles. However, very little is known about the role of sound perception in the sea turtle's normal

activities. While it is not possible to estimate how much of a problem it would be for a turtle to have either temporary or permanent hearing impairment, there is some evidence indicating that hearing plays an important role in sea turtle survival.

1) It has been suggested (Eckert et al. 1998; Eckert 2000) that sea turtles may use passive reception of acoustic signals to detect the hunting sonar of killer whales, a known predator of leatherback sea turtles (Fertl and Fulling 2007). Further investigation is needed before this hypothesis can be accepted. Some communication calls of killer whales include components at frequencies low enough to overlap the frequency range where sea turtles hear. However, the echolocation signals of killer whales are at considerably higher frequencies and may be inaudible to sea turtles (e.g., Simon et al. 2007).
2) Hearing impairment, either temporary or permanent, might inhibit a turtle's ability to avoid injury from vessels. A recent study found that green sea turtles often responded behaviorally to close, oncoming small vessels and that the nature of the response was related to vessel speed, with fewer turtles displaying a flee response as vessel speed increased (Hazel et al. 2007). However, Hazel et al. (2007) suggested that a turtles' ability to detect an approaching vessel was vision-dependent.
3) Hearing may play a role in navigation. For example, it has been proposed that sea turtles may identify their breeding beaches by their acoustic signature (Lenhardt et al. 1983). However, available evidence suggests that visual, wave, and magnetic cues are the main navigational cues used by sea turtles, at least in the case of hatchlings and juveniles (Lohmann et al. 1997, 2001; Lohmann and Lohmann 1998).

Other Physiological Effects

Little information is available on other potential physiological effects of underwater sound on sea turtles. Theoretically, non-auditory physiological effects or injuries could occur in sea turtles exposed to high-level underwater sound. These include stress, neurological effects, and organ or tissue damage. Moein et al. (1994) noted evidence of increased stress in sea turtles during enclosed airgun exposure experiments; however, this stress could also have resulted from handling of the turtles. There is no proof that any of these effects occur in sea turtles exposed to sound from airgun arrays (even large ones). However, there have been no direct studies of the potential for airgun pulses to elicit any of those effects. If such effects do occur, they would probably be limited to unusual situations when animals might be exposed at close range for unusually long periods. Overall, it is considered unlikely that sea turtles would be exposed to sound levels of sufficient strength and for sufficient duration to cause significant physiological effects.

3.4.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Entanglement and Ingestion

Other potential project-related effects on sea turtles involve ingestion of marine debris as well as entanglement and entrapment in marine debris and equipment. Onshore and onboard waste management are of issue with respect to marine debris. Plastics and other foreign materials are prevalent in the marine environment. They present a serious risk of injury through ingestion and entanglement. Researchers have estimated that the North Pacific Gyre contains six times as much plastic by mass as it does plankton. Sampling in the North Pacific found 334,271 plastic pieces/km² (Moore et al. 2001).

Sea turtles appear to be particularly susceptible to mortality associated with ingestion of plastics and other materials. It is believed that floating plastic bags may be mistaken for jellyfish or simply accidentally ingested as sea turtles feed on other prey. The NRC (1990) identified ingestion of debris as a source of sea

turtle mortality related to human activities but was unable to determine the level of significance for hatchling, juvenile, and adult sea turtles. An estimated 24,000 metric tons of plastic packaging is dumped into the ocean each year (Welch 1988). Over 100,000 marine mammals and turtles die each year from eating or becoming entangled in plastic debris, including netting, plastic fishing line, packing bands, and Styrofoam (Welch 1988; McGavern 1989; Sanders 1989).

Sea turtles ingest a wide variety of marine debris including plastic bags, plastic sheeting, balloons, Styrofoam, and fishing line. Ingestion of these foreign materials can cause intestinal blockage, release toxic chemicals, inhibit feeding or mating, and result in suffocation, ulceration, malnutrition, and starvation (Wehle and Colemar 1983; Wallace 1985; O'Hara et al. 1986; Gramentz 1988; Welch 1988; McGavern 1989). In one 22-month study, plastic was found in nearly 80% of turtle stomachs (Stanley et al. 1988). NMFS estimates that one-third to one-half of all turtles have ingested plastic products or byproducts (Cottingham 1988).

Entanglement of sea turtles with marine debris, fishing gear, dredging operations, and equipment operations are a documented occurrence and of elevated concern for sea turtles. Turtles can become wrapped around cables, lines, nets, or other objects suspended in the water column and become injured or fatally wounded, drowned, or suffocated (e.g., Hofman 1995; NMFS 2007). During proposed seismic operations, numerous cables, lines, and other objects associated with the airgun array and hydrophone streamers are towed behind the survey at water depths up to approximately 39 ft (12 m) (Tables 2-3 and 2-4) and could potentially entrap sea turtles. Seismic personnel reported that sea turtles (number unspecified) became fatally entrapped between gaps in tail-buoys associated with industrial seismic vessel gear deployed off West Africa in 2003 (Weir 2007).

We are not aware of any other cases of entanglement by sea turtles with seismic survey equipment. With PSVO monitoring, no incidents of entanglements of sea turtles with this gear has been documented in over 54,000 nm (100,000 km) of previous NSF-funded seismic surveys (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005b; Holst and Smultea 2008; Hauser et al. 2008; refer to Table 2-1). Towing of the hydrophone streamer or other equipment is not expected to significantly interfere with sea turtle movements, including migration, unless they were to become entrapped as indicated above. Sea turtles are expected to be capable of swimming around, under, or avoiding such equipment as long as they are able to detect it. The actual volume/area "occupied" by this equipment is minute compared to surrounding water; however, there is a potential low risk that a sea turtle could encounter and become entangled with seismic lines and gear. Monitoring for sea turtles from seismic vessels would reduce the potential for related adverse effects. Modifying equipment in which sea turtles can become entangled is also a possible mitigation measure. Weir (2007) suggested that "turtle guards" could be placed over gaps between tail-buoys (e.g., in deployed seismic vessel gear) to avoid entanglement of sea turtles with seismic gear in areas where sea turtles occur.

Waste management plans are in place on all research vessels used for NSF-funded or USGS seismic research. These plans would be designed to minimize the amount of plastic used on board. Further, in accordance with U.S. and international marine laws and regulations, no plastic materials would be disposed of at sea. Monitoring for sea turtles from seismic vessels by trained biological observers and subsequent attempts to maneuver the ship to avoid potential entanglements with sea turtle(s) would reduce the potential low risk of this occurrence.

Ship Strikes

Sea turtles are at risk from collisions with vessels. In Florida, surveys in 1998 found that one-third of the 566 dead turtles examined showed signs of boat-related injuries (CCC and Sea Turtle Survival League

1998). Earlier studies of turtles stranded on the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic coasts of the U.S. found that 6-9% of strandings had boat-related injuries, involving an average of about 150 turtles per year (Schroeder 1987; Schroeder and Warner 1988; Teas and Martinez 1989).

Little information is available on the types of vessels responsible for turtle deaths, although the focus has tended to be on recreational boat traffic (NRC 1990). In the Virgin Islands, sea turtles are reportedly regularly hit and killed by ferries (Hillis-Starr et al. 1998). NRC (1990) provides a qualitative ranking of the relative importance of various mortality factors on sea turtle adults, eggs, and hatchlings. Entrapment in shrimp trawling gear caused more turtle deaths than any other human activities, followed by other fisheries interactions (rated medium to low). Collision with boats was considered of "low" importance for juveniles and adults and to be "unimportant" with respect to hatchlings (NRC 1990).

Collision of sea turtles with seismic vessels and associated deployed/towed gear and equipment is possible, including airgun arrays (on or off), buoys, cables, hydrophone streamers, and coring equipment (see Chapter 2). Based on a recent report by Weir (2007) (see preceding subsection), sea turtles sometimes were startled near and moved away from the seismic vessel and/or towed equipment, but apparently resumed their previous behaviors after being startled. A total of 13 sea turtles dived in apparent response to the seismic vessel, including nine that "startle dived" at the bow (seven while the airguns were off). Another seven sea turtles dived in apparent response to towed seismic equipment: six near surface floats (five while airguns were off) and one near an inactive array (Weir 2007). These responses usually occurred within 33 ft (10 m) of approaching objects; thus, reactions were likely based mainly on visual detection. These observations suggest that some turtles may avoid collisions by diving. However, Weir (2007) also reported "near misses" of collisions between "basking" sea turtles and towed seismic survey gear.

It has been hypothesized that hearing impairment in sea turtles, either temporary or permanent, might inhibit a turtle's ability to avoid injury from vessels, although this is largely conjectural. Hazel et al. (2007) suggested that a turtle's ability to detect an approaching vessel was vision-dependent. They found that as vessel speed increased, fewer green sea turtles displayed a flee response. Collisions, if they do occur, are likely to be fatal to individuals. However, since aggregations of turtles in pelagic waters tend to be rare, such incidents would be expected to be insignificant to regional populations.

3.4.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Alternatives A and B include specific monitoring and mitigation measures to minimize the potential for adverse effects on sea turtles (see Chapter 2). As indicated above, data are limited on the potential effects of seismic and other underwater sound on sea turtles and there remain many unknowns. While a few existing studies provide some basis for short-term behavioral and TTS effects, there are no data with respect to potential PTS, injury, or mortality. Thus, it is unknown whether received sound levels near the airguns would be sufficiently high to potentially induce such effects on sea turtles (Table 3.4-5). Potential long-term effects of exposure to seismic survey sound are also unknown. There are no specific data that demonstrate the consequences to sea turtles if seismic operations occur in important areas at important times of year. Until there are sufficient new data to allow better assessment, it is considered prudent to implement precautionary monitoring and mitigation measures. This is the basis for the monitoring and mitigation measures proposed under Alternatives A and B. The primary monitoring and mitigation measures under Alternatives A and B that are applicable to sea turtles are summarized below (see Chapter 2 for a complete description of monitoring and mitigation measures).

- Prior to a cruise, locations of survey lines will be planned to the maximum extent practicable to avoid critical breeding, nesting, rearing, and/or migration areas and periods for sea turtles. This

will be based on available data, in so far as these can be identified in advance from other sources of information, or during the cruise.

- Real-time visual monitoring for sea turtles by trained biologists approved by NMFS will be conducted immediately before and during seismic operations. This includes a minimum of 30 min prior to start up and ramp up of the airguns during both day and night (the airguns could not be turned on or up if a sea turtle is observed within the designated avoidance radii) and during all daytime seismic operations.
- If the airguns are started up at night, two PSVOs would watch for marine mammals and turtles near the source vessel for 30 min prior to start up of the airguns using NVDs, if the proper conditions for nighttime start up exist (see Chapter 2).
- As practicable, visual monitoring for sea turtles will be conducted during other non-seismic periods, including transits to and from the study area, to provide baseline data and to reduce the potential risk of vessel collisions with sea turtles; in some areas, the resultant data may provide information on sea turtles in areas with little or no previous data.
- The airguns will be ramped down or shut down if sea turtles are observed near, approaching, or within the estimated 180 dB re 1 µPa "safety" radius. Airgun operations would not be restarted or ramped up until the turtle has been seen to move out of this radius or the vessel has moved outside the safety zone for turtles, whichever occurs first.

On a site-specific basis, additional mitigation and monitoring measures may be implemented. These measures would be determined in coordination with NMFS based on the best available, site-specific information on sea turtles in a selected seismic survey area. Measures could also be based on information obtained during a seismic cruise, particularly in previously undescribed areas. Such measures could include:

- avoiding or remaining a minimum distance from certain areas considered important to sea turtles (e.g., nesting, breeding, feeding, migration, etc.), the use of which coincides with the season of the survey;
- implementing other site-specific mitigation measures on an adaptive mitigation approach based on data obtained during the cruise, in coordination with NMFS;
- adjusting safety radii based on any new data that may become available after completion of this PEIS. For example, NSF and USGS are aware that NMFS is developing new noise-exposure guidelines for various marine animals that have not yet been finalized or approved for use. NSF will be prepared to develop their procedures for estimating numbers of turtles "taken" (per the ESA) via sound exposure, safety radii, etc., as may be required at some future date by the new guidelines.

The following analysis of the environmental consequences of Alternative A or B on sea turtles assumes that the above and other monitoring and mitigation measures described in Chapter 2 would be implemented.

3.4.5.1 Acoustic Effects

Potential impacts on sea turtles under Alternative A for each analysis area and species are summarized in Table 3.4-6. These effects are described below based on similarities between the physical characteristics and the nature of the seismic activities in each analysis area relative to the anticipated occurrence of sea turtle species. Based on the above review, implementation of Alternative A or B is expected to result in short-term behavioral disturbance of sea turtles due to exposure to seismic airgun sounds; sea turtles are not expected to be capable of hearing the MBES, SBP, or pingers (Table 3.4-6). The impacts will likely

include behavioral changes and/or localized avoidance of an area of unknown size in the vicinity of the seismic vessel. There is also the unlikely possibility of temporary hearing impairment or perhaps even permanent hearing damage to individual turtles that are in very close proximity to the airguns when they are fired. There are few data on temporary hearing loss (i.e., TTS) and no data on permanent hearing loss (i.e., PTS) or mortality in sea turtles exposed to airgun pulses. Thus, the received sound level at which such impacts might occur is unknown (Table 3.4-5). However, the potential for mortality or permanent injury is considered negligible from the proposed seismic survey activities given a number of factors. These include the pulsed/intermittent downward-directed nature of the sounds, the brief period of potential exposure to a relatively slow-moving turtle while a vessel is transiting and transmitting pulsed sound, the low likelihood of encountering sea turtles sufficiently close and of sufficient duration to possibly induce such effects, and implementation of the monitoring and mitigation measures.

Table 3.4-6. Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Turtles with Implementation of Alternative A or B

Analysis Area	*Species**	*Alternative A or B***
DAAs		
NW Atlantic, Caribbean	Green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, leatherback, loggerhead	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of feeding/migrating leatherbacks and possibly loggerheads likely by small array in shallow to deep waters, other species highly unlikely. Affected number smaller than large-array areas with similar water depths. • Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but unlikely to occur as turtles expected to avoid such exposure and vessel would quickly pass. • Potential for PTS, injury, lethal effects from airguns unknown but considered unlikely as turtles expected to avoid such exposure and vessel would quickly pass. • No significant impacts expected at the population level. • May affect, likely to adversely affect leatherbacks and loggerheads. • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley.
S California, Galapagos	Green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of breeding or feeding green and hawksbill likely and smaller numbers of breeding, feeding or migrating loggerhead, olive ridley, Kemp's ridley, and leatherback possible by large array in shallow to deep waters. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, likely to adversely affect all six ESA-listed sea turtles.
W Gulf of Alaska	Green, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Effects highly unlikely as all species considered rare in the project area. • No significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback.
QAAs		
BC Coast	Green, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of migrating green and leatherback possible by large array in shallow and intermediate-depth waters, other species highly unlikely/rare. • TTS and PTS highly unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, likely to adversely affect green and leatherback. • May affect, not likely to adversely affect loggerhead and olive ridley
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	Green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Effects highly unlikely as all species considered rare within the project area. • No significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect all six ESA-listed species

Table 3.4-6. Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Turtles with Implementation of Alternative A or B

Analysis Area	*Species**	*Alternative A or B***
Marianas	Green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of migrating or feeding individuals possible by large array in shallow to deep waters (all five species likely uncommon) • TTS and PTS highly unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic) • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback
Sub-Antarctic	Green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, leatherback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of very small numbers of migrating green, hawksbill and olive ridley likely and smaller numbers of migrating or feeding loggerhead and leatherback possible by small array in only deep waters. Affected number expected to be smaller than most other analysis areas with larger arrays and/or in shallow or intermediate-depth waters. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback.
SW Atlantic	Green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, leatherback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small number of breeding or feeding green likely and smaller numbers of hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback possible by large array in shallow to deep waters. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, and leatherback.
W India	Green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley, leatherback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small number of breeding or migrating green and olive ridley likely and smaller numbers of hawksbill, loggerhead, and leatherback possible by large array in intermediate to deep waters. Affected number expected to be smaller than large array operating in shallow water. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect green, hawksbill, loggerhead, olive ridley and leatherback.
N Atlantic/ Iceland	Leatherback, loggerhead	• Effects highly unlikely as both species considered rare • No significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic) • May affect, not likely to adversely affect loggerhead and leatherback
W Australia	Green, hawksbill, leatherback, loggerhead, olive ridley, flatback	• Short-term disturbance and localized displacement of small numbers of breeding, feeding or migrating green, hawksbill and olive ridley likely and smaller numbers of feeding or migrating loggerhead and leatherback, and breeding or feeding non-listed flatback possible by small array in shallow to deep waters. Affected number expected to be smaller than areas with larger array at same water depths. • TTS and PTS unlikely, no significant impacts to populations (see NW Atlantic). • May affect, not likely to adversely affect all six ESA-listed species.

Notes: *All sea turtle species listed except for the flatback have ESA status (see Table 3.4-1). ** No acoustic impacts to sea turtles from MBES, SBP, or pingers (above turtle hearing capability) in all the analysis areas. Low risk of potential entanglement in towed/deployed seismic gear (e.g., lines, buoys, etc.) as described in text; proposed mitigation and monitoring reduces this risk.

Anticipated short-term impacts would be limited to small numbers of seven sea turtle species depending on the analysis area; six of the seven species are ESA listed (see Table 3.4-1). Overall, no significant impacts are expected at the population level. Implementation of the monitoring and mitigation measures proposed for Alternatives A and B are expected to effectively reduce the exposure of sea turtles to high-intensity sound associated with the proposed action (see Chapter 2).

The acoustic assessment criterion for this PEIS consists of evaluating the potential for sea turtles to be exposed to the precautionary "safety" radii corresponding to the 180 dB re 1 µPa isopleth, required as mitigation by NMFS during previous NSF-funded seismic surveys. These radii were estimated based on results of the acoustic modeling conducted specifically for the exemplary DAAs in this PEIS. However, because there are very limited/localized, if any, reliable data on the at-sea distribution and density of sea turtles and the analysis areas are exemplary, it is not possible to estimate the numbers of sea turtles that may potentially be exposed to the 180 dB re 1 µPa sound level criterion in any of the analysis areas. Therefore, only qualitative estimates of the relative numbers of sea turtles that may be exposed to airgun sounds during the exemplary seismic surveys can be made relative to the expected occurrence of sea turtles in these areas. Furthermore, these estimates are based on limited and general information on the occurrence, abundance, and distribution of sea turtles in the exemplary analysis areas. More detailed analyses on sea turtles and the preparation of additional environmental documentation would occur as required once actual seismic survey areas have been selected and proposed by NSF in coordination with NMFS, where relevant data are available.

In general, seismic operations in or near analysis areas where sea turtles concentrate and where large airgun arrays are proposed for use in shallow water are likely to have the greatest relative potential for acoustic impacts (acoustic propagation relationship to water depth and array size reviewed in Chapter 2). ESA-listed sea turtles are considered common or potentially common in 6 of the 12 analysis areas where turtles would occur during the season of an exemplary seismic cruise: NW Atlantic and Caribbean DAAs, and SW Atlantic, W Australia, W India, and Sub-Antarctic QAAs (Tables 3.4-3 and 3.4-4). A large array operating in shallow water is proposed for two of these six analysis areas: the Caribbean DAA and SW Atlantic QAA. In addition, within the W India QAA, two turtle species may be common where a large array would operate in intermediate-depth waters. Thus, in the Caribbean, SW Atlantic, and W India analysis areas, the relatively greatest numbers of individual turtles are likely be affected behaviorally compared to the remaining 10 analysis areas where sea turtles occur in smaller numbers or where smaller arrays would be operated. This is based on the relatively larger areas estimated to be ensonified by received airgun sound levels of >180 dB re 1µPa (see Tables 2-7 and 2-10) and the predicted highest concentrations of turtles (Tables 3.4-3 and 3.4-4).

Commensurately, in analysis areas where turtles are common but small arrays are proposed, relatively fewer sea turtles would be affected (compared to areas with larger arrays at the same water depths). This is because a smaller area would be ensonified to airgun sound levels >180 dB re 1µPa where small arrays are used (Table 2-11). Small arrays are proposed for the remaining three of six analysis areas where sea turtles are considered common (NW Atlantic DAA, W Australia QAA, and Sub-Antarctic QAA). Shallow-water surveys are proposed within the NW Atlantic DAA and W Australia QAA while deep-water surveys are proposed within the Sub-Antarctic QAA. Although shallow-water surveys are proposed in the NW Atlantic DAA and W Australia QAA, given the smaller array sizes, the number of individual sea turtles potentially affected would likely be considerably less than in those analysis areas with proposed shallow-water surveys but with large arrays (Caribbean DAA and SW Atlantic QAA described above).

The relative numbers of individual sea turtles affected in the remaining seven of 13 analysis areas where sea turtles are considered uncommon or rare are unknown, and potential trends are less evident. Four of the seven sites involve a large array in shallow water (W Gulf of Alaska DAA and N Atlantic/Iceland, BC Coast, and Marianas QAAs); the remaining three involve a small array in shallow water (S California DAA) or a large array in deep water (Galapagos Ridge DAA and Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA). Given the

relatively fewer turtles expected within these seven analysis areas, the number potentially affected would likely be quite small, and smaller than at the other six analysis areas.

Overall, under Alternatives A and B, potential acoustic effects in all of the 13 analysis areas where sea turtles may occur are expected to be limited to localized short-term behavioral or avoidance effects (Table 3.4-6). The only potential difference in effects between the 13 analysis areas are expected to be in relative numbers of turtles affected behaviorally. Differences would be related primarily to array size, turtle density, water depth, and site-specific sound-propagation characteristics. At all 13 analysis areas, the number of sea turtles potentially adversely affected is expected to be insignificant relative to the regional population sizes since only a minor proportion of the available habitat would be ensonified at levels where behavioral reactions might be expected to occur.

Implementation of monitoring and mitigation under Alternatives A and B is expected to minimize and reduce potential impacts to sea turtles. Furthermore, the seismic vessel would be underway at 4-5 kt (7.4-9.3 km/hr) while the airguns are intermittently active. Therefore, potential exposure of relatively slow-moving turtles to high-intensity sounds close to the faster-moving airguns would be of brief duration if it occurs at all. Further, available studies indicate that sea turtles would probably move away from the survey vessel and/or move to the water surface in response to seismic survey sounds. This behavior would reduce the sound levels to which turtles might be exposed to from proposed seismic survey activities. Thus, any sea turtles potentially missed during monitoring by observers are unlikely to experience more than short-term behavioral effects, even without the implementation of power-down or shut-down of the airguns. Therefore, implementation of Alternative A or B would result in disturbance or displacement of small numbers of individual sea turtles in localized, transient areas, including ESA-listed species. No significant impacts are expected to sea turtle populations due to acoustic sources during proposed seismic surveys.

3.4.5.2 Other Potential Effects

Entanglement

Although entanglement of sea turtles in fishing gear and marine debris are quite common, it is considered unlikely and of low risk that a sea turtle could get entangled in the airgun array, hydrophone streamer, buoys, or other gear deployed from the seismic vessel (see Section 3.4.4.4). Although we are aware of one incidence of reported sea turtle mortality associated with seismic vessel buoys (Weir 2007), entanglement has never been documented in over 54,000 nm (100,000 km) of previous NSF-funded seismic surveys (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005b; Holst and Smultea 2008; Hauser et al. 2008; refer to Table 2-1). Visual monitoring as proposed under Alternatives A and B further reduces the risk of entanglement because observers watch for sea turtles near the vessel and array. Hydrophone streamers operating near the water surface are not expected to block movement or migration of sea turtles which spend most of their time swimming further below the water surface, although a low risk of entanglement exists (see Section 3.4.4.4). In summary, implementation of Alternative A or B is not likely to result in entanglement of individual sea turtles and no related significant effects are expected at the population level.

Ingestion

An oil spill (or fuel) spill is considered highly unlikely to occur during the exemplary seismic surveys. Also, no plastics or toxic materials are permitted to be disposed of from the vessel while at sea. Considering the vessel's safety protocols, implementation of Alternative A or B would have no significant impacts on sea turtles and no effect on ESA-listed species or populations due to ingestion.

Ship Strikes and Other Activities

The chances of the seismic vessel or towed/deployed equipment striking a sea turtle are considered highly unlikely (see Section 3.4.4.4). While vessel collisions with sea turtles are known to occur, the project vessel(s) will be moving relatively slowly (4-5 kt [7.4-9.3 km/hr]) and in a straight line at most times, particularly during seismic acquisition. There is indication from field observations that some turtles dive when in close proximity to seismic vessels and towed equipment, which presumably reduces the chances of collision if those dives are oriented away from and/or below the oncoming object (see Section 3.4.4.4). In general, the risk of collision or entanglement by sea turtles with seismic vessel gear is considered low relative to the many more miles of seismic surveys conducted with no such known occurrences reported (see above). In addition, under Alternatives A and B, PSVOs would watch for sea turtles within the safety radius defined under the proposed mitigation measures and advise ship personnel to avoid collisions with nearby sea turtle(s). PSVOs would also watch for sea turtles during transits to and from the study area as possible.

Proposed seismic research surveys could also include activities such as coring, dredging, sediment sampling, use of boomers and sparkers, and the deployment of ocean bottom hydrophones (see Chapter 2). The physical presence or noise of these activities could disturb or displace sea turtles. In general, sea turtles are capable of and expected to move out of the way of these activities and equipment, and related potential disturbance or displacement of sea turtles is expected to be short-term (see Section 3.4.4.4). Indirect effects to sea turtle bottom habitat and associated prey or other food in shallow-water areas could occur from activities that disturb the sea bottom including coring, dredging, sediment sampling, and minimally, deployment of ocean-bottom hydrophones. However, these activities for the purposes of the proposed academic geophysical research (i.e., sampling) would be very limited in scope and size compared to the surrounding area. Mitigation and monitoring, including dedicated watches for sea turtles and avoidance of sensitive habitats and/or periods for ESA-listed turtle species, reduces the potential for adverse effects described above.

In summary, under Alternatives A and B, collisions between sea turtles and project vessel(s) or towed/deployed equipment are unlikely. However, disturbance or displacement of a small number of individual sea turtles close to the vessel or equipment is possible in areas where they occur. The latter effects would not result in significant impacts on sea turtle populations.

3.4.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research surveys using various acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, MBES, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to sea turtles with implementation of Alternative C.

3.4.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Sea Turtles

3.4.7.1 Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Under Alternatives A and B, with the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures in place, no significant impacts are likely to sea turtle populations due to airgun operations in any of the analysis areas where they may occur (Table 3.4-6). The number of individual sea turtles expected to be closely approached during the exemplary surveys would be small in relation to regional population sizes. With the proposed monitoring, ramp-up, power down, and shutdown provisions, effects on those individuals are likely to be limited to short-term behavioral disturbance and short-term localized avoidance of an area of unknown size near the active airguns. Operation of the MBES, SBP, or pingers is not expected to affect

sea turtles, because the associated frequency ranges are above the known hearing range of sea turtles. Furthermore, the intermittent and/or narrow downward-directed nature of these sounds and the fact that they are emitted from a transiting seismic vessel would result in no more than one or two brief pulse exposures to relatively slow-moving sea turtles. In summary, implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed sea turtle species occurring in analysis areas (Table 3.4-6). No significant impacts are expected to occur at the population level for any sea turtle species.

3.5 SEABIRDS

The term "seabirds" describes a diverse array of taxonomic families of birds that spend all or a considerable portion of their lives in marine environments. Seabirds invariably nest on land, and their use of marine waters is primarily for feeding and loafing. Seabirds covered by this assessment are limited to the 13 taxonomic families that surface- or plunge-dive below the water surface in search of prey. This behavior could expose such seabirds to underwater sound resulting from the exemplary seismic survey activities. The status, abundance, general ecology, general distribution and migratory movements of the 13 seabird families of relevance are summarized in Table 3.5-1 and discussed briefly below.

3.5.1 Overview of Seabird Groups

3.5.1.1 Taxonomic Groups of Seabirds

Of the approximate 20 taxonomic families of seabirds, 13 are included in the following discussion. Analyses focused on taxonomic families of seabirds rather than individual species for several reasons. First, families of seabirds share functional behavioral and physical similarities that naturally lend themselves to grouping in terms of effects of seismic noise. Second, detailed seasonal surveys of individual species are lacking for most parts of the world. Thus, available information is often limited to generalized distribution maps and movement patterns typically available only at the taxonomic family level. Third, the dynamic nature of the marine environment—particularly with regard to food availability—reduces the certainty with which the timing and abundance of a given species can be predicted, especially for pelagic species.

3.5.1.2 Distribution and Movements

The life of adult seabirds cycles between breeding and non-breeding seasons which influence the distribution and movement of seabirds. Movements and distribution are typically most limited during the breeding and nesting season when they are geographically tied to nesting and the rearing of young. Collectively, some families of seabirds nest in very restricted geographic ranges while others are cosmopolitan, nesting throughout much of the world. Breeding typically occurs during the local spring or summer and may last for a few months or up to a full year in the case of some albatrosses. Nesting may be completed by lone pairs or in colonies numbering hundreds of thousands of breeding pairs. Following the breeding season, young and adults exhibit a range of movement patterns. Some reside near the breeding site year-round, some undergo a predictable migration to traditional areas where they feed and often molt, and others simply disperse with no overall pattern. Migration or dispersal distances can be modest or vast. Some species are always found in large flocks or in the presence of a few other individuals, while others are usually encountered individually. Arctic waters sustain an abundance of seabirds during the ice-free period but during winter, most of those birds travel to lower latitudes. While at sea, distribution and movements are closely tied to the distribution and abundance of prey which tends to be dynamic in nature.

Table 3.5-1. Summary of the Status, General Ecology, and General Distribution & Movement of Seabirds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

*Group (Family)**	*Status*** *ESA/CITES/ IUCN-BLI*	*General Ecology*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Loons (Gaviidae) Four species globally	-/-/ LC	Lone pairs breed mostly on or near freshwater; winter alone or in large groups in nearshore marine waters; surface-dives 2-10 m for small fish.	Circumpolar in Holarctic; highly migratory between Arctic and inland breeding areas and temperate nearshore marine areas.
Grebes (Podicipedidae) 22 species globally	-/-/ LC	Lone pairs breed mostly near freshwater; some species winter alone or in groups in nearshore marine waters; shallow dives for invertebrates and fish.	All regions except Antarctic; highly migratory between inland breeding areas and (primarily) temperate nearshore marine areas.
Albatrosses (Diomedidae) 14 species globally	E(1)/-/ NT, VU, E, CR	Highly pelagic; most species breed in colonies on islands; breeding cycle can last up to 1 year from nest to fledgling; annual and biannual breeding species; mature slowly (e.g., some species first breed at 9-10 years); usually forages alone; plunge- and surface-dives up to 1 m in pursuit of squid, fish, offal.	Circumpolar in S Ocean; throughout the Pacific Ocean and into the southern half of the Bearing Sea; disperses widely between island breeding colonies and offshore feeding areas; uses land only for breeding.
Petrels/Shearwaters (Procellariidae) 70 species globally	-/-/ LC, NT, VU, E, CR	Highly marine; most species breed in colonies on islands; mostly gregarious outside breeding season; some shearwaters can plunge- or surface-dive up to 20 m in pursuit of invertebrates, fish, offal.	Cosmopolitan, in all oceans; many species are highly migratory between island breeding colonies and offshore and nearshore feeding areas.
Diving-petrels (Pelicanoididae) 4 species globally	-/-/ LC, E	Highly marine; breed in colonies on islands and mainland; forages alone or in small groups; surface- and plunge-dives to depths of approximately 30-40 m (sometimes approaching 100 m) for planktonic invertebrates, small fish, and cephalopods.	Circumpolar in S Ocean; subantarctic marine waters, inshore and offshore; not known to undertake migrations; tend to disperse randomly from breeding colonies after breeding season mostly to nearshore areas near breeding colonies, some disperse to pelagic areas.
Tropicbirds (Phaethontidae) 3 species globally	-/-/ LC	Highly marine; generally breed in small colonies on islands; forages alone or in pairs; dives to several m in pursuit of invertebrates (mainly squid) and fish (mainly flying fish).	Pantropical; tropical and subtropical oceans; disperse widely between island breeding colonies and offshore feeding areas.
Pelicans (Pelicanidae) 7 species globally	E(1)/-/ LC, VU	Most species are highly gregarious year-round; breeds in colonies on ground or in trees at inland and marine (island) locations; makes shallow surface- or plunge-dives (up to 2 m) in pursuit of invertebrates and fish.	All regions except Antarctic; stretches of open water, both nearshore and inland from tropical to warmer temperate zones; disperse widely from inland and marine island nesting areas to freshwater and nearshore marine foraging areas.
Gannets/Boobies (Sulidae) 9 species globally	-/CR/ LC, VU, E	Highly gregarious year-round; colonial breeders in marine environment; some species plunge-dive as deep as 25 m in pursuit of squid and fish.	All regions except Antarctic, North Pacific and Arctic; tropical, subtropical, and temperate oceans; some species migrate, others disperse widely from breeding areas to offshore and nearshore feeding areas.

Table 3.5-1. Summary of the Status, General Ecology, and General Distribution & Movement of Seabirds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

*Group (Family)**	*Status** ESA/CITES/ IUCN-BLI	*General Ecology*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Cormorants (Phalocrocoracidae) 39 species globally	-/-/ LC, NT, VU, E	Highly gregarious year-round; colonial breeders in marine and freshwater environments; surface-dives in pursuit of invertebrates and fish (likely to depths of several meters or more).	Cosmopolitan, with greatest diversity in tropical and temperate zones; stretches of open water, both coastal and inland; some migrate but most species are sedentary or are locally/regionally dispersive after breeding.
Gulls (Laridae) 51 species globally	-/V(1)/ LC, VU, NT, E	Most species highly gregarious year-round; colonial breeders at marine and inland locations; make shallow surface- or plunge-dives (to max. depths of 1 m) in pursuit of invertebrates, fish, and offal.	Cosmopolitan; mainly coastal but also inland; some species migrate or disperse considerable distances between breeding areas and nearshore and offshore feeding areas.
Terns/Noddies (Sternidae) 44 species globally	E(1)/-/ LC, VU, NT, E, CR	Highly gregarious year-round; most species breed in colonies; some species make shallow plunge-dives in pursuit of invertebrates and fish.	Most terns are migratory, some are nomadic during non-breeding season; most that breed in north temperate region winter in tropics or S Hemisphere; occurs in nearshore and offshore marine environments.
Auks/Murres/Puffins (Alcidae) 22 species globally	T(1)/-/ LC, VU, NT, E, CR	Highly social, with most species breeding in colonies or loose aggregations; all species surface-dive in pursuit of plankton or fish; larger species dive up to 100 m deep; smaller species to 20 m; some species avoid disturbance (e.g., vessels) by diving rather than flying away.	Circumpolar north of Tropic of Cancer; exclusively marine, neritic and pelagic; depending on species and area, can be sedentary, dispersive and migratory during post-breeding period.
Seaducks (Anatidae: Mergini) 18 species globally	T(2)/-/ LC, VU, E, CR	Gregarious during non-breeding period; lone pairs nest at inland freshwater and marine environments; dive (likely <10 m) for vegetation, benthic and pelagic invertebrates, fish.	Circumpolar north of Tropic of Cancer; highly migratory during post-breeding period; can occur in large numbers in nearshore marine environments.

Notes: *Limited to birds that use marine habitats. Species with ESA status identified within each seabird group. E = endangered, T = threatened, VU = vulnerable, CR = critically endangered, LC = least concern, NT = near threatened, - = none listed.

Sources: del Hoyo et al. 1992; Zavalaga and Jahncke 1997; BirdLife International (BLI) 2006; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010; USFWS 2010.

3.5.1.3 Important Ecological Considerations

The key aspect of seabird ecology that makes them potentially vulnerable to seismic survey sound is that many species regularly dive beneath the surface as a means of obtaining food or, less regularly, as an avoidance mechanism. Seabirds are well adapted to capture prey in marine water using a range of tactics. These include shallow plunges that begin from the water surface down to depths of 3 ft (1 m), aerial plunges from various altitudes to depths of several meters, and dives to depths of a few meters to tens of meters or more. During such dives, the seabirds' wings (e.g., alcids) or feet (e.g., loons) provide propulsion. Invertebrates (e.g., squid) and small fish (e.g., flying fish, schooling fish such as anchovy, etc.) are prominent in seabird diets as summarized in Table 3.5-1.

Many seabirds are nocturnal—a strategy to avoid diurnal predators (Keitt et al. 2004). Artificial lights in close proximity to colonies can adversely affect nocturnal seabirds. Squid fisheries using lights at night and lights on oil platforms at sea attract seabirds. Fledgling murrelets, shearwaters, petrels, and storm-petrels are attracted to artificial lights during their first flights to sea. A common result is that many fall to the ground where they are injured, taken by predators, or die of starvation (Le Corre et al. 2002). The reason invoked to explain this attraction is that these birds typically feed on bioluminescent squids, and inexperienced birds tend to search for lights (including artificial ones) in an attempt to improve their foraging success (Imber 1975 cited in Le Corre et al. 2002). Seabirds are also known to be attracted to offshore rigs, presumably due to lights, structural stimuli, foodstuffs, oceanographic processes, and gas flares (Montevecchi et al. 1999; Wiese et al. 2001). Seabirds are often attracted to fishing vessels that provide them with foraging opportunities in the form of discarded bycatch and offal.

3.5.1.4 Special-Status Species

Table 3.5-1 presents a summary of the global conservation status of seabirds based on the 13 taxonomic families reviewed herein, including ESA, CITES, and IUCN rankings. BirdLife International (BLI), an international bird conservation organization, uses the IUCN rankings. Five marine bird species with ESA status occur within 5 of the 13 marine bird groups: three are endangered (short-tailed albatross, brown pelican, and roseate tern) and two are threatened (marbled murrelet and Steller eider) (Table 3.5-1). The five ESA-listed species are expected to occur in 8 of the 13 analysis areas during the period of the exemplary seismic surveys. In addition, on a global level, a total of 27 marine birds species have CITES and/or IUCN/BLI conservation status.

There are numerous causes for declines in some species of seabirds. Persecution as competitors for fish, breeding habitat alteration and destruction, egg and nestling predation by human-introduced animals (e.g., rats, cats), oiling, collision with offshore wind-farm turbines, longline/net bycatch, net-cable collisions, and plastics ingestion are known or suspected to contribute to seabird mortality or reduced reproductive output.

3.5.1.5 Acoustic Capabilities

The physiology of avian audition is very similar to that of reptiles and mammals (including humans) (Dooling and Popper 2000). The frequency range of sound waves a single bird species can receive is narrower than that of most mammals. Birds are less sensitive to the high and low ends of their range than are mammals. However, MF bird hearing is similar, spanning 1-5 kHz with the greatest sensitivity to sounds at approximately 2-3 kHz (Dooling et al. 2000). Most birds have an upper limit of <15 kHz (Dooling 2002) (the normal range of human hearing is approximately 20-20,000 Hz; greatest sensitivity approximately 1-4 kHz). A notable exception is the rock pigeon, which can detect sounds in the region of 1-10 Hz (Kreithen and Quine 1979). Like humans, birds are sensitive to fluctuations in pitch. They can

distinguish between frequencies that differ by ≤1% and between sounds separated in time by 2-3 ms (Dooling et al. 2000).

Little if anything is known about the hearing abilities and sensitivities of seabirds. Available information suggests that the avian ear is adapted to in-air hearing although seabirds are believed to be able to hear underwater. For example, Melvin et al. (1999) found that underwater acoustic pingers operating at 1.5 kHz (±1 kHz) at a signal duration of 300 ms (±10%) every 4 s (±10%) at 120 dB re 1 µPa deterred diving seabirds (common murre and rhinoceros auklet; family Alcidae) from gill nets used to catch salmon.

For the purpose of impact assessment, it is assumed that the in-air hearing of seabirds is similar to that of other birds that have been tested. It is also assumed that the bird ear is better adapted for hearing in-air sounds than those underwater. Consequently, like other animals that have evolved to primarily hear in-air, but that are capable of hearing underwater (e.g., northern fur seal [Moore and Schusterman 1987] and humans [Parvin 1998]), frequency-dependent hearing thresholds of birds should be higher underwater than in-air.

3.5.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

The general distribution and abundance of marine seabirds is described for the DAAs in Tables 3.5-1 and 3.5-2. At sea, as stated previously, this information is typically not predictable beyond a general and regional level. While there is usually more information on nesting and breeding locations, even this information is scarce for many of the remote and/or little-studied analysis areas addressed in this PEIS. Furthermore, nesting and breeding areas are generally terrestrial locations, and the exemplary seismic studies addressed herein would occur well beyond any distance that could be expected to directly or indirectly affect any ESA-listed species of birds while they are in those areas. Moreover, the analysis areas addressed in this document are not meant to represent site-specific seismic survey locations, but rather exemplary locations within a region where a specific seismic cruise could potentially occur at a future date (see Chapters 1 and 2).

The number and species of ESA-listed marine birds relevant to this assessment were discussed in the previous section and summarized for each DAA in Table 3.5-2. Five ESA-listed marine birds potentially occur in four of the five DAAs. These are the endangered short-tailed albatross, brown pelican, and roseate tern; and the threatened marbled murrelet and Steller eider. The highest number of ESA-listed species (three) occurs in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, followed by two in S California, and one each in the NW Atlantic and Caribbean DAAs; no ESA-listed seabird species occur in the Galapagos Ridge DAA (Table 3.5-2). Both feeding and migration by ESA-listed species occurs in the five DAAs. The one exception is the endangered brown pelican, which feeds but does not migrate in the S California DAA during the exemplary spring or summer seismic survey period. All five ESA-listed species are considered common to locally abundant in the analysis areas where they occur.

Table 3.5-2. Potential Occurrence of Seabirds within the DAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Group	*NW Atlantic (Sum)**	*Caribbean (Spr or Sum)**	*S California (Spr or Sum)**	*W Gulf of Alaska (Sum)**	*Galapagos Ridge (Win)**
Loons	M u	-	F M u	F u	-
Grebes	F M c	F M u	F M c	F M u	-
Albatrosses	-	-	F r	F c (STA)	F c
Petrels/Shearwaters	F M a	F M a	F M c	F M a	F M a
Diving-petrels	-	-	-	-	-
Tropicbirds	-	F c	F u	-	-

Table 3.5-2. Potential Occurrence of Seabirds within the DAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Group	*NW Atlantic (Sum)**	*Caribbean (Spr or Sum)**	*S California (Spr or Sum)**	*W Gulf of Alaska (Sum)**	*Galapagos Ridge (Win)**
Pelicans	F u	F u	F c (BP)	-	-
Gannets/Boobies	F M c	F M c	-	-	F M c
Cormorants	F M c	-	F M a	F M a	-
Gulls	F M a	F M c	F M a	F M a	-
Terns/Noddies	F M c (RT)	F M c (RT)	F M c	F M c	F M u
Alcids	F M a	-	F M a (MM)	F M a (MM)	-
Seaducks	M u	M u	F M c	F M a (STE)	-

Notes: *(Season) = Northern Hemisphere seasons during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area. Spr = spring, Sum = summer, Win = winter. **F** = known to feed within the area, **M** = known to migrate or disperse through the area; **a** = abundant: the species is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area; **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years; **-** = members of this group are not expected to be present. The potential presence of ESA-listed species in a given area is indicated by abbreviations that follow. Note that use and abundance ratings apply to the group, not necessarily to the ESA-listed species. ESA-listed species: **BP** = brown pelican, **STA** = short-tailed albatross, **RT** = roseate tern, **MM** = marbled murrelet, **STE** = Steller eider.

Sources: del Hoyo et al. 1992; L-DEO and NSF 2004d; BLI 2006; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010; USFWS 2010.

3.5.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

For the same reasons as stated above in Section 3.5.2, details on seabirds beyond those generalized in Tables 3.5-1 and 3.5-3 are not provided in this discussion. Three ESA-listed seabird species of relevance to the analysis occur in four of the eight QAAs (Table 3.5-3). These are the endangered short-tailed albatross and roseate tern, and the threatened marbled murrelet. Two ESA-listed species occur in the BC Coast QAA, and one each in the W Australia and Marianas QAAs. No ESA-listed seabird species occur in the N Atlantic/Iceland, SW Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic Ridge, or W India QAAs. Both feeding and migration by ESA-listed species occurs in the four QAAs. All three ESA-listed species are considered locally abundant in the analysis areas where they occur.

3.5.4 Environmental Consequences – General

There are no scientific data indicating or suggesting that seabirds are adversely affected by seismic airguns or other sound sources used during the proposed seismic surveys. Moreover, thousands of hours of observational data by PSVOs during numerous seismic surveys throughout the world suggest that seabirds do not remain in the water near the airgun array where they would be at potential risk of injury. In addition, the Lloyd's Mirror Effect (see Section 3.2.2.7) serves to reduce acoustic energy (i.e., sound levels) at and just below the water surface where seabirds occur and/or feed. Thus, the potential for acoustic sources associated with the proposed seismic surveys to injure seabirds is considered insignificant. Although these activities would likely affect seabird behavior above the water, such effects are considered short-term and negligible to individuals and populations. Given the general lack of empirical data on these subjects and the theoretical remote possibility of seabirds being below the water surface near operating airguns, potential project effects on seabirds from sound sources and other activities are addressed in the following subsections.

Table 3.5-3. Potential Occurrence of Seabirds within the QAAs during the Period of Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Group	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (Sum)**	*BC Coast (Fall)**	*SW Atlantic (Any)**	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (Spr, Sum, or Fall)**	*W India (Spr or Fall)**	*W Australia (Spr or Fall)**	*Mariana Islands (Spr)**	*Sub-Antarctic (Jan-Feb)**
Loons	F a	FM a	-	M u	-	-	-	-
Grebes	FB c	FM a	-	-	-	-	-	-
Albatrosses	-	F u (STA)	-	-	-	-	FM a (STA)	FM a
Petrels/Shearwaters	FM a	FM a	FM a	FM a	FM u	-	FM a	FM a
Diving-petrels	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	F a
Tropicbirds	-	-	-	-	-	FM u	F c	-
Pelicans	-	-	F u	-	-	-	-	-
Gannets/Boobies	FM c	-	FM c	-	-	FM c	FM c	FM u
Cormorants	FM u	FM a	-	-	F u	-	-	-
Gulls	FM a	FM a	M u	FM c	FM a	-	FM a	M r
Terns/Noddies	FM a	M u	FM a	M r	FM a	FM a (RT)	FM c	FM c
Alcids	FM a	FM a (MM)	-	FM u	-	-	FM a	-
Seaducks	FM a	FM a	FM u	-	FM c	-	M u	-

Notes: *(Season) = N hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Spr = spring, Sum = summer. **F** = known to feed within the area; **M** = known to migrate or disperse through the area; **a**= abundant: the species is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more, **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few10s, **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area, **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years, **-** = members of this group are not expected to be present. The potential presence of ESA-listed species in a given area is indicated by abbreviations that follow. Note that use and abundance ratings apply to the group, not necessarily to the ESA- listed species. ESA-listed species: **STA** = short-tailed albatross, **RT** = roseate tern, **MM** = marbled murrelet.

Sources: del Hoyo et al. 1992; BLI 2006; L-DEO and NSF 2006a; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010; USFWS 2010.

The following sections and Table 3.5-4 summarize the few studies and documented information regarding potential implications of seismic surveys for marine birds. In the face of current data gaps, we have postulated the pathways and significance of any adverse effects using empirical evidence from other species and analogous studies, known aspects of seabird ecology, and professional opinion. Only those taxonomic families whose members are known to dive beneath the surface are considered. Within those, families with deep-diving species are given more consideration.

Table 3.5-4. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sound and Other Project-Related Sound on Seabirds

Species or Group of Concern	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*Temporary Hearing Impairment, Injury, or PTS and Other Physiological Effects**
ESA-LISTED			
Short-tailed albatross (E) Brown pelican (E) Roseate tern (T, E) Steller eider (T) Marbled murrelet (T)	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Table 3.5-4. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sound and Other Project-Related Sound on Seabirds

Species or Group of Concern	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*Temporary Hearing Impairment, Injury, or PTS and Other Physiological Effects**
GROUP			
Loons, petrels/shearwaters, diving-petrels, gannets/ boobies, cormorants, alcids, grebes, albatrosses, tropicbirds, pelicans, gulls, terns/ noddies, seaducks	Unknown	• Stemp (1985): no conclusive evidence that airgun noise displaced fulmars, kittiwakes, or murres. • Lacroix et al. (2005): found no evidence that airgun noise affected distribution or diving patterns of long-tailed ducks.	Unknown

Note: *As determined from the lack of published accounts of injurious effects, together with observational data by PSVOs with LGL Ltd. during many seismic surveys throughout the world, suggesting that seabirds do not remain in the water near the airgun array where they would be at risk of injury.

3.5.4.1 Criteria

It is not possible to use quantitative sound-energy criteria to assess impacts of airguns or sonar on seabirds as there are no measured or predicted underwater audiograms for any seabird species, published or otherwise, or quantitative noise criteria used to characterize effects of airgun noise on seabirds, such as auditory thresholds corresponding to TTS or PTS levels caused by underwater noise. Where impact thresholds have been estimated for impulsive sources by others (e.g., Teachout 2006), criteria are highly speculative. In considering potential impacts of the Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) Sonar on seabirds, U.S. Navy (2005b) concluded that birds did not warrant detailed evaluation because, 1) there is no evidence that birds use sound underwater, 2) birds in that project area are shallow divers, and 3) birds can rapidly disperse away from the noise source if disturbed. In assessing potential impacts of (impulsive) pile driving noise on marbled murrelets underwater, Teachout (personal communication, Biologist, USFWS, Lacey, WA, June 2006) applied safety criteria to marbled murrelets based on data from studies of fish. In that project, 180 dB (peak) and 150 dB (rms) were used as the thresholds for injury and temporary effects on behavior, respectively.

Considering the potential for other forms of acoustic injury, it is assumed that animals very close to the acoustic source (e.g., within a few meters) would theoretically be at risk. However, available data suggest that seabirds are not expected to occur this close to the acoustic source at depth. Other potential impacts from disturbance, collisions, and entanglement were evaluated according to documented ecological aspects of seabirds, description of the proposed action and alternatives (see Chapter 2), and documented interactions with analogous components of the proposed action (e.g., lighted vessel at night).

3.5.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

Depending on received levels (largely a function of distance between source and receiver), portions of the sound frequency spectrum (primarily those in the range of 1-5 kHz) generated by airgun discharges and by the vessel's engine would be audible to seabirds below and above the water. Sounds produced by the MBES, SBP, and ADCP are believed to be well above the upper frequency limit of bird hearing. As a result, these devices should be inaudible to seabirds, but due to the lack of underwater audiograms for seabirds, this cannot be known with certainty.

3.5.4.3 Acoustic Effects

Investigations into the effects of airguns on seabirds are extremely limited. A literature review of the effects of seismic surveys using airguns on marine-associated birds revealed only two primary investigations. Stemp (1985) conducted opportunistic observations on the effects of seismic exploration on seabirds. He did not find any conclusive evidence that seismic surveying affected the distribution or abundance of northern fulmars, black-legged kittiwakes, or thick-billed murres. However, he warned that his observations should not be extrapolated to areas with large concentrations of feeding or molting birds. In a more intensive and directed study, Lacroix et al. (2003) investigated the effect of seismic surveys on molting long-tailed ducks in the Beaufort Sea, Alaska. They did not detect any effects of nearshore seismic exploration on molting long-tailed ducks in the inshore lagoon systems of Alaska's North Slope. Both aerial surveys and radio-tracking indicated that the proportion of ducks that stayed near their marking location from before to after seismic exploration was unaffected by proximity to seismic survey activities. Seismic activity also did not appear to significantly change the diving intensity of long-tailed ducks. Neither Stemp (1985) nor Lacroix et al. (2003) observed any bird injuries or mortalities resulting from seismic surveying with airguns.

Birds might be affected by seismic survey sounds, but the impacts are not expected to be significant to individual birds or their populations. The types of impacts that are possible are summarized below.

Masking

In the absence of empirical data on the underwater hearing ability of birds or their use of or dependence on underwater sound, the extent to which masking by seismic survey noise occurs cannot be predicted. However, even if birds exhibit some dependence on underwater sounds, considering the brief pulses and multi-second spacing between pulses, airgun noise is not expected to cause masking. If birds use underwater sounds, peripheral devices such as sonars might pose some potential for masking. However, the sound output from these devices is expected to be beyond the upper limit of the range of bird hearing, so no masking is expected. Further, MBESs and SBPs associated with the proposed seismic surveys have a narrow beam width and operate beneath the ship where the probability of a bird encountering the sound field is considered negligible.

Disturbance

Four pathways of potential direct or indirect disturbance to seabirds from seismic surveying have been identified:

- *Localized, temporary displacement and disruption of feeding.* Such displacements would be similar to those caused by other large vessels that passed through the area. Any adverse effects would be negligible.
- *Disturbance to breeding birds.* A vessel (seismic or otherwise) that approaches too close to a breeding colony could disturb adult birds from nests in response either to sonic or to visual stimuli. There is no potential for this because none of the exemplary surveys would occur close to land.
- *Egg and nestling mortality.* Disturbance of adult birds from nests can lead to egg or nestling mortality *via* temperature stress or predation. There is no potential for this because none of the exemplary surveys would occur close to land.
- *Modified prey abundance.* It is unlikely that prey species for birds will be affected by seismic activities to a degree that affects the foraging success of birds. If prey species exhibit avoidance

of the ship, the avoidance is expected to be transitory and limited to a very small portion of a bird's foraging range.

Temporary Hearing Impairment

Many species of marine birds feed by diving to depths of several meters or more. Flocks of feeding birds may consist of hundreds or even thousands of individuals. Also, some species of seabirds (particularly alcids) escape from approaching boats by diving. It is theoretically possible, though considered highly unlikely, that during the course of normal feeding or escape behavior, some birds could be near enough to an airgun to experience a TTS by a pulse if they dove to depths >33 ft (10 m) and were directly beneath an array. However, there is no evidence for such effects if they occur. There is no specific information available about the circumstances (if any) where this might occur. Furthermore, it is considered highly unlikely that marine birds would dive near enough to a sound source to experience TTS and Lloyd's Mirror Effect further reduces the potential for TTS.

Injury

'If' airguns disorient, injure, or kill prey species, or otherwise increase the availability of prey species to marine birds, a seismic survey could attract birds to within approximately 33 ft (10 m) of active airguns. Birds very close to an airgun may be at risk of induced PTS or other injury due to the intense pressure pulses of the airgun discharges at such close range. However, available evidence from other seismic surveys utilizing airguns has not shown a pattern of fish (or other prey) kills from airguns (see Section 3.3, *Fish*). During a seismic study involving underwater explosives and airguns, Stemp (1985) reported that northern fulmars and black-legged kittiwakes "persisted in hovering over the float bags [seismic survey gear]"; however, no indication of feeding activity was reported. Presumably, that portion of Stemp's study involving explosives (individual charges ≤125 kg) could have killed or stunned fish that in turn attracted seabirds. However, available evidence from seismic testing with airguns has not shown a pattern of fish (or other prey) kills (Turnpenny and Nedwell 1994). Also, during thousands of hours spent conducting biological observations from operating seismic vessels, LGL personnel have seldom observed birds being attracted to an airgun array (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, b; Ireland et al. 2005; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008). Furthermore, during the few occasions when seabirds were seen near active seismic arrays, it was not clear that the birds were attracted by stunned prey. Anecdotal reports during the ACCRETE seismic survey project in the eastern Pacific Ocean indicated that gulls were attracted to the vicinity of the array for what seemed to be reasons of curiosity rather than any enhanced foraging opportunities (L. Hollister, personal communication, Professor of Geosciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ. May 2006.)

Other Physiological Effects

As with auditory effects of seismic surveying on seabirds, we are unaware of any studies that have looked for evidence of physiological effects (e.g., stress) of underwater acoustic sources on seabirds.

3.5.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Collision, Entanglement, and Ingestion

Seabirds can be injured and killed by collisions with net-cables associated with fishing vessels (Wilson et al. 2004). Collisions and entanglement with wires is largely precipitated by the foraging opportunities provided by discarded offal, catch spillage, and baited gear associated with some fishing vessels. Considering that seismic survey vessels do not provide any such foraging opportunities, the apparent potential for seabirds to be struck by, or become entangled in, survey gear after being attracted to it is

negligible. For those species that dive to escape disturbance (e.g., alcids), it is possible that they could be struck by the vessel or its gear. The extent to which this occurs is unknown but would be expected to be negligible.

Many seabird species (primarily members of the families Procellariidae, Pelicanoididae, and Alcidae) in general are attracted to offshore rigs and vessels; presumably due to light attraction (Bertram 1995; Montevecchi et al. 1999; Black 2005). Fledgling petrels and shearwaters (Procellariidae) in particular are strongly attracted to artificial lights during their first flights to sea (Imber 1975; Le Corre et al. 2002). Bird mortality has been documented as a result of collision with oil platforms, oiling, and incineration in flares (Wiese et al. 2001) and as a result of light-induced attraction and subsequent collision with vessels (Bertram 1995; Black 2005). In the latter instance, the birds were consistently small, burrow-nesting alcids and petrels. Black (2005) reported that birds regularly strike ships at night, but that mortality is usually low. Occasionally, a strike can even involve hundreds of birds.

Waste management practices that effectively prevent any form of overboard discharge of plastics, Styrofoam, or other such non-degradable solid waste products during a seismic survey preclude opportunities for ingestion by seabirds or other marine animals.

3.5.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

There are no scientific data indicating or suggesting that seabirds are adversely affected by seismic airguns or other acoustic sources proposed under Alternative A and Alternative B. Based on the foregoing information, acoustic impacts of airguns, MBES, and SBP on seabirds are unlikely to occur under Alternative A or B. However, some mitigation and monitoring measures may be applicable on a site-specific basis for ESA-listed seabird species if an actual proposed seismic survey occurred close to shore and could potentially disturb sensitive nesting, breeding, foraging, and resting areas. Accordingly, the potential occurrence of threatened and endangered bird species would be examined on a project-by-project basis to ensure that all applicable federal regulatory measures are followed. A preliminary review of project sites would be undertaken during NSF's or USGS's review of actual proposed seismic surveys and would identify any such concerns. At that time, specific mitigation measures and best management practices would be considered as required. Additional potential mitigation measures specific to seabirds are discussed in L-DEO and NSF (2006a). Potential effects on seabirds with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B are discussed and summarized below.

3.5.5.1 Acoustic Effects

Masking

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that airgun noise or survey-associated sonar devices would, in any meaningful way, mask auditory signals used by seabirds. Similarly, there are no credible hypotheses by which noise from airguns or other proposed acoustic sources could impact seabirds via masking. Implementation of Alternative A or B is not expected to affect ESA-listed species or populations and impacts to other non-listed species would not be significant.

Disturbance

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that airgun noise or other survey-associated acoustic devices would, in any meaningful way, disturb seabirds. The presence of the seismic vessel and its associated equipment and supporting gear are expected to result in transient disturbance effects where birds are physically displaced by the moving vessel and gear. In some instances, modest numbers of seabirds (especially gulls) are expected to be attracted to the airspace above the airgun array and/or streamers.

Such behavior is believed to be driven more by "curiosity" than any enhanced opportunities to capture prey (e.g., by plunge-feeding or diving beneath the surface where the risk of injury is greater). Thus, implementation of Alternative A or B may change the behavior of individual seabirds, but such effects would be short-term and temporary, and populations would not be affected.

Temporary Hearing Impairment

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that airguns or survey-associated acoustic sources would result in temporary hearing impairment of seabirds. While it is theoretically possible that seabirds beneath the water in very close proximity to and below an operating airgun array could experience TTS, the lack of any published accounts of such effects, together with observational data by PSVOs during numerous previous marine seismic surveys throughout the world, suggests that seabirds do not remain in the water near the array where they would be at risk of hearing impacts. Lloyd's Mirror Effect further reduces this remote possibility.

Injury

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that airguns or other survey-associated acoustic sources would injure seabirds. While it is theoretically possible that seabirds beneath the water in close proximity to an operating airgun array could experience acoustic trauma, this is highly unlikely to occur as discussed above. Regarding potential for acoustic injury, implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B is not expected to have any effect on ESA-listed species or populations and impacts to other non-listed species would not be significant.

3.5.5.2 Other Potential Effects

Collision, Entanglement, and Ingestion

The potential for the seismic survey vessel to cause seabird mortality via collision and effects of light-induced attraction is considered negligible, particularly at the population level. Implementation of Alternative A or B may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, ESA-listed birds due to light-induced effects; populations are likely to experience no effect. Other potential effects on other species are expected to be not significant.

There is no empirical evidence that seabirds would become entangled in seismic survey gear deployed from the vessel (e.g., hydrophone streamers, buoys, scientific coring or dredging equipment, and pingers), including as a result of being attracted to it. Similarly, the proposed marine seismic surveys would not discharge materials that would pose ingestion or entanglement hazards to seabirds. For those members of the family Alcidae that dive to escape surface-based disturbances such as vessels, there is a very low risk of collision with the vessel or survey gear. Regarding potential for collision, entanglement, and ingestion, implementation of Alternative A or B is expected to have no effect on ESA-listed species and impacts to other non-listed species would not be significant.

3.5.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research surveys using various acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, MBES, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to seabirds with implementation of Alternative C.

3.5.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Seabirds

Environmental consequences of implementing Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are summarized in Table 3.5-5. Implementation of Alternative A or B would have no significant impact on seabirds and no effect on ESA-listed species or populations. However, site-specific mitigation and monitoring measures should be considered if nesting or breeding colonies of ESA-listed seabirds or other sensitive aggregations or habitat-use areas for seabirds are found to be located near actual proposed seismic survey lines.

Table 3.5-5. Summary of Potential Impacts to Seabirds with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B

Analysis Area	*ESA-listed Species* or Family*	*Alternative A or B*
DAAs		
NW Atlantic	Loons, grebes, petrels/shearwaters, pelicans, gannets/boobies, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies (**roseate tern**), alcids, seaducks	• Low numbers of birds potentially displaced by physical presence of vessel. • Potential for TTS, PTS, injury, lethal effects < several m from airguns unknown but not expected.** • Petrels/shearwaters and alcids possibly attracted to vessel lights at risk for collision. • For alcids that dive to escape disturbance, potential collision with vessel or gear. • No effect to ESA-listed species. • No significant impacts expected at the population level for all seabird species.
Caribbean	Grebes, petrels/shearwaters, tropicbirds, pelicans, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies (**roseate tern**), seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
S California	Loons, grebes, albatrosses, petrels/shearwaters, tropicbirds, pelicans (**brown pelican**), gannets/boobies, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids (**marbled murrelet**), seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
W Gulf of Alaska	Loons, grebes, albatrosses (**short-tailed albatross**), petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids (**marbled murrelet**), seaducks (**Steller eider**)	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
Galapagos	Albatrosses, petrels/shearwaters, gannets/boobies, terns/noddies	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level
QAAs		
BC Coast	Loons, grebes, albatrosses (**short-tailed albatross**), petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids (**marbled murrelet**), seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	Loons, petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level
Marianas	Albatrosses (**short-tailed albatross**), petrels/shearwaters, tropicbirds, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
Sub-Antarctic	Petrels/shearwaters, diving-petrel**s**, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
N Atlantic/ Iceland	Loons, grebes, petrels/shearwaters, pelicans, gannets/boobies, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
SW Atlantic	Petrels/shearwaters, pelicans, gannets/boobies, gulls, terns/noddies, alcids, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.

Table 3.5-5. Summary of Potential Impacts to Seabirds with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B

Analysis Area	*ESA-listed Species* or Family*	*Alternative A or B*
W India	Petrels/shearwaters, cormorants, gulls, terns/noddies, seaducks	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.
W Australia	Tropicbirds, gannets/boobies, Terns/noddies (**roseate tern**)	• Same as above. • No significant impacts expected at the population level.

Notes: *ESA-listed species in **bold** font.

**As determined from the lack of any published data of such effects, together with observational data by PSVOs with LGL Ltd. during numerous seismic surveys throughout the world, suggesting that seabirds do not remain in the water near the airgun array where they would be at risk of injury.

3.6 MARINE MAMMALS – CETACEANS: MYSTICETES

3.6.1 Overview of Mysticete Groups

All 14 recognized mysticete (baleen whale) species (Rice 1998) may occur in some of the 13 exemplary analysis areas. The status, global population estimates, general ecology, and general distribution and migratory movements of these 14 species are summarized in Table 3.6-1 and discussed below. Ecological considerations, known hearing, and call characteristics of mysticetes are also discussed.

3.6.1.1 Taxonomic Groups of Mysticetes

Mysticetes, or baleen whales, are one of two suborders of cetaceans (odontocetes and mysticetes). Mysticetes use several hundred keratin baleen plates that hang from the top of their mouth to filter large quantities of water and capture small schooling fish, zooplankton, and sometimes other marine prey. Mysticetes are large, ranging in length from approximately 20 to 98 ft (6 to 30 m). The suborder Mysticeti includes four families (Balaenopteridae, Balaenidae, Eschrichtiidae, and Neobalaenida). The family Balaenopteridae, also known as rorquals, includes blue, fin, sei, Bryde's, Omura's, minke, Antarctic minke, and humpback whales. This family is characterized by a sleek body shape and pleats on the underside of the throat. The family Balaenidae includes the bowhead whale and the three species of right whales. Balaenids have no dorsal fin, no ventral pleats, and long, narrow baleen plates. The little-known pygmy right whale is the sole member of the family Neobalaenidae. The lone member of the family Eschrichtiidae is the gray whale. Gray whales possess relatively short, coarse baleen used to filter water and sediments for small, bottom-dwelling shrimp-like organisms.

3.6.1.2 Distribution and Movements

Baleen whales are widely distributed throughout all major oceans (Table 3.6-1). They are highly mobile and often move seasonally for food and breeding. Nearly all baleen whales undertake significant seasonal migrations. Many stocks return to the same breeding and/or feeding areas each year including humpback, gray, and the North Atlantic, North Pacific, and southern right whales (Reeves et al. 2002).

Many studies show correlations between whale densities and physical variables in the habitat that influence distribution and abundance of prey (e.g., bottom relief, water depth, water temperature, and water-mass boundaries) (Sutcliffe and Brodie 1977; Reeves and Whitehead 1997; Hooker 1999). Baleen whales often feed at high latitudes in summer, exploiting biologically productive areas, and move to lower latitudes during the winter to mate and calve. Exceptions include the Bryde's whale, which remains year-round in tropical and subtropical areas, and the pygmy right whale, which appears to remain in southern temperate and sub-polar waters (Reeves et al. 2002). Most baleen whale species calve in offshore areas. A few exceptions are the eastern Pacific gray whale and some populations of humpback and right whales that inhabit shallow coastal, reef, or lagoon areas during the calving season.

Table 3.6-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Mysticetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status* ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*U.S. MMPA Stock*	*Global Population Size*[a-c, e, h, l, m]	*General Ecology*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements* [d, e, f]
N Atlantic right whale	E, CH/SS E/I	Western	approx. 393	Coastal, shallow shelf waters, occasionally offshore interm. & deep waters. Prey – copepods, other small crustaceans, krill.	Primarily temperate & subpolar waters of N. Atlantic; calve/winter coastal low latitudes, US & W Sahara; feed summer SE Canada/NE US.
N Pacific right whale	E, CH/SS E/I	E N Pacific	approx. 400 (E Pacific approx. 100;/near extinction; W Pacific approx. 200-300/severely depleted)	Coastal, shallow shelf waters, occasionally offshore interm. & deep waters. Prey – copepods & krill.	Primarily temperate & subpolar waters of N Pacific; feed/summer Sea of Okhotsk/Kuril Isl. E through Bering Sea, Aleutians to Gulf of AK; calving and breeding grounds unknown; historically winter S to Baja Calif. Sur & Taiwan; migratory patterns unknown; summer in higher latitudes.
S right whale	E/SS LC/I	NA	approx. 7,000	Coastal, shallow shelf waters, occasionally offshore interm. & deep waters. Prey – copepods & krill.	All S hemisphere waters 30-60°S; summers in Antarctica, S Ocean, open ocean; most feeding areas not well known; Austral winter & spring in N regions of range, mainly coastal; breed near Argentina, S Africa, S Australia.
Pygmy right whale	-/- DD/I	NA	NA	Coastal to pelagic shallow, interm. & deep waters. Prey – copepods & euphausiids.	Sub-Antarctic & temperate waters 30-52° S, including S America, S Africa, Australia, New Zealand, year-round Tasmania; winters S Africa; unk. breeding, calving, migration areas.
E N Pacific gray whale (California stock = E gray whale)	-/- LC/I	E N Pacific	18,813	Primarily shallow coastal waters & lagoons. Prey – benthic and epibenthic amphipods & mid-water prey.	E N Pacific & Bering/Chukchi Seas; winter breeding/calving Mexican lagoons; spring & fall migration coastal NE Pacific; summer feed in Bering & Chukchi Seas & NW US & Canada; feeding may be far off coast where water is shallow.
W N Pacific gray whale** (Korean stock = W gray whale)	E/SS CR/I	W N Pacific	approx. 100	Primarily shallow coastal waters and lagoons. Prey – benthic amphipods and mid-water prey.	W N Pacific only; feeds Sea of Okhotsk; assumed to breed and calve off southeast China in winter; migrates through Japan, Korea, China, Taiwan waters.
Humpback whale	E/SS LC/I	W N Pacific; E N Pacific; Central N Pacific; Gulf of Maine	approx. 27,000-36,000 (N Pacific 18,302; N Atlantic 11,600; S hemisphere 10,000-17,000)	Shallow to deep waters. Prey – krill, small schooling fish	High-latitude summer feeding; low-latitude winter breeding/calving in coastal waters; some remain in high latitudes year round.

Table 3.6-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Mysticetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status* ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*U.S. MMPA Stock*	*Global Population Size*[a-c, e, h, l, m]	*General Ecology*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements* [d, e, f]
Minke whale	-/- LC/I, II	Alaska; CA/OR/WA; E Coastal Canadian	approx. 960,000 (N Pacific 25,000; N Atlantic 174,000; S hemisphere 761,000[d, h])	Shallow to deep waters, often coastal. Prey – small schooling fish, euphausiids, copepods.	All N hemisphere oceans, polar waters to tropical regions; higher latitudes summer, lower latitudes winter; year-round Calif. & Gulf of Calif.; specific breeding areas unknown.
Dwarf minke whale subspecies	-/- LC/I	NA	NA	Shallow to deep waters. Prey – small schooling fish, krill.	S hemisphere mid & lower latitudes; winter (May – Sept) Great Barrier Reef Australia, New Caledonia, S Africa, Brazil; summers in higher latitudes (65° S).
Antarctic minke whale	-/- DD/I	NA	760,000	Shallow to deep waters. Prey – krill, small schooling fish.	Summer feeding Antarctic; winter breeding in dispersed open ocean in tropical & subtropical latitudes; breeding grounds include off Brazil coast.
Bryde's whale (2 subspp.?),; Omura's whale^	-/- DD/I	ETP	90,000[i] (W N Pacific 24,000; ETP 13,000; other pops. NA)	Shallow to deep waters. Prey – schooling fish, copepods, euphausiids.	Pantropical, generally between 40° N & 40° S; seasonally use temperate waters of W Pacific; year-round S Africa, Gulf of Calif.; breeding includes S Africa; foraging grounds not well known; pygmy form known in the Indian Ocean, Australasia, and western Pacific.[j]
Sei whale	E/SS E/I	E N Pacific; W N Atlantic	>54,000/NA (N Pacific approx. 7,000-14,000; N Atlantic 4,000[j]; S Hemisphere 10,000–37,000; other pops. NA)	Primarily offshore pelagic deep & interm. waters. Prey – copepods in higher latitudes, schooling fish in lower latitudes.	Global, temperate waters; summer feed high latitudes (e.g., Nova Scotia, Labrador, Gulf of AK, Bering Sea); winter breeding/calving subtropical or tropical waters (e.g., FL, CA, Japan); no specific breeding grounds known.
Fin whale	E/SS E/I	W N Atlantic; N E Pacific; CA/OR/WA	approx. 100,000-150,000 (N Atlantic approx. 30,000[h]; N Pacific approx. 13,600-18,700[k]; ETP approx. 1,851; S Hemisphere 25,000-103,000; other pops. NA)	Mostly pelagic, continental slope interm. & deep waters. Prey – planktonic crustaceans, fish, squid.	Global, rare in tropical or icy polar regions; common in Mediterranean Sea; summer feed in higher latitudes (some remain year round); winter, breed in lower-latitude areas; breeding areas, unknown but assumed mid-latitude pelagic waters.

Table 3.6-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Mysticetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status* ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*U.S. MMPA Stock*	*Global Population Size*[a-c, e, h, l, m]	*General Ecology*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements* [d, e, f]
Blue whale (incl. 3 subspecies)	E/SS E/I	W N Pacific; E N Pacific; W N Atlantic	approx. 10,000-13,000 (E N Pacific approx. 1500-2,000; ETP approx. 1400; other N Pacific pops. in 100s; NW Atlantic approx. 300-500; NE Atlantic approx. 1,000; S. hemisphere 5,000-10,000; Antarctic pop. extremely low; other pops. NA)	Coastal & pelagic shallow, interm. & deep waters; Prey – euphausiids.	Global; summer feed high latitudes; winter low latitudes continental shelf, incl. Bermuda; some summer feeding in low-latitude upwelling areas in Pacific; some may be year-round residents.

Notes: * CH = critical habitat, E = endangered, SS = strategic stock, DD = data deficient, VU = vulnerable, CR = critically endangered, LC = least concern. CITES I = includes species threatened with extinction that are or may be affected by trade; CITES II = includes species that are not presently threatened with extinction, but may become so if their trade is not regulated. It also includes species that need to be regulated so that trade in certain other Appendix-I or -II species may be effectively controlled; these species are most commonly listed due to their similarity of appearance to other related CITES species. ? = unknown. NA = Reliable data not available or uncertain or species status was not assessed; interm. = intermediate; unk. = unknown.

**Although not occurring in any of the exemplary analysis areas examined in this PEIS, the W N Pacific gray whale (Korean stock or W gray whale) is the only mysticete not addressed in the current analysis. Any potential seismic survey cruise within the range of the W gray whale will need to specifically address this stock.

^ A new species described by Wada et al. (2003) for which very little species-specific information is known; previously together with Bryde's whale.

[a]Koski et al. 1998; [b]Wade et al. 2003; [c]Bradford et al. 2006; [d] Bannister et al. 1996; [e] Moore et. al. 2006; [f]May-Collado et al. 2005; [g]Wada et al. 2003; [h]IWC 2006; [i]American Cetacean Society 2004; [j]Perry et al. 1999; [k]Carretta et al. 2008; [l]Hain 2007; [m]Calambokidis et al. 2008.

Sources: Ridgway and Harrison 1989; Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Perry et al. 1999; Reeves et al. 2002; L-DEO and NSF 2003a, b, c, d, e; L-DEO and NSF 2004a, b, c, d; SIO and NSF 2004, 2005; U.S. Navy 2005; L-DEO and NSF 2006a; NOAA Fisheries 2010; UNEP 2006; University of Texas-Austin (UTA) and NSF 2006; Waring et al. 2009; Angliss and Allen 2009; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010. Also see above.

3.6.1.3 Important Ecological Considerations

Primary foods consumed by baleen whales include small crustaceans, such as krill (euphausiids), amphipods, and copepods; and small schooling fish such as anchovies and herring (Table 3.6-1). The highest levels of primary productivity tend to occur at high latitudes during summer. Summer is also when most baleen whales migrate to high-latitude waters to feed intensively on high concentrations of prey (Clapham 2001; Corkeron and Connor 1999; Reeves et al. 2002; Mesnick and Ralls 2002). During winter, most baleen whale populations migrate to low-latitude waters to breed and calve where they consume little if any food. In contrast, bowhead whales winter, breed, and calve in cold subarctic waters near the ice edge where prey is apparently more available, albeit at lower densities than at their arctic summering grounds. It is important that baleen whales consume adequate food sources during feeding periods to sustain them through their reproduction and migration periods, which tend to occur at lower and generally less-productive latitudes (Reeves et al. 2002).

3.6.1.4 Special-Status Species

All baleen whales (except the pygmy right whale) were heavily exploited by commercial whaling industries, in some cases over several centuries. In recent years, some species, or some stocks of some species, appear to be recovering. However, other species or stocks were hunted until their numbers were very low, and some of those stocks do not appear to have recovered and remain highly vulnerable to extinction. Distinct populations of 9 of the 14 mysticete species are listed as endangered under the ESA: North Atlantic, North Pacific, and southern right whales; W North Pacific gray whale; and the bowhead, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-1). In addition, Critical Habitat under ESA is designated for the N Atlantic and N Pacific right whales.

3.6.1.5 Acoustic Capabilities

The known hearing and sound production characteristics of baleen whales are summarized in Table 3.6-2. Although the hearing abilities of mysticetes have not been studied directly, they can be inferred from the vocalizations that they produce, the sounds to which they do and do not respond, and their auditory anatomy. Optimum hearing is likely within the frequency range of vocalizations emitted (see below), and hearing may extend beyond this frequency range since other environmental sounds may also be important (Ketten 2004; Southall et al. 2007) (Table 3.6-2).

Overall, the current information suggests that mysticete hearing includes frequencies of 10-15 Hz (or lower) at the lower end and up to 20-30 kHz (Au et al. 2000; Frisk et al. 2003). Functional hearing for mysticetes as a group extends from approximately 7 Hz to 22 kHz, though the hearing range of individual species may not be as wide (Southall et al. 2007). The auditory threshold for mysticetes is unknown, but is estimated to be approximately 60-80 dB re 1 μPa within the frequency range of best hearing (Ketten 2004). However, the absolute sound levels that mysticetes can detect at frequencies below 1 kHz are probably limited by increasing levels of natural ambient noise at decreasing frequencies; ambient noise levels tend to be higher at low frequencies than at mid-frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004; Hildebrand 2004).

Sound production by some species of baleen whales has been documented at frequencies ranging up to 10 kHz to at least 24 kHz (Table 3.6-2). Spectral peaks in mysticete vocalizations are generally between 12 Hz and 3 kHz, with the fin and blue whales producing infrasonic signals at frequencies as low as 10-12 Hz (and commonly at 16-25 Hz).

Table 3.6-2. Summary of Characteristics of Underwater Sounds Produced by Mysticetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species[a]	*Sound Production* *Vocalization Frequency Range (Hz)*	*Dominant Vocalization Frequencies (Hz)*	*Source Level (dB re 1 µPa-m)*
N Atlantic right whale	70–600	Low-frequency calls: 70	137–192
N Pacific right whale	<400	90–150	-
S right whale	30–2,200	Tones: 160–500 Pulses: 50–500 & 1,500	172–187
Pygmy right whale	60–300	Pulses: 90–135 with downsweep to 60	153–179
E gray whale	20–20,000	Knocks/pulses: 327–825 Tonal moans: 100–200 & 700–1,200 Calf clicks: 3400–4000	167–188
Humpback whale	10[b]–>22,000[c]	Male Song: 120–4,000 Social sounds: <3,000 Feeding calls: 500 Calf sounds: 10–300[b]	Male song: 144–174 (mean 165) Social sounds: 190
Minke whale	60–20,000	Downsweeps: 50–250 Thumptrains: 100–200 Pulses: 50–9400 Moans: 60–140 Rachet: 850 Pings/clicks: <12,000	151–175
Bryde's whale	70–950	Moans: 124–250 Pulsed moans: 100–900 & <60 Calf pulses: 700–900	152–174
Sei whale	approx. 100-150[d] – 3,500[e]	Low-frequency tonal moan & frequency swept calls: approx. 100–1,000[e] MF pulsive bursts: 1,500– 3,500[e]	147–156[f]
Fin whale	10–750	Pulses: 18–35 FM calls: 20–70 Moans: 20	155–190
Blue whale	10–390	Songs: 30–100 FM calls/moans: 15–25	180–190

Sources: Richardson et al. 1995a; Au et al. 2000; U.S. Navy 2007; also see footnotes below.

Notes: [a] For some mysticete species, the frequency range of hearing has been suggested (e.g., footnotes c and d) based on indirect evidence. However, there are no specific data on the frequency range of hearing by any mysticete and the suggested ranges are of unknown accuracy. Some mysticetes may have at least limited hearing capabilities at frequencies as low as 7 Hz and up to at least 22-24 kHz (Au et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007), given their auditory anatomy, the frequencies of their calls, and their responsiveness (or lack thereof) to sounds at particular frequencies.

[b] Zoidis et al. 2005, 2008.

[c] Au et al. 2006.

[d] Southall et al. 2007.

[e] Thompson et al. 1979; Knowlton et al. 1991.

[f] (rms) re 1 µPa-m.

The hearing systems of baleen whales are more sensitive to low-frequency sounds than are those of small toothed whales (see Section 3.7). In particular, mysticetes are believed to hear well at frequencies below 1 kHz, where most energy from airguns also occurs (Richardson et al. 1995a; Ketten 2000). Thus, baleen whales are likely to hear airgun pulses at greater distances from the source than can toothed whales (odontocetes); at closer distances, airgun sounds may seem more prominent to baleen than to toothed whales.

The in-water acoustic capabilities of marine mammals occurring in the analysis areas have been categorized into four functional hearing groups based on anatomical information and available auditory

threshold data (Southall et al. 2007) (see Appendix B for more information). All mysticetes are members of the LF cetacean functional hearing group. The effective hearing bandwidth for this group is estimated to range from 7 Hz to 22 kHz (Southall et al. 2007). This LF group was further divided into four subgroups for purposes of AIM: (1) right whales; (2) gray whale; (3) humpback whale; and (4) minke, sei, Bryde's, fin, and blue whales (Appendix B).

3.6.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

This section summarizes the region-specific occurrence of mysticetes within the five DAAs for which acoustic modeling was conducted. Discussion is limited to those species present during the season(s) of the exemplary marine seismic surveys (Table 3.6-3). Discussion is focused on species with special status (e.g., ESA) and those that are expected to be most abundant/common.

Table 3.6-3. Potential Occurrence of Mysticetes within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

*Species (ESA status)**	*NW Atlantic (N Sum)** [1, 2, 3]	*Caribbean (N Spr or Sum)** [4]	*S California (N Spr or Sum)** [7, 8, 9]	*W Gulf of Alaska (N Sum)** [6, 7, 11]	*Galapagos Ridge (N Win/S Sum)** [5, 10]
N Atlantic right whale (E)	F r?	-	-	-	-
N Pacific right whale (E)	-	-	Spr M? r	F r-u	-
E gray whale	-	-	Spr M a	F u	-
Humpback whale (E)	F r	Spr BM u	Spr M u-c Sum F u-c	F c	M–S hem. pop. r
Minke whale	F c	Spr M? r	F u	FM c	-
Bryde's whale^	-	F c	Sum? F? r	-	FB u
Sei whale (E)	F? r	Spr M? r	Spr? M? r Sum F r	F u	B? r
Fin whale (E)	F c	Spr? M? r	Spr M u Sum F u	F c	B? r
Blue whale (E)	F r	Spr? M? r	FM c	F? r	B? r

Notes: *Excludes species that do not occur in the indicated analysis areas or do not occur in the analysis areas during the exemplary season. **E** = endangered; (Season) = northern (**N**) and southern (**S**) hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; **Spr** = spring, **Sum** = summer; **B** = known to breed or calve within the area/season; **F** = known to feed within the area/season; **M** = known to migrate through the area/season; **?** = unknown/possible; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area during the relevant season; and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered (during the relevant season) at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area; **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years during the relevant season; **-** = species does not occur there.

^ Two subspecies – includes the new species described by Wada et al. (2003) and any subspecies.

Sources: Reeves et al. 2002; Carretta et al. 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008; Angliss and Allen 2009; Waring et al. 2009; and the following footnotes: [1]U.S. Navy 2005; [2]L-DEO and NSF 2003d; [3]U.S. Navy 2007; [4]L-DEO and NSF 2003e; [5]L-DEO and NSF 2003a; [6]Moore et el. 2006; [7]Koski et al. 1998; [8]MMC 2004; [9]Calambokidis et. al. 2002; [10]L-DEO and NSF 2004b; [11]L-DEO and NSF 2004d.

3.6.2.1 NW Atlantic

The occurrence and distribution of mysticetes in the NW Atlantic is based on aerial and shipboard (sighting) surveys, opportunistic and historical sightings, strandings, and incidental fisheries bycatch records, as well as radio- and satellite-tagging programs and other miscellaneous sources (U.S. Navy 2005; Palka 2006). Five of the six mysticetes that could occur in the analysis area are listed as endangered under the ESA: North Atlantic right, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-1). Based on Palka

(2006), feeding fin whales and a small number of the unlisted minke whale are most likely to occur in the NW Atlantic during the analysis period.

North Atlantic Right Whale. North Atlantic right whales (n = approximately 400) are believed to pass the coast of New Jersey during spring and fall migrations (Clapham et al. 1999; IWC 2001; Hain 2007; Kraus and Rolland 2007), including 70 mature females (Kraus et al. 2001). Due to this migration, any seismic survey off the New Jersey coast would occur in summer, rather than spring or fall, to minimize the likelihood of encounters. During spring and summer, North Atlantic right whales feed along the continental shelf off the northeastern U.S. and Canada (Table 3.6-1). Known calving grounds and two feeding areas in U.S. waters are designated as Critical Habitat for North Atlantic right whales under the ESA (NMFS 1994a). The nearest U.S. critical feeding habitat occurs approximately 155 mi (250 km) northeast of the NW Atlantic DAA; the nearest critical calving habitat occurs approximately 550 mi (880 km) to the southwest. Although known feeding grounds are located north of the analysis area, it is possible that a small number of right whales could occasionally feed in the analysis area during the summer based on satellite tagging studies (e.g., Mate and Úrban 2005; Wade et al. 2005).

Humpback Whale. The principal feeding ground of western North Atlantic humpback whales is the Gulf of Maine during mid-April to mid-November; other aggregations feed from the coast of Massachusetts north to Canada, largely in shallow- to intermediate-depth waters (Cetacean and Turtle Assessment Program [CETAP] 1982; Whitehead 1982; Kenney and Winn 1987; Weinrich et al. 1997). Distribution in this region has been largely correlated to the distribution and abundance of prey species (Payne et al. 1986, 1990). Although the NW Atlantic DAA is not a regular feeding ground, it is possible that some humpback whales may use the area to feed during summer.

Minke Whale. Minke whales are among the most widely distributed and most abundant of the baleen whales (Cawardine 1998). They occupy warmer tropical waters during winter and colder northern waters in summer where they frequently utilize coastal and shelf waters to feed on a variety of small schooling fish and krill (Reeves et al. 2002). In the N Atlantic, breeding takes place from October to March (Cawardine 1998). A small number of minkes are expected to occur in the NW Atlantic DAA during the summer based on past shipboard and aerial surveys in the area (Palka 2006).

Fin Whale. The fin whale is the most commonly sighted, ESA-listed large whale in the western North Atlantic (Palka 2006). From late spring through early fall fin whales feed along the continental shelf and shelf break waters from the U.S. mid-Atlantic coast north to eastern Canada (CETAP 1982; Hain et al. 1992; Waring et al. 2004). They likely feed in the NW Atlantic DAA during the summer (Palka 2006).

Blue Whale. The blue whale is considered an occasional visitor in the U.S. EEZ (Waring et al. 2004), which may represent the limits of its feeding range (CETAP 1982; Wenzel et al. 1988). Thus, a small number of blue whales may occasionally occur in the NW Atlantic DAA during the summer.

Sei Whale. Sei whales are typically associated with steep bathymetric relief, such as the continental shelf break, canyons, or basins situated between banks and ledges where prey is concentrated (Kenney and Winn 1987; Schilling et al. 1992; Best and Lockyer 2002) (Table 3.6-1). Sei whales are not common in U.S. Atlantic waters, and thus are unlikely to occur in the NW Atlantic DAA (NMFS 1998b).

3.6.2.2 Caribbean

Little is known about the occurrence and distribution of mysticetes in the SE Caribbean compared to the remainder of the Caribbean (reviewed in Smultea et al. 2004). Swartz et al. (2001, 2003) conducted a major winter survey of Caribbean waters, but with limited effort in the exemplary analysis area. The most extensive survey of the SE Caribbean was conducted from April to June 2004 as part of a marine mammal

monitoring program during a previous NSF-funded marine seismic cruise (Smultea et al. 2004). Over 900 hr and 5,400 nm (10,000 km) of visual observation effort and >800 hr and >3,942 nm (7,300 km) of acoustic monitoring effort were conducted by observers aboard the R/V *Ewing* and the R/V *Seward Johnson II*. The project provided survey data on the occurrence of cetaceans across a wide span of longitudes during spring. In particular, prior to this effort, no surveys had been undertaken in the SE Caribbean Sea west of approximately 68ºW.

Based on the above cruise and other available data, six mysticete species have the potential to occur within the analysis area during the spring or summer (Romero et al. 2001; Swartz et al. 2001, 2003; Smultea et al. 2004) (Table 3.6-3). Four are listed as endangered under the ESA: humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales. Bryde's and minke whales are not ESA-listed but have IUCN and CITES status (Table 3.6-1).

Humpback, Minke, Sei, Fin, and Blue Whales. The humpback whale is the most abundant mysticete in the region during winter (Swartz et al. 2001, 2003), but most humpbacks migrate north to feeding grounds by early spring, prior to the date of the exemplary seismic survey (*Note*: the 2004 NSF-funded seismic survey in the SE Caribbean was purposefully scheduled to avoid the humpback wintering season [L-DEO and NSF 2003e]). No humpback, minke, sei, fin, or blue whales were seen in the SE Caribbean survey area during the 2004 spring (April-June) seismic survey (Smultea et al. 2004). Blue and minke whales are uncommon in the region, and probably occur there only during the winter (reviewed in L-DEO and NSF 2003e). Even less is known about the distribution, numbers, and occurrence of sei and fin whales in the analysis area (L-DEO and NSF 2003e). Any that do occur there in winter are likely to move north, out of the area, in spring. Neither of these species was seen or heard via PAM during the NSF-sponsored 2004 spring seismic survey (Smultea et al. 2004). However, historical strandings of fin whales are known from the analysis area along the Venezuelan coast (Agudo 1995).

Bryde's Whale. Bryde's whale is the only mysticete likely to occur within the analysis area during spring or summer. The Bryde's whale was the only mysticete species detected during a 2004 spring seismic survey (Smultea et al. 2004) and was the only mysticete recorded from Venezuelan strandings in 2000-2004 (Bermudez-Villapol and Sayegh 2005). It is the second-most abundant mysticete in the region throughout the year. The Bryde's whale occurs primarily in waters <3,280 ft (1,000 m) deep and is a common year-round resident within the Caribbean DAA, particularly around and east of Margarita Island (Romero et al. 2001; Smultea et al. 2004).

3.6.2.3 S California

Based on dedicated vessel and aerial surveys for marine mammals in coastal to pelagic waters off California (e.g., Forney and Barlow 1998; Calambokidis et al. 2002; Barlow 2003; Carretta et al. 2005), up to eight mysticete species may occur within the S California DAA during spring and summer. Five of these species are listed under the ESA: North Pacific right, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-3). During spring, the waters off S California are migration corridors for six mysticete species; in summer, the same waters provide feeding areas for four of these species plus two others (Table 3.6-3).

E Gray Whale. The most abundant mysticete species during spring is the E gray whale as it migrates north to feeding areas through shallow coastal California waters. The spring migration is largely finished by approximately the end of May, although cows with newborn calves migrate through June (Carretta et al. 2005). Except for the aforementioned late-migrating individuals, gray whales are not expected in the S California DAA area during summer.

Fin Whale. Fin whales are present off S California throughout the year, but are seen most frequently during summer when relatively high concentrations occur in offshore waters north of Point Conception and off S California near San Nicolas, San Clemente, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and Santa Rosa islands (Leatherwood et al. 1987; Bonnell and Dailey 1993; Koski et al. 1998).

Humpback and Blue Whales. Humpback and blue whales are common spring migrants off S California; during the summer feeding period their numbers are fewer and more variable (Schulman 1984; Koski et al. 1998; Calambokidis et al. 2003). However, Calambokidis (1995) reported that more than 100 blue whales were present in the Santa Barbara Channel during the summers of 1992 and 1994.

Minke, Bryde's, Sei, and N Pacific Right Whales. The remaining four mysticete species that may occur off S California are seen much less frequently and in considerably smaller numbers, if at all (Table 3.6-3). Sei whales are rare migrants in continental slope and offshore areas of S California. They may be seen during spring but are more likely to be seen in summer, and are not seen during other times of year. There is no estimate of the size of the sei whale stock that inhabits California waters, but the number is very small. Minke whales are uncommon off S California and occur primarily over the continental shelf, but they also occur in offshore waters. The number of minke whales peak in this area during the spring and summer migration, but a small number is also present year-round (Koski et al. 1998; Carretta et al. 2006, 2007). Bryde's whales may feed off S California in small numbers during summer (Koski et al. 1998). The N Pacific right whale probably migrates north off California in spring, but the total population size is very small, and sightings in this region are extremely rare (Scarff 1991; Carretta et al. 1994, 2005; Rowlett et al. 1994). Thus, it is highly unlikely that N Pacific right whales would be encountered in the S California DAA (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-3).

3.6.2.4 W Gulf of Alaska

Numerous marine mammal visual and acoustic surveys have been conducted in the W Gulf of Alaska and the nearby Aleutian Islands region (e.g., Forney and Brownell 1996; Moore 2001; Moore et al. 2002a; Wade et al. 2003, 2005; Zerbini et al. 2003; Barlow 2004a, b). Recent information on the seasonal distribution of mysticetes in this region has been obtained from the reception of whale calls by bottom-mounted, offshore hydrophone arrays along the U.S. Pacific coast, in the central North Pacific, the Gulf of Alaska, and the western Aleutian Islands (Moore et al. 1998, 2006; Watkins et al. 2000a, b; Mellinger et al. 2004). Seven mysticete species potentially occur within the analysis area during the summer, five of which are listed under the ESA: N Pacific right, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-3). The eastern gray and minke whales also occur there during summer. The most common species is expected to be the humpback whale as that species is known to feed commonly in this region (Zerbini et al. 2003; Barlow 2004a, b; L-DEO and NSF 2004d).

Humpback Whale. Humpback whales are commonly seen in the nearshore waters of the W Gulf of Alaska as well as the Aleutian Islands during the summer feeding season (Wade et al. 2003; Waite et al. 2003; Zerbini et al. 2003; Barlow 2004a, b). The humpback was the second-most frequently encountered cetacean and the most commonly seen large whale during surveys on the south side of the Aleutian Islands in 1994, mostly in deep offshore waters over the Aleutian Trench or the Aleutian Abyssal Plain (Forney and Brownell 1996). Zerbini et al. (2004a) estimated the abundance of humpbacks in the northern Gulf of Alaska and Aleutian Islands at 2,866 whales, with most humpbacks seen from the Kenai Peninsula to Unimak Island.

N Pacific Right Whale. Considering the rarity of N Pacific right whale sightings and the generally restricted area of Alaskan sightings, it is unlikely that any right whales would be seen in the analysis area during summer. No sightings have been made in the W Gulf of Alaska since 1998, despite dedicated

surveys in the region (e.g., Moore et al. 2000, 2002a; Angliss and Outlaw 2005). Only two right whale sightings are known from the W Gulf of Alaska in nearly 30 years. In 1979, a sighting of four right whales was reported at the mouth of Yakutat Bay, and in 1998 one individual was seen south of Kodiak Island (Waite et al. 2003), and additional lone animals were observed off Kodiak Island in the Barnabas Canyon area from NOAA surveys in August 2004, 2005, and 2006 (Allen and Angliss 2010). Most sightings and acoustic detections of N Pacific right whales have been made during summer in the SE Bering Sea in Bristol Bay. These detections have occurred predominantly within a rectangle bounded by 58°00′N to 56°30′N latitude and 162°20′W and 166°50′W longitude in an area called the "right whale box" (Goddard and Rugh 1998; Tynan 1999; Moore et al. 2000, 2002a; Leduc et al. 2001; Tynan et al. 2001; McDonald and Moore 2002; Angliss and Lodge 2004). The "right whale box" is located approximately 186 mi (300 km) west-northwest of the analysis area on the north side of the Aleutian Islands chain. Critical Habitat for the N Pacific right whale was designated in April 2008 approximately 250 mi (400 km) east of the analysis area (NMFS 2008b).

Gray, Fin, Minke, Sei, and Blue Whales. These five species may be present in small numbers during the summer. Although gray whales are common in the W Gulf of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands during the spring and fall migrations, only small numbers of feeding gray whales may occur in summer in shallow nearshore waters, mostly near the Aleutian Islands (Brueggeman et al. 1987; Moore et al. 2002b; Wade et al. 2003). Fin whales are likely to be observed in the analysis area during summer based on various surveys and cruises in the W Gulf of Alaska and Aleutian Islands (Forney and Brownell 1996; Moore 2001; Moore et al. 2002a; Wade et al. 2003; Zerbini et al. 2003; Barlow 2004b). Fin whale calls have been detected year-round in this region, peaking from August to February (Moore et al. 2006). Minke whales are expected to be common in the eastern North Pacific (Brueggeman et al. 1990; Mizroch 1991). Sei whales may be observed feeding in small numbers in the Aleutians during summer but are considered rare in the W Gulf of Alaska (Sobolevsky and Mathisen 1996). Blue whale calls peak in the Gulf of Alaska from August to November (Stafford 2003); however, sightings are rare in Alaska. In July 2004, for the first time in the previous three decades, blue whales were sighted approximately 100 nm (185 km) southeast of Prince William Sound in waters about 2 mi (3.2 km) deep (NMFS 2004c; Calambokidis et al. 2009) (approximately 100 nm northeast of the W Gulf of Alaska DAA).

3.6.2.5 Galapagos Ridge

The Galapagos Ridge DAA is located in a remote, mid-ocean area approximately 4° south of the equator and 870 mi (1,400 km) southwest of the Galapagos Islands (refer to Figure 2-21). Largely due to this remoteness, very few marine mammal studies have been conducted there. Multi-year ship surveys for cetaceans have been conducted by the NMFS's Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) from late July to early December in the wider ETP encompassing the Galapagos Ridge DAA (e.g., Polacheck 1987; Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001). Observers aboard the R/V *Ewing* conducted a survey approximately 375 mi (600 km) north of the analysis area as part of a marine mammal monitoring program during an NSF-funded marine seismic survey in July 2003 (Smultea et al. 2003). However, no multi-species surveys are known to have occurred in or near the Galapagos Ridge DAA from January through June (which encompasses the exemplary seismic survey period). Based on the above data, six mysticete species could potentially occur within the analysis area during the austral summer (N hemisphere winter – January-March): humpback, minke, Bryde's, Eden's, sei, fin, and blue whales. Humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales are listed as endangered under the ESA (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-3).

Among the mysticetes that they may occur in the Galapagos Ridge DAA, Bryde's whale is the most likely to be present during the southern summer/northern winter (Table 3.6-3). It is a relatively common

year-round resident in the ETP (Ferguson and Barlow 2001). Little is known about the breeding habits of the remaining five mysticete species in these remote waters (Smultea et al. 2003). Northern hemisphere humpback, minke, sei, fin, and blue whales could occur there in small numbers (Ferguson and Barlow 2001) as they migrate, breed, and calve in tropical waters during the northern winter. However, the S hemisphere populations of these species are not expected to occur along the Galapagos Ridge in the analysis area because they spend the austral summer (northern winter) feeding in sub-Antarctic and Arctic waters. Furthermore, the analysis area is located in deep pelagic waters where marine mammal density is expected to be relatively low based on past ETP surveys (e.g., Polacheck 1987; Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001).

3.6.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific use and occurrence of mysticetes within the eight QAAs. In general, these summaries address broader analysis areas than considered above for the DAAs for which acoustic modeling was conducted. Fewer data are available on distribution, occurrence, and particularly abundance of mysticetes for some of the QAAs as compared to most of the DAAs. As done for the DAAs, discussion herein is limited to those species occurring within each region during the season when a marine seismic survey would potentially occur (Table 3.6-4). The following discussion focuses on species with special status (e.g., ESA, IUCN, etc.) and those that are expected to be most abundant or common.

3.6.3.1 N Atlantic/Iceland

The occurrence and distribution of mysticetes in the N Atlantic near Iceland is well documented, including the analysis area off the SE Iceland coast. Information is based primarily on data collected during aerial and ship-based surveys and modern whaling excursions, but also commercial whalewatches, strandings, and incidental fisheries bycatch records (e.g., Larsen 1995; North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission [NAMMCO] 2005; Cawardine 1998). Five of the six mysticetes known to occur in the analysis area during the summer are listed as endangered under the ESA: N Atlantic right, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-4). The N Atlantic/Iceland region provides summer feeding habitat for all six of the mysticetes as described below. Humpback, fin, blue, and minke whales are expected to be the most common species potentially occurring in the analysis area during the summer.

N Atlantic Right Whale. The population of right whales in the N Atlantic is depleted as a result of commercial whaling (Reeves et al. 2007). North Atlantic right whales were historically common off Iceland but until the 1990s had not been observed since the late 1800s. Knowlton et al. (1992) reported several long-distance movements of N Atlantic right whale**s** as far north as the southeast coast of Greenland. In addition, photo-identified whales from the W Atlantic stock have been resighted off Iceland and arctic Norway (Waring et al. 2005b) but sightings are considered rare.

Humpback Whale. Humpback whales feed in shallow waters around Iceland during the summer months, often in the fjords and bays. The population size in Icelandic waters is uncertain, but is estimated to be approximately 1,500-1,800 (Cawardine 1998; Husavik Whale Centre 2006).

Minke Whale. Minkes are considered abundant around the entire coast of Iceland where the estimated summer population is approximately 50,000-60,000 individuals (Cawardine 1998). Off Iceland, they are often associated with steep underwater drop-offs where prey tends to be concentrated (Husavik Whale Centre 2006). These minkes belong to the IWC central stock and are genetically distinct from minke populations in the NW Atlantic (Donovan 1991; NAMMCO 2005).

Table 3.6-4. Potential Occurrence of Mysticetes within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

*Species (ESA status)**	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (N Sum)** [1, 2, 3]	*BC Coast (N Fall)** [4]	*SW Atlantic (Any)** [5, 6]	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (N Spr, Sum or Fall)** [7]	*W Australia (N/S Spr or Fall)** [8, 9]	*W. India (N/S Spr Or Fall)** [8-10]	*Mariana Islands (N Spr)**	*Sub-Antarctic (N Win/ S Sum)** [8, 11]
N Atlantic right whale[N] (E)	F r	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N Pacific right whale[N] (E)	-	F M r?	-	-	-	-	-	-
S right whale[S] (E)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	F u
Pygmy right whale[S]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	F u-c
E gray whale[N]	-	M a F c	-	-	-	-	-	-
Humpback whale (E)	F c	F c	Sum f B r+ S hem pop	Spr f M u	M c	F r	M c B c+	M r
Minke whale	F c	F c	B? na	Spr f M u	M na	M na	M u	See dwarf minke
Dwarf minke whale[S] subsp.	-	-	-	-	M na	-	-	F r?
Antarctic minke whale[S]	-	-	Sum B? na[7]	-	M na	-	-	M r
Bryde's and Omura's whale^	-	-	B? F c	F r	B? F c	B? F c	B? F c	F c
Sei whale (E)	F u	F M r	Sum B? na[7]	Spr f M u	M na	M na	M na	F c
Fin whale (E)	F c	F M u	Sum B? na	Spr f M u	M na	M na	M na	M u
Blue whale (E)	F c	F M r	Sum B? na	Spr f M r	-	M r[§]	M r	M u
Pygmy blue whale[S?] subsp.	-	-	Sum B? na	-	M na	F u M u	-	F u

Notes: *(Season) = northern (N) and southern (S) hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; **B** = known to breed or calve within the area; **F** = known to feed within the area; **M** = known to migrate through the area; **W** = winter, **Spr** = spring, **Sum** = summer, **F**= fall; **?** = unknown/possible; **a** = abundant: the species is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area; **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years; **na** = reliable data not available or uncertain or species status was not assessed; **-** = species does not occur there. **+** Mothers and calves stay into N spring from N hemisphere population or into N fall/S spring for S hemisphere population.

[N] Occurs only in the northern hemisphere; [S] occurs only in the southern hemisphere; [S?] uncertain whether occurs only in the S hemisphere (Reeves et al. 2002).

[§] Blue whales reported off W India likely to be pygmy blue whales (Stafford et al. 2005).

^ includes the new species described by Wada et al. (2003), as well as Eden's whale which may be a subspecies.

Sources: Reeves et al. 2002; Angliss and Lodge 2004; Carretta et al. 2004, 2005, 2008; Waring et al. 2004, 2009; Angliss and Allen 2009; also see footnotes below.

[1]UTA and NSF 2006; [2]L-DEO and NSF 2003b; [3]Cawardine 1998; [4]L-DEO and NSF 2006a, Williams and Thomas 2007; [5]UNEP 2006; [6]Andriolo et al. 2006a, b; [7]L-DEO and NSF 2003c; [8]Bannister et al. 1996; [9]de Boer et al. 2003; [10] Stafford et al. 2005; [11]SIO and NSF 2005.

Sei Whale. The sei whale population that uses the N Atlantic near Iceland (including analysis area) for summer feeding is depleted. Sei whales have been observed off the west coast of Iceland, but appear to prefer deeper waters 30-60 mi (48-96 km) offshore. An estimated 10,000 sei whales feed in Icelandic waters every summer (Cawardine 1998).

Fin Whale. The fin whale is the second-most-common mysticete (after the minke whale) in Icelandic and adjacent waters. According to a sightings survey conducted in summer 2001, the abundance of fin whales in the East Greenland-Iceland stock was estimated at 24,887 individuals and may be approaching its carrying capacity (Gunnlaugsson et al. 2002). In Icelandic waters, fin whales feed predominantly on euphausiids (Sigurjonsson and Vikingsson 1997) and fish such as whiting and herring (Sigurjonsson 1995).

Blue Whale. The blue whale population that summers in the analysis area is estimated at approximately 700-1,000 individuals (Cawardine 1998). Blue whales migrate to Iceland where they spend the entire summer feeding off the western and northern coast. In September, they migrate south to unknown breeding grounds (Reeves et al. 2002).

3.6.3.2 BC Coast

Considerable information is available on the occurrence and distribution of mysticetes in Canadian coastal waters that encompass the BC Coast QAA. Data were obtained primarily from aerial, acoustic, and ship-based (including photo-identification) surveys, but also from opportunistic and historical whaling records. Five of the seven mysticete species known or expected to occur in the analysis area during the fall are listed as endangered under the ESA: N Pacific right, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-4). The E gray, minke, and humpback whales are the mysticetes most likely to occur in the analysis area during the fall (Williams and Thomas 2007). During fall, the analysis area is used for feeding as well as a migration corridor south to warmer breeding areas.

N Pacific Right Whale. N Pacific right whales are very rare in BC waters and are unlikely to be encountered in the analysis area. Historical whaling records (1785-1913) show that right whales occurred in offshore BC waters from April to October, presumably feeding or migrating to or from sub-tropical wintering/calving grounds (Reeves et al. 1985; Nichol et al. 2002; Clapham et al. 2004). Only seven right whales were documented as taken by BC whalers in 1900-51, mainly in coastal waters (North Pacific Right Whale Recovery Team 2004). The last documented sighting in BC waters occurred in 1970 west of the Queen Charlotte Islands (Wada 1975 cited in North Pacific Right Whale Recovery Team 2004). Seven individuals were seen in U.S. waters near the BC/Washington border from 1959 to 1992 (Fiscus and Niggol 1965; Rice and Fiscus 1968; Rowlett et al. 1994). The last sighting off the Washington coast was in May 1992 (Rowlett et al. 1994). No right whales were seen during 2,400 nm (4,400 km) of systematic small boat surveys conducted in coastal waters of BC during summers 2004 and 2005 (Williams and Thomas 2007).

Humpback Whale. Humpback whales are commonly observed feeding in BC coastal waters off the Queen Charlotte Islands, W Hecate Strait, Langara Island, and Vancouver Island from May or June until October (Calambokidis et al. 1997, 2000, 2001, 2003; Williams and Thomas 2007). An NSF-funded baseline survey in October 2005 documented 40 humpbacks in the northern channels and inlets of the analysis area (LGL 2005). Recent acoustic data suggest that some individuals also use offshore areas during periods when they are not expected to be migrating (C.W. Clark cited in Baird 2003). Based on vessel-based sightings surveys, an estimated 1,313 humpback whales occur in BC coastal waters in summer (Williams and Thomas 2007). About 1,200 individuals were photo-identified in 1989-2004 (DFOC 2005c). In some areas of BC, the humpback whale is the most reported baleen whale (Ford et al. 1994).

Sei Whale. Until recently, no sei whales had been documented off Canada's Pacific coast since commercial whaling was halted in 1976 (Environment Canada 2006; Williams and Thomas 2007). There has, however, been limited survey effort, and sei whales may have been mistaken for fin or minke whales (Environment Canada 2006). The sei whale population estimate for the N Pacific is approximately 7,000-13,000 (Tillman 1977). The sei whale has been considered rare in inshore waters of BC as it tends to occur off the continental shelf of Vancouver Island and the Queen Charlotte Islands (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). Historical whaling records and predictive modeling indicate that sei whales fed along Vancouver Island during summer (Gregr and Trites 2001; L-DEO and NSF 2006a). Gregr (2002) estimated that no sei whales presently inhabit Hecate Strait. However, one sei whale was seen near the southern tip of Queen Charlotte Island during 2,400 nm (4,400 km) of systematic small boat surveys conducted in coastal waters of BC during summers 2004 and 2005 (Williams and Thomas 2007).

Fin Whale. Fin whales, although typically associated with offshore waters, were frequently encountered by BC whalers for extended periods in the summer and fall in Hecate Strait and in some of the channels and inlets on the northern mainland BC coast (Gregr et al. 2000). Fin whales have been sighted commonly during summer in the Queen Charlotte Basin, adjacent north-coast mainland inlets, and from the tip of Vancouver Island to the southern Queen Charlotte Islands (Gregr and Trites 2001; Charest et al. 2003; Calambokidis et al. 2003; Williams and Thomas 2007). These sightings encompass the BC QAA. Based on historical whaling records, Gregr (2002) estimated that approximately 425 fin whales could inhabit Hecate Strait. Based on recent summer surveys during which there were several sightings in the area, Williams and Thomas (2007) estimate that 496 fin whales occur in BC coastal waters as a whole during summer.

Blue Whale. The blue whale population in BC waters is little known. The rare visual and acoustic detections are consistent with the estimate that only approximately 10-50 blue whales presently inhabit Hecate Strait based on historical whaling records (Gregr 2002). Two blue whales photo-identified off the Queen Charlotte Islands in northern BC in 2003 both matched animals seen off California (Calambokidis et al. 2004). Although Williams and Thomas (2007) did not sight any whales during 2,400 nm (4,400 km) of systematic small boat surveys conducted in coastal waters of BC during summers 2004 and 2005, Calambokidis et al. (2009) reported several sightings south of the Queen Charlotte Islands during surveys in 2005-2007.

Gray Whale. The E gray whale occurs in the analysis area during the fall. The majority of the approximately 17,000 E gray whales pass by the BC coast during their spring and fall migrations to and from northern summer feeding grounds and southern winter calving grounds (Table 3.6-1). The periods of primary northward and southward migration along the central BC coast are from March to May and from November to January, respectively. In general, gray whales are sighted frequently during the spring to fall period along the entire BC coast including both sides of the Queen Charlotte Islands (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). The migration route north of Vancouver Island is poorly understood but most gray whales probably cross the Queen Charlotte Islands north to Cape St. James, and follow the east and west coasts of the Queen Charlotte Islands (Pike 1962), remaining within approximately 3 mi (5 km) of shore. An estimated 179 gray whales are known to move freely between N California and southeast Alaska from April to November (Calambokidis et al. 2002; Calambokidis 2003). There is some evidence that the number of gray whales utilizing BC waters during the spring-autumn period, especially cow-calf pairs, is increasing (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). However, Williams and Thomas (2007) report very few summer sightings, and, for the specific analysis area, data are insufficient (due to low observer effort) to assess the spring-autumn distribution and abundance of gray whales.

Minke Whale. Minkes are expected to be common in the analysis area during fall (Table 3.6-4). They have never been abundant in BC waters, but are commonly seen in some regions along the coast (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). There is little specific information about their distribution in BC waters, but Williams and Thomas (2007) reported several sightings and derived a tentative estimate of 388 individuals in BC coastal waters. In inshore marine waters of Washington and central California, minke whales are well-studied and appear to establish home ranges (Dorsey et al. 1990). Minkes appear to occur year-round in inland Washington waters (Hoelzel and Stern 2000). This suggests that minke whales may be present year-round in BC waters as well.

3.6.3.3 SW Atlantic

Little research has been conducted on mysticetes off the expansive northeast coast of Brazil in the SW Atlantic QAA. Based on general distribution information (e.g., Reeves et al. 2002) and limited species-specific studies (e.g., Andriolo et al. 2006a, b), seven species and one subspecies of baleen whale are known to or may occur at least seasonally in the analysis area. Four of the seven species are listed as endangered under the ESA: humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-4). The Bryde's whale is the only mysticete that may occur in the analysis area year-round. The other six baleen whale species are presumably seasonal residents during the S hemisphere winter when breeding and calving of S hemisphere populations occur (Reeves et al. 2002).

Humpback Whale. A small number of S hemisphere humpbacks may occur in the SW Atlantic analysis area from July through November during the austral winter breeding/calving season; however, the analysis area is located approximately 1,550 mi (2,500 km) north of the main breeding aggregations. Humpbacks off Brazil generally breed and calf from approximately 4º to 23º S (the analysis area is located near 5° N) (Freitas et al. 2004; Zerbini et al. 2004b, 2006; Andriolo et al. 2006a, b); they feed during the austral summer in the Antarctic (Moore et al. 1999) and to a lesser extent near South Georgia and the South Shetland Islands (Van Blaricom et al. 2005). The total size of the Brazilian breeding population is estimated to be approximately 10,160 whales based on line-transect aerial surveys (Andriolo et al. 2006b). This stock of humpback whales follows an offshore migration route, roughly south-southeast from just south of the main wintering area at Abrolhos Bank (approximately 17-18° S) to South Georgia (Zerbini et al. 2006).

Antarctic Minke Whale. The Antarctic minke whale may breed and calve in the SW Atlantic analysis area during the austral winter based on its reported general distribution. Although this species is considered a S hemisphere species, it is known to cross the equator (Reeves et al. 2002). However, nothing is known about its specific distribution or numbers in the analysis area.

Minke, Sei, Fin, Bryde's, and Blue Whales. The northern range of four mysticete species—the S hemisphere minke, sei, fin, and blue whales—includes the tropical waters of the analysis area off northeast Brazil from May through November during the austral winter/spring breeding/calving period (Reeves et al. 2002). All four species breed in tropical climates and feed at higher S hemisphere latitudes. Bryde's whale occurs year-round in tropical and subtropical latitudes, and it is likely to be one of the most commonly encountered mysticetes based on its general distribution and behavior (Reeves et al. 2002). Locations of austral-winter breeding grounds for this species off central-eastern South America are uncertain, although it may breed and/or calve in the SW Atlantic analysis area.

3.6.3.4 Mid-Atlantic Ridge

The Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA is located essentially in the middle of the deep-water ocean at mid-latitude near the Trans-Atlantic Geotransect active mound on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge (refer to Figure 2-18). Data

on marine mammal distribution for this remote region are scant. No marine mammals were seen by dedicated observers during approximately 620 mi (1,000 km) of observation effort during an NSF-funded seismic survey in this region from October to November 2003, including transits to and from the site (Holst 2004). However, it has been hypothesized that large baleen whales use the Mid-Atlantic Ridge as a migration corridor between low-latitude breeding grounds and high-latitude feeding grounds (Olsen et al. 2005). The general distribution of six mysticete species overlaps the analysis area. Four of these species are listed as endangered under the ESA: humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-4). The two additional non-ESA-listed species in the area are the minke and Bryde's whales. The rare N Atlantic right whale has primarily a coastal distribution and is therefore not expected to occur in the analysis area.

Available data are insufficiently detailed to allow meaningful quantitative estimates of species presence during a seismic survey in spring, summer, or fall. The limited information suggests that the density of mysticetes is low in the region, at least during fall, and is probably associated mainly with whales transiting through the area during spring and fall migrations. Low densities may be related to the considerable distance from coastlines and shelf-breaks and typically low productivity in deep waters. In the oceanic waters of the Atlantic, primary production is relatively low compared to coastal waters (Parsons et al. 1977). However, patches of high productivity may occur along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge where seamounts are of sufficient topography to be associated with upwelling of nutrients that in turn enhance surface chlorophyll, interact with diel migrant zooplankton and consequent patch formation, and induct relatively high biomasses of pelagic fish based on general ecological effects associated with seamounts (Saltzman and Wishner 1997; Longhurst 2006). Regardless, productivity in the Mid-Atlantic QAA is likely lower than in the coastal areas or higher latitudes of the North Atlantic (Parsons et al. 1977; National Aeronautics and Space Administration 2006). High whale density sites located to the north, within the Mid-Atlantic ridge, seem to combine favorable topographical features with biologically productive waters (Nottestad et al. 2005). Five of the six mysticete species—humpback, minke, sei, fin, and blue whales—may use the analysis area in small numbers during spring and fall migration. Summer feeding habitat for these species occurs farther north in the Atlantic, and winter breeding habitat presumably occurs further south based on available information (e.g., Reeves et al. 2002).

Humpback Whale. Humpback whale migrations between high-latitude summer feeding grounds and low-latitude winter mating grounds are reasonably well known (Winn and Reichley 1985; Smith et al. 1999). Although humpbacks are primarily considered coastal, at least during winter and summer, they traverse deep pelagic areas while migrating to and from winter and summer grounds. For example, Bermuda (located farther west in deep waters of the North Atlantic) is considered an important area for migrating humpbacks. The western North Atlantic population uses Bermuda as a mid-ocean habitat during the spring migration where they may feed on the deep-water scattering layer (Stone et al. 1987). Historically, humpbacks occurred in Bermuda from February to May, and presently humpback whales mainly occur there in April (Stone et al. 1987). It is likely that small numbers of migrating humpback whales may be seen in or near the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA during the same time of year when they are seen at Bermuda.

Minke and Fin Whales. Minke whales occur most often in coastal and shelf areas of the North Atlantic but occur in pelagic waters as well; however, migratory patterns are unknown (NAMMCO 2005). Fin whales apparently have complex seasonal movements (Gambell 1985a; Jonsgård 1966 in Christensen et al. 1992; see Table 3.6-1). In the North Atlantic, they use the shelf edge as a migration route between summer feeding areas in high latitudes and southern wintering grounds (Evans 1987).

Sei Whale. Sei whales are primarily pelagic (Jonsgård 1966; Jonsgård and Darling 1977; Harwood and Wilson 2001). However, their current status in the North Atlantic and other areas is uncertain. In 2005, a sei whale was satellite tagged and tracked as it migrated north from near the Azores to northern feeding grounds. From mid-April to early May 2005, the whale first traveled straight northward then apparently started feeding along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge near the Charlie Gibbs Fracture Zone (this fracture zone bisects the Mid-Atlantic Ridge near 56°N and extends from approximately 18° to 43°W (in comparison, the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA is located near 26°N 40°W) (Olsen et al. 2005). Past surveys have shown that relatively high densities of sei whales occur in this zone during summer (Olsen et al. 2005). From May through June, the sei whale then traveled essentially straight westward to the Labrador Sea, with occasional apparent feeding bouts en route. This observation appears to support the theory that baleen whales migrate along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge (Olsen et al. 2005), and may possibly do so in the analysis area as well.

Bryde's Whale. In contrast to the other mysticete species, Bryde's whales occur year-round in tropical pelagic as well as coastal waters, though rarely at latitudes above 35ºN or S. In the Atlantic they typically inhabit lower-latitude areas with high productivity, such as the Caribbean Sea (Reeves et al. 2002; L-DEO and NSF 2003e). However, a small number may feed as well as transit through the analysis area during spring, summer, and/or fall. Bryde's whales do not undertake the long migrations characteristic of other mysticetes, although they may move closer to the equator in winter and toward temperate waters in the summer (Best 1975 in Cummings 1985).

3.6.3.5 W India

Data on the current occurrence, distribution, and abundance of mysticetes in the N Indian Ocean encompassing the W India QAA are limited. Commercial whaling severely depleted all the large whale populations in this region, and subsequently, in 1979, the IWC declared the Indian Ocean north of 55ºS latitude as a whale sanctuary. A compilation of known research and historical records indicate that six species potentially occur off W India during the proposed spring or fall study period: humpback, Bryde's, minke, sei, fin, and blue whales, including the pygmy blue whale subspecies (de Boer et al. 2003; Sathasivam 2004; SIO and NSF 2006b). Four are listed as endangered under the ESA (Table 3.6-4). The unlisted Bryde's and minke whales may also occur off W India, as indicated by broad-scale species distribution information and data from the Arabian Sea and Gulf of Oman (Collins et al. 2002; Minton et al. 2002; Reeves et al. 2002; Sathasivam 2004; SIO and NSF 2006b).

At-sea information for mysticetes of the QAA is limited primarily to the humpback, blue, and pygmy blue whales. Humpback whales are seen year-round in the Arabian and Red seas, and along with some blue whales in the Indian Ocean, do not appear to undertake extensive migrations, probably due to the predictable year-round presence of prey (Yochem and Leatherwood 1985; Mikhalev 1997; Sathasivam 2004; SIO and NSF 2006b). Compared with historical catches, the Antarctic ('true') blue subspecies is very rare in the Indian Ocean, including in the Arabian Sea and W India analysis area (Sathasivam 2004; Branch et al. 2007; SIO and NSF 2006b). In the Indian Ocean, blue whale sighting rates are low everywhere, but highest near Sri Lanka, Indonesia, and south of Madagascar (Branch et al. 2007). The first blue whale sighting since the late 1800s was recorded in 1996 with few sightings reported since; eight of these whales were seen in the northern equatorial Indian Ocean (Reeves et al. 2002; de Boer et al. 2003; SIO and NSF 2006b). Pygmy blue whales are considered more common than the Antarctic subspecies in the Indian Ocean (Sathasivam 2004; Branch et al. 2007; SIO and NSF 2006b). Pygmy blue whale vocalizations were recorded by Stafford et al. (2005) from two locations in the northern Indian Ocean where there are believed to be both resident and migratory populations. In general, blue whales tend to

avoid oligotrophic central gyres of the Indian Ocean and are more common where high densities of phytoplankton occur (Branch et al. 2007).

Fin whales are considered common in the Indian Ocean as a whole (SIO and NSF 2006b), but information from Indian waters is associated mainly with dead and live strandings. At least eight fin whale strandings occurred off India from August 1965 to November 1995 (Sathasivam 2004). Some of the unidentified rorquals recorded in India also may have been fin whales, and strandings are also known from Pakistan and Sri Lanka (Sathasivam 2004; SIO and NSF 2006b).

3.6.3.6 W Australia

The occurrence and distribution of mysticetes in coastal waters off W Australia is relatively well documented, with less known about those in offshore waters. Information comes from historical whaling data as well as recent cetacean studies, including those conducted in conjunction with offshore oil and gas exploration (e.g., Bannister 1985; Bannister et al. 1996; McCauley et al. 2000a, b; ADEH 2001; Stafford et al. 2005). Three of the seven mysticete species that may or are known to migrate through the W Australia analysis area during the spring and fall exemplary survey period are listed as endangered under the ESA: humpback, sei, and fin whales (Table 3.6-4). The unlisted dwarf minke, Antarctic minke, pygmy blue, and Bryde's whales may also use the region for migrating and/or feeding during spring and fall, although little is known about their numbers (Kasamatsu et al. 1995; Reeves et al. 2002; de Boer et al. 2003; Minke Whale Project 2004a). Humpback and Bryde's whales are expected to be the most common baleen whale species in the analysis area during the exemplary spring or fall survey period based on available data (Table 3.6-4).

Humpback whales commonly migrate northeast through the W Australia analysis area during the austral fall on their way to calving/wintering grounds in coastal shallow waters generally east-northeast of the analysis area in the Broome/King Sound area. Some individuals overwinter in more southern areas including Ningaloo, Shark Bay, Perth, and Cape Leeuwin (McCauley et al. 2000a, b; ADEH 2001; Burton 2001; Jenner et al. 2001). During the austral spring, humpbacks again pass through the analysis area on their way south to Antarctic summer feeding grounds. The number of humpback whales migrating along the W Australian coast was estimated to be approximately 8,200-13,600 animals several years ago, and increasing rapidly (Bannister and Hedley 2001).

The dwarf minke subspecies, Antarctic minke subspecies, sei, fin, Bryde's, and pygmy blue whales may use the analysis area during fall and spring, although little is known about them in the analysis area (ADEH 2001; Reeves et al. 2002; de Boer et al. 2003; Minke Whale Project 2004b). Dwarf minke whales were sighted 324-448 nm (600-830 km) offshore of W Australia between 18 and 35°S in late November and early December; none were seen in the same area during a repeat survey in late February and March (Minke Whale Project 2004b). The only known current blue whale aggregation off W Australia occurs much farther south, off southwest Australia (ADEH 2001). However, McCauley and Cato (2003) recorded blue whale calls from as far north as Exmouth Gulf during March. Ljungblad et al. (1997) recorded pygmy blue whale calls off southwest Australia during December; little is known about this subspecies.

3.6.3.7 Marianas

Current published data on baleen whales for the Marianas QAA are scarce, but the U.S. Navy funded a systematic baseline survey for cetaceans in this area during winter 2007. Available information suggests that six species of mysticetes would potentially occur in this analysis area during the exemplary spring seismic survey period (Table 3.6-4) (Reeves et al. 2002; Naval Facilities Engineering Command

[NAVFAC] Pacific 2007). Four of these, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales, are listed as endangered under the ESA; the minke, Bryde's, and Omura's whales are unlisted (Table 3.6-4). Use of this tropical region during spring coincides with the end of the N hemisphere winter breeding period and the beginning of the migration northward to higher latitude feeding grounds. The Bryde's whale may also feed there; its breeding period is unknown (Reeves et al. 2002). The N Pacific right whale was historically present in the northern Bonin Islands located north of the Mariana Islands, but current low population numbers and lack of sightings indicate that it is unlikely to occur in the analysis area. In general, existing data are inadequate to estimate the abundance of any of these five species in the Marianas analysis area (Table 3.6-4).

Bryde's whales have been heard calling in the western N Pacific and typically occur year-round in tropical and/or subtropical waters. Bryde's whales are considered the most common baleen whale in the Marianas region, typically occurring from May to July and possibly August (Eldredge 2003). They likely feed and/or breed in the analysis area. Bryde's whales have been sighted near the Marianas during spring surveys (e.g., NAVFAC Pacific 2007).

Minke whales occur throughout the N Pacific and this species is the most abundant baleen whale worldwide; sightings of mothers with calves in tropical waters and acoustic detections of minkes in the western N Pacific suggest that they may winter in tropical waters (Reeves et al. 2002; NOAA 2005). Thus, small numbers of minkes may use the analysis area in early spring near the end of the breeding season. Although no visual records exist of minke whales near the Marianas, minkes were detected acoustically during a spring survey in the waters of Guam and the southern CNMI (NAVFAC Pacific 2007).

Sei, fin, and blue whale distributions in the western N Pacific are largely unknown, but these species may migrate through or breed/calve in the analysis area during spring (Table 3.6-4) (Reeves et al. 2002). Sei whale distribution during winter appears to be concentrated near approximately 20° N. Although sei whales were generally considered uncommon in the Marianas region, 16 sightings were made during spring surveys in the area in 2007 (NAVFAC Pacific 2007). Fin whales migrate in the open ocean but breeding areas are uncertain. Recent sightings of blue whales in the western North Pacific are rare; however, some are reported to winter near Taiwan, Japan, and Korea, and they have been heard in the western N Pacific. No sightings or acoustic detections of fin or blue whales were made near the Marianas during spring surveys in 2007 (NAVFAC Pacific 2007).

The western Pacific stock of humpback whales is estimated at 938-1107 (Calambokidis et al. 2008). This stock is known to winter and calve in Taiwan and the Mariana, Bonin, Ryukyu, and Ogasawara islands (Reeves et al. 2002; Carretta et al. 2005; Calambokidis et al. 2008). In 1988–90, humpbacks were commonly sighted from January to May throughout the Ogasawara Archipelago and near the Kerama Islands, Okinawa. Humpbacks wintering off the Bonin Islands' coast appear to be increasing in number and re-occupying habitats used before whaling depleted their numbers in the N Pacific (Yamaguchi et al. 2005). In spring, humpbacks may be seasonally common in the Marianas at the end of the breeding season and during northward migration. At least five sightings of humpback whales from 1978 to 1996 near Guam, Saipan, or Rota were described in Eldredge (2003). A small number of sightings occurred northwest of the Marianas during surveys in February–March 1999–2001 (Shimada and Miyashita 2001). Although there were no humpback sightings during the January–April 2007 survey in the waters of Guam and the southern Mariana Islands, 11 humpbacks were detected acoustically, in both deep and shallow water around and north of Tinian and Saipan (NAVFAC Pacific 2007). In the N Pacific, mothers and calves often remain on the breeding grounds into April in the (Smultea 1994; Craig et al. 2002).

3.6.3.8 Sub-Antarctic

The Sub-Antarctic QAA lies within the open ocean in a productive area mid-way between New Zealand and southern Chile (refer to Figure 2-18). Few data have been compiled on the presence of marine mammals in this remote area during the exemplary survey period during the austral summer. The southwest Pacific is thought to support nine mysticete species and two subspecies, five of which are listed as endangered under the ESA: S right, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales (Table 3.6-4). All 11 of these species or subspecies may use the Sub-Antarctic analysis area for feeding and/or migration during the austral summer.

S Right Whale. Small numbers of feeding S right whales could be present in the analysis area during the austral summer. Summer feeding grounds have not been fully characterized for this species, but could potentially include the analysis area based on the latitude of known feeding areas in the S hemisphere (Reeves et al. 2002). Historic whaling data suggest that this species migrates south past New Zealand during the austral spring, arriving in feeding waters near approximately 40°S 140°W by November and December (Bannister 2001) (the analysis area is located near approximately 42°S 145°W). Richards (2002) noted S right whales moving south and east from the Kermadec Islands beginning in November, continuing across 40°S, and reaching 50°S in January. The migration followed the line of the Louisville Ridge, where the whales may have fed on copepod and krill populations stimulated by upwelling from the ridge (SIO and NSF 2005).

Pygmy Right Whale. Pygmy right whales are not well described and their feeding, breeding, and migration strategies are largely unknown (Reeves et al. 2002). They are known to inhabit coastal and pelagic waters (Kemper 2002) in the southern hemisphere between 30°S and 55°S. They are rarely seen at sea, but one group (n = 80) was seen in oceanic waters (SIO and NSF 2005). As the reported distribution of this subspecies overlaps the Sub-Antarctic analysis area (Reeves et al. 2002), some pygmy right whales might also be encountered during a survey there.

Humpback Whale. Southern hemisphere humpback whales typically feed south of the analysis area near 60°S during austral summer (December-March) (SIO and NSF 2004, 2005). However, a small number of late- or early-migrating whales may pass through the analysis area during early or late austral summer based on the species' typical migration patterns (Reeves et al. 2002). Animals using this region are likely part of the Area V stock that breeds in and around French Polynesia, the Cook Islands, and Tonga (Chittleborough 1965; Hauser et al. 2000; Garrigue et al. 2002; Olavarría et al. 2003; Gannier 2004). Humpbacks that winter off New Caledonia and Tonga are estimated to number only in the few hundreds (Baker et al. 1998).

Blue Whale. Blue whales are the first species of baleen whale to arrive on the Antarctic feeding grounds each austral summer, and some probably migrate through the analysis area during early austral summer (SIO and NSF 2004, 2005). Visual and acoustic surveys conducted by the IWC in Antarctic waters recorded 710 blue whale calls in January and 2559 calls in February 2002 (Ljungblad and Stafford 2005). Blue whales begin migrating north out of the Antarctic earlier than fin and sei whales, and some likely pass through the analysis area again in late austral summer while migrating north to winter breeding grounds (SIO and NSF 2004, 2005).

Fin Whale. Fin whales likely migrate south through the analysis area during early to mid-austral summer, arriving on more southern feeding grounds after blue whales. The New Zealand stock summers from 170°E to 145°W (SIO and NSF 2004, 2005). Fin whales migrate north through the exemplary survey area before the end of austral summer toward breeding grounds in and around the Fiji Sea (Gambell 1985a).

Sei Whale. Sei whales are the last mysticete whales to arrive in the S Ocean during the austral summer (SIO and NSF 2004, 2005). Their main summer feeding concentration occurs between 40°S and 50°S (Gambell 1985b), putting them well within the analysis area during austral summer.

Antarctic Minke Whale. These whales begin their southern migration from breeding grounds north of the analysis area in November (austral spring), and arrive in Antarctic feeding grounds by early summer (January) (Kasamatsu et. al. 1995). A few are probably still migrating south through the analysis area in early summer. By February, some begin migrating north and are likely to pass through the analysis area again during mid- to-late summer.

Bryde's, Dwarf Minke, and Pygmy Blue Whales. The Bryde's, dwarf minke, and pygmy blue whales typically do not migrate as far south as other baleen whales in the S hemisphere (Reeves et al. 2002). These species may feed in the analysis area during the exemplary austral summer survey period. However, relatively little is known about the abundance or specific distribution of these species: Bryde's whales, given their general abundance, are likely to be common throughout the analysis area, with denser concentrations to the northeast and northwest (Kato 2002). The dwarf minke whale's range, although not well defined, covers 11°S to 65°S (Reeves et al. 2002), overlapping that of the Antarctic minke and the analysis area. Pygmy blue whales have a more northerly distribution than true blue whales and are thus more likely to be seen in the analysis area, although their total population size is believed to be low (Reeves et al. 2002; SIO and NSF 2005).

3.6.4 Environmental Consequences – General

The following sections provide a synopsis of the potential effects on mysticetes from sounds and activities associated with seismic survey operations. In comparison with what is known about seismic survey effects on other marine animals, considerable information is available on the effects of airguns on a number of mysticete species. For the purpose of this analysis, project effects are assessed at two levels: (1) the individual level and (2) the population level. Prior to discussing potential effects, the criteria used to assess effects are described. This is followed by a comparison of the overlap between the sound frequencies of acoustic sources used in seismic surveys with presumed mysticete hearing sensitivity (Section 3.6.1.5 and Table 3.6-2). Acoustic and non-acoustic effects are then described.

3.6.4.1 Criteria and Approach

The criteria used to evaluate and quantify the potential effects on mysticetes were described in detail in Section 2.3.3 (see also Appendix B). In this analysis, the received sound levels at which Level B behavioral effects and Level A PTS, injury, or mortality could potentially occur as a result of the exemplary seismic research operations are based on two approaches (see Section 1.6.3 for the definitions of Level A and B effects). The first is to use the traditional sound exposure criteria identified by NMFS and applied during past NSF-sponsored cruises. These 'current criteria' use the sound pressure measurement unit of dB re 1 µPa (rms) and are referred to as pressure criteria (Table 2-7). These criteria were identified by NMFS before there was any specific information about the received levels of underwater sound that would cause temporary or permanent hearing impairment in marine mammals. However, since that time, new information has become available, including results of the deliberations of a noise criteria group, which has developed recommended acoustic injury criteria consistent with current scientific knowledge (Southall et al. 2007; see also Section 2.3.3). The second approach is based on these more recent data. These 'proposed criteria' are based mainly on cumulative acoustic energy (in SEL units), and are referred to herein as the energy criteria. (The noise criteria group also recommends a "do not exceed" peak pressure criterion, but, under field conditions, the SEL criterion is the one that would be exceeded first and thus would be the operative criterion.) In applying the new energy-based (SEL)

criteria, both flat (unweighted) and M-weighting (see Section 2.3.3.3) were used. The M-weighting approach had the effect of down-weighting sound components at frequencies to which the mammals in question are considered less sensitive (Southall et al. 2007). The two approaches, as applied to mysticetes and to other groups of marine mammals, are described in more detail in Section 2.3.3 and Appendix B.

Acoustic modeling was then performed for the DAAs to provide a quantitative method of simulating and estimating the numbers of mysticetes by species or group that might be exposed to sounds at or above the threshold criteria (refer to Section 2.3.3 and Appendix B for detailed descriptions of the acoustic modeling approach and methodology). These estimates are based on the best available population densities for the analysis areas of interest as well as the modeled received sound levels around the operating airguns, taking account of empirical oceanographic, bathymetric, and bottom-property data available for each DAA. The modeling work, including both (1) physical acoustic modeling to predict the sound field and (2) prediction of numbers of mammals that might be exposed to specified sounds, is presented in Appendix B.

The DAAs and QAAs and their respective assumed seismic surveys are meant to represent a realistic mix of locations, seasons, and seismic operations rather than actual planned, site- and season-specific seismic surveys (see Chapters 1 and 2). The exposure estimates resulting from modeling conducted for the DAAs provide a general indication of the types and numbers of marine mammals that could be exposed to various levels of sound during operations with the various airgun array sizes (see Section 1.5). Rather than numerical modeling, analysis of the QAAs involves qualitatively estimating the relative numbers of mysticetes in the QAAs that could potentially be exposed to seismic survey acoustic sources. The QAAs are included to expand upon the representative sample of potential seismic surveys by qualitatively considering additional combinations of location, season, and airgun array configuration.

There have been no direct studies on the hearing capabilities of mysticetes (Section 3.6.1.5 and Table 3.6-2). Thus, our understanding of mysticete hearing sensitivity is based on their auditory anatomy, the sounds to which they are known to respond, and the characteristics of their calls: they are presumed to be capable of hearing sounds they produce (but may also hear a wider range of frequencies). The available information indicates that the mysticete auditory system is sensitive to the predominantly low-frequency energy produced by the airguns and the vessels associated with the seismic research surveys as summarized below. Blue and fin whales, in particular, are presumably capable of hearing very low-frequency components of airguns and vessels because the sounds that these species produce are of similar very low frequency, more so than most other mysticete species. The potential sensitivity of mysticetes to the mid- to high-frequency SBPs, the higher frequency MBESs, and pingers is believed to be more variable and generally less sensitive among species.

3.6.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

To assess potential effects of project sound sources on mysticetes, it is important to identify any overlap in their acoustic characteristics with those of the acoustic sources that would be used during the seismic surveys. We assume that mysticetes can detect project sources whose sounds overlap in frequency with those produced by mysticetes. In addition, they may hear some sounds at lower or higher frequencies. It is also plausible that a mysticete could potentially be harmed by the sound energy (if exposed to high enough levels for a sufficient period) even if the sound's frequencies are outside the hearing sensitivity range of the animal (see Section 3.6.4.3). The degree of overlap between the frequencies produced by the airguns, general MBES, SBPs, pingers, and project vessels and (on the other hand) the calls and auditory sensitivity of mysticetes is described below (also see Table 3.6-2).

Mysticetes are considered most sensitive to low-frequency sounds (Richardson et al. 1995a; Southall et al. 2007). However, the frequency range over which mysticetes as a group are believed to hear sounds is approximately 7 Hz to 22 kHz (Table 3.6-2) (Richardson et al. 1995a; Southall et al. 2007).

The airguns and airgun arrays have dominant frequency components of 2-188 Hz. This frequency range broadly overlaps the lower part of the frequency range of mysticete calls (see Table 3.6-2). Airguns also produce a small proportion of their sound at mid- and high frequencies, although at progressively lower levels with increasing frequency (see Chapter 2 and Appendix E). In general, most of the energy in the sound pulses emitted by airgun arrays is at low frequencies, with strongest spectrum levels below 200 Hz, considerably lower spectrum levels above 1000 Hz, and smaller amounts of energy emitted up to approximately 150 kHz (Goold and Fish 1998; Sodal 1999; Goold and Coates 2006; Potter et al. 2007) (Appendix E). These frequencies overlap all frequencies produced by mysticetes. Sounds from the project airguns would be high enough to be detected by mysticetes out to tens of miles or more. Furthermore, the pulsed sounds associated with seismic exploration have higher peak levels than most other anthropogenic sounds to which marine animals are routinely exposed (Richardson et al. 1995a).

The MBES proposed for the *Langseth* is the Kongsberg EM122 which operates at frequencies of approximately 10.5-13 (usually 12) kHz with a maximum source level of approximately 242 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) (Table 2-5). Four other MBESs proposed for other project vessels, the Sunbeam 200 and 2100/12, and the Krupp-Atlas HydroSweep DS, also operate near this range (12-15.5 kHz), with maximum source levels of approximately 234 to 237 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms). These frequency ranges overlap the known or suspected frequency sensitivity range of all mysticetes. The other two MBESs proposed for use on project vessels operate at 30 and 95 kHz. The 30-kHz MBES is very likely outside the frequency range audible to any mysticete, and the 95 kHz MBES is far outside the functional hearing range (Southall et al. 2007).

The SBPs associated with the proposed marine seismic activities operate in the MF range of approximately 2.5–7 kHz with a maximum source output of 204 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms). The frequency range of the SBP is within the known or suspected frequency band audible to all mysticete species.

Omnidirectional pingers would also be used during proposed marine seismic surveys (see Chapter 2). A total of 32 omnidirectional pingers will be used for multi-streamer 3-D surveys: seven on each streamer and one on each source array string. Their peak output is 183 dB re 1 µPa-m at 55-110 kHz, with a maximum rate of 3 pings per 10 sec; the transducers are powered by NiCad batteries. Sounds from these pingers are well above and outside the known hearing range of mysticetes (maximum 23 kHz) (Table 3.6-2). In addition, during coring, battery-powered pingers operating at lower frequency will be mounted on coring mechanisms as acoustic location beacons. These pingers produce omnidirectional 12-kHz signals with a source output of approximately 192 dB re 1 µPa-m with one ping of 0.5, 2, or 10 ms duration per second. The source frequency is within the frequency range audible to at least some mysticetes (Table 3.6-2).

Ship engines and the vessel hull itself also emit sounds into the marine environment (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a; NRC 2003a). These broadband sounds have frequencies and amplitudes that would allow them to be heard by mysticetes. The source level of vessel sound would be considerably less than that of the airguns, MBESs, and SBPs, but vessel sound (unlike those other sources) would be emitted continuously (Richardson et al. 1995a). Possible effects of vessel sound on mysticetes are variable. Vessel sound can cause behavioral disturbance in at least some individuals and species (Richardson et al. 1995a). However, the occurrence and nature of responses are variable, depending on species, location, whale activity, novelty of the sound, vessel "behavior", and habitat, among many other

factors (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a; Wartzok et al. 2004; see also Appendix E). Further, vessel sounds would not be at levels expected to cause anything more than possible localized and temporary behavioral changes (Richardson et al. 1995a). In addition, in all oceans of the world, large vessel traffic is currently so prevalent that it is commonly considered a usual source of ambient sound (McDonald et al. 2006). Based on the above, potential effects of vessel sound on mysticetes are considered to be short-term (i.e., minutes) and behavioral in nature and are not further discussed in detail in this document (see review in Appendix E).

In summary, mysticetes can presumably detect acoustic impulses from airguns and vessel sounds (Richardson et al. 1995a). The SBPs and coring pingers, and most of the MBESs, would likely be detectable by some mysticetes based on presumed mysticete hearing sensitivity. This assumption is based only on what is known about their sound production characteristics (Table 3.6-2) and ear structure (Richardson et al. 1995a; Southall et al. 2007).

Types of potential effects from the aforementioned sound sources on mysticetes are described below and summarized in Table 3.6-5. For more detailed information, refer to Appendix E. In general, the potential for adverse effects can be reduced by implementing a mitigation and monitoring program. With effective mitigation, the potential for temporary or permanent adverse effects to mysticete populations through exposure to project sound sources is considered insignificant for all the proposed sound sources. While short-term behavioral effects are expected during exemplary seismic survey operations, no adverse effects are expected on the viability of any mysticete population.

3.6.4.3 Acoustic Effects

The following sections discuss the types of potential acoustic effects that may occur to mysticetes exposed to seismic sounds, MF- and HF-sonar from echosounders and pingers, and other anthropogenic sounds relevant to the proposed action based on the limited available data. Further discussion of these topics is found in Appendix E.

Masking

Masking is defined as the obscuring of sounds of interest by interfering sounds, generally at similar frequencies. Introduced underwater sound will reduce (i.e., mask) the effective communication distance of a marine mammal species if the frequency of the source is close to that used as a signal by the marine mammal, and if the anthropogenic sound is present for a significant fraction of the time (Richardson et al. 1995a). If little or no overlap occurs between the introduced sound and the frequencies used by the species, communication is not expected to be disrupted. Also, if the introduced sound is present only infrequently, communication is not expected to be disrupted much if at all. In general, most energy in sound pulses emitted by airgun arrays is at low frequencies. Among marine mammals, baleen whales are considered particularly vulnerable to masking by industrial sounds as they use low-frequency sound and communicate over great distances (Simmonds et al. 2006). However, the duty cycle of airguns is low. In most situations, high-level airgun sound will only be received for a brief period (<1 sec), with these sound pulses being separated by at least several seconds of relative silence. A single airgun array might cause appreciable masking in only one situation: when propagation conditions are such that sound from each airgun pulse reverberates strongly and persists for much or all of the interval up to the next airgun pulse.

Table 3.6-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated Effects of Seismic Surveys on Mysticetes*

*Species or Groups***	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Balaenidae and *Neobalaenidae* spp. – **Right whale (N Atlantic, N Pacific)**, Pygmy right whale, **Bowhead whale**	N Atlantic right whales shift call frequencies in response to strong vessel sounds (Parks et al. 2007); Bowheads heard calling between seismic pulses (Richardson et al. 1986; Greene et al. 1999a, b), but call rates are reduced (Greene et al. 1999a, b; Blackwell et al. 2009a, b; Koski et al. 2009; Nations 2009).	Temporary behavioral changes and/or avoidance likely upon receipt of airgun sounds at levels <160-170 dB re 1 μPa (rms)(see text); some balaenopterids show little or no displacement during seismic operations (Stone 2003; Moulton and Miller 2005); Bowheads show strong avoidance at received levels of 120-130 dB during migration (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999; Manly et al. 2007); Bowheads more tolerant of seismic survey sound during feeding than during migration (Richardson et al. 1986; Miller et al. 2005; Christi et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009).	Not likely—*Balaenidae* and other mysticetes typically avoid seismic vessels (Richardson et al. 1995a); no specific data on TTS thresholds in mysticetes; auditory thresholds of mysticetes within their frequency band of best hearing believed higher (less sensitive) than for odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). TTS threshold likely >183 dB re (1 μPa)^2-sec SEL (Southall et al. 2007).	Not likely—*Balaenidae* and other mysticetes typically avoid seismic vessels (Richardson et al. 1995a); no specific data on PTS thresholds in mysticetes but likely >198 dB re (1 μPa)^2-sec SEL (Southall et al. 2007).	Auditory impairment or other non-auditory physical effects potentially limited to short distances and unlikely—mysticetes typically avoid seismic vessels (Richardson et al. 1995a); Right whales possibly risk oil ingestion if spill, due to restricted feeding areas (e.g., bays); risk of ship strikes and entanglement in seismic gear for slow-moving species unlikely due to slow speed of seismic vessels and monitoring efforts.	NMFS Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A injury not expected due to behavioral avoidance (and implementation of proposed mitigation measures). Prolonged or population-level effects not likely.
E Pacific gray whale	Increase in call rates and change in call structure noted in response to small boat engine noise (Dahlheim 1987).	Temporary avoidance, displacement and cessation of feeding shown at 3 km from source upon receipt of high level sounds near 170 dB re 1 μPa (rms) (Malme and Miles 1985; Malme et al. 1986, 1988; Johnson 2002; Weller et al. 2002, 2006; Gailey et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2007; Yazvenko et al. 2007a, b).	See *Balaenidae* above.	See *Balaenidae* above.	Auditory impairment or other non-auditory physical effects limited to short distances and unlikely – mysticetes typically avoid seismic vessels (Richardson et al. 1995a).	See *Balaenidae* above.
Humpback whale	Limited possible effects based on other mysticete species (see above).	Temporary avoidance by pods with females at mean received levels of 140 dB re 1 μPa (rms), but some males approached within 179 dB (McCauley et al. 1998); avoidance reaction greater for cow-calf pairs than traveling pods (McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). No avoidance in some surveys (Malme et al. 1985; Mobley 2005).	See *Balaenidae* above.	See *Balaenidae* above.	See E Pacific gray whale above.	See *Balaenidae* above.

Table 3.6-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated Effects of Seismic Surveys on Mysticetes*

*Species or Groups***	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Minke whale	Limited possible effects based on other mysticete species (see above).	Off U.K., all baleen whales (including minkes) tended to remain significantly further from active airguns than in quiet periods (Stone and Tasker 2006). Some individuals showed little or no avoidance during seismic operations (Stone 2003; Moulton and Miller 2005; Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a, b); individual minkes occasionally approached airgun array to near 170-180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) (MacLean and Haley 2004).	See *Balaenidae* above.	See *Balaenidae* above.	See E Pacific gray whale above.	See *Balaenidae* above.
Bryde's whale, **Sei whale**	Limited possible effects based on other mysticete species (see above).	Temporary avoidance or displacement per other mysticete results (e.g., see minke and humpback); no data on Bryde's whales reactions; sei whales less likely to remain submerged during seismic shooting (Stone 2003). Off U.K., all baleen whales (including sei) tended to remain significantly further from active airguns than during quiet periods (Stone and Tasker 2006).	See *Balaenidae* above.	See *Balaenidae* above.	See E Pacific gray whale above.	See *Balaenidae* above.
Fin whale	Called between seismic pulses (McDonald et al. 1995). Ceased calling during pulsed pile-driving noise (Borsani et al. 2005). Limited possible effects per other mysticete species (see above).	Fin whales less likely to remain submerged during seismic shooting (Stone 2003); Off U.K., all baleen whales (including fins) remained significantly further from active airguns than during quiet periods (Stone and Tasker 2006).	See *Balaenidae* above.	See *Balaenidae* above.	See E Pacific gray whale above.	See *Balaenidae* above.
Blue whale	Called between seismic pulses (McDonald et al. 1995; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). Limited possible effects per other mysticete species (see above).	See minke whale above. Off U.K., all baleen whales (including blues) remained significantly further from active airguns than during quiet periods (Stone and Tasker 2006).	See *Balaenidae* above.	See *Balaenidae* above.	See E Pacific gray whale above.	See *Balaenidae* above.

*See text and Appendix E for summary of documented effects of MBES, SBP, and pingers on mysticetes.
****bold*** = ESA-listed species.

Studies of the effects of masking of cetacean sounds by anthropogenic noise, particularly seismic sounds, are limited and results are variable (summarized in Table 3.6-5 and Appendix E). However, masking of marine mammal calls and other natural sounds by pulsed sounds (even from large arrays of airguns) is expected to be limited. Some whales continue calling in the presence of seismic pulses (reviewed in Appendix E). The airgun sounds are pulsed, with quiet periods between pulses, and whale calls often can be heard between the seismic pulses (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986; McDonald et al. 1995; Greene et al. 1999a, b; Nieukirk et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2006). Masking effects in general are discussed further in Appendix E.

Marine mammal communications would not be masked appreciably by MBES or pinger signals given their low duty cycle, the brief period when an individual mammal would potentially be within the MBES beam, and the relatively low source level of a pinger. Furthermore, in the case of mysticetes, both of these signal types are predominantly or entirely at frequencies (>11 kHz) higher than the predominant frequencies in mysticete calls, significantly reducing any potential for masking. Similarly, mysticete communications would not be masked appreciably by the SBP signals given their downward directionality and the brief period when an individual mammal is likely to be within the SBP beam.

Disturbance

Disturbance includes a variety of effects, including subtle to conspicuous changes in behavior, movement, and displacement. Based on NMFS (2001b:9293) and NRC (2005), simple exposure to sound, or brief reactions that do not disrupt behavioral patterns in a potentially significant manner, do not constitute harassment or "taking" (see Sections 1.6.3 and 1.6.4). In this analysis, we interpret "potentially significant" to mean in a manner that might have deleterious effects on the well-being of individual marine mammals or their populations.

Reactions to sound, if any, depend on the species, state of maturity, experience, current activity, reproductive state, time of day, and many other factors (Richardson et al. 1995a; Wartzok et al. 2004; Southall et al. 2007). If a marine mammal reacts briefly to an underwater sound by changing its behavior or moving a small distance, the impacts of the change are unlikely to be significant to the individual, let alone the stock or population. However, if a sound source displaces marine mammals from an important feeding or breeding area for a prolonged period, impacts on the animals could be significant. Given the many uncertainties in predicting the quantity and types of impacts of sound on marine mammals, it is common practice to estimate how many mammals would be present within a particular distance of industrial activities and exposed to a particular level of industrial sound. This approach likely overestimates the numbers of marine mammals that would be affected in some biologically significant manner. One of the reasons for this is that the selected distances/isopleths are based on limited studies indicating that some animals reacted at a particular distance or sound level, whereas the calculation assumes that all animals exposed to this level would react in a biologically significant manner (reviewed in Appendix E).

The sound criteria used to estimate how many mysticetes might be disturbed to some biologically significant degree by seismic survey activities are primarily based on observed reactions of humpback, gray, and bowhead whales to seismic surveys (see Table 3.6-5 and Appendix E). Information is limited or lacking for other mysticete species including N Atlantic and N Pacific right, Bryde's, sei, minke, fin, and blue whales (see Table 3.6-5).

Baleen whales generally tend to avoid operating airguns, but avoidance radii are quite variable among species, locations, whale activities, oceanographic conditions affecting sound propagation, etc. (reviewed

in Richardson et al. [1995a] and Appendices B and E). Whales are often reported to show no overt reactions to pulses from large arrays of airguns at distances beyond a few kilometers, even though the airgun pulses remain well above ambient sound levels out to much longer distances. However, baleen whales exposed to high-level sound pulses from airguns often react by deviating from their normal migration route and/or interrupting their feeding and moving away (reviewed in Appendix E). Strong avoidance reactions by several species of mysticetes to seismic vessels have been observed at ranges up to 3.2-4.3 nm (6-8 km) and occasionally as far as 10.8-16.2 nm (20-30 km) from the source vessel when large arrays of airguns were used (Table 3.6-5 and Appendix E). For migrating gray and bowhead whales, the observed changes in behavior appeared to be of little or no biological consequence to the animals. They simply avoided the sound source by displacing their migration route to varying degrees, but within the natural boundaries of the migration corridors (Table 3.6-5 and Appendix E).

Studies of gray, bowhead, and humpback whales have shown that seismic pulses with received levels of 160-170 dB re 1 µPa (rms) seem to cause obvious avoidance behavior in a substantial portion of the animals exposed (Appendix E). In many areas, seismic pulses from large arrays of airguns diminish to those received levels at distances ranging from 2.4-7.8 nm (4.5-14.5 km) from the source. A substantial proportion of the baleen whales within those distances may show avoidance or other strong disturbance reactions to the airgun array. Subtle behavioral changes sometimes become evident at somewhat lower received levels, and studies summarized in Appendix E have shown that some baleen whale species (notably bowhead and humpback whales), at times show strong avoidance at received levels lower than 160-170 dB re 1 µPa (rms).

Responses of humpback whales to seismic surveys have been studied during migration and on the summer feeding grounds, and there has also been discussion of effects on the Brazilian wintering grounds. During migration off W Australia, McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a) found localized displacement by humpback whales during airgun operations that varied with pod composition, behavior, and received sound levels (see Appendix E). These studies used a 16-airgun 2,678-in^3 seismic array and a single 20-in^3 airgun with source level 227 dB re 1 µPa-1·m (peak-peak). Avoidance reactions (course and speed changes) began at 2.2-2.7 nm (4-5 km) from the full-scale seismic array for traveling pods, with standoff distances at 1.6-2.2 nm (3-4 km) at an estimated received level of 157-164 dB re 1 µPa (rms) (McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). More sensitive resting pods (cow-calf) exhibited a stand-off range of 3.8-6.5 nm (7-12 km) (McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). Avoidance distances with respect to the single airgun were smaller but consistent with the results from the full array in terms of the received sound levels. The mean received level for avoidance was 140 dB re 1 µPa (rms) for humpback pods containing females, and the mean stand-off range occurred at 143 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Some individual humpback whales, especially males, approached to within 328-1,312 ft (100–400 m) of the source, where the maximum received level was 179 dB re 1 µPa (rms). In summary, the McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a, b) studies show evidence of greater avoidance of seismic airgun sounds by pods with females (it was unknown in the study whether they were pregnant) than other pods during humpback migration off W Australia.

Humpback whales on their summer feeding grounds in southeast Alaska did not exhibit persistent avoidance when exposed to seismic pulses from a 100-in^3 airgun (Malme et al. 1985). Some humpbacks seemed "startled" at received levels of 150-169 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Malme et al. (1985) concluded that there was no clear evidence of avoidance, despite the possibility of subtle effects, at received levels up to 172 dB re 1 µPa (rms).

Among wintering humpback whales off Angola (n=52 useable groups), there were no significant differences in encounter rates (sightings/hr) when a 24-airgun array (3,147 in^3 or 5,085 in^3) was operating

vs. silent (Weir 2008). There was also no significant difference in the mean CPA distance of the humpback sightings when airguns were on vs. off (1.6 nm [3.0 km] vs. 1.5 nm [2.7 km], respectively).

Engel et al. (2004) suggested that South Atlantic humpback whales wintering off Brazil may be displaced or even strand upon exposure to seismic surveys. However, the evidence for this was circumstantial, subject to alternative explanations (International Association of Geophysical Contractors [IAGC] 2004), and inconsistent with results from direct studies of humpbacks exposed to seismic surveys in other areas and seasons. After allowance for data from subsequent years, there was "no observable direct correlation" between strandings and seismic surveys (IWC 2007).

Responsiveness of bowhead whales to seismic surveys can be quite variable depending on their activity (migrating vs. feeding). Bowhead whales migrating west across the Alaskan Beaufort Sea in autumn, in particular, are unusually responsive, with substantial avoidance occurring out to distances of 11-16 nm (20-30 km) from a medium-sized airgun source at received sound levels of around 120-130 dB re 1 μPa (rms) (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999; Manly et al. 2007; see also Appendix E). However, bowheads are not as sensitive to seismic sources during the summer feeding season and they typically begin to show avoidance reactions at a received level of about 160-170 dB re 1 μPa (rms) (Richardson et al. 1986; Ljungblad et al. 1988; Miller et al. 2005; Christie et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009). There are no data on reactions of wintering bowhead whales to seismic surveys.

Reactions of migrating and feeding (but not wintering) gray whales to seismic surveys have been studied. In the N Bering Sea, Malme et al. (1986, 1988) estimated, based on small sample sizes, that 50% of E Pacific gray whales stopped feeding in response to pulses from a single 100-in^3 airgun at an average received level of 173 dB re 1 μPa (rms). Another 10% interrupted feeding at received levels of 163 dB re 1 μPa (rms). These findings were generally consistent with studies on larger numbers of gray whales migrating off California (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985) and on W Pacific gray whales feeding off Sakhalin Island, Russia (Gailey et al. 2007; Johnson 2007; Yazvenko et al. 2007a, b), along with a few data on gray whales off British Columbia (Bain and Williams 2006).

Blue, sei, fin, and minke whales (all of which are members of the genus *Balaenoptera*) have sometimes been seen in areas ensonified by airgun pulses (Stone 2003; MacLean and Haley 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006), and calls from blue and fin whales have been localized in areas with airgun operations (e.g., McDonald et al. 1995; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). At times of good sightability, numbers of rorquals seen from seismic vessels off the U.K. during periods when seismic airguns are operating are similar to numbers seen when airguns are silent (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). However, based on observations during 201 seismic surveys off the U.K., all baleen whales (combined, mostly *Balaenoptera* spp.) tended to exhibit localized avoidance, remaining significantly further (on average) from the airguns during seismic operations compared with non-seismic periods (Stone and Tasker 2006). Off Nova Scotia, Moulton and Miller (2005) found little or no difference in sighting rates and initial sighting distances of balaenopterid whales when airguns were operating vs. silent. However, there were indications that these whales were more likely to be moving away when seen during airgun operations. Similarly, ship-based monitoring studies of blue, fin, sei, and minke whales offshore of Newfoundland found no more than small differences in sighting rates and swim directions during seismic vs. non-seismic periods (Moulton et al. 2005; 2006 a, b). Minke whales have occasionally been observed to approach active airgun arrays where received sound levels were estimated to be near 170-180 dB re 1 μPa (MacLean and Haley 2004). In the SE Caribbean, the closest CPA of Bryde's/unidentified whales to a seismic vessel towing a large airgun array (20 Bolt airguns, total volume 6947 in^3) tended to be closer during non-seismic periods

(mean 4,537 ft [1,383 m]) vs. seismic periods (mean 7,185 ft [2,190 m]), although the sample size was small (n=9).

Data on short-term reactions (or lack of reactions) by cetaceans to impulsive sounds are not necessarily indicative of long-term effects. It is unknown whether impulsive sounds affect reproductive rate or distribution and habitat use in subsequent days or years. However, gray whales have continued to migrate annually along the west coast of North America with substantial increases in the population over recent years (Appendix A in Malme et al. 1984; Angliss and Outlaw 2005), despite intermittent seismic exploration and much ship traffic in that area for decades. Similarly, bowhead whales have continued to travel to the eastern Beaufort Sea each summer, and their numbers have increased notably despite seismic exploration in their summer and autumn range for many years (Richardson et al. 1987; Angliss and Outlaw 2005). In any event, the brief exposures to sound pulses from the proposed airgun sources are unlikely to result in prolonged effects.

Relatively few studies have been conducted on responses of mysticetes to MF and HF echosounders or pingers similar to the MBES and SBP echosounders, and pingers proposed for the project (reviewed in Appendix E). Available studies indicate that reactions appear to vary by species and circumstance (Appendix E). Whaling catcher boats reported that baleen whales showed strong avoidance of sonar that was sometimes used to track them underwater (Ash 1962; Richardson et al. 1995a). "Ultrasonic" pulses emitted by "whale scarers" during whaling operations tended to scare baleen whales to the surface (Reeves 1992; Richardson et al. 1995a). During exposure to a 21-25 kHz whale-finding sonar with a source level of 215 dB re 1 µPa-m, gray whales showed slight avoidance behavior at a distance of approximately 656 ft (200 m) (Frankel 2005). Humpback whales wintering in Hawaii moved away from 3.3 kHz sonar sounds, and increased their swimming speeds and track linearity in response to 3.1- to 3.6-kHz sonar sweeps (Maybaum 1990, 1993). No reactions were noted by right, humpback, and fin whales to pingers and sonars at and above 36 kHz, although these species often reacted to sounds at frequencies of 15 Hz to 28 kHz (Watkins 1986).

During the proposed marine seismic surveys, the pings from the MBES, SBP, and pingers would be very short (<1-64 ms) (Table 2-5). Thus, a given mammal would not receive many of the downward-directed MBES or SBP pings as the vessel passes by. Pingers are not directional, but given their lower source levels and the approximately 3-sec spacing between pings, a whale would not be exposed long if at all to any high-level pings. In the case of the MBESs that operate at 30 kHz or higher, their operating frequencies are too high to have any effects on mysticete behavior. During a recent low-energy seismic survey from the R/V *Thompson*, the EM300 MBES, which operates at 30 kHz, operated most of the time, and many cetaceans were seen by PSVOs from aboard the ship (Ireland et al. 2005).

Sounds from an SBP are at a somewhat lower level than those from a MBES, and those from the coring pingers are even weaker (see Section 2.4.3). Therefore, behavioral responses are not expected unless marine mammals are very close to the source. Also, NMFS (2001b) has concluded that momentary behavioral reactions "do not rise to the level of taking" (see Sections 1.6.3 and 1.6.4). Thus, brief exposure of cetaceans to small numbers of signals from the SBP, MBES, or to pingers on coring equipment, would not result in a "take" by harassment as defined above by NMFS (see Chapter 2), even if a brief reaction did occur.

Temporary Hearing Impairment

Temporary hearing impairment or TTS is the mildest form of hearing impairment that can occur during exposure to a strong or high-level sound (Kryter 1985). While experiencing TTS, the hearing threshold rises, and a sound must be stronger in order to be heard. At least in terrestrial mammals, TTS can last

from minutes or hours to (in cases of strong TTS) days. For sound exposures at or somewhat above the TTS threshold, hearing sensitivity of both terrestrial and marine mammals recovers rapidly after exposure to the sound ends (see Appendix E). However, few data on sound levels and durations necessary to elicit mild TTS have been obtained for marine mammals, none have been obtained for mysticetes, and none of the published data concern TTS elicited by exposure to multiple pulses of sound (Southall et al. 2007) (Appendix E).

There has been no specific documentation that TTS occurs for marine mammals exposed to sequences of airgun pulses during operational seismic surveys (Appendix E). NMFS's policy regarding exposure of marine mammals to high-level sounds has been that cetaceans should not be exposed to impulsive sounds ≥180 dB re 1 μPa (rms) (NMFS 2000). This criterion has been used in defining the safety (shut-down) radii for cetaceans for previous seismic surveys. However, those sound levels have ***not*** been considered to be the levels above which TTS might occur. Rather, they were the received levels above which, in the view of a panel of bioacoustics specialists convened by NMFS before TTS measurements for marine mammals started to become available, one could not be certain that there would be no injurious effects, auditory or otherwise, to marine mammals. The 180-dB re 1 μPa (rms) criterion for cetaceans is actually probably quite precautionary (i.e., lower than necessary to avoid TTS) at least for delphinids, belugas, and similar species as discussed in Appendix E and Southall et al. (2007).

Southall et al. (2007) have recommended new noise exposure criteria for marine mammals that account for the now-available scientific data on TTS, the expected offset between the TTS and PTS thresholds, differences in the acoustic frequencies to which different marine mammal groups are sensitive, and other relevant factors (reviewed in Section 2.3.3.2). The proposed sound exposure threshold for onset of TTS in mysticetes from impulse sounds is a cumulative (across pulses) SEL of 183 dB re $(1\ \mu Pa)^2$-sec, after allowance for frequency weighting issues (Southall et al. 2007). However, direct comparison of the 180 dB re 1 μPa (rms) (one pulse) criterion vs. the 183 dB SEL (cumulative) criterion is not possible given differences in how these units are measured, expressed, etc. (see Appendix B for technical details). For preliminary information about this process, and about the anticipated structure of the new criteria for marine mammals see Wieting (2004), NMFS (2005c), and Southall et al (2007). Detailed recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria are provided in Southall et al. (2007).

Monitoring and mitigation measures are designed to detect marine mammals occurring near airguns to avoid exposing them to sound pulses that might, at least in theory, cause TTS (e.g., NMFS 2004b, 2005b, 2005f). In addition, many cetaceans show some avoidance of the area where received levels of airgun sound are high enough such that TTS could potentially occur (see above and Hildebrand 2005). In those cases, the avoidance responses of the animals themselves would reduce or (most likely) eliminate any possibility of hearing impairment.

For mysticetes, there are no data, direct or indirect, on levels or properties of sound that are required to induce TTS. The frequencies to which baleen whales are most sensitive are lower than those to which odontocetes are most sensitive, and natural background noise levels at those low frequencies tend to be higher. As a result, auditory thresholds of baleen whales within their frequency band of best hearing are believed to be higher (less sensitive) than are those of odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004), meaning that baleen whales require sounds to be louder (i.e., higher dB levels) than odontocetes in the frequency ranges at which each group hears the best. From this, it is suspected that received levels causing TTS onset may also be higher in mysticetes (Southall et al. 2007). However, based on preliminary simulation modeling that attempted to allow for various uncertainties in assumptions and variability around population means, Gedamke et al. (2008) suggested that some baleen

whales whose closest point of approach to a seismic vessel is 1 km or more could experience TTS or even PTS. Nonetheless, no cases of TTS in mysticetes are expected given three considerations: (1) the low abundance of baleen whales in most parts of the exemplary analysis areas, (2) the strong likelihood that baleen whales would avoid the approaching airguns (or vessel) before being exposed to levels high enough for there to be any possibility of TTS (Gordon et al. 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006; Wilson et al. 2006), and (3) the mitigation measures that are proposed (see Section 2.4.1.1).

In addition to airguns and airgun arrays, MBESs are proposed for scientific research as echosounders to study ocean bottom sediment characteristics, etc. TTS through exposure to the downward-directed MBES sounds is highly unlikely to occur. Kremser et al. (2005) noted that the probability of a cetacean swimming through the area of exposure when an MBES emits a ping is small. The animal would have to pass the transducer at close range and be swimming at speeds similar to the vessel in order to be subjected to sound levels that could cause TTS (Kremser et al. 2005). Given the maximum source level of 242 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) for the *Langseth's* proposed MBES (Table 2-5), the received level for an animal within the beam 328 ft (100 m) below the ship would be about 202 dB re 1 µPa (rms), assuming 40 dB of spreading loss. Given the MBES's narrow beam, only one ping is likely to be received by a given animal. The received energy level from a single ping of duration 15 ms would be about 184 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$, i.e., 202 dB + 10 log (0.015 sec). That is below the TTS threshold for a cetacean exposed to a non-impulse sound (195 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$) and even further below the anticipated PTS threshold (215 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$) (Southall et al. 2007). Furthermore, auditory thresholds of baleen whales within their frequency band of best hearing are believed to be higher (less sensitive) than those of odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004).

Source levels of the SBPs, another type of echosounder, are lower (maximum source level 222 dB re 1 µPa [rms]) than those of the MBES discussed above (Table 2-5). Thus, there is even less likelihood of TTS occurring through exposure to SBP sounds, even in an animal that is briefly near the source. The SBP is usually operated simultaneously with other higher-power acoustic sources. Many marine mammals, particularly mysticetes, move away in response to the approaching higher-power sources or the vessel itself before the mammals are close enough for there to be any possibility of effects from the SBP's less-intense sounds. For any mysticetes that do not avoid the approaching vessel and its various sound sources, mitigation measures implemented to minimize effects of other acoustic sources (e.g., airguns) would further reduce or eliminate any potential minor temporary effects of the SBP.

Sound levels produced by project pingers (maximum source level about 192 dB re 1 µPa [rms]) are not considered high enough to cause TTS even in an animal that is briefly near the source based on the recently recommended exposure thresholds presented in Southall et al. (2007) (see also previous paragraphs).

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

When PTS occurs, there is physical damage to the sound receptors in the ear (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a). In some cases, there can be total or partial deafness, whereas in other cases, the animal has an impaired ability to hear sounds in specific frequency ranges. There is no specific evidence that exposure to airgun pulses can cause PTS in any marine mammal, even with large airguns arrays (Appendix E). However, given the likelihood that some marine mammals close to an airgun array might incur at least mild TTS (see Finneran et al. 2002), there has been further speculation about the possibility that some

individuals occurring very close to airguns might incur PTS (Richardson et al. 1995a:372ff; Gedamke et al. 2008).

In terrestrial mammals, single or occasional occurrences of mild TTS are not indicative of permanent auditory damage, but repeated or (in some cases) single exposures to a level well above that causing TTS onset might elicit PTS (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a and Southall et al. 2007). Relationships between TTS and PTS thresholds have not been studied in marine mammals, but are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals. PTS might occur at a received sound level at least several decibels above that inducing mild TTS if the animal were exposed to high-level sound pulses with rapid rise time (see Appendix E). The specific difference between the PTS and TTS thresholds has not been measured for marine mammals exposed to any sound type. However, based on data from terrestrial mammals, a precautionary assumption is that the PTS threshold for impulse sounds (such as airgun pulses as received close to the source) is at least 6 dB higher than the TTS threshold on a peak-pressure basis, and probably more than 6 dB (Southall et al. 2007).

When exposure to impulse sound is measured in SEL units, Southall et al. (2007) estimate that received levels would need to exceed the TTS threshold by at least 15 dB for there to be risk of PTS. Thus, for cetaceans they estimate that the PTS threshold might be an SEL of about 198 dB re $(1\ \mu Pa)^2$-sec. Given the higher level of sound necessary to cause PTS as compared with TTS, it is even less likely that PTS could occur during a proposed seismic survey. In fact, even the levels immediately adjacent to the airguns may not be sufficient to induce PTS, especially because a mammal would not be exposed to more than one high-level pulse unless it swam immediately alongside the airgun for a period longer than the inter-pulse interval. The low-to-moderate levels of TTS that have been induced in captive odontocetes and pinnipeds during controlled studies have shown no measurable residual PTS (Kastak et al. 1999; Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002; Nachtigall et al. 2003, 2004). Southall et al. (2007) note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 230 dB re 1 µPa (peak).

The possibility of PTS through exposure to MBES or SBP sounds is considered negligible and PTS is not expected to occur. Burkhardt et al. (2008) concluded that immediate direct injury was possible only if a cetacean dived under the vessel into the immediate vicinity of the transducer. As summarized above for TTS, only one such ping is likely to be received by a given animal, given the narrow emitted beam of these echosounders combined with the moving vessel. This received signal would be at a level well below the anticipated PTS threshold of about 215 dB re $(1\ \mu Pa)^2$-sec (Southall et al. 2007). Expected avoidance behavior and adequate mitigation and monitoring further minimize the low possibility of PTS. Furthermore, PTS (or any injury or pathological effect) has never been demonstrated for any marine mammal exposed to echosounders such as the proposed MBESs and SBPs.

PTS via exposure to sounds from the proposed pingers is not anticipated. The source levels for the pingers are approximately 183 dB and 192 dB re 1 µPa (rms) and the durations of pings are short. As a result, received SEL values both for single pings and for short sequences of pings will be well below the threshold at which PTS may occur for non-impulses (approximately 215 dB re $(1\ \mu Pa)^2$-sec) (see Section 2.3.3).

As discussed previously, mysticetes generally avoid the immediate area around operating seismic vessels (see also Appendix E). Implementation of proposed monitoring and mitigation measures (including visual monitoring, PAM, ramp ups, and power downs or shut downs of the airguns when marine mammals are seen within the safety radii) will minimize the already low probability of exposure of marine mammals to sounds high enough to induce PTS.

Strandings and Mortality

Marine mammals close to underwater detonations of high explosives can be killed or severely injured, and the auditory organs are especially susceptible to injury (Ketten et al. 1993; Ketten 1995). However, explosives are no longer used for NSF-funded or USGS seismic research; they have been replaced by airguns and other non-explosive sources. Airgun pulses are less energetic and have slower rise times, and there is no evidence that they can cause serious injury, death, or stranding even in the case of large airgun arrays. However, the association of strandings of beaked whales with naval exercises and, in one case, an L-DEO seismic survey (Malakoff 2002; Cox et al. 2006), has raised the possibility that beaked whales (an odontocete) exposed to high-level pulsed sounds may be especially susceptible to injury and/or behavioral reactions that can lead to stranding (see the detailed summary of this topic for odontocetes in Section 3.7.4 and Appendix E). Hildebrand (2005) reviewed the association of cetacean strandings with high-intensity sound events and found that deep-diving odontocetes, primarily beaked whales, were by far the predominant (95%) cetaceans associated with these events, with less than 2% being mysticete whales (minke).

Seismic pulses and MF sonar sounds are quite different. Sounds produced by airgun arrays are broadband with most of the energy below 1 kHz. Typical military MF sonars operate at frequencies of 2-10 kHz, generally with a relatively narrow bandwidth at any one time. Thus, it is not appropriate to assume that the effects of military sonar on marine mammals are similar to the potential effects of airguns on marine mammals. For example, resonance effects (Gentry 2002) and acoustically-mediated bubble-growth (Crum et al. 2005) are implausible in the case of exposure to broadband airgun pulses. However, evidence that sonar signals can, in special circumstances, lead to physical damage and mortality (Balcomb and Claridge 2001; NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001; Jepson et al. 2003; Fernández et al. 2004, 2005a, 2005b; Cox et al. 2006), even if indirectly, suggests that caution is warranted when dealing with exposure of marine mammals to any high-intensity pulsed sound.

Proposed MBESs (i.e., echosounders) are also quite different than sonars used for Navy operations. Signal duration of the MBESs is very short (0.2 to 20 ms; Table 2-5) relative to the naval sonars (at least a few hundred milliseconds, and sometimes longer). Also, at any given location, an individual marine mammal would be in the beam of the MBES for much less time given the generally downward orientation of the beam and its narrow fore-aft beamwidth. (Navy sonars often use near-horizontally-directed sound.) Those factors would all reduce the sound energy received from the MBES rather drastically relative to that from the sonars used by the Navy. No strandings or mortalities of marine mammals are predicted due to project operation of the MBES or the lower-energy SBPs or pingers.

There is no conclusive evidence of cetacean strandings as a result of exposure to seismic surveys. Speculation concerning a possible link between seismic surveys and strandings of humpback whales in Brazil (Engel et al. 2004) was not well founded (IAGC 2004; IWC 2007). Based on available data, no strandings or injuries of baleen whales are anticipated during the proposed marine seismic surveys with implementation of the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures.

Other Physiological Effects

Theoretically, non-auditory physiological effects or injuries are possible in marine mammals close to high-level underwater acoustic sources. These effects might include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, resonance, and other types of organ or tissue damage (Cox et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007) (Appendix E). It is possible that some marine mammal species (e.g., beaked whales) may be especially susceptible to injury and/or stranding when exposed to high-level pulsed sounds. However, as summarized below, there is no definitive evidence that any of these effects occur even for marine

mammals in close proximity to large airgun arrays. Even if gas and fat embolisms can at times occur during exposure of beaked whales to MF sonar, there is no evidence that that type of effect occurs in baleen whales exposed to airgun sounds. Given the brief duration of exposure (i.e., seconds) of any marine mammal to high-level seismic sounds, the intermittent nature of airgun sounds, and implementation of monitoring and mitigation measures, it is unlikely that these effects would occur during the proposed seismic survey activities.

In general, little is known about the potential for seismic survey sounds to cause auditory impairment or other physical effects in marine mammals. Available data suggest that such effects, if they occur at all, would probably be limited to unusual situations when animals might be exposed at close range for unusually long periods and probably to projects involving large airgun arrays. Examples might include situations where the sound is strongly channeled with less-than-normal propagation loss, or when dispersal of the animals is constrained by shorelines, shallows, etc. Airgun pulses, because of their brevity and intermittence, are less likely to trigger resonance or bubble formation than are more prolonged sounds. The available data do not allow identification of a specific exposure level above which such effects can be expected (Southall et al. 2007), or any meaningful quantitative predictions of the numbers (if any) of marine mammals that might be affected in those ways. Most mysticetes show behavioral avoidance of seismic vessels and are considered especially unlikely to incur auditory impairment or other physical effects from acoustic sources associated with seismic surveys. In addition, mitigation measures including shut downs of the airguns if a marine mammal occurred within a given distance from the vessel would reduce or eliminate any potential impacts.

3.6.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Entanglement

Entanglements occur when marine mammals become wrapped around cables, lines, nets, or other objects suspended in the water column. During seismic operations, numerous cables, lines, and other objects primarily associated with the airgun array and hydrophone streamers will be towed behind the survey ship near the water's surface. Personnel on seismic vessels have reported that sea turtles (number unspecified) became fatally entrapped between gaps in tail-buoys associated with industrial seismic vessel gear off West Africa in 2003 (Weir 2007). However, we are not aware of any cases of entanglement of mysticetes in seismic survey equipment. No incidents of entanglement of marine mammals with seismic survey gear have been documented in over 54,000 nm (100,000 km) of previous NSF-funded seismic surveys when PSVOs were aboard (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Haley and Koski 2004; Holst 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a; Haley and Ireland 2006; SIO and NSF 2006b; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008).

However, incidents of entanglement by marine mammals, including mysticetes, in fishing gear are well known. Heyning and Lewis (1990) noted that gray whales were the most frequently entangled species (94% of records) in southern California. Most of the entangled gray whales were three years of age or younger (<33 ft [10 m] in length), and many of the live entanglements were released alive. However, entanglement in fishing gear often leads to mortality of baleen whales, and it is unknown whether entanglement has any long-term effects on live-released whales (Moore and Clarke 2002).

Towing of hydrophone streamers or other equipment is not expected to significantly interfere with whale movements, including migration. Whales could swim below such equipment as it is towed near the surface. Although entanglement with the streamer is theoretically possible, it has not been documented during tens of thousands of miles of NSF-sponsored seismic cruises (see above) or, to our knowledge, during hundreds of thousands of miles of industrial seismic cruises. However, the R/V *Langseth* would tow multiple streamers several km or more in length during some surveys. Thus, the apparent low risk of

entanglement could be slightly greater for such surveys than during past NSF-sponsored cruises that towed fewer streamers.

Ingestion

In the highly unlikely event of an oil or fuel spill from a seismic vessel, marine mammals could ingest oil with water or contaminated food, or oil could be absorbed through the respiratory tract. Mysticete species like the humpback and right whales that feed in confined areas (e.g., bays) may be at greater risk of ingesting oil (Würsig 1990). Some ingested oil could be voided in vomit or feces but some would likely be absorbed and could cause toxic effects (Geraci 1990). When returned to clean water, contaminated animals can expel this internal oil through urine or feces (Engelhardt 1978, 1982). Cetaceans exposed to an oil spill are unlikely to ingest enough oil to cause serious internal damage (Geraci and St. Aubin 1980, 1982).

Cetaceans may also inhale vapors from volatile fractions of oil from a spill. The most likely effects of inhalation of these vapors would be irritation of respiratory membranes and absorption of hydrocarbons into the bloodstream (Geraci 1990). Stressed individuals that could not escape a contaminated area would be most at risk due to the duration of exposure.

In mysticetes, crude oil could coat the baleen and reduce filtration efficiency (Braithwaite et al. 1983). However, in one study, the filtration efficiency of baleen did not change when experimentally fouled with oil (St. Aubin et al. 1984), and most adherent oil was removed within 30 min after fouling (Geraci and St. Aubin 1985). The effects of oiling of baleen on feeding efficiency appear to be only minor (Geraci 1990).

Ship Strikes

The risk of collision of seismic vessels or towed/deployed equipment with marine mammals exists but is extremely unlikely. This is based on the relatively slow operating speed (typically 4-5 kt or 7-9 km/h) of the vessel during seismic operations, and the generally straight-line movement of the seismic vessel. Although a seismic vessel would travel faster during transits to and from seismic survey sites (approximately 10 kt or 18 km/h), movement would be predominantly in a straight line, with typically gradual changes in orientation. Theoretically, this should make the vessel tracks more predictable for whales than vessels engaged in erratic changes in headings and speeds, thereby allowing time for whales to move out of the vessel's path. However, there is some indication that some whales do not move out of the way of vessels on a consistent heading (see next paragraph). In addition, studies indicate that vessels traveling at higher speeds than those typical of the proposed seismic vessels are more likely to collide with whales (Laist et al. 2001; Jensen and Silber 2003). The presence of trained on-board observers to alert ship crew of nearby cetaceans significantly minimizes the risk of ship strikes and other equipment collisions with whales. A general background on collisions between vessels, equipment and marine mammals is presented below.

Collisions between ships and marine mammals occur in many parts of the world, particularly with baleen whales (Laist et al. 2001; Moore and Clarke 2002; Jensen and Silber 2003; Van Waerebeek et al. 2006; Knowlton and Brown 2007). Vessel operators attempt to avoid colliding with marine mammals. In addition to injury or death of the animal, such collisions can result in damage to the vessel. Many species of baleen whales tend to show avoidance in response to vessels (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a; Macleod et al. 2006). However, avoidance does not always prevent collisions, injury, and mortality of whales, especially for the slower-swimming species such as right whales (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a; Jensen and Silber 2003; Knowlton and Brown 2007). Migrating gray whales appear more susceptible to vessel collisions than other whale species (Laist et al. 2001). In the North Atlantic,

endangered right whales are also known to be highly susceptible to vessel collisions, experiencing significant mortality and damage from collisions (Laist et al. 2001; Jensen and Silber 2003; Knowlton and Brown 2007). Shipping has been restricted in some areas of the Northwest Atlantic, such as the Bay of Fundy, during times when right whales congregate there. Off the east coast of the U.S., NMFS has recommended vessel routes and vessel speed reductions to reduce the number of collisions. Collisions have also been reported for other species of mysticetes, including humpback, fin, and minke whales (Barlow et al. 1994; Richardson et al. 1995a; Laist et al. 2001; Jensen and Silber 2003; Van Waerebeek et al. 2006; Knowlton and Brown 2007).

Although most whales try to avoid ships, a close approach and potentially a collision can occur when a slow-swimming whale attempts to flee ahead of a faster moving vessel (Richardson et al. 1985, 1995a). The likelihood of collisions increases during darkness and poor weather conditions, particularly fog, thunderstorms, and high seas. Special care is needed to minimize the chance of collisions during poor visibility. It also appears likely that most impacts are not reported. For example, large vessels may be unaware that an impact has occurred. Often, impacts are only realized after-the-fact if the whale remains caught on the front of the ship when the vessel enters port.

There is also the potential for collision between whales and seismic gear including lines and cables towed or deployed from seismic vessels (e.g., hydrophone streamers, buoys, coring equipment). Such collisions have not been reported during previous seismic vessel activities (see also *Entanglement* above).

In summary, the risk of collision of seismic vessels or towed/deployed equipment with marine mammals exists but is extremely unlikely given the operating characteristics of the seismic vessels during proposed seismic surveys and transit to and from the area of proposed operations.

Other Activities

The proposed seismic research surveys could include other activities such as coring, dredging, sediment sampling, and the deployment of OBS/Hs (see Chapter 2). These operations are typically small-scale (i.e., very localized, transitory, and small in physical dimensions) and related directly to academic geophysical research goals involving scientific sampling. There has never been a related adverse impact in over 54,000 nm (100,000 km) of previous NSF-funded seismic surveys (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Haley and Koski 2004; Holst 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a; Haley and Ireland 2006; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008). Potential direct effects include temporary localized disturbance or displacement from associated sounds and/or physical movement/actions of the operations (the potential for sound-related effects and collisions was discussed previously). Potential indirect effects to mysticetes consist of very localized and transitory/short-term disturbance of bottom habitat and associated prey in shallow-water areas as a result of coring, dredging, sediment sampling, and (minimally) deployment of ocean-bottom hydrophones. Mitigation and monitoring, including dedicated watches for marine mammals and avoidance of sensitive habitats and/or periods for ESA-listed species, minimize the potential for adverse effects.

3.6.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Alternatives A and B consist of a combination of monitoring and mitigation measures developed in consultation with NMFS designed to minimize the potential effects of NSF-funded or USGS seismic survey activities on marine mammals (reviewed in Chapter 2). These measures have been implemented during previous NSF-funded academic seismic cruises (Table 2-1) in accordance with the individual IHAs issued by NMFS for each such cruise. For the purposes of analysis in this PEIS, the mitigation (i.e., shut-down and power-down) radii that would be implemented under Alternative A were predicted

separately for the five DAAs, allowing for the planned airgun configuration and expected site- and season-specific environmental conditions. Under Alternative B, there would be a proposed 100-m MZ for low-energy sources, but for the purposes of this PEIS, low-energy sources were modeled and the resulting MZs were found to be less than the proposed low-energy source 100-m MZ under Alternative B. These mitigation radii are the distances where the received levels of airgun sounds at each site are expected to match the current (rms) pressure criteria (see Appendix B for further details). For the eight QAAs, safety radii were not modeled for this analysis, although site-specific safety radii would be modeled for an actual survey, were it proposed in the future. For this analysis, potential effects in the QAAs were evaluated based on their similarities with the five acoustically modeled DAAs (Table 2-7) and the general review of seismic effects.

The primary monitoring and mitigation measures for all of the exemplary seismic surveys considered herein are briefly listed below and described fully in Chapter 2.

- Pre-planning of each cruise to identify seasonal periods with the least potential for impacts and the smallest airgun array that could be used and still meet the geophysical scientific objectives.
- Employing trained and experienced PSVOs approved by NMFS.
- Minimum of one observer maintaining a visual watch for marine mammals during all daytime airgun operations.
- Two observers maintaining a visual watch for marine mammals from 30 min before the start of ramp ups through the duration of the ramp ups (and when possible at other times) during the day and at night.
- PAM via towed hydrophones during both day and night (when practicable) in shallow-water areas where large airgun arrays are to be operated and/or the full mitigation radius is not visible (to be determined prior to each cruise in consultation with NMFS).
- Power downs (or if necessary shut downs) when marine mammals or sea turtles are detected in or about to enter designated mitigation zones identified specifically for each airgun array at each analysis area (Table 2-11). During a shut down or power down, the airguns would be shut down or powered down for 30 min following the last sighting of a mysticete.

On a site-specific basis, additional mitigation and monitoring measures may be implemented. These measures would be determined in coordination with NMFS based on the best available, site-specific information on marine mammals in a selected seismic survey area. Measures could also be adapted based on information obtained in-situ during a seismic cruise, particularly in previously undescribed areas. Such measures could include:

- avoiding or remaining a minimum distance from certain areas considered important to mysticetes (e.g., breeding, feeding, migration, etc.) whose use coincides with the season of the survey;
- implementing other site-specific mitigation measures on an adaptive mitigation approach based on data obtained during the cruise, in coordination with NMFS;
- adjusting mitigation radii based on any new data that may become available after completion of this PEIS. For example, NSF is aware that NMFS is developing new sound-exposure guidelines for marine mammals that have not yet been approved for use (Southall et al. 2007). NSF will be prepared to revise its procedures for estimating numbers of marine mammals that might be "taken" (per the ESA and MMPA) via sound exposure, mitigation radii, etc., as may be required at some future date by the new guidelines.

The following analysis of the environmental consequences of Alternative A and Alternative B on mysticetes assumes that the above and other monitoring and mitigation measures described in Chapter 2 would be implemented. The MBESs, SBPs, and pingers are not expected to significantly affect mysticetes given the lower acoustic exposures relative to airguns and other factors summarized in Sections 3.6.1.5, 3.6.4, and 3.6.5.

3.6.5.1 Acoustic Effects

This section summarizes the various types and levels of potential acoustic effects on mysticetes in the analysis areas anticipated to occur during the exemplary seismic cruises. Factors influencing the estimated level of potential acoustic effects of the seismic surveys on mysticetes include:

- The predicted occurrence and densities of mysticetes at each site during the exemplary seismic survey period based on available information and data.
- The number, volumes and depths of the airguns to be used, and the area-specific environmental factors that influence acoustic propagation.
- For DAAs, the estimated distances at which received levels of airgun sounds are predicted to equal the three SEL criteria applied for mysticetes (Table 2-8).
- For DAAs, both flat (unweighted) and M-weighting approaches were utilized and are presented in Appendix B. However, Table 3.6-6 presents the exposures based on flat-weighted calculations. M-weighting accounts for the high sensitivity of mysticetes (as compared with other groups of marine mammals) to low frequencies; all mysticetes belong to the LF hearing group.
- The numbers and corresponding percent of regional populations of mysticetes estimated to be exposed to the modeled received sound levels specific to each DAA.

The factors listed above interact to result in differing site-specific estimates of the number of individual mysticetes that could potentially be exposed to sound levels equal to or greater than the selected acoustic threshold criteria levels (see Appendix B). Table 3.6-6 summarizes estimated numbers of mysticetes potentially exposed to the relevant levels of sound, and corresponding percentages of regional populations that might be impacted by proposed seismic survey activities within the DAAs under Alternative A (see also Appendix B). Numbers of mysticete exposures are presented based on the exposure criteria discussed in Section 2.3.3 and listed in Table 2-8.

NMFS had not, at the time of writing of this document, officially identified or implemented any energy-based criteria; however, energy-based criteria may be adopted by NMFS in the future (Appendix E). The A_e columns in Table 3.6-6 summarize numbers of mysticetes that might be exposed to cumulative energy levels exceeding the SEL criterion proposed by Southall et al. (2007) for mysticetes, i.e., 198 dB re $(1\ \mu Pa)^2 \cdot s$. No energy-based Level B criteria have been proposed (Southall et al. 2007), and this PEIS does not attempt to apply cumulative energy criteria to estimate Level B take. Modeled numerical estimates of exposure are considered precautionary (likely overestimated) because they do not account for individual whales that are expected to avoid the sounds. The AIM model assumes baseline "undisturbed" distribution and movement of animals whether or not airgun sounds are being emitted.

Table 3.6-6. Estimated Number of Level A and B Exposures (Individuals) of Mysticetes to Seismic Survey Sound with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs Based on Modeling Results

	NW Atlantic (N Atlantic pop)[(a)]			*Caribbean (N Atlantic pop)*[(a)]			*S California (N Pacific pop)*[(a)]			*W Gulf of Alaska (N Pacific pop)*[(a)]			*Galapagos Ridge (S Hemisphere pop)*[(a)]		
	Exposure Criterion[(b)]			*Exposure Criterion*[(b)]			*Exposure Criterion*[(b)]			*Exposure Criterion*[(b)]			*Exposure Criterion*[(b)]		
Species	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*
N Atlantic right whale	0.2 *0.07*	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
N Pacific right whale	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3 *0.08*	0.0	0.0	-	-	-
Bowhead whale	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
E Pacific gray whale	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	150.7 *0.8*	12.5 *0.07*	0.0	-	-	-
Humpback whale	0.7 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.3 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	186.2 *≤3.1*	19.1 *0.3*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minke whale (Common & Antarctic)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	46.4 *0.2*	3.0 *0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bryde's & Eden's whales[(c)]	-	-	-	1.4 *<1*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	16.8 *0.1*	0.6 *<0.01*	0.0
Sei whale	0.1 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fin whale	1.3 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.2 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	161.9 *≤1.2*	14.3 *0.1*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blue whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9 *≤0.02*	0.0	0.0

[(a)]Population estimates from Table 3.6-1 are combined for E and W areas of the respective oceans (note: % of impacted N Pacific right whales would be higher if based on eastern population only). Where a range of population estimates is available, the lowest is used, thus maximizing the estimated percent of population that might be exposed.

- = not present; *italics* = estimated percent of regional population impacted; **bold** = ESA-listed species.

[(b)]Exposure Criteria (flat weighted): **Bp** = NMFS Level B harassment -- pressure units (rms), corresponding to exposure to ≥160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) received sound level above which behavioral changes expected to occur. **Ap** = NMFS Level A harassment – pressure units (rms), corresponding to exposure to ≥ 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) received sound level above which the potential for injury was suspected at the time this criterion was implemented by NMFS. **Ae** = Level A – cumulative energy (SEL) – corresponding to Level A criterion applied in this analysis to identify the level above which there is potential for injury (e.g., PTS), based on limited empirical results from a few small odontocete species (Southall et al. 2007). See also Appendix B. For the purpose of analysis, for non-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.5 animal as presented in Appendix B, Tables B-13 – B-17 are considered an actual exposure. For ESA-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.05 animal as presented in Appendix B, Tables B-13 – B-17 are considered an actual exposure.

[(c)]N Atlantic population data unavailable for Bryde's whale, so % shown is an estimate; ETP population size was used for the Galapagos Ridge, as population estimates for the S Hemisphere are not available. Includes the newly discovered Eden's whale.

Table 2-11 shows the estimated mitigation radii under Alternatives A and B for the exemplary seismic surveys that are assumed to occur in the five DAAs. As discussed elsewhere, the mitigation distances around the airguns vary with number and volume of airgun(s) and arrays, water depth, sound velocity profile, bottom type, etc. (Appendix B). In general, for the small airguns and arrays (e.g., two GI guns, two pairs GI guns), the estimated mitigation radii for mysticetes at all water depths are typically smaller than the radii for larger airgun arrays. Conversely, the modeled mitigation radii for the largest airgun arrays (e.g., 36 airguns) are considerably larger. For example, in the exemplary DAAs, regardless of water depth and other factors (e.g., M-weighting), the modeled mitigation radii for the small airguns/arrays range from 0-210 ft (0-64 m) compared to 250-4,390 ft (76-1,338 m) for large arrays (Table 2-11).

In addition to the type of airgun array used, it is clear from Appendix B (Tables B-7 – B-12) that water depth strongly influences the mitigation radii. Any given received sound level occurs farther from the airgun arrays in shallow and intermediate waters (<3,281 ft [1,000 m]) compared to deep water (>3,281 ft [1,000 m]) for reasons discussed in Appendix B. Additionally, applying M-weighting diminishes the contribution of frequency components of the seismic sounds for which a given cetacean group is less sensitive, and instead focuses on frequencies within their best hearing range (Appendix B). In general, these factors, combined with the anticipated density of mysticetes in each analysis area, determine the estimated number of exposures of individual mysticetes in each DAA.

Potential acoustic effects are discussed under the following subsections: masking, disturbance, TTS, injury including PTS, other physiological effects, and other potential effects. Most of this discussion focuses on disturbance (i.e., Level B behavioral effects) since this is the primary type of effect anticipated. Detailed discussion of Level B effects, including numerical modeling results, is presented in the *Disturbance* subsection. Potential Level A effects based on pressure and cumulative energy criteria are described in the *Injury* subsection.

Masking

The degree of potential masking in a seismic survey area depends among other things on the strength of the sound source used, propagation conditions, the frequencies of the potentially masked sounds relative to the predominant airgun frequencies, and the density of animals of concern. Therefore, exemplary surveys in the BC Coast and N Atlantic/Iceland QAAs – which may use large 36-airgun arrays and could commonly encounter ESA-listed mysticete species – have greater potential for masking than surveys in other analysis areas. Although ESA-listed mysticetes could also be common in the NW Atlantic, W Australia, W India, and Sub-Antarctic analysis areas, exemplary surveys in these locations would use small airgun sources (<7 airguns) with less potential for masking. Nonetheless, masking attributable to an NSF-sponsored seismic survey is expected to be limited and short-term for all mysticete species in Section 3.6.4.3. It is expected that implementation of Alternative A or B would not result in significant impacts to mysticete individuals or populations due to masking (Table 3.6-5).

Disturbance

Disturbance would be the primary type of effect resulting from the proposed seismic surveys under Alternative A (Tables 3.6-5 and 3.6-6). With the proposed mitigation and monitoring, disturbance is expected to be limited to short-term behavioral changes and localized avoidance by individual mysticetes responding to airgun sound. Short-term behavioral changes are likely for many of the individual mysticetes in the areas ensonified to the Level B criterion sound level of >160 dB re 1 µPa (rms), and in some cases for animals exposed to lower received levels (Table 3.6-5). These effects may occur in any of the exemplary analysis areas where a given mysticete species occurs (Tables 3.6-3 and 3.6-4). However,

there would be no significant impacts to mysticetes at the population level due to disturbance. The percentages of the regional populations estimated to be exposed (under Alternative A or B) to airgun sounds at levels equaling or exceeding Level B disturbance criteria are presented below and in Table 3.6-6 (B_p columns) based on population estimates for the ocean basin of interest.

Level B Exposure Estimates for ESA-listed Mysticetes

This section focuses on ESA-listed species (those shown in boldface in Table 3.6-6) at the ocean-basin population level. It concentrates on areas where the highest numbers of mysticetes are predicted to be exposed to sufficient airgun sound for there to be Level B exposure, and discusses the reasons for differences among DAAs in the potential number of Level B exposures. Again, these are conservative exposure estimates because the modeling does not account for individual mysticetes that are expected to move away from actual seismic survey sounds. Analyses are based on the DAA modeling results presented in Table 3.6-6 and Appendix B, and similarities between the DAAs and QAAs as summarized in Table 2-7. Each species is addressed as an ocean-basin population, since overall significance of effects is assessed at the population level. Potential effects are also discussed based on DAAs and QAAs. The potential for Level A (rms) exposures is discussed below under *Injury*.

Right Whale. Two species of right whales are considered in this analysis: the N Pacific and the N Atlantic (Table 3.6-1). Under Alternative A or B, <1 individual N Pacific right whale would potentially experience Level B exposures in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. This is considered an insignificant amount of behavioral exposure affecting 0.08% of the N Pacific population (Table 3.6-6). N Pacific right whales are not expected to occur in any of the QAAs. In the NW Atlantic DAA, modeling indicates that <1 N Atlantic right whale would potentially experience Level B exposures, and only in shallow water. This is considered an insignificant amount of Level B behavioral exposure affecting 0.07% of the N Atlantic population (Table 3.6-6). The only other analysis area where N Atlantic right whales could occur—and only rarely—is the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA (Table 3.6-4). Although an exemplary large array was modeled for the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA, no impacts are expected on N Atlantic right whales because they are highly unlikely to occur there (see Section 3.6.3.1). Furthermore, assuming similar responses to those documented for the one balaenid species whose reactions to seismic surveys have been studied (the bowhead whale), right whales are expected to avoid seismic survey sounds, in some cases at received levels lower than the Level B criterion (160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}); however, potential avoidance is not considered in the modeling. Therefore, short-term behavioral effects are anticipated for <1 N Atlantic and <1 N Pacific right whale with implementation of Alternative A or B within the DAAs and QAAs. This would not significantly impact or adversely affect these populations, notwithstanding their highly endangered status (Table 3.6-6).

In conclusion, no effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of right whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) may affect and is likely to adversely affect North Atlantic right whales and North Pacific right whales in the NW Atlantic and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs, respectively. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with and authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to right whales. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Humpback Whale. Three regional populations of humpback whales are considered in this analysis based on their occurrence within all the DAAs and QAAs: the N Atlantic, N Pacific, and S hemisphere

populations (Table 3.6-1). However, humpbacks are considered common in only 5 of these 13 analysis areas during the season of the exemplary survey as described below (Tables 3.6-3 and 3.6-4).

In the two DAAs where the N Atlantic population of humpbacks potentially occurs, acoustic modeling estimates that no significant impacts would occur on humpbacks as a result of the exemplary seismic surveys: a maximum of <1 humpback was predicted to experience Level B behavioral exposures in each of the Caribbean and NW Atlantic DAAs, representing insignificant portions (<0.01%) of these regional populations (Table 3.6-6).

Humpbacks are considered common in only one of the two QAAs in the N Atlantic: the Iceland/NW Atlantic QAA where an exemplary large airgun array was considered. Because modeling was not conducted for the QAAs, the anticipated potential level of exposure of humpbacks was qualitatively estimated by comparison with modeled results from DAA(s) with similar species occurrence and/or acoustic environments (in this case, the W Gulf of Alaska DAA). Both exemplary surveys involved all water depth categories, cold water, and similar SSP vs. depth (Table 2-7). However, the airgun array assumed for the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA is larger (36 vs. 18 airguns) and the sound channel near 328-ft (100-m) depth is considerably weaker than in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. Other factors being similar, the higher number of airguns in the QAA might lead to larger effects, but the weaker sound channel might lead to reduced effects. Overall, given the numbers of humpbacks, a small number (relative to population size) of Level B behavioral exposures of humpback whales potentially similar to that estimated for the W Gulf of Alaska DAA could occur within the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA (see Table 3.6-6).

In the two N Pacific DAAs where humpbacks occur, modeling indicates that humpbacks in the S California DAA would not be exposed to sound levels exceeding the Level B criterion (Table 3.6-6 and Appendix B, Table B-16). This is based primarily on their expected zero densities in the shallow-intermediate-depth waters during the exemplary late spring/early summer survey along with the small airgun array size (Table 2-7). In contrast, modeling for the W Gulf of Alaska DAA indicates that 186 humpbacks could experience Level B behavioral exposures (155 whales in shallow water and 31 whales in deep water) during the exemplary seismic cruise, representing $\leq$3.1% of the regional N Pacific population (Table 3.6-6 and Appendix B, Table B-22). No serious injury or mortality of humpback whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of humpback whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or B may affect and is likely to adversely affect humpback whales in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with and authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to humpback whales. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Humpbacks are considered common in the two N Pacific QAAs where they occur: the BC Coast and Marianas (Table 3.6-4). Acoustic conditions, in terms of SSP, are quite different in the BC Coast QAA from those in any of the DAA sites (Appendix B). The BC Coast QAA has shallow to intermediate water depths (<656 ft [<200 m]) and has no sound channel that could trap sound and reduce transmission loss. In contrast, at the W Gulf of Alaska and S California DAA sites, distinct sound channels occur near the water surface and trap sound (Appendix B Sections 6.4 and 6.5). However, at the BC Coast site, endangered humpbacks are common, and the exemplary array is large and would be operated in relatively shallow water. Thus, the potential for Level B exposures at the BC Coast QAA could be similar to the W Gulf of Alaska DAA site (see above). The Marianas QAA is considered most similar to the Galapagos

Ridge (deep water) and Caribbean (shallow water) DAAs in terms of acoustic conditions (Table 2-7). Although very little is known about humpbacks in the Marianas (Section 3.6.3), their potential relative numbers would be considerably reduced during spring when the exemplary survey is proposed, as most N Pacific humpbacks have departed for more northern feeding grounds by spring (Section 3.6.3). Based on the available data, a small number of humpbacks could experience Level B exposures from the exemplary seismic survey during spring in the Marianas QAA. Potential effects on humpbacks at the Marianas QAA could be reduced by delaying a survey until later in spring, when more humpbacks are expected to have departed the winter breeding grounds.

Within the one DAA and four QAAs in the S hemisphere, humpbacks are considered common in only the W Australia QAA (Tables 3.6-3 and 3.6-4). Modeling was conducted only for the one DAA, Galapagos Ridge, where no humpbacks would be exposed to seismic survey sounds given their expected zero densities at the time of the exemplary survey (Table 3.6-6 and Appendix B, Table B-20). The W Australia QAA has dissimilar acoustic properties to all of the five DAAs (Table 2-7 and Appendix B, Section 6.5). The W Australia QAA has a sound speed vs. depth profile that decreases slightly with water depth and has no sound channel; thus, the relatively shallow environment favors refraction of sound toward the bottom (Appendix B). This information, combined with the exemplary small airgun array proposed for the W Australia QAA, suggests that potential exposures to seismic survey sounds would be limited to a small number of Level B behavioral exposures. Furthermore, humpbacks are expected to show some avoidance of seismic sounds based on studies off W Australia and elsewhere (Section 3.6.4 and Table 3.6-5).

Sei Whale. Sei whales are considered rare within all five of the DAAs (Table 3.6-3 and Appendix B, Annex 4). The exemplary seismic survey activities are expected to have no effects on sei whales in any of the DAAs (Tables 3.6-3, 3.6-6, and 3.6-8). In the NW Atlantic DAA, the density of sei whales is estimated at $<0.0001/km^2$ (Appendix B, Table A4-3). Potential effects are possible here only in shallow water and are considered insignificant; <1 sei whale is predicted to receive a Level B behavioral exposure (Table 3.6-6). No serious injury or mortality of sei whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of sei whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or B may affect but is not likely to adversely affect sei whales in the NW Atlantic DAA. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with and authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to sei whales. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Within the eight QAAs, sei whales are rare in six QAAs but possibly common in the Sub-Antarctic QAA and uncommon in the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA. Sei whales would be feeding in both of the latter two areas during summer when the survey is assumed to occur. The populations in those areas are separate (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-4). In the Sub-Antarctic DAA a proposed small seismic airgun array would be used only in deep water. Potential acoustic impacts would be low and limited to Level B behavioral exposures. In the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA, an exemplary large airgun array is proposed for use in shallow to deep waters (Table 2-7). The acoustic conditions at this QAA somewhat resemble the W Gulf of Alaska DAA; however, the proposed airgun array to be used in the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA is larger (36 vs. 18 airguns) and the sound channel near the 328-ft (100-m) depth is considerably weaker than in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA (Table 2-7 and Appendix B, Sections 6.4 and 6.5). Overall, a small number of Level B behavioral exposures could occur among sei whales within the Sub-Antarctic and N Atlantic/Iceland QAAs with no significant impacts to sei whale individuals or populations.

Fin Whale. Among the five DAAs, the fin whale is most likely to occur only in the NW Atlantic and W Gulf of Alaska while feeding (Table 3.6-3). Two different populations of fin whales occur in these areas. In the NW Atlantic, an estimated 1.3 fin whales in shallow water would potentially experience Level B behavioral exposures, representing <0.01% of this population (Table 3.6-6). In contrast, in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, it is estimated 162 fin whales could experience Level B behavioral exposures (123 whales in shallow water and 39 whales in deep water), representing ≤1.2% of the regional N Pacific population (Table 3.6-6). No serious injury or mortality of fin whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of fin whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or B may affect and is likely to adversely affect fin whales in the NW Atlantic and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with and authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to fin whales. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Fin whales are known to occur in four of the eight QAAs, but are considered potentially common in only the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-4). Fin whales would be feeding in this QAA during summer, and predicted effects would be similar to those described above for the humpback and sei whales in the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA. Thus, potential exposure to the proposed seismic survey activities would likely be limited to a small number (relative to population size) of short-term Level B behavioral exposures similar to the W Gulf of Alaska DAA (see Table 3.6-6), and no significant population-level effects are expected.

Blue Whale. The blue whale is considered rare in the five DAAs, with very low densities in the five DAAs (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-3, and Appendix B, Tables A4-3 and A4-6). Blue whales in the five DAAs belong to three regional populations in the N Atlantic, N Pacific, and S Hemisphere, and include three subspecies (Section 3.6.2 and Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-3). In total, <1 blue whale is estimated to potentially experience a Level B behavioral exposure in deep water at the Galapagos Ridge DAA, during the exemplary winter/austral summer survey period, representing <0.02% of the estimated S Hemisphere population or <0.07% of the estimated ETP population (Table 3.6-6 and Appendix B, Table B-20). No serious injury or mortality of blue whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of blue whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or B may affect and is likely to adversely affect blue whales in the Galapagos Ridge DAA. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with and authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to blue whales. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Blue whales may occur in all eight of the QAAs where they belong to four regional populations: N Atlantic, N Pacific, Indian Ocean, and S Hemisphere (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-4). However, they are considered potentially common only in the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA at the time of an exemplary summer seismic survey; they would be feeding there (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-4). Predicted effects here would be similar to those described above for the humpback and fin whales in the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA (Table 3.6-6). Thus, potential impacts from proposed seismic survey activities under Alternative A or B would likely be limited to a small number of Level B behavioral exposures, and those exposures are not anticipated to have significant population-level effects.

Level B Exposure Estimates for Non-ESA Listed Mysticete Species

Six non-ESA listed species of mysticetes occur in the DAAs or QAAs: the E Pacific gray whale, minke whale (including common and Antarctic species and one subspecies), two species of Bryde's whale, and the pygmy right whale (Tables 3.6-1, 3.6-3, and 3.6-4). Because very little is known about the recently discovered new species of Bryde's whale (Eden's whale, see Section 3.6.1), the two species are treated simply as one species – Bryde's whale.

Gray Whale. Under Alternative A, individual gray whales belonging to the E North Pacific population would likely be exposed to exemplary seismic survey activities in one DAA (W Gulf of Alaska) and one QAA (BC Coast). As the expected density of gray whales at the time of the exemplary surveys is 0 within the S California modeling site, and the S California airgun array would be small, gray whales would not be exposed in these analysis areas (Tables A4-2 and A4-5). In the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, modeling indicates that 151 gray whales could experience Level B behavioral exposures (116 whales in shallow water and 35 in deep water), representing 0.8% of the N Pacific population (Tables 3.6-6 and Appendix B, Table B-22). In the BC Coast QAA, a small number of gray whales could experience Level B behavioral exposures in response to the large exemplary airgun array (Table 2-7). This is based on the shallow waters and the shared similarities in acoustic properties with the shallow waters at the Caribbean DAA. No significant population-level effects are anticipated. No serious injury or mortality of gray whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of gray whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. In accordance with the MMPA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to gray whales in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Minke, Antarctic Minke, and Subspecies. For the purposes of modeling, all minkes were combined into one group (Appendix B). The minke whale is the most ubiquitous of the mysticete species, potentially occurring in four of the five DAAs and all eight of the QAAs, representing three regional populations: N Atlantic, N Pacific, and S Hemisphere (Tables 3.6-1, 3.6-3, and 3.6-4). However, the expected density of minkes is zero or nearly zero in all DAAs except the W Gulf of Alaska (density 0.0111/km^2) (see Appendix B, Annex 4). At the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, modeling indicates that 46 minkes could experience Level B behavioral exposures (37 in shallow water and 9 in deep water), representing 0.2% of the N Pacific population (Table 3.6-6). At the S California DAA, modeling indicates that <1 minke could experience Level B behavioral exposures, representing <0.01% of the N Pacific population (Table 3.6-6). No serious injury or mortality of mink whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of minke whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. In accordance with the MMPA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to minke whales in the S California and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

The two QAAs where minkes are considered potentially common are the N Atlantic (Iceland) and N Pacific (BC Coast) regional populations (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-4). At both of these QAAs, a small number of minkes could experience Level B behavioral exposures as described previously for minkes in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA and for fin whales at the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA.

Pygmy Right Whale. The pygmy right whale only occurs in the S Hemisphere where it is considered potentially uncommon to common only in the Sub-Antarctic QAA; no reliable population estimates are available for this species. Given the small size of the proposed airgun array and its operation only in deep water, as well as some acoustic similarities with the S California DAA (Table 2-7), a small number of pygmy right whales could experience Level B behavioral exposures at the Sub-Antarctic QAA. Overall, no significant impacts on pygmy right whales are expected at the population level with implementation of Alternative A.

Bryde's Whale. Based on DAA modeling results, a very small number of Bryde's whales would experience Level B behavioral exposures in the Caribbean and Galapagos DAAs, representing two separate populations in the N Atlantic and ETP, respectively. Approximately 1 Bryde's whale is predicted to experience a Level B behavioral exposure in the Caribbean DAA and 17 Bryde's whales within the Galapagos Ridge DAA, representing <1% and 0.1% of the respective regional populations in these separate ocean basins (Table 3.6-6). No significant population-level effects are predicted for this species as a result of the proposed action. No serious injury or mortality of Bryde's whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of Bryde's whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. In accordance with the MMPA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires authorization from NMFS regarding exposures to Bryde's whales in the Caribbean and Galapagos Ridge DAAs. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Bryde's whales are potentially common in five of the eight QAAs, representing populations from the N Pacific (Marianas QAA) and S Hemisphere (SW Atlantic, W Australia, W India, Sub-Antarctic QAAs) (Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-4). In the Marianas QAA, a low number of Level B exposures may occur. This assessment is based on similarities between the Marianas QAA and the Galapagos and Caribbean DAAs, including use of a large airgun array (Table 2-7). Similarly, among Bryde's whales in the S Hemisphere, the number of Level B exposures would be low. This is based on applying the same assessment approach as above since large airgun arrays are similarly proposed for the SW Atlantic and W India QAAs. Potential Level B exposures would be lower within the W Australia and Sub-Antarctic QAAs given the use of a small airgun array and similarities with the S California DAA.

Temporary Hearing Impairment or TTS

Temporary hearing impairment or TTS as a result of implementing Alternative A is unlikely to occur, as described previously in Section 3.6.4.3. The only mysticetes that could incur TTS would be those that approach close to the operating airguns. Based on available studies, most mysticetes are expected to avoid close approaches to the seismic vessel where exposure to sound levels could potentially cause TTS (Table 3.6-5 and Appendix E). Furthermore, implementation of mitigation and monitoring measures under Alternative A or B, including ramp ups, power downs and shut downs, would further reduce the potential for TTS. The real-time monitoring necessary for effectively implementing power downs and shut downs is most effective at the close distances where TTS is a concern. Furthermore, TTS is (by definition) a temporary phenomenon that is very unlikely to have long-term consequences for the individual(s) involved. In summary, no significant impacts to individual or populations of mysticetes are expected to occur under Alternative A or B (Preferred Alternative) as a result of potential TTS: mysticetes are expected to avoid close approaches to operating sources.

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

Implementation of Alternative A within the exemplary DAAs is not anticipated to result in Level A exposures or PTS in mysticetes as described in Section 3.6.4.3 and Appendix E. As previously discussed for TTS, mysticetes are expected to avoid exposure to sound levels that could potentially cause PTS (Table 3.6-5 and Section 3.6.4.3). Furthermore, avoidance would likely begin well before mysticetes are within the NMFS-designated 180-dB re 1 µPa (rms) isopleth around an approaching seismic research vessel, and well before reaching the Level A cumulative exposure criterion applied in this analysis. Although modeling results simulate that a small number of Level A (rms) exposures of ESA-listed mysticetes could potentially occur in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA (19 humpback and 14 fin whales; A_p columns in Table 3.6-6), the model does not allow for the likelihood that exposed mysticetes would show avoidance of the airgun source, as most are expected to do during an actual seismic survey. No mysticetes are predicted to experience Level A exposures based on the cumulative energy exposure criterion, which is currently considered a more realistic estimate of the level above which injury to mysticetes might occur, allowing for recent research (Southall et al. 2007) (see Section 3.2, A_e columns of Table 3.6-6, and below).

Potential exposure of mysticetes at or near the current 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) criterion identified by NMFS for potential Level A effects is not expected to cause adverse effects. Recent research indicates that the 180-dB criterion for cetaceans appears to be lower than necessary to avoid TTS (a type of Level B exposure), let alone PTS (Southall et al. 2007) (see Appendix B). The minimum sound exposure necessary to cause PTS is higher than that inducing barely-detectable TTS (Appendix E). The level associated with the onset of TTS is considered a precautionary estimate of the level below which there is no danger of permanent damage (Southall et al. 2007).

The model simulates the possibility of Level A exposures of two ESA-listed species in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA when the 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) criterion is applied, but no such exposures when the energy-based criterion is applied. Further site-specific consultation with NMFS would be conducted were an actual seismic survey proposed at this site or in an area with similar acoustic conditions, airgun configuration, and/or densities of mysticetes (e.g., NW Atlantic/Iceland, BC Coast, Sub-Antarctic QAAs). A supplemental or tiered project-specific EA would likely be prepared for a proposed project where seismic activities would occur in the same areas and seasons as concentrations of ESA-listed mysticetes. If determined to be necessary, the potential for Level A effects could be further reduced by implementation of additional mitigation and monitoring (which could be considered either in a separate, site-specific NEPA document or during the MMPA authorization process) or by modifying the cruise characteristics such as reducing the airgun source level (i.e., smaller airgun array).

Overall, no Level A exposures including PTS would be expected to occur to mysticetes during the exemplary seismic survey activities for the aforementioned reasons. Therefore, no long-term or significant impacts to individual mysticetes or mysticete populations would be expected as a result of Level A exposures with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative).

Strandings and Mortality

No injury, strandings, or mortalities of mysticetes exposed to seismic or other project sounds are expected under Alternative A as discussed in Section 3.6.4 and above. This is based on their expected avoidance behavior combined with mitigation and monitoring measures designed to minimize potential impacts. As indicated earlier, injuries to marine mammals are not known to occur near airgun arrays.

Other Physiological Effects

Other types of physiological effects on mysticetes (e.g., stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, or other types of organ or tissue damage) are considered unlikely to occur based on available data. No such physiological effects have been demonstrated in mysticetes exposed to seismic sounds, although related studies are lacking for mysticetes (see Section 3.6.4.4).

3.6.5.2 Other Potential Effects

Entanglement, Ingestion, and Ship Strikes

Under Alternatives A and B, non-acoustic effects from entanglement, ingestion, ship strikes, collisions with towed/deployed equipment, and other potential ancillary project activities (e.g., coring, dredging, etc.) are unlikely with the mitigation and monitoring proposed under Alternative A (see Section 3.6.4.4). The relatively slow speeds and generally linear paths of seismic vessels also minimize the possibility of ship strikes and collisions with towed/deployed equipment. An oil or fuel spill is considered highly unlikely to occur during the proposed seismic surveys. Each research vessel used for NSF-funded marine seismic surveys has a spill prevention plan or similar document outlining procedures and policies to prevent a fuel or oil spill and to address such spills in the highly unlikely instance that one did occur. None of the equipment proposed for in-water use during the seismic surveys is considered potentially ingestible by a marine mammal due to its size and composition. In addition, there has never been a recorded oil/fuel spill, ship strike, or entanglement of any marine mammal in the survey equipment during more than 54,000 nm (100,000 km) of previous NSF-funded seismic surveys where PSVOs have been present (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Haley and Koski 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a; Haley and Ireland 2006; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; refer to Table 2-1). We also are not aware of any documented/reported collisions of cetaceans with seismic vessels or equipment during other marine seismic surveys. Visual monitoring procedures further reduce the risk of entanglement or ship strike because observers watch for any marine mammals and sea turtles near the vessel and equipment. Therefore, entanglement and ship strikes are considered unlikely.

In summary, it is expected that the proposed seismic survey activities under Alternatives A and B within the exemplary analysis areas would have no significant impact on individual mysticetes or mysticete populations and would not adversely affect ESA-listed species due to entanglement with seismic gear, ingestion of toxic or other materials, and ship strikes.

3.6.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research surveys using various acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, MBES, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to mysticetes with implementation of Alternative C.

3.6.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Mysticetes

The potential impacts on mysticetes with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are summarized in Tables 3.6-7 and 3.6-8. With implementation of the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, unavoidable impacts to mysticetes under Alternative A or B are expected to be limited to short-term behavioral disturbance and short-term localized avoidance of the area near the active airguns. This is expected to have negligible short- and long-term impacts on individual mysticetes, their habitats, and regional populations within the exemplary analysis areas. However, because airgun operations are likely to result in localized avoidance by some ESA-listed mysticetes in some analysis

areas, implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) may affect, and is likely to adversely affect such species, as indicated in Table 3.6-7.

Operation of MBESs, SBPs, and pingers is not likely to impact mysticetes. The intermittent and narrow downward-directed nature of the MBES and SBP acoustic sources would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures of any individual mysticete given the movement and speed of the vessel; such brief exposure to this sound is not expected to cause injury or PTS based on results of limited studies of some odontocete species (reviewed in Appendix E). The streamer and core-mounted pingers are also highly unlikely to affect mysticetes given their intermittent nature, short-term and transitory use from a moving vessel, relatively low source levels, brief signal durations, and in the case of ancillary core sampling, their relatively infrequent use.

In the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, modeling estimates that a small number of Level A (rms) exposures could occur under Alternative A or B despite proposed mitigation and monitoring (Table 3.6-5). However, such effects are highly unlikely to occur during an actual seismic survey because the model does not account for behavioral avoidance of source sounds. Based on empirical studies, mysticetes are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sounds levels $\geq$180 dB re 1 µPa (rms), and these avoidance behaviors typically begin at lower received sound levels (reviewed in Section 3.6.4, Table 3.6-5, and Appendix E). Furthermore, modeling indicates that no Level A exposures of mysticetes would occur under Alternative A or B based on the more realistic cumulative energy exposure criterion. However, because the modeled potential Level A (rms) exposures would be of concern and involve ESA-listed species (see Tables 3.6-6 and 3.6-7), further site-specific consultation with NMFS would occur.

Overall, the primary anticipated impacts to mysticetes with implementation of Alternative A or B are:

- Small numbers of mysticetes are modeled or would be expected to experience Level B behavioral disturbance in all of the DAAs and potentially all eight of the QAAs. However, this is not expected to result in any long term or significant consequences to disturbed individuals or their populations. The S California DAA is the only site where mysticetes are not likely to be disturbed by the proposed seismic survey activities. This is due primarily to the near-zero estimated mysticete densities at the season (late spring/early summer) of the exemplary survey, the proposed small airgun array, and the acoustic characteristics of the S California DAA.
- Modeling predicts that, under Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative), a small number of Level A exposures could occur in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA based on the current 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) NMFS criterion, despite proposed mitigation and monitoring. However, no or insignificant (<0.019 whales) Level A exposures are expected to occur based on the more realistic cumulative energy exposure criterion. Cumulative energy (SEL) is now considered a more appropriate metric for assessing potential exposure of mysticetes to pulsed underwater sounds (see Section 3.2 and Appendix E). Furthermore, Level A effects are highly unlikely to occur during a seismic survey, as mysticetes are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sound levels that could actually result in Level A exposures.

Table 3.6-7. Summary of Potential Impacts to Mysticetes with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs

DAA	*Whale Species*[(a)]	*Alternative A or B*[(a)]
NW Atlantic	**N Atlantic right, Humpback,** Minke**, Sei, Fin**	Limited to insignificant number of short-term Level B behavioral effects in shallow water. Likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species or their populations and consultation with NMFS required.
Caribbean	**Humpback, Fin**	Limited to insignificant number of short-term Level B behavioral effects in shallow water. Likely to adversely affect ESA-listed humpback and fin whales and consultation with NMFS required.
	Minke, **Sei**, **Blue**	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)]. Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species.
	Bryde's	Limited to small number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures.
S California	**N Pacific right,** Bryde's, **Sei, Fin, Blue**, E Pacific gray, **Humpback**	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 densities.[(b)]
	Minke	Limited to insignificant number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures.
W Gulf of Alaska	**N Pacific right**	Limited to small number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures and likely to adversely affect right whales; consultation with NMFS required.
	E Pacific gray, Minke	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects possible but highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposure.
	Humpback, Fin	Limited to short-term Level B behavioral exposures. Likely to adversely affect ESA-listed humpback and fin whales and consultation with NMFS required. Level A effects possible but highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure. No Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposure predicted. No effects expected at population level. However, given species' ESA status, common occurrence, and modeled small number of Level A (rms) exposures, further site-specific consultation with NMFS and tiered EA/OEA to be prepared when a seismic survey is definitively proposed in the future.
	Sei, Blue	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)].
Galapagos Ridge	**Humpback,** Minke	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)].
	Bryde's	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely primarily in deep water; insignificant number[(b)] of Level A (rms) exposures. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposure. Level A exposures highly unlikely as whales expected to avoid such exposure.
	Sei, Fin	Effects highly unlikely given expected 0 density[(b)].
	Blue	Limited to small number of short-term Level B behavioral exposures and likely to adversely affect blue whales; consultation with NMFS required.

[(a)]No effects expected at population level for any species; see text, Tables 3.6-6 and 3.6-7 and Appendix B, Tables B-14 – B-25 for modeled numbers of exposures and percent of population exposed to Level A and B sound criteria. Insignificant number = >0.0 / <1.0 individual exposed representing <1% of estimated regional population size. Small number =>0.0 / ≤3.1% of estimated regional population size exposed. See Tables 3.6-6 and 3.6-7 and footnote (a). **bold** = ESA-listed species.
[(b)] See Appendix B, Annex 4 Tables A4-1 – A4-6 for estimated densities in the DAAs based on best available data.

Table 3.6-8. Summary of Potential Impacts to Mysticetes with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the QAAs

QAA	*Whale Species**	*Alternative A or B**
BC Coast	**N Pacific right**	Effects highly unlikely—species not expected to occur.
	E Pacific gray, Minke	Small number of Level B behavioral exposures likely; Level A exposures highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Humpback	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species or their populations. Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5). No effects expected at population level. However, given species' ESA status, common occurrence, large array, shallow water and some similarities with W Gulf of Alaska DAA, further site-specific consultation with NMFS likely to be conducted were an actual seismic survey proposed here.
	Sei whale	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Level B behavioral effects possible but unlikely; Level A effects highly unlikely as species rare and expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Fin, Blue	Small number of Level B behavioral effects possible; Level A effects highly unlikely--species uncommon and expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	**Humpback, Fin**	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral effects possible; Level A effects highly unlikely--species uncommon and expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Minke	See humpback above.
	Sei, Bryde's, **Blue**	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Level B behavioral effects possible but unlikely; Level A effects highly unlikely--species rare and expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
Marianas	**Humpback**	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5). No effects expected at population level. However, given species' ESA status, common occurrence, large array, and some shallow water, *further site-specific consultation with NMFS likely to be conducted were an actual seismic survey proposed here.*
	Minke, **Blue**	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Level B behavioral effects possible but unlikely; Level A effects highly unlikely—species uncommon to rare and expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Bryde's, Omura's	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Sei, Fin	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral effects possible; Level A effects highly unlikely – whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
Sub-Antarctic	**Southern right,** Pygmy right, **Humpback**, Antarctic minke, Dwarf minke **Fin, Blue**, Pygmy blue	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral effects possible; Level A effects highly unlikely-- species rare or uncommon, small array in deep water, and whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Sei, Bryde's	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--small array in deep water and whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).

Table 3.6-8. Summary of Potential Impacts to Mysticetes with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the QAAs

QAA	*Whale Species**	*Alternative A or B**
N Atlantic/ Iceland	**N Atlantic right**	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Level B behavioral effects possible; Level A effects highly unlikely--species rare and whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Humpback, Sei, Fin, Blue	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5). No effects expected at population level. Given species' ESA status, uncommon to common occurrence, large array, some shallow water, and some similarities with W Gulf of Alaska DAA, further site-specific consultation with NMFS to be conducted were an actual seismic survey proposed here.
	Minke	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
SW Atlantic	**Humpback**	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Level B behavioral effects possible but unlikely; Level A effects highly unlikely—species rare and expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Minke, Antarctic minke, **Sei, Fin, Blue**, Pygmy blue	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral changes possible; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5). Little known about these species in this area.
	Bryde's	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
W India	**Humpback, Blue**, Pygmy blue	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral changes possible; Level A effects highly unlikely--species rare to uncommon and expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Minke, Dwarf minke, **Sei, Fin**	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral changes possible; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5). Little known about these species in this area.
	Bryde's	Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
W Australia	**Humpback,** Bryde's	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral changes likely; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5).
	Minke, Antarctic minke, Dwarf minke, **Sei, Fin, Pygmy blue**	Not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species. Small number of Level B behavioral changes possible; Level A effects highly unlikely--whales expected to avoid such exposure (see Table 3.6-5). Little known about these species in this area.

*No effects expected at population level for any species (see text). **Bold** = ESA-listed species.

3.7 MARINE MAMMALS – CETACEANS: ODONTOCETES

3.7.1 Overview of Odontocete Groups

Of approximately 66 species of odontocetes[(1)] occurring in marine waters worldwide (Rice 1998; Reeves et al. 2002), 58 may occur in the 13 analysis areas during the season(s) of the exemplary seismic studies (Table 3.7-1). The status, global population estimates, general ecology, general distribution and migratory movements, and ecological considerations of these species are summarized in Table 3.7-1 and discussed below. Known hearing and call characteristics of odontocetes are also discussed.

3.7.1.1 Taxonomic Groups of Odontocetes

Under the taxonomic order Cetacea there are two suborders: the odontocetes, or toothed whales and dolphins, and the mysticetes, or baleen whales (Section 3.6). Odontocetes have teeth and use HF echolocation to navigate and find food. Odontocetes are divided into six taxonomic families: sperm whales (3 species), beaked whales (approximately 20 species), river dolphins (4 species), the monodonts (2 species), ocean dolphins (approximately 34 species), and porpoises (6 species). Odontocetes are a diverse group in distribution, habitat use, acoustic repertoire, and behavior, among other factors. They primarily occur in marine waters, though some have adapted to an estuarine existence (e.g., the Tucuxi dolphin, Irrawaddy dolphin, and finless porpoise) and four species occur strictly in fresh water.[(2)]

Many odontocetes–particularly beaked whales, various other deep-diving whales, and some porpoises–avoid vessels and are not easily seen at the surface (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995a; Barlow and Gisiner 2006). As a result, data on their habits, population, and distribution are limited. In addition, most of these inconspicuous species were never hunted commercially; thus, whaling-based data on distribution and population are lacking. In contrast, many dolphins spend considerable time near the surface in large groups, commonly interact with vessels, and often suffer fatalities in conflict with fishing operations. As a result, dolphin species of the genera *Stenella*, *Delphinus*, and *Tursiops* have been the subject of more research, and population sizes are better known for them than for most of the more cryptic or solitary species of odontocetes. Sperm whales, although they dive deeply and for extended periods, are also fairly well known from historic whaling records and numerous recent studies.

3.7.1.2 Distribution and Movements

Odontocetes are widely distributed and occur in all major oceans (Table 3.7-1). They are highly mobile and often move seasonally for food and breeding (Reeves et al. 2002). Many species remain year-round in tropical and subtropical areas, including the Fraser's dolphin, pantropical spotted dolphin, and pygmy killer whale (Reeves et al. 2002; Jefferson et al. 2008). Some are year-round residents in colder waters, with relatively small seasonal migrations (e.g., harbor porpoise) (Culik 2004). Others are more cosmopolitan, including the killer whale, sperm whale, and Cuvier's beaked whale. Some toothed whales undertake extensive seasonal migrations. For example, adult male sperm whales travel to high latitudes for summer feeding and back toward the equator for winter breeding (Reeves et al. 2002; Jefferson et al. 2008).

[1] The exact number of odontocete species in the world is uncertain, given the increasing use of genetics to revise taxonomy and identify new species (Reeves et al. 2002). Recently described and confirmed odontocete species, including Perrin's beaked whale, Arabian common dolphin, and Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin, are considered herein.

[2] Three species of river dolphin are entirely excluded from this section because they occur exclusively in freshwater and thus would not occur in marine habitats addressed in this EIS/OEIS.

Table 3.7-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Habitat, and General Distribution and Movement of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas*

Species	*Status[(a)] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES[)]*	*U.S. MMPA Stock[(a)]*	*Global Population Size[(a)]*	*General Ecology and Prey*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Sperm whale	E/SS VU/I	N Atlantic, N Pacific, CA/OR/WA	500,000-2 million Atlantic 13,190, NE Pacific 39,200, S Hemisphere 26,053	Deep water, especially along continental slope.	Cosmopolitan, near-worldwide, most abundant in warm tropical waters.
Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales	-/- DD/II	CA/OR/WA, W N Atlantic	Global population NA; ETP 11,200, US Atlantic 695	Continental shelf edge, deep water.	Cosmopolitan in warm waters.
Baird's beaked whale	-/- DD/I	Alaska, CA/OR/WA	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Pacific Ocean north of 35º N, Bering Sea, Sea of Okhotsk.
Arnoux's beaked whale	-/- DD/I	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	S oceans from 34ºS to ice edge.
Shepherd's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Thought to be circumpolar in cold temperate waters of S hemisphere.
Cuvier's beaked whale	-/- LC/II	Alaska, CA/OR/WA W N Atlantic	Global population NA; US Pacific1884, Hawaii 12,728, ETP 90,725, US Atlantic 3,196	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Worldwide, except polar waters.
Longman's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water.	Tropical Pacific and Indian Ocean waters.
Hector's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	All oceans in S hemisphere.
True's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water, occasionally coastal; feed primarily on squid.	N Atlantic Ocean, 30º N-50º N.
Gervais' beaked whale	-/- DD/II	W N Atlantic	Global population NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Tropical and warmer temperate Atlantic.
Sowerby's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water of continental shelf edge and slopes; feed primarily on squid.	N temperate to sub-polar north Atlantic.
Gray's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Circumpolar temperate waters of the S hemisphere.
Pygmy beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic mid- to deep waters; feed primarily on squid.	Tropical oceans, 15º S-25º N.
Andrew's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Circumpolar in temperate waters of S hemisphere.
Spade-toothed whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Known from only three stranding records from temperate S Pacific.

Table 3.7-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Habitat, and General Distribution and Movement of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas*

Species	*Status[(a)] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES[)]*	*U.S. MMPA Stock[(a)]*	*Global Population Size[(a)]*	*General Ecology and Prey*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Hubb's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Cold temperate waters of the N Pacific.
Gingko-toothed beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Temperate and cooler tropical waters of the Pacific and Indian oceans.
Stejneger's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Endemic to cold waters of North Pacific, Sea of Japan, and Bering Sea.
Strap-toothed whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Circumpolar temperate and subantarctic waters of S hemisphere.
Blainville's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	CA/OR/WA, W N Atlantic	Global population NA; ETP 32,678 (all *Mesoplodon* sp.)	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	Tropical and warmer temperate waters worldwide.
Perrin's beaked whale	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	No information; strandings known from California.
Northern bottlenose whale	-/- DD/I	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; known to forage in submarine canyons.	Subarctic north Atlantic to Nova Scotia; distribution possibly linked to that of squid of genus *Gonatus*.
Southern bottlenose whale	-/- LC/I	na	NA	Pelagic deep water; feed primarily on squid.	S oceans from 30º S to ice edge; summers in Antarctic waters, winter in more temperate areas.
Killer whale	E (S Residents)/ - DD/II	E N Pacific, Alaska, N Resident Offshore, Transient, S Resident, GoA & Aleutian Isl. Transient Offshore, W Coast Transient, W N Atlantic	Thousands to tens of thousands; S Residents in BC and WA ↓; Atlantic 6,600, ETP 8,500	Three distinct ecotypes: residents, transients, & offshore groups; occur from open ocean waters to estuaries and fjords.	Cosmopolitan; found from tropical oceans to pack ice in both hemispheres.
False killer whale	-/- DD/II	na	Tens of thousands; ETP 40,000	Deep offshore waters; feed on fish and squid, occasionally other marine mammals.	Tropical to temperate oceans worldwide.
Pygmy killer whale	-/- DD/II	W N Atlantic	Hundreds of thousands; ETP 38,900	Deep water; feed on fish and squid, possibly other dolphins.	Pantropical.
Melon-headed whale	-/- LC/II	W N Atlantic	Tens of thousands; ETP 45,400	Pelagic or around oceanic islands; feed on squid, fish and shrimp.	Pantropical, 20º N-20º S; sightings in temperate areas likely associated with warm currents.

Table 3.7-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Habitat, and General Distribution and Movement of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas*

Species	*Status[(a)] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES[)]*	*U.S. MMPA Stock[(a)]*	*Global Population Size[(a)]*	*General Ecology and Prey*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Long-finned pilot whale	-/- DD/II	W N Atlantic	Millions	Pelagic; feed on squid and some fish.	Mid-latitude waters of the N Atlantic and S hemisphere.
Short-finned pilot whale	-/- DD/II	CA/OR/WA, W N Atlantic	Tens of thousands; ETP 160,200	Pelagic; feed on squid and some fish.	Circumglobal 40º S-50º N.
Risso's dolphin	-/- LC/II	CA/OR/WA, W N Atlantic	Hundreds of thousands; US Pacific 16,066; US Atlantic 29,110; ETP 175,800	Pelagic over steep slopes, seamounts, and escarpments; feed primarily on squid.	Tropical and mid-temperate waters worldwide, approx. 55º S–60º N.
Short-beaked common dolphin	-/- LC/II	CA/OR/WA, W N Atlantic	Millions; US Pacific 449,846; ETP 3,093,300; US Atlantic 120,743	Feed on small epipelagic schooling fish, squid.	Tropical and temperate oceans, worldwide.
Long-beaked common dolphin	-/- DD/II	California	>25,000	Feed on small epipelagic schooling fish, squid.	Nearshore tropical and warm temperate waters of some oceans.
Fraser's dolphin	-/- LC/II	W N Atlantic	Hundreds of thousands; ETP 289,300, US Atlantic 726	Occur in waters >1000 m deep; feed on squid, shrimp, and mesopelagic fish.	Tropical oceans worldwide, occasional presence in temperate waters during El Niño events.
Indo-Pacific humpback dolphin	-/- NT/I	na	A few thousand	Coastal and estuarine waters; feed on fish and benthic invertebrates.	Coastline of the Indian Ocean, southern China, Borneo, northern and eastern Australia.
Bottlenose dolphin	-/SS LC/II	California Coastal, CA/OR/WA Offshore, W N Atlantic Coastal & Offshore	Millions; US Pacific 5065; US Atlantic >185,000; ETP 243,500	Two types: one inhabits continental shelf and upper slope <1000 m deep; the other deep oceanic waters; feed on a variety of fish.	Worldwide in temperate and tropical waters excluding Indian Ocean.
Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Coastal and shelf waters; diet unknown.	Entire rim of Indian Ocean from western Pacific to the Red Sea and Persian Gulf.
Pantropical spotted dolphin	-/- LC/II	W N Atlantic	Millions; ETP 2,059,100	Deeper waters; feed nocturnally on vertically migrating prey.	Tropical oceans worldwide.
Atlantic spotted dolphin	-/- DD/II	W N Atlantic	Millions; US Atlantic 50,978	Continental shelf waters <250 m deep; feed on flying fish & other epipelagic species.	Tropical and warm temperate waters of the western north Atlantic.
Spinner dolphin	-/- DD/II	W N Atlantic	approx. 2 million; ETP 1,651,100	Pelagic & near oceanic islands; feed nocturnally on mesopelagic fish and squid.	Pantropical at 30º-40º N and 20º-30ºS.

Table 3.7-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Habitat, and General Distribution and Movement of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas*

Species	*Status[(a)] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES[)]*	*U.S. MMPA Stock[(a)]*	*Global Population Size[(a)]*	*General Ecology and Prey*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Clymene dolphin	-/- DD/II	W N Atlantic	Thousands	Linked to sea surface temperatures of 22.8º to 29.1ºC at depths ranging 700 to >3000 m; feed on small mesopelagic fish and squid.	Tropical and warm Atlantic waters.
Striped dolphin	-/- LC/II	CA/OR/WA, W N Atlantic	Hundreds of thousands; US Pacific 13,934; ETP 1,918,000; US Atlantic 94,462	Pelagic edge of continental shelf, occasionally coastal; feed on small fish and cephalopods.	Worldwide tropical and temperate waters.
White-beaked dolphin	-/- LC/II	W N Atlantic	Tens of thousands	Continental shelf waters, especially along shelf edge; prey - variety of fish & inverts.	Subarctic north Atlantic Ocean, often to edge of pack ice.
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	-/- LC/II	W N Atlantic	Tens to hundreds of thousands	Continental shelf, slope, and canyons; feed on squid and schooling fish.	Temperate and subarctic north Atlantic.
Pacific white-sided dolphin	-/- LC/II	N Pacific, CA/OR/WA	approx. 1 million; US Pacific 59,274	Continental margins, occasionally enter inshore passages; feed on squid and schooling fish.	Temperate North Pacific Ocean.
Dusky dolphin	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Occur in coastal and continental shelf waters <200 m deep; feed on squid and schooling fish.	Discontinuous in southern Pacific Ocean; usually cooler waters but found as far north as 11º S along coast of Peru.
Peale's dolphin	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Shallow coastal waters, frequently very close to shore; feed on shrimp, squid, and fish; have been observed foraging among kelp beds.	Argentinean and Chilean coasts south of 40º S.
Hourglass dolphin	-/- LC/II	na	Hundreds of thousands	Pelagic frequently sighted among fin whales.	Throughout southern hemisphere south of 45º S.
Rough-toothed dolphin	-/- LC/II	W N Atlantic	Global NA; Hawaii 19,904; ETP 145,900	Deep offshore waters; feed on fish and cephalopods.	Worldwide tropical, subtropical, and warm temperate waters.
Northern right whale dolphin	-/- LC/II	CA/OR/WA	Hundreds of thousands; US Pacific 20,362	Shelf and slope waters up to and >2000m; feed at night on vertically migrating prey.	Cooler temperate and subarctic northern Pacific waters, 30º-50º N.
Southern right whale dolphin	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Primarily offshore but occasionally coastal.	Between subtropical and Antarctic convergences in S hemisphere.

Table 3.7-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Habitat, and General Distribution and Movement of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas*

Species	*Status[(a)] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*U.S. MMPA Stock[(a)]*	*Global Population Size[(a)]*	*General Ecology and Prey*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Tucuxi	-/- DD/I	na	NA	Coastal, estuarine and riverine waters; feed on pelagic and demersal fish.	Amazon–Orinoco River system, coastal waters from Columbia to southern Brazil.
Irawaddy dolphin	-/- VU/I	na	>1000	Mangrove wetlands, estuarine, shallow coastal waters.	Discontinuous in Eastern Indian Ocean, coasts of southeast Asia, India, Indonesia; those off N Australia proposed as new species.[(b)]
Finless porpoise	-/- VU worldwide, E in China/I	na	Thousands	Coastal and estuarine waters; feed on a wide variety of fish and invertebrates.	Tropical Asia, central Japan to Java and the Persian Gulf.
Harbor porpoise	-/SOC LC/II	Gulf of Alaska, SE Alaska, Gulf of Maine/Bay of Fundy	Thousands; US Pacific 78,000; Alaska 125,000; W N Atlantic 89,054	Shallow coastal and shelf waters; feed on small schooling fish.	Arctic to temperate northern Atlantic and Pacific, small remnant population in the Black Sea.
Spectacled porpoise	-/- DD/II	na	NA but rare throughout range.	Deep oceanic waters.	Circumpolar in colder temperate to Antarctic waters.
Burmeister's porpoise	-/- DD/II	na	NA	Coastal waters normally <100 m deep but up to 1000 m.	Cape Horn to N Peru.
Dall's porpoise	-/- LC/II	Alaska, CA/OR/WA	Hundreds of thousands to millions; US Pacific 99,517; Alaska 83,400	Inshore to deep oceanic waters; feed on squid and small fish.	N Pacific and adjacent seas, 20º-65º N.

Notes: *Excludes five marine odontocete species of limited distribution that do not occur in any of the 13 analysis areas: Commerson's dolphin (*Cephalorhynchus commersonii*), Chilean dolphin (*C. eutropia*), Heaviside's dolphin (*C. heavisidii*), Hector's dolphin (*C. hectori*), vaquita (*Phocoena sinus*), along with all three species of river (freshwater) dolphins (Ganges and Indus river dolphins [*Platanista gangetica*], Amazon River dolphin [*Inia geoffrensis*], and Franciscana or La Plata River dolphin [*Pontoporia blainvillei*]).

[(a)]E = endangered; CR = Critically Endangered; DD = Data Deficient; EN = Endangered; LC = Least Concern; na = not applicable; NA - Data not available or species status was not assessed. NT = Near Threatened; SS = Strategic Stock; VU = Vulnerable; I = Appendix I – includes species threatened with extinction that are or may be affected by trade; II = Appendix II – includes species that are not presently threatened with extinction, but may become so if their trade is not regulated. - = no status listing;

[(b)]A new species of dolphin, the Australian snubfin dolphin, has recently been proposed off the north coast of Australia; these dolphins have previously been considered Irawaddy dolphins (Beasley et al. 2005). For the purposes of this analysis, the two are combined under Irawaddy dolphin.

Sources: Ridgway and Harrison 1989; Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Bannister et al. 1996; Koski et al. 1998; Reeves et al. 2002; Whitehead 2002; L-DEO and NSF 2003a, b, c, d, e; Mullin and Fulling 2003; Wade et al. 2003; L-DEO and NSF 2004 a, b, c, d; NMFS 2005b; SIO and NSF 2004, 2005; May–Collado et al. 2005; Navy 2007; Barlow et al. 2006; L-DEO and NSF 2006a, b; NOAA Fisheries 2010; UNEP 2006; UTA and NSF 2006; Waring et al. 2006, 2009; Angliss and Outlaw 2007; Carretta et al. 2007, 2009; Angliss and Allen 2009; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010.

Many studies show correlations between cetacean densities and physical variables that influence distribution and abundance of prey (e.g., bottom relief, water depth, water temperature, water-mass boundaries) (Sutcliffe and Brodie 1977; Reeves and Whitehead 1997; Hooker 1999). Numerous odontocetes, such as Atlantic white-sided dolphin, Pacific white-sided dolphin, and hourglass dolphin, feed at high latitudes in summer, exploiting biologically productive areas (Reeves et al. 2002; Jefferson et al. 2008).

Calving and/or breeding can occur year-round throughout the range of some odontocetes. Others exhibit specific breeding/calving periods and/or locations. In general, species that occur in colder waters tend to calve in warmer months while those in tropical waters year-round show less seasonality (e.g., *Stenella* dolphins). Although most odontocetes breed and calve primarily in spring and summer (e.g., killer whale and beluga whale), some species do calve in fall and winter (e.g., tucuxi dolphin and pygmy sperm whale) (Reeves et al. 2002). For some species data on reproduction are scarce or absent (e.g., most beaked whales, Risso's dolphin, Fraser's dolphin, and rough-toothed dolphin) (Reeves et al. 2002; Jefferson et al. 2008).

3.7.1.3 Important Ecological Considerations

Important ecological considerations for odontocetes with respect to activities considered in the analysis for this PEIS are (1) the location, duration, and timing of calving and breeding; (2) the locations of important feeding and migration areas; (3) the duration and depths of foraging dives; and (4) the sensitivity of some species to the low-frequency and other sound from seismic survey activities, as it potentially affects an animal's ability to interact with its environment and meet its biological needs. Items (1) and (2) were discussed briefly above and are further summarized in Tables 3.10-3 and 3.10-4 relative to each analysis area. For this analysis, particular attention is given to those odontocetes that undertake deep, prolonged foraging dives. These habits may potentially result in longer exposure to higher-energy sounds associated with seismic research activities.

Depths and durations of foraging dives by odontocetes vary with species, age class, time of day, and the depths at which prey occurs. Odontocetes that feed on squid generally make the deepest dives. Such species routinely dive to at least several hundred meters for up to about 1 hr at the extreme (Reeves et al. 2002; U.S. Navy 2007). About 60% of the odontocete species addressed here are considered deep (>3,280 ft [1,000 m]) divers. These include the sperm, dwarf and pygmy sperm, beaked, pilot, false killer, and melon-headed whales, and many dolphins (Table 3.7-1). For example, the sperm whales can dive to 6,300 ft (1,920 m) or more for periods of over 1 hr; however, most foraging dives occur at 1,000–2,600 ft (300-800 m) for 30-45 min. During a foraging dive, sperm whales typically travel about 1.9 mi (3 km) horizontally and 0.3 mi (0.5 km) vertically (Whitehead 2002).

A few odontocetes considered here feed in shallow (<328 ft [100 m]) waters, usually coastal, including the Tucuxi dolphin, Indo-Pacific humpback dolphin, Peale's dolphin, and harbor porpoise (Table 3.7-1). However, the foraging range of many other odontocetes includes intermediate water depths of 328-3,280 ft (100-1,000 m). Such odontocetes prey on epipelagic species (e.g. flying fish) or mesopelagic fishes, squid, or invertebrates (e.g., dusky, common bottlenose, and Atlantic spotted dolphins; killer whale; beluga whale; and some beaked whales). Some feed largely nocturnally on vertically migrating prey, associated with the deep scattering layer, which move closer to the water surface during darkness (e.g., spinner and northern right whale dolphins). Underwater topographic features are often associated with concentrations of pelagic prey and thus odontocete habitats include seamounts, escarpments, canyons, slope areas, and oceanic islands.

Threats to odontocetes include commercial fishing, entanglement, oil spills, organic pollutants, food availability, pollution, harvesting by humans, habitat degradation, and increasing underwater noise among others. Among odontocetes, sperm whales in particular were heavily exploited by commercial whaling industries over the last two centuries. Although the IWC issued a ban on all commercial whaling in 1985, the sperm whale is still considered endangered. Many small odontocetes are currently hunted in various coastal waters of the world, including belugas in U.S. waters (Alaska).

3.7.1.4 Special-Status Species

Of the 58 odontocete species considered in this PEIS, the only ESA-listed species are the sperm whale (endangered) and the Southern Resident Population of killer whales listed as endangered in Washington State, U.S. (Table 3.7-1). Although the sperm whale is officially considered endangered under the ESA, it is cosmopolitan and relatively numerous, and it is not biologically endangered. Two other marine odontocetes, the vaquita or Gulf of California harbor porpoise and Cook Inlet population of beluga whales, that are listed under the ESA do not occur in the analysis areas, and thus are excluded from further discussion.

All marine mammals are protected by U.S. federal law under the MMPA. Some species or populations (or stocks) receive special attention under the MMPA due to concern about population numbers or trends. Two odontocete species in this analysis are considered as MMPA Species of Concern or "Strategic Stocks". Strategic stocks are defined as "those that are suffering depletion from human causes, in excess of the potential biological removal level (or, natural mortality), which are likely to face listing under the ESA of 1973, based on scientific information, or are already listed as a Threatened, Endangered or Depleted species under the ESA" (MMC 2003). The two MMPA Species of Concern addressed herein are all killer whale populations and the Gulf of Maine stock of harbor porpoises (Table 3.7-1).

Beaked whales, although protected under the MMPA in the same manner as other marine mammal species, do not have special status under U.S. law. However, there is increasing recognition that they can be unusually sensitive to some forms of underwater sound, and it is becoming increasingly common to give special consideration to beaked whales when planning or conducting activities producing high-level underwater sound (reviewed in Appendix E).

All toothed whales except the Arabian common dolphin have IUCN status and CITES status (Table 3.7-1). Only one odontocete population listed in Table 3.7-1 is considered Endangered by the IUCN: the China population of the finless porpoise. Three species are listed by the IUCN as Vulnerable (finless porpoise [worldwide], sperm whale, and Irawaddy dolphin), 1 species is Near Threatened (Indo-Pacific humpback dolphin), 17 species are considered Least Concern, and 35 species are listed as Data Deficient.

3.7.1.5 Acoustic Capabilities

Odontocetes rely on underwater sound to communicate and gain information about their surroundings. In addition to communication sounds, odontocetes use HF echolocation while foraging and presumably while navigating and orienting (Au 1993; Richardson et al. 1995a; Au et al. 2000; Reeves et al. 2002). The hearing abilities and sound production characteristics of some odontocete species have been studied in detail (summarized in Table 3.7-2) (Richardson et al. 1995a; Au et al. 2000; U.S. Navy 2007; Southall et al. 2007). Available data on odontocete hearing come from a limited number of species and, for almost all of those, from very few (often only 1 or 2) individuals. The results from the bottlenose dolphin, where hearing by numerous individuals has been studied, show considerable variability in the hearing abilities of different individuals (Houser and Finneran 2006), as also occurs in humans and other terrestrial mammals.

Table 3.7-2. Summary of Underwater Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Odontocetes Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

	Sound Production[a]			*Hearing*	
Species or Group	*Frequency Range (kHz)*	*Dominant Frequencies (kHz)*	*Source Level (dB re 1 µPa-m)*	*Frequency Range (kHz)*	*Threshold at Best Sensitivity (dB re 1 µPa)*
Sperm whale	<0.1-30	2-4, 10-16	202, 236	2.5-60	-
Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales	60-200	120-130	-	90-150	-
Cuvier's beaked whale	13-17	-	-	-	-
Baird's beaked whale	12-134	23-24.6, 35-45	-	-	-
Arnoux's beaked whale	1-8.7	-	-	-	-
Bottlenose whales (*Hyperoodon* spp.)	0.5-26+	3-16	-	-	-
Beaked whales (*Mesoplodon* spp.)	0.380	0.3-2	200-220	5-90	-
Beluga	0.1-150	0.1–16, 40-60, 100-120	206-225	0.04-150	42 at 11-100 kHz[c]
Narwhal	0.3-18	0.3-10	-	-	-
Dolphins (*Cephalorhynchus* spp.)	0.32-150	0.8-2, 4-4.5, 116-134	160-163	-	-
Rough-toothed dolphin	0.1-200	2-14, 4-7, 25	-	-	-
Humpbacked dolphins (*Sousa* spp.)	1.2–16+	-	-	-	-
Tucuxi	3.6-23.9	7.1-18.5	-	<4-135[a]	50 at 85 kHz[a]
Bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops* spp.)	0.05-150	0.3-14.5, 25-30, 95-130	125-173 228	0.15-135	42–52 at 15 kHz[c]
Dolphins (*Stenella* spp.)	0.06–160	5-60, 40-50, 130-40	210, 223	0.5-160	42 at 64 kHz[b, c]
Common dolphins (*Delphinus* spp.)	0.2-150	0.5-18 30-60	143-180	<5–150	53 at 65 kHz[d]
Fraser's dolphin	4.3-40	-	-	-	-
Dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus* spp.)	0.06-325	0.3-5, 4-15, 6.9-19.2, 60-80	80-219	0.5-135 0.1-140[e]	64 kHz[e]
Right whale dolphins (*Lissodelphis* spp.)	1-<40	1.8-3	170	-	-
Risso's dolphin	0.1-65	2-5, 65	216	1.5-100	63.6–74.3 at 4-80 kHz[c]
Melon-headed whale	8-40	8-12, 20-40	155-165	-	-
False killer whale	4-130	4.7-6.1, 25-30, 100-130	228	<1-115	39-49 at 17 kHz 70 at 5 kHz[c]
Killer whale	0.08-85	1-20	105-160	<0.5-120	35 at 15-42 kHz[c]
Pilot whales (*Globicephala* spp.)	0.28-100	2-14, 30-60	180	-	-
Porpoises (*Phocoena* spp.)	0.04-150	0.04-0.6, 1.4-2.5, 110-150	177	0.1-140	55 at approx. 30 kHz[c]
Dall's porpoise	0.04-160	0.04-12 120-130	175	-	-

Notes: [a] Sauerland and Dehnhardt 1998; hearing threshold directly measured.
[b] Kastelein et al. 2003; hearing threshold directly measured for striped dolphin.
[c] Richardson et al. 1995a; hearing thresholds directly measured for beluga, killer whale, harbor porpoise, bottlenose dolphin, false killer whale, Risso's dolphin, and *Stenella* dolphins.
[d] U.S. Navy 2005; hearing threshold directly measured.
[e] Tremel et al. 1998; hearing threshold measured based on behavioral/psychophysical response studies of Pacific white-sided dolphin.

Sources: Richardson et al. 1995a; Sauerland and Dehnhardt 1998; Au et al. 2000; Kastelein et al. 2003; Johnson et al. 2004; U.S. Navy 2007; Zimmer et al. 2005; Cook et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007; Finneran et al. 2009.

Optimum hearing among odontocetes is likely within the frequency range of vocalizations emitted, but hearing may extend beyond this frequency range since other environmental sounds may also be important (Richardson et al. 1995a; Ketten 2004; Southall et al. 2007). Studies to date indicate that small- to moderate-sized odontocetes have relatively poor hearing sensitivity at frequencies <1 kHz, but extremely good sensitivity at, and above, several kHz. Hearing sensitivity of several species has been determined as a function of frequency (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995a; Ketten 2004). In comparison, there are very few data on the absolute hearing thresholds of most of the larger, deep-diving toothed whales, such as the sperm and beaked whales. However, Cook et al. (2006) report that a stranded juvenile Gervais' beaked whale showed evoked potentials from 5 to 80 kHz, with the best sensitivity at 80 kHz (Table 3.7-2). An adult Gervais' beaked whale had a similar upper cutoff frequency (80-90 kHz; Finneran et al. 2009).

The hearing systems of small toothed whales are almost certainly less sensitive to low-frequency sounds than are the ears of the mysticetes (summarized in Section 3.7.1.5). Odontocetes are generally believed to be less sensitive to the low frequencies that contribute most of the energy in sound pulses from airgun arrays. However, most odontocetes appear to be highly sensitive to mid- and high-frequencies (e.g., 3-100 kHz), at which various sonar systems operate (Table 3.7-2).

Odontocetes occurring in the analysis areas were categorized into MF and HF functional hearing groups based on similarities in their hearing capabilities and physiology (see Section 2.3.3 and Appendix B for more details). The MF group, collectively, is believed to have functional hearing from about 150 Hz to 160 kHz, although individual species may not have quite so broad a range (Southall et al. 2007). This MF functional hearing group is further subdivided into 15 genus or species groupings as identified in the AIM procedures applied to this analysis: sperm whale; *Kogia*; beaked whales; narwhal, orca; blackfish; and Risso's, common, Fraser's, bottlenose, *Stenella*, *Lagenorhynchus*, *Steno*, *Lissodelphis*, and shallow-water dolphins (see Section 3.5.3.3 and Appendix B). The HF group, with functional hearing from about 200 Hz to 180 kHz, contains only one subgroup addressed in these analyses – porpoises. In this analysis, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales are treated as MF odontocetes, following common practice until very recently (Southall et al. 2007).

3.7.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

This section summarizes the region-specific occurrence of odontocetes within the five DAAs for which acoustic modeling was conducted. Discussion is limited to those species present during the season(s) of the exemplary marine seismic surveys (Table 3.7-3). Discussion is focused on species considered most relevant based on special status (e.g., ESA), deep-diving habits, and those that are expected to be most abundant/common.

3.7.2.1 NW Atlantic

A broad body of research and data exist for the occurrence and distribution of odontocetes in the NW Atlantic. Marine mammals are regularly assessed (e.g., via NOAA Stock Assessments) within the U.S. Atlantic EEZ using aerial and shipboard sighting surveys combined with historical sightings and records of strandings and incidental fisheries bycatch (e.g., Waring et al. 2006). Additionally, opportunistic sightings, radio- and satellite-tagging programs, academic research, and other miscellaneous projects (e.g., U.S. Navy 2005; Palka 2006) contribute data here.

Nineteen odontocete species may occur in the NW Atlantic DAA during summer (Table 3.7-3). Those most relevant to the exemplary seismic study are sperm whales, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, short-finned pilot whales, long-finned pilot whales, short-beaked common dolphins, common bottlenose dolphins, Atlantic spotted dolphins, pantropical spotted dolphins, striped dolphins, Atlantic white-sided

dolphins, white-beaked dolphins, and harbor porpoises. Dolphins (common, bottlenose, Atlantic spotted, and striped) are most likely to be encountered during the analysis period. The only species with special status is the ESA-listed endangered sperm whale (Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-3). Several species of beaked whales occur in the area at least occasionally; they are of concern because of potential sensitivity to anthropogenic sounds.

Table 3.7-3. Potential Occurrence of Odontocetes within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Species	*NW Atlantic (N Sum)*[a]*	*Caribbean (N Spr or Sum)*[b]*	*S Calif. (N Spr or Sum)*[d]*	*W Gulf of Alaska (N Sum)*[e,f]*	*Galapagos (S Sum)*[g]*
Sperm whale	F c	F c	BF r	F r	F u
Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales	F u [2]	BF r [2]	F r [2]	-	BF c [2]
Beaked whales (2 *Berardius* spp.)	-	-	B? F r [1]	F u [1]	-
Cuvier's beaked whale	F r	B? F r	B? F r	F u	B? F u
Longman's beaked whale	-	-	-	-	B? F r
Beaked whales (14 *Mesoplodon* spp.)	F r [4]	B? F r [2]	B? F r [5]	F r [1]	B? F u [3]
Beluga	-	-	-	F r	-
Narwhal	-	-	-	-	-
Killer whale	-	BF r	BF u	BF u	BF r
False killer whale	-	B? F r	B? F r	-	B? F u
Pygmy killer whale	-	BF r	-	-	B? F u
Melon-headed whale	-	B? F r	-	-	B? F u
Pilot whales (2 *Globicephala* spp.)	B? F r [2]	B? F c [1]	BF r [1]	F r [1]	B? F u c [1]
Risso's dolphin	F r?	B? F?r	BF r	F r?	B? F u
Common dolphins (3 *Delphinus* spp.)	F a [approx. 1]	BF a [1]	BFM a [2]	-	B? F c [1]
Fraser's dolphin	-	B? F r	-	-	B? F u
Bottlenose dolphins (2 *Tursiops* spp.)	BF a [1]	BF a [1]	BF r [1]	-	BF r [1]
Dolphins (5 *Stenella* spp.)	F a [3]	BF a [5]	B? F r [3]	-	B? F a [3]
Dolphins (6 *Lagenorhynchus* spp.)	BF r? [2]	-	BFM a [1]	B? F u [1]	-
Rough-toothed dolphin	-	B? F u?	B? F r	-	B? F c
Right whale dolphins (2 *Lissodelphis* spp.)	-	-	BFM a [1]	-	-
Porpoises (3 *Phocoena* spp.)	BF r [1]	-	BF r [1]	BF c [1]	-
Dall's porpoise	-	-	BF a	B? F a	-

Notes: *[ ] = number of species found in the specific analysis area; (Season) = N or S hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; **B** = known to breed or calve within the area/season; **F** = known to feed within the area/season; **M** = known to migrate through the area/season; **?** = unknown/possible; **a** = Abundant: the species is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area during the relevant season, and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year during the relevant season, assuming many visits to the area; **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years during the relevant season,; **na** = reliable data not available or uncertain or species status was not assessed; - = species does not occur there.

Sources: Reeves et al. 2002; Culik 2004; Angliss and Outlaw 2005; Carretta et al. 2006, 2008; Waring et al. 2006, 2009; Angliss and Allen 2009; also see footnotes.
[(a)]U.S. Navy 2005; [(b)]L-DEO and NSF 2003e; [(d)]Koski et al. 1998; [(e)]L-DEO and NSF 2004c; [(f)]L-DEO and NSF 2004d; [(g)]L-DEO and NSF 2003a.

Sperm whales summer in the Mid-Atlantic Bight off the Eastern U.S. coast from Virginia to Massachusetts (Reeves et al. 2002; Palka 2006). Female/juvenile groups inhabit temperate and tropical waters and rarely move as far north as the Canadian EEZ. Males have a wider range, including the Hudson Strait in Canada (Reeves and Whitehead 1997; Whitehead 2003). Groups commonly consist of 20-40 animals including adult females, their calves, and juveniles (Waring et al. 2006). They feed on squid through the summer months, foraging mainly near the ocean bottom; they move to more southern temperate and tropical latitudes for the winter (Reeves et. al 2002; Waring et al. 2005b). The sperm whale population off the eastern U.S. coast is estimated at 4,800 animals, although estimates may be low due to undercounting because of their lengthy dives (Waring et al. 2006).

Beaked whale natural history is poorly known worldwide and many existing data are from strandings. From 1992 to 2003, a total of 77 beaked whales are known to have stranded along the U.S. Atlantic coast; causes included fishery interaction, pollution, illness, and unknown origins. Beaked whales are deep divers and feed primarily on deep-diving squid (Table 3.7-1). Sightings occur mostly along the shelf edge and in deeper oceanic waters. Recent surveys conducted for the U.S. NOAA western North Atlantic Stock Assessment (Waring et al. 2006) suggest beaked whales are most abundant in the Gulf Stream and warm-core ring features. Unidentified beaked whales have been recorded during aerial and vessel surveys in the area during the summer (Palka 2006).

Specific identification of beaked whale species at sea is difficult. The total number of beaked whales of all species off the northern U.S. Atlantic coast has been estimated at approximately 2,840 (Palka 2006). Cuvier's beaked whale is the species for which most is known. It has been sighted in late spring or summer along the shelf edge in the Mid-Atlantic region of the U.S. coast. Most sightings of *Mesoplodon* beaked whales were also recorded in late spring and summer. True's and Blainville's beaked whales have been recorded from Nova Scotia to Florida and the Bahamas. Gervais' beaked whale is the most common species in stranding records from the U.S. Atlantic coast (Cape Cod Bay to Florida); however, this species is thought to be more oceanic than some other mesoplodonts (Angliss and Outlaw 2005). Sowerby's beaked whales are included in the population estimate for beaked whales but occur primarily to the north of the analysis area.

Bottlenose dolphins in the NW Atlantic consist of at least five genetically distinct stocks distributed from southern Long Island, New York to central Florida (NMFS 2001a; McLellan et al. 2003). Eight management units have been established in this region. There are two morphotypes: coastal and offshore (Waring et al. 2006). The coastal morphotype seems to be restricted to waters <82 ft (25 m) deep north of Cape Hatteras (35°N) (Kenney 1990). The northern coastal stock of bottlenose dolphins is considered depleted under the MMPA. The offshore morphotype inhabits deeper offshore waters of the NW Atlantic and is thus more likely in the DAA. The summer abundance figure for the 2004 survey region encompassing the DAA is approximately 2,942 offshore bottlenose dolphins (Palka 2006).

3.7.2.2 Caribbean

Occurrence and distribution data for odontocetes in the SE Caribbean are limited. The most extensive cetacean surveys in the greater Caribbean were conducted in winter by Swartz et al. (2001, 2003). Smultea et al. (2004) report on visual and acoustic monitoring in the specific DAA in spring 2003 during an NSF-sponsored marine seismic cruise. The most abundant species were long-beaked common dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin, and Atlantic spotted dolphin. Data from the larger Caribbean Sea include the presence of 21 odontocetes during spring or summer. Those most relevant to the exemplary Caribbean DAA are dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, two *Mesoplodon* species, short-finned pilot whale, long-beaked common dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin, and five *Stenella* species (Table 3.7-3). One ESA-listed species, the sperm whale, is present. Other odontocetes include various beaked whales. Based on combined results of available studies (Smultea et al. 2004; Kannada and Romero 2005), the most common species are likely to be the short-finned pilot whale and the common, bottlenose, pantropical spotted, Atlantic spotted, and spinner dolphins.

All three deep-diving sperm whale species occur in the DAA. The sperm whale is most likely to be encountered (Table 3.7-3). Adults, juveniles, and calves are most common during summer throughout the Caribbean Sea (Watkins et al 1985; Romero et al 2001). However, their deep-diving habits reduce the likelihood of detection. Watkins et al (1999, 2002) found that sperm whale dives averaged 3,248 ft (990 m) deep and 44 min long, and were interspersed with surface activity for rest or social interactions. Dives

are associated with foraging for squid below the deep scattering layer (Wahlberg 2002). The mean size of sperm whale groups is fewer than four individuals (Roden and Mullin 2000). Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales are less frequently reported than sperm whales but are still common throughout the Caribbean Sea. They are thought to reside there year-round. Both species are poorly known, but the Caribbean Sea seems to be a breeding and calving area (Cardona-Maldanado and Mignucci-Giannoni 1999). Pygmy sperm whales mate and calve from fall through spring; less is known about the breeding and calving season for the dwarf sperm whale (Reeves et al. 2002). Differentiation of dwarf and pygmy sperm whales is difficult at sea, so sightings of either species are usually categorized as *Kogia* species.

Several other deep-diving odontocetes occur in the Caribbean Sea and may potentially occur within the DAA. Three species of beaked whale inhabit the Caribbean Sea year-round, although observations are rare. Much of the current knowledge about distribution comes from strandings. Cuvier's beaked whale is likely the most common odontocete, yet records in and around the analysis area are few. Gervais' beaked whales are more commonly seen than Blainville's beaked whales and records indicate that they are more abundant in winter (Debrot and Barros 1992). Blainville's beaked whales are the least abundant, but present throughout the year. They inhabit coastal waters more than other beaked whales. Other deep-diving odontocete species in the SE Caribbean are the rough-toothed dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin (offshore populations), Risso's dolphin, melon-headed whale, and pygmy and false killer whales.

3.7.2.3 S California

Many years of marine mammal surveys by ship and aircraft document numerous odontocete species off the S California coast (e.g., Barlow and Gerrodette 1996; Forney and Barlow 1998; Koski et al. 1998; Barlow and Taylor 2001; Calambokidis et al. 2002, Barlow 2003; Carretta et al. 2006). Twenty-three species of odontocetes are expected to occur in the S California DAA during spring or summer. Those most relevant are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, Baird's beaked whale, five *Mesoplodon* species, short-finned pilot whale, short- and long-beaked common dolphins, bottlenose dolphin, striped dolphin, spinner dolphin, pantropical spotted dolphin, Pacific white-sided dolphin, and harbor porpoise (Table 3.7-3). The sperm whale is the only ESA-listed odontocete in the DAA (Table 3.7-1). The California stocks of the short-finned pilot and sperm whales are considered "Strategic" under the MMPA, meaning that human impacts may influence the sustainability of these populations. Populations of odontocetes in offshore California waters have increased in the last 12 years, except for the short-finned pilot whale and harbor porpoise populations, which have decreased (Barlow 1994, 1995; Forney et al. 1995).

Sperm whales are present year-round in offshore waters. They are more abundant in fall and winter and rare in spring (Koski et al. 1998; Carretta et al. 2006). Based on ship surveys conducted in 2001 and 2005 by Barlow and Forney (2007) and Forney (2007), respectively, the most recent and precise estimate of abundance of the California-Oregon-Washington stock of sperm whales is 2,853 animals (Carretta et al. 2008). This estimate is corrected for diving animals not seen during the surveys.

Beaked whales are also important in the DAA. Carretta et al. (2006) summarize abundance estimates for beaked whales off California-Oregon-Washington for 1996-2001. However, these are considered underestimates. Cuvier's beaked whales are distributed offshore throughout the year, with an estimate of 1,121. Baird's beaked whales are thought to move into continental slope waters from late spring to autumn (Barlow et al. 1997) with a population estimate of 152. Mesoplodont beaked whales (including Hubb's, Hector's, ginkgo-toothed, Blainville's and Stejneger's) are known primarily from strandings and a few sightings, and thus, seasonal abundance and distribution of these species are difficult to establish. The population estimate for the Mesoplodont group is 645.

Dolphins are the most abundant odontocete species off S California during spring and summer (Table 3.7-3). Most abundant is the common dolphin (short-beaked and long-beaked dolphins combined), followed by the Pacific white-sided dolphin (Koski et al. 1998). Approximately 230,000 common dolphins may be present in spring, decreasing to approximately 150,000 in summer as they disperse northward (Carretta et al. 2006). Pacific white-sided dolphins are also more abundant in spring (23,000-28,000), also moving north during summer, leaving only about 1,000 individuals in the region (Koski et al. 1998). The three *Stenella* species (i.e., striped, spinner, and pantropical spotted dolphins) are rare.

3.7.2.4 W Gulf of Alaska

Few studies have been published on abundance and distribution of odontocetes in the W Gulf of Alaska. Eleven species are expected during summer (Table 3.7-3). Those most relevant are the sperm whale; Baird's, Cuvier's, and Stejneger's beaked whales; beluga, killer, and short-finned pilot whales; Pacific white-sided and Risso's dolphins; and Dall's and harbor porpoises. The most commonly sighted odontocete species in the W Gulf of Alaska are generally Dall's porpoise and killer whale (Angliss and Outlaw 2005; MacLean and Koski 2005).

The sperm whale is the only ESA-listed odontocete in the DAA (Table 3.7-1). Sperm whales occur as far north as Cape Navarin (62ºN) and the Pribilof Islands (Omura 1955). Adult males are more common in these higher-latitude waters. Females and juveniles are found mostly in temperate and tropical regions. Breeding occurs in temperate/tropical waters from January-August (Rice 1989), peaking in April-June (Best et al. 1984). Males feed during summer in the Gulf of Alaska, around the Aleutian Islands, and in the Bering Sea, although abundance is unknown (Angliss and Outlaw 2005). Most information regarding sperm whales in the Gulf of Alaska comes from fishermen and reports from observers aboard commercial fishing vessels (e.g., Dahlheim 1988; Hill et al. 1999). Interactions occur most often in the southeast Gulf of Alaska, east of Kodiak Island. Available data show few or no sightings in the DAA (Moore 2001; Wade et al. 2003; Barlow 2004a, b; Ireland et al. 2005; Sinclair et al. 2005). Zerbini et al. (2004a) estimated the abundance of sperm whales in the northern Gulf of Alaska and Aleutian Islands at 159.

Three species of beaked whales are expected in the W Gulf of Alaska: Baird's, Cuvier's, and Stejneger's (Table 3.7-3). Baird's beaked whales have been sighted numerous times in the mid-Gulf of Alaska, Aleutian Islands, and southern Bering Sea (Kasuya and Ohsumi 1984; Wade et al. 2003; Sinclair et al. 2005). The Bering Sea/eastern North Pacific population is considered a distinct stock (Balcomb 1989; Reyes 1991). However, reliable abundance estimates are unavailable. Feeding is near the continental slope at depths of 3,281–9,843 ft (1,000–3,000 m). Cuvier's beaked whales are widely distributed from 60°N to 50°S, but mostly in deep (>3,280 ft or 1,000 m) warmer waters (>10°C). They range into the Aleutian Islands (Rice 1986, 1998) but abundance estimates are unavailable and the species is rare this far north. Mesoplodonts have been seen recently in the region, but there have been no confirmed sightings of Stejneger's beaked whale since 1986 (Wade et al. 2003; Barlow 2004b).

Dall's porpoise are common and widespread from the Aleutians throughout the Gulf of Alaska, including the W Gulf of Alaska analysis area (Forney and Brownell 1996; Moore et al. 2002; Wade et al. 2003; Angliss and Outlaw 2005; Ireland et al. 2005; MacLean and Koski 2005).

Killer whales occur worldwide, but are most common at higher latitudes. They inhabit almost all coastal waters of Alaska (L-DEO and NSF 2004c). Based on appearance, feeding habits, vocalizations, social structure, and distribution and movement patterns, there are three types or populations of killer whales: residents, transients, and offshore animals. Genetic analyses indicate that these three populations rarely, if ever, interbreed. The resident and transient populations have also been divided into different subpopulations based mainly on genetic analyses and distribution; not enough is known about the

offshore whales to divide them into subpopulations. A transient and resident population or stock are expected to potentially occur within the W Gulf of Alaska DAA: Eastern North Pacific Gulf of Alaska, Aleutian Islands, and Bering Sea Transients and Eastern North Pacific Alaska Residents. It is estimated that 1,337 transient and resident killer whales potentially occur in the N Gulf of Alaska and waters of the Aleutian Islands (Allen and Angliss 2010).

3.7.2.5 Galapagos Ridge

Information about odontocetes in the Galapagos Ridge DAA during austral summer is scarce. Odontocete data comes from extensive surveys in the ETP during the austral winter and spring (Polacheck 1987; Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Smultea and Holst 2003). Twenty-one odontocete species potentially occur in the DAA (Table 3.7-3). Those most relevant are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, five beaked whale species, short-finned pilot whale, short-beaked common dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin, and three *Stenella* species. The most common species within the DAA are expected to be the pantropical spotted, striped, and short-beaked common dolphins. The beaked whale species are considered rare in the region.

Northern hemisphere sperm whales likely breed in the DAA during the austral summer (Table 3.7-1 and 3.7-3). Long-term studies indicate that N hemisphere males migrate south to breed near the equator and the Galapagos Islands in January to August, with peak breeding from April to June (Rice 1989). Southern hemisphere sperm whales breed from July to March, with peak breeding from September to December; S hemisphere males feed in sub-Antarctic waters during the austral summer. A population of approximately 200 sperm whales inhabits the Galapagos Islands region to the northeast; the number of sperm whales potentially within the DAA is unknown. An estimate for the overall ETP is 26,053 (Whitehead 2002). Polacheck (1987) noted that sperm whales seemed most abundant in nearshore (but relatively deep) waters. Sperm whales are generally distributed over large areas that have high secondary productivity and steep underwater topography (Jaquet and Whitehead 1996).

The five species of beaked whales with distributions encompassing the DAA are Cuvier's, Longman's, pygmy, ginkgo-toothed, and Blainville's (Table 3.7-3). Approximately 20,000 Cuvier's beaked whales are estimated in the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). They prefer deep water (3,280 ft [1,000 m]) and dive for 20–40 min. Little is known about their reproductive behavior. Longman's beaked whale has been confused with the tropical bottlenose whale; thus, some sightings are likely misidentified, making abundance difficult to estimate (Reeves et al. 2002). They are thought to reside in the ETP year-round. The pygmy beaked whale is thought to occur between 15°S and 25°N. The ginkgo-toothed beaked whale is known only from strandings, including the Galapagos Islands. Blainville's beaked whales have been sighted in offshore and nearshore areas of South and Central America (Pitman et al. 1987; Pitman and Lynn 2001), although generally in deep waters (Davis et al. 1998). They do not appear to migrate.

The *Stenella* dolphin species plus the short-beaked common dolphin are the most abundant odontocetes in the ETP (Polacheck 1987; Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001). The striped dolphin breeds mainly during the austral summer (Boyd et al. 1999), coinciding with the exemplary analysis season (Table 3.7-3). The pantropical spotted dolphin feeds here during the austral summer, but its reproductive peak is spring and fall (Barlow 1984), though calving occurs year round (Reeves et al. 2002). The short-beaked common dolphin calves all year in the Costa Rica Dome area near 9°N 90°W, northeast of the DAA (Danil and Chivers 2005).

3.7.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

This section summarizes the occurrence and habits of odontocetes in the eight QAAs. These summaries generally address broader regions than the five DAAs. Fewer data are available on abundance of odontocetes for some QAAs as compared to most DAAs. Discussion is limited to species within each region during the season that an exemplary marine seismic survey is proposed (Table 3.7-4). Discussion focuses on species with special status (e.g., ESA listed), those that are most abundant, beaked whales, and other deep divers.

3.7.3.1 N Atlantic/Iceland

N Atlantic cetaceans are well-documented through aerial and ship-based surveys, as well as modern whaling cruises, commercial whale-watch cruises, strandings, fisheries bycatch records, and other sources (e.g., Larsen 1995; Cawardine 1998; NAMMCO 2005; Vikingsson et al. 2004). Thirteen odontocetes potentially occur in the QAA during summer (Table 3.7-4). Those most relevant include: sperm whale, beaked whales, long-finned pilot whale, short-beaked common dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin, striped dolphin, Atlantic white-sided and white-beaked dolphins, and harbor porpoise. The sperm whale is the only species with ESA status (endangered; Table 3.7-1). The IUCN lists two species, the sperm whale and harbor porpoise, as Vulnerable. The most common odontocetes are the northern bottlenose whale, killer whale, long-finned pilot whale, Atlantic white-sided dolphin, white-beaked dolphin, and harbor porpoise.

Sperm whales near Iceland are exclusively males. Females and juveniles reside year-round in lower latitudes. All sperm whales harvested off Iceland from 1948 to 1982 were males. Off Iceland, they feed on deep-water fish, rays, sharks, cod, redfish, monkfish, and lumpfish in addition to squid (Cawardine 1998). Gunnlaugsson and Sigurjónsson (1990) estimated 1,542 sperm whales for Icelandic, Faroese, and adjacent waters. Mean school sizes in the Norwegian Sea are one or two (Christensen et al. 1992).

The N bottlenose whale is the only common beaked whale near Iceland. Approximately 3,142 individuals are estimated near Iceland, with approximately 40,000 in the eastern North Atlantic overall (Culik 2004). This species feeds off Iceland during summer (Table 3.7-4). Unlike most other beaked whales, N bottlenose whales often approach boats and sources of unusual noises.

Five additional odontocete species are common or abundant near Iceland (Table 3.7-4). Harbor porpoise are common in coastal areas. In summer, they often occur within a couple of miles from shore. They can be difficult to sight as they tend to avoid boats and are inconspicuous when they surface. They breed and calve in spring and summer. The Iceland population is estimated at 25,000–27,000 (Cawardine 1998). An estimated population of 6,600 killer whales feed in Iceland and Faroese waters during summer (Culik 2004). They are most common in late summer and early fall, hunting shoals of herring, but are present year-round (Cawardine 1998). Long-finned pilot whales are also common near Iceland. Their peak breeding season is summer, with most calves born in late summer (Cawardine 1998). The population estimate for long-finned pilot whales in the eastern North Atlantic is 778,000 individuals. Atlantic white-sided and white-beaked dolphins are the most abundant odontocetes in the QAA (Cawardine 1998). Both breed and calve in summer (Culik 2004). Atlantic white-sided dolphins are common in deeper waters. Iceland is near the northern extreme for Atlantic white-sided dolphins. Population estimates for the N and W of Scotland are 6,317 Atlantic white-sided dolphins, and they are the most abundant species there. White-beaked dolphins are thought to number a few thousand in Icelandic waters (Culik 2004) and tend to be more coastal than white-sided dolphins (Cawardine 1998).

Table 3.7-4. Potential Occurrence of Odontocetes within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

*Species**	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (N Sum)*[a,b]*	*BC Coast (N Fall)*[c]*	*SW Atlantic (Any)*[d,e]*	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (N Spr, Sum or Fall)*[f]*	*W Australia (S Spr or Fall)**	*W India (N Early Spr or, Late Fall)*[g]*	*Marianas (N Spr)**	*Sub-Antarctic (S Sum)*[h]*
Sperm whale	F u	BF u	BF na	F c	-	BF c	BF c	BF c
Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales	-	F r [2]	BF na [2]	F r [2]	F r [2]	BF c [2]	B? F na [2]	F c [2]
Beaked whales (2 *Berardius* spp.)	-	F r [1]	BF na [1]	F na [1]	-	-	-	F u [1]
Shepherd's beaked whale	-	-	-	-	B? F r	-	-	F u
Cuvier's beaked whale	F r	F r	B? F na	F r	B? F r	B? F r	B? F u	F c
Longman's beaked whale	-	-	-	-	B? F r+	B? F? na	B? F na	-
Beaked whales (14 *Mesoplodon* spp.)	F r [2]	F r [1]	BF na [1]	F r [3]	B? F r [3]	B? F c [2]	B? F na [2]	B? F r-u-c [7]
Bottlenose whales (2 *Hyperoodon* spp.)	F c [1]	-	-	-	B? F r[1]	BF na [1]	-	F c
Killer whale	F c	BF c	B? F na	F r	B? F u	BF r		F c
False killer whale	-	F r	B?F? na	F r	B? F u	BF u	B? F u	F c
Pygmy killer whale	-	-	BF na	F r	F r	F u	F u	F c
Melon-headed whale	-	-	BF na	F r	BF c	B? F r	F c	-
Pilot whales (2 *Globicephala* spp.)	F c [1]	F r [1]	BF na [1]	F c [2]	BF u [2]	BF c [1]	F c [1]	F c [2]
Irrawaddy (=snubfin) dolphin	-	-	-	-	BF u	BF na	-	-
Risso's dolphin	-	F r	B? F na	B? F u?	-	BF a	B? F na	F u
Common dolphins (3 *Delphinus* spp.)	F r [1]	-	BF na [1]	F c [1]	BF c [1]	BF a [approx. 2]	-	F r [1]
Fraser's dolphin	-	-	B? F na	F r	B? F r	B? F r	B? F na	-
Indo-Pacific humpbacked dolphin	-	-	-	-	BF u	BF na	-	-
Tucuxi	-	-	F r	-	-	-	-	-
Bottlenose dolphins (2 *Tursiops* spp.)	F r [1]	-	BF c [1]	F u [1]	BF a [2]	BF a [2]	BF c [2]	B? F c [1]
Dolphins (5 *Stenella* spp.)	F r [1]	-	BF c [5]	F u-c [4]	BF na [3]	BF a [3]	BFM a [3]	F c [3]
Dolphins (6 *Lagenorhynchus* spp.)	F a [2]	F c [1]	-	BFr? [1]	-	-	-	F u [1]
Rough-toothed dolphin	-	-	B? F na	F r	B? F u	B? F c	B? F r	-
Right whale dolphins (2 *Lissodelphis* spp.)	-	F r [1]		-	-	-	-	F na
Finless porpoise	-	-	-	-	-	BF na	-	-
Porpoises (3 *Phocoena* spp.)	F c [1]	F c [1]	-	-	-	-	-	B? F r [1]
Dall's porpoise	-	F c	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: *[ ] = number of species from this genus found in the specific analysis area; some are approximations as some were identified only to genus in some analysis areas; (Season) = N or S hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; **B** = known to breed or calve within the area/season; **F** = known to feed within the area/season; **M** = known to migrate through the area/season; **?** = unknown / possible; **a** = abundant: the species is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area during the relevant season, and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year during the relevant season assuming many visits to the area; **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years during the relevant season; **na** = reliable data not available or uncertain or species status was not assessed; - = species does not occur; **+** = tropical bottlenose whale has been reclassified as Longman's beaked whale (Pitman et al. 1999).

Sources: Reeves et al. 2002; Culik 2004; Ross 2006; also see following footnotes:
[(a)] UAF and NSF 2005; UTA and NSF 2006; [(b)] Cawardine 1998; [(c)] L-DEO and NSF 2006a; [(d)] UNEP 2006; [(e)] L-DEO and NSF 2003g; [(f)] L-DEO and NSF 2003c; [(g)] Ballance and Pitman 1998; [(h)] SIO and NSF 2004.

3.7.3.2 BC Coast

Occurrence and distributions of odontocetes in western Canadian coastal waters, including the BC Coast QAA, are well known (Williams and Thomas 2007). Data sources include aerial, acoustic, and ship-based (including photo-identification) surveys as well as opportunistic and historical whaling records (summarized in L-DEO and NSF 2006a; Williams and Thomas 2007). Fourteen species of odontocetes are expected during a fall seismic survey. Those most relevant during the exemplary fall BC Coast survey are the sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, beaked whales (Cuvier's, Baird's, and Stejneger's), Pacific white-sided dolphin, Dall's porpoise, and harbor porpoise (Table 3.7-4). Only four species are common in the QAA: Pacific white-sided dolphin, killer whale, Dall's porpoise, and harbor porpoise. Recent abundance estimates for odontocetes are available for only the latter four species based on systematic sighting surveys conducted during summer in coastal BC waters (Williams and Thomas 2007). The latter survey encompasses the BC Coast QAA. The S Resident population of killer whales in Washington State (not part of the QAA) were recently listed as endangered under the ESA (Table 3.7-1). The Canadian government considers the N Resident and transient killer whale populations, both of which occur in the QAA, to be Threatened. The three beaked whale species are rare in the area. Ten of the 14 odontocetes are IUCN-listed as Vulnerable, Conservation Dependent, or Data Deficient.

Male sperm whales may occur in the QAA in small numbers during the fall, but their distribution and abundance are unknown. Before the whaling era, sperm whales commonly occurred off BC; currently they are only occasionally observed there, primarily in spring and summer (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). They may breed in BC waters in spring (April–May) and calve there during summer (July–August; Gregr et al. 2000). Male sperm whales have larger ranges than females (Reeves and Whitehead 1997) and have most often been associated with the shelf break; females are more uniformly distributed throughout deeper waters. During the whaling era, females were not recorded north of Vancouver Island, whereas males were observed in deep water off the Queen Charlotte Islands (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). Sperm whales feed primarily on squid, but also octopus and deep-water fish (Flinn et al. 2002). Highly suitable habitat for sperm whales is along the continental slope and a large area off the northwest coast of Vancouver Island (Gregr and Trites 2001).

Cuvier's, Stejneger's, and Baird's beaked whales are believed to be sparingly present in the QAA during fall. Specific distributions and abundances are unknown, but all are rare in nearshore waters where the exemplary survey would occur. Cuvier's beaked whales inhabit deep waters near the 3,215-ft (1,000-m) bathymetric contour (Houston 1991). Available information on Stejneger's beaked whales comes primarily from strandings and a few sightings. Baird's beaked whales use continental slope waters during summer and autumn when water temperatures are highest (Kasuya 1986). They are also observed where deep water approaches the coast (Jefferson et al. 1993). Historically, Baird's beaked whales were most frequently seen off the west coast of Vancouver Island from May through October, with a peak in August (Balcomb 1989).

Killer whales occur in three ecotypes or populations off the BC Coast: resident, transient, and offshore. The populations most likely in the QAA are the N Resident and transient populations; however, S Residents or offshore killer whales could be present (L-DEO and NSF 2006a). Resident killer whales inhabit small ranges in summer and autumn, following seasonal salmon runs (Heimlich-Boran 1988; Heimlich 1994; Baird 2001). Transient populations regularly move through the ranges of resident populations. Calving appears to occur year-round, peaking from October to March. Resident populations have decreased by as much as 20% in the last decade and appear particularly vulnerable to vessel traffic and declines in salmon. The N Resident population consisted of 201 individuals in 2001 (L-DEO and

NSF 2006a). Based on recent summer surveys during which there were several sightings in the BC Coast QAA, Williams and Thomas (2007) estimate that 161 (95% CI 45-574) killer whales occur in BC coastal waters as a whole during summer. They were most frequently seen in Queen Charlotte Basin, Johnstone Strait, and adjacent north and central-coast mainland inlets. However, the abundance estimate for killer whales was 0 in the sub-survey area near and within the BC QAA consisting of the mainland BC inlets (Williams and Thomas 2007).

Transient whales feed on marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish (Baird and Dill 1995; Ford et al. 1998; Baird and Whitehead 2000; Saulitis et al. 2000). The transient population of BC and S Alaska is 218 whales. Killer whales face risks from pollution, and the transient population has high organochlorine concentrations (NMFS 2006d).

The three other common odontocetes in BC coastal waters are the Pacific white-sided dolphin, harbor porpoise, and Dall's porpoise (Table 3.7-4). Large pods of Pacific white-sided dolphins are seen off the BC coast in the spring and summer, most commonly in Queen Charlotte Basin but also in Johnstone Strait and sometimes in the southern straits (Williams and Thomas 2007). They can be coastal in cooler months, moving offshore when waters warm. Williams and Thomas (2007) recently estimated that 25,900 (95% CI 12,900-52,100) white-sided dolphins occur in BC coastal waters during summer. However, the abundance estimate for Pacific white-sided dolphins was 0 in the sub-survey area near and within the BC QAA consisting of the mainland BC inlets.

Harbor porpoises occur year-round in the BC coastal water region where the most recent population estimate is 9,120 (95% CI 4,210-19,760) (Williams and Thomas 2007). In the sub-survey area near and within the BC QAA consisting of the mainland BC inlets, the abundance estimate for harbor porpoises is 1,140 (95% CI 29-44,989). They occur commonly throughout coastal BC, with the highest numbers in the southern straits followed by the inland straits and Queen Charlotte Basin (Williams and Thomas 2007).

Dall's porpoises use both nearshore and offshore areas of BC and appear to be resident all year. The most recent summer population estimate for BC coastal waters is 4,910 (95% CI 2,700-8,940) Dall's porpoises (Williams and Thomas 2007). In the sub-survey area near and within the BC QAA consisting of the mainland BC inlets, the abundance estimate for Dall's porpoises is 69 (95% CI 1-2825). They occur most commonly in offshore waters of Queen Charlotte Basin and occasionally in the southern straits, with relatively infrequent sightings in the mainland inlets (Williams and Thomas 2007). Breeding and calving occur among Dall's porpoises in summer (June to September).

3.7.3.3 SW Atlantic

Distribution and population data for odontocetes are sparse in the SW Atlantic QAA off the coast of Brazil. Nineteen species are potentially present (Reeves et al. 2002; Culik 2004). Those most relevant are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, beaked whales (Cuvier's, Baird's, and Blainville's), short-finned pilot whale, long-beaked common dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin, and five *Stenella* species (Table 3.7-4).

Population data are insufficient for most species in the QAA. Based on data from other tropical locations, the most common dolphins are likely to be six species of the genera *Stenella* or *Tursiops*. Atlantic spotted dolphin was the most common cetacean seen during fisheries operations off southern Brazil (Marcatto et al. 2005). Moreno et al. (2005) confirmed the presence of Atlantic spotted dolphins off both southern (21°–36°S) and northern Brazil (north of 6°S), pantropical spotted dolphins mainly off northeastern South America, Clymene and spinner dolphins as far south as 30°S, and striped dolphins primarily off southern Brazil and Argentina.

The sperm whale occurs in the SW Atlantic QAA throughout the year. In general, sperm whales occur in deep waters and along continental slopes (Rice 1989). Females and juveniles use smaller ranges than males and remain in tropical and temperate latitudes year-round. Mature and subadult males migrate to sub-Antarctic waters during the austral summer to feed.

3.7.3.4 Mid-Atlantic Ridge

Quantitative data on odontocete abundance and distribution are scarce for the remote Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA. General distribution information, historical whaling data, and a few recent studies provide an indication of species present (Reeves et al. 2002; L-DEO and NSF 2003c; Doksæter et al. 2005; Nøttestad et al. 2005; Skov et al. 2005; Waring et al. 2005a). Twenty-four odontocete species may occur during a spring, summer, or fall survey in the QAA. If present, they would likely be feeding (Table 3.7-4). Those species considered most relevant are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, Baird's and Cuvier's beaked whales, three *Mesoplodon* species, short- and long-finned pilot whales, short-beaked common dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin, and four *Stenella* species (Table 3.7-4).

Historical whaling data indicate that the Mid-Atlantic Ridge was important cetacean habitat (Waring et al. 2006). Recent studies suggest that cetaceans along the Mid-Atlantic ridge concentrate near underwater topographic features (e.g., seamounts, hydrothermal activity, rough bottom topography) where their prey concentrate due to upwelling or retention (Doksæter et al. 2005; Nøttestad et al. 2005; Skov et al. 2005; Waring et al. 2005a). However, an NSF-funded seismic survey in October–November 2003 in the QAA detected no marine mammals, either in the survey area or during transits (Holst 2004). Because the QAA is characterized by deep water (4,921–14,764 ft [1,500-4,500 m]) and is not near land, odontocetes inhabiting deep, temperate waters are most likely, but generally in low densities. Such species include the sperm, dwarf sperm, Cuvier's beaked, True's beaked, false killer, and short-finned pilot whales; short-beaked common, pantropical spotted, spinner, striped, and Risso's dolphins; and possibly the Atlantic white-sided dolphin (Doksæter et al. 2005; Nøttestad et al. 2005; Waring et al. 2005a) (Table 3.7-4). Of these, the most likely to be sighted are sperm and pilot whales, and short-beaked common and striped dolphins (Waring et al. 2005a; Table 3.7-4). Waring at el. (2005) found pilot whales mainly in colder waters along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, with common and striped dolphins further south. Doksæter et al. (2005) reported that dolphin group sizes appeared to increase at night along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge.

Sperm whales are likely to be foraging or possibly migrating in the Mid-Atlantic QAA during spring, summer, or fall (Table 3.7-4). Waring et al. (2005a) reported that sperm whales were the second-most common species (n = 50 groups) seen during summer 2004 surveys along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, with the highest concentration north of the Charlie Gibbs Fracture Zone. Nøttestad et al. (2005) reported sperm whales most commonly along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge in waters <6,560 ft (2,000 m) deep, often at the surface above seamount peaks, where concentrations of cephalopods were higher.

3.7.3.5 W Australia

Considerable survey work has been conducted on marine mammals in northwest Australian coastal waters. Most such work has occurred in the Kimberley, NW Shelf, and Shark Bay regions, and in oceanic waters between the NW Shelf and Cocos Island. Studies have also been done in the southwest region of Australia (summarized in de Boer et al. 2003; Ross 2006). A wide range of water depths (i.e., shallow coastal to pelagic) and a wide variety of marine habitats occur within the W Australia QAA (e.g., numerous reefs, islands, seamounts). This habitat diversity supports the estimated 26 odontocetes during the exemplary austral spring or fall analysis period (Table 3.7-4).

Species most relevant are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, beaked whales, short- and long-finned pilot whales, short-beaked common dolphin, Indo-Pacific bottlenose and common bottlenose dolphins, and three *Stenella* species (Table 3.7-4). The sperm whale is the only odontocete that is ESA listed (endangered) (Table 3.7-1). The Australian government has identified the Irrawaddy, Indo-Pacific humpbacked, and spinner dolphins as Priority Species because of concern for their conservation status. In particular, spinner dolphin populations experienced large losses (n = 4,900) between 1981 and 1985 in the Taiwanese gill-net fishery. The most common odontocete is the Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin.

The Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin is the most numerous species along Australian shores (Hale et al. 2000). Aerial surveys over Shark Bay, in northwest Australia, estimated 2,000–3,000 Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (Preen et al. 1997). The common bottlenose dolphin occurs in deeper, offshore waters (Ross 2006).

Little is known about the beaked whales off W Australia, although they constitute about one-third of all small cetacean species in the Australian region (Ross 2006). Elsewhere, beaked whales tend to inhabit shelf-edge habitats associated with underwater canyons (Waring et al. 2001). The species most likely to occur along the northwest Australian coast are Shepherd's, Cuvier's, True's, ginkgo-toothed, and Blainville's beaked whales.

The sperm whale has been recorded all around Australia, although there are no current population estimates or trends. However, most sperm whales have been recorded off southwestern Australia, and few would be likely to occur in the more northern QAA during the seasons analyzed. During austral summer, sperm whales move southward from Australia to feed, with a corresponding northward migration to breed and calve in the austral winter. Mating occurs from September to December and calving from November to March in temperate and tropical waters (Bannister et al. 1996).

3.7.3.6 W India

The northwestern Indian Ocean contains numerous odontocetes, but their distribution and abundance have been little studied. The Arabian Sea experiences upwellings of cool water in boreal summer that cause an influx of nutrients, contributing to extremely high primary productivity. The southwestern monsoon current flows from the Arabian Sea along India and into the Bay of Bengal, exchanging water between the two basins (de Boer et al. 2002). Small odontocetes are the most common species in the Arabian Sea, with larger odontocetes less frequent. The Indian Ocean north of 55°S latitude was declared a whale sanctuary by the IWC in 1979 in order to protect large whales from commercial whaling (de Boer et al. 2003). Previous commercial whaling depleted sperm whale stocks in the Indian Ocean.

Twenty-six species of odontocetes have ranges that include the W India QAA and may be present during spring or fall (Table 3.7-4). Species most relevant are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, beaked whales (Longman's, Cuvier's, ginkgo-toothed, and Blainville's), short-finned pilot whale, Arabian common and undifferentiated common dolphins, Indo-Pacific and common bottlenose dolphins, and pantropical spotted, spinner, and striped dolphins (Table 3.7-4).

Much of the recent information on odontocetes in the QAA comes from a 1995 research survey in the western tropical Indian Ocean (Ballance and Pitman 1998), from Baldwin et al. (1998), and from a compilation reported in de Boer et al. (2003). The sperm whale was the most frequently sighted cetacean group, along with *Tursiops* spp., striped dolphin, *Delphinus* spp., and Risso's dolphin. Although relatively fewer groups of spinner dolphins were seen, these groups consisted of more individuals than other groups of cetaceans (Ballance and Pitman 1998). The most frequently encountered species in Omani coastal waters, west of the QAA were *Delphinus* spp., *Tursiops* spp., the Indopacific humpback dolphin, and the

spinner dolphin (Baldwin et al. 1998). Sperm whales are year-round breeding residents in the Arabian Sea (Gallagher 1991; Baldwin 1995). During the 1996 survey by Ballance and Pitman (1998), sperm whales were widespread, with 86 sightings of 240 individuals. *Mesoplodon* spp. (26 sightings) were also seen; most sightings were thought to be ginkgo-toothed beaked whales. Other breeding residents include the Arabian common dolphin, common dolphin, Indopacific humpback dolphin, finless porpoise, Risso's dolphin, false killer whale, pantropical spotted dolphin, spinner dolphin, and *Tursiops* spp. (de Boer 2002) (Table 3.7-4). Of these, the Indopacific humpback dolphin and finless porpoise prefer nearshore, shallow waters <2 mi (3.2 km) from shore. Finless porpoises utilize fresh and saltwater habitats. Calving has been reported in spring and fall months for common dolphins (Culik 2004) with no seasonality reported for false killer whales. Pantropical and spinner dolphins seem to breed year-round with peaks in the spring and fall (Reeves 2002).

3.7.3.7 Marianas

Current published data on odontocetes for the Marianas QAA are scarce, although the U.S. Navy funded a systematic baseline survey for cetaceans in this area during winter 2007. Nineteen species of odontocetes may use the QAA during spring. Species most relevant are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, beaked whales (Cuvier's, Longman's, ginkgo-toothed, and Blainville's), short-finned pilot whale, Indo-Pacific and common bottlenose dolphins, and pantropical spotted, spinner, and striped dolphins (Table 3.7-4). The *Stenella* species are expected to be the most abundant odontocete species, based on surveys elsewhere at low-latitudes (e.g., Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Balance and Pitman 1998; Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Reeves et al. 2002). Pantropical spotted and striped dolphins, as well as the false killer whale, were the most frequently encountered delphinid species during spring surveys in the southern Marianas in 2007 (NAVFAC Pacific 2007). Regardless of ocean, the three *Stenella* species comprise 62–82% of all individuals for all cetaceans (Ballance and Pitman 1998).

Sperm whales occur throughout the N Pacific and males migrate seasonally as mentioned previously (see Table 3.7-1). In winter, N hemisphere sperm whales are typically south of 40°N (Gosho et al. 1984) and occur in the QAA during spring. Sperm whales migrate long distances in the Pacific, as shown from data from past commercial whaling; these data revealed a great deal of movement between Alaska waters and the western North Pacific (Japan and the Bonin Islands) (Carretta et al. 2006). The sperm whale was the most frequently sighted cetacean (21 sightings) during the January–April 2007 survey off the southern Marianas; they were observed in waters ~800 to 10,000 m deep (NAVFAC Pacific 2007). The population estimate for Guam and the Marianas is estimated at 705 sperm whales (NAVFAC Pacific 2007).

Cuvier's beaked whales likely occur in the QAA in small numbers. They are widely distributed through temperate and tropical waters of the North Pacific (Reeves et al. 2002). There are local populations off Japan and year-round populations off Hawaii (Ross 2006). They are considered common near oceanic islands (Culik 2004). Specific data about other beaked whales and other deep-diving species in this QAA are unavailable, but these species will be mainly distributed in slope and deep-water areas, based on habitats known elsewhere.

Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins were recently reported to occur in the Bonin Islands just northwest of the analysis area (Mori et al. 2005). A total of 963 dolphins were sighted throughout the year 1.2–25 mi (2-40 km) from shore; some identified individuals seemed to be year-round residents. Given the proximity of the latter location, it is inferred that Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins might be distributed year-round in the coastal waters of the analysis area; however, none were seen during spring surveys in the area in 2007 (NAVFAC Pacific 2007).

3.7.3.8 Sub-Antarctic

The Sub-Antarctic QAA lies in one of the least-described regions of the ocean. Still, it is the most uniform and seasonally stable region of the open oceans, with an enhanced biomass of chlorophyll that supports a relatively high biomass of small fish and squid, and concentrations of large pelagic fish (NMFS 2005b). Information on odontocete species in the Sub-Antarctic QAA during the austral summer is extrapolated from research studies conducted in other locations including the Antarctic (Branch and Butterworth 2001), Hawaii (Carretta et al. 2004, 2006), ETP (Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Wade and Gerrodette 1993), and French Polynesia (Gannier 2002). The southwest Pacific Ocean is thought to support approximately 31 species of odontocetes. The sperm whale is the only ESA-listed odontocete.

Species most relevant to this analysis are sperm whale, dwarf and pygmy sperm whales, beaked whales, short- and long-finned pilot whales, short-beaked common dolphin, common bottlenose dolphin, three *Stenella* species, hourglass dolphin, and spectacled porpoise (Table 3.7-4).

Sperm whales, consisting of solitary males and mixed sex/age classes, are likely to occur in the QAA based on their distribution in the S Ocean during the austral summer. Young calves could also be present during summer. A single group of four sperm whales was sighted in February 2005 during an NSF-funded SIO academic seismic survey in the southwest Pacific Ocean (SIO and NSF 2004). Female and immature sperm whales generally occur at tropical and temperate latitudes of 50º N–50º S, while solitary adult males are found to 75º N and 75º S (Reeves and Whitehead 1997). Home ranges of individual females span distances of up to 620 mi (1,000 km) (Best 1979; Dufault and Whitehead 1995); however, some females travel several thousand miles across large parts of an ocean basin (Kasuya and Miyashita 1988). Sperm whales generally occur in waters >590 ft (180 m) deep; waters in the QAA are >3,280 ft (1,000 m) deep.

Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales are likely common in the QAA based on their general distribution in the S Ocean (Reeves et al. 2002) (Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-4). However, they are rarely sighted at sea due to avoidance of vessels, inconspicuous surfacing, and logging (lying still at the water surface) behaviors. Their distribution in the S Ocean is mostly known from strandings. The dwarf sperm whale is the most frequently stranded cetacean species in New Zealand, with 19 strandings of 23 individuals from April 1988 to March 1989 (Cawthorn 1990).

More species of beaked whales occur in the Sub-Antarctic QAA than any of the other areas evaluated in this PEIS. Ten species are expected including Arnoux's, Cuvier's, Shepherd's, Andrew's, Blainville's, ginkgo-toothed, Gray's, Hector's, strap-toothed, and spade-toothed (Table 3.7-4). Arnoux's beaked whales feed primarily on deep-water bottom fish (Kasuya 2002). They have been sighted in waters near New Zealand and Antarctica and to the south of the QAA during January-March (Balcomb 1989). Cuvier's and Blainville's beaked whales have been recently sighted near French Polynesia and the Cook Islands (South Pacific Whale Research Consortium 2004). Shepherd's beaked whale and the *Mesoplodon* species are known primarily from strandings (Pitman 2002). Most mesoplodonts are thought to be rare, with the exception of Gray's beaked whales, strap-toothed whales, and Blainville's beaked whales, which appear to be widespread and fairly common based on stranding records (Table 3.7-4; Pitman 2002).

3.7.4 Environmental Consequences – General

The following sections provide a synopsis of the potential effects on odontocetes from sounds and activities associated with seismic survey operations. In comparison with seismic survey effects on mysticetes, limited studies have been published on odontocete reactions to airguns and research-type echosounders and pingers, particularly of the type proposed for use during NSF-funded or USGS seismic

surveys. For the purpose of this analysis, project effects are assessed at the individual level and the population level. Prior to discussing potential effects, the criteria and approach used to assess effects are described. This is followed by a comparison of the overlap between the sound frequencies of acoustic sources used in seismic surveys with presumed and documented odontocete hearing sensitivity (Section 3.7.1.5 and Table 3.7-2).

3.7.4.1 Criteria and Approach

The criteria and approach used to evaluate and quantify the potential project effects on odontocetes are the same as those applied to mysticetes (see Table 2.9 and Sections 2.3.3.2 and 3.7.4.1). However, for the Level A potential injury criteria based on cumulative energy, different M-weighting (see Section 2.3.3.3) was used to down-weight sound components to which the MF and HF odontocetes hearing groups are considered less sensitive (Southall et al. 2007).

Our understanding of odontocete hearing sensitivity is based on limited auditory studies, knowledge of their auditory anatomy, the sounds to which they are known to respond, and the characteristics of their calls: they are presumed to be capable of hearing sounds they produce. In addition, odontocetes may hear some sounds at lower or higher frequencies. It is also plausible that an odontocete could be harmed by the sound energy (if exposed to high enough levels for a sufficient period) even if the sound's frequencies are outside the hearing sensitivity range of the animal. Direct measurements of the hearing capabilities of a few small- to moderate-sized odontocete species have been done, including bottlenose dolphins, beluga whales, harbor porpoises, and several other species (reviewed in Section 3.7.1.5, Table 3.7-2 and Appendix E). Results indicate that these species have relatively poor hearing sensitivity at frequencies below 1 kHz, but extremely good sensitivity at and above several kHz (Section 3.7.1.5) (Richardson et al. 1995a; Miller et al. 2005; Southall et al. 2007).

3.7.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

To assess potential effects of project sound sources on odontocetes, it is important to identify any overlap in their acoustic characteristics with those of the acoustic sources that would be used during the seismic surveys. For this analysis, all the odontocete species addressed except the HF porpoises belong to the MF hearing group. This follows common practice until very recently when *Kogia* was reclassified into the HF group by Southall et al. (2007), suggesting that impacts of predominantly low-frequency airgun sound on *Kogia* will be slightly less than predicted here. Collectively, the MF odontocetes are believed to have functional hearing from about 150 Hz to 160 kHz, although individual species may not have quite so broad a range (Southall et al. 2007). The HF hearing group (i.e., porpoises) has functional hearing from about 200 Hz to 180 kHz. The degree of overlap between the frequencies produced by the airguns, MBESs, SBPs, pingers, and project vessels and (on the other hand) the calls and auditory sensitivity of odontocetes is described below (also see Table 3.7-2).

The proposed airguns and airgun arrays have dominant frequency components of 2-188 Hz (Tables 2-3 and 2-4). This frequency range somewhat overlaps the lower part of the frequency range of odontocete calls and/or functional hearing (full range about 150 Hz to 180 kHz) (see Table 3.7-2). Airguns also produce a small proportion of their sound at mid- and high frequencies, although at progressively lower levels with increasing frequency (see Chapter 2 and Appendix E). These frequencies overlap most, if not all, frequencies produced by odontocetes. Sounds from the project's larger airgun configurations would, in regions with efficient sound propagation, be high enough to be detected by some odontocetes out to tens of miles or more (Richardson et al. 1995a; Richardson and Würsig 1997). The pulsed sounds associated with seismic exploration have higher peak levels than most other anthropogenic sounds to which marine animals are routinely exposed (Richardson et al. 1995a). In summary, airgun sounds are

audible to odontocetes, although their sensitivity is considered poor at the low frequencies that dominate airgun and airgun array sounds.

Odontocetes are presumably more sensitive to the mid- to high frequencies produced by the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers than to the dominant low frequencies produced by the airguns and vessel. The MBESs proposed for the *Langseth* is the Kongsberg EM122 which operates in the range of approximately 10.5-13 (usually 12) kHz with a maximum source level of approximately 242 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) (Table 2-5). Four other MBESs proposed for other project vessels, the Sunbeam 200 and 2100/12, and the Krupp-Atlas HydroSweep DS, also operate near this frequency range (12-15.5 kHz), with maximum source levels of about 234 to 237 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) (Table 2-5). These frequency ranges overlap the known or suspected frequency sensitivity range of all odontocetes and are within or near the range of greatest sensitivity of many odontocetes (Table 3.7-2). The other two MBESs proposed for use operate at 30 and 95 kHz (Table 2-5). The 30-kHz MBES is likely audible to all the odontocetes. The 95 kHz MBES is within the known or suspected frequency range of many odontocetes species and may be within the range of them all (Southall et al. 2007) (Table 3.7-2). In summary, sounds from all the MBESs would be readily audible to most and possibly all odontocetes when animals are within the narrow angular extent of the intermittent sound beam.

The SBPs associated with the proposed seismic activities operate in the MF range of approximately 3.5 kHz with a maximum source output of 222 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms). The frequency range of the SBPs is within the known or suspected frequency band audible to all odontocete species (Table 3.7-2).

Omnidirectional pingers would also be used during proposed seismic surveys (see Section 2.4.3). A total of 32 omnidirectional pingers will be used for multi-streamer 3-D surveys: 7 on each streamer and 1 on each source array string. Their peak output is 183 dB re 1 µPa-m at 55-110 kHz, with a maximum rate of 3 pings per 10 sec; the transducers are powered by NiCad batteries. Sounds from these pingers overlap the known or suspected frequency sensitivity range of all odontocetes (Table 3.7-2). In addition, during scientific coring, battery-powered pingers that operate at lower frequency will be mounted on coring mechanisms as acoustic location beacons. These pingers produce omnidirectional 12-kHz signals with a source output of approximately 192 dB re 1 µPa-m with one ping of 0.5, 2, or 10 ms duration per second. This 12-kHz frequency overlaps the known or suspected frequency sensitivity range of all odontocetes and is within or near the range of greatest sensitivity for many odontocetes for which such data are available (Table 3.7-2).

Ship engines and the vessel hull itself emit broadband sounds at frequencies and amplitudes that would allow them to be heard by odontocetes (Table 3.7-2). The source level of vessel sound would be considerably less than that of the airguns, MBESs, and SBPs, but vessel sound (unlike those other sources) would be emitted continuously (Richardson et al. 1995a).

In summary, airgun and vessel sounds are audible to odontocetes, although odontocetes are considered less sensitive to the predominant low frequencies produced by these sound sources. Sound frequencies produced by the MBES, SBPs, and pingers overlap the range of most sensitive hearing of many odontocetes, and all odontocetes can presumably hear these sounds based on what is known about their hearing, sound production, and ear structure (Table 3.7-2) (Richardson et al. 1995a; Southall et al. 2007).

Types of potential effects from the aforementioned sound sources on odontocetes are described below and summarized in Table 3.7-5. For more detailed information refer to Appendix E. In general, the potential for adverse effects from exposure to the project sound sources can be reduced by implementing a mitigation and monitoring program. With effective mitigation, no significant effects are anticipated to odontocetes on a population and ocean-region scale through exposure to project sound sources. While

short-term exposures are expected during exemplary seismic survey operations, no adverse effects are expected on the viability of any odontocete population.

3.7.4.3 Acoustic Effects

The following sections discuss the types of potential acoustic effects that may occur to odontocetes exposed to sounds similar to those proposed for the project, including airgun pulses, MF and HF echosounder signals, and other anthropogenic sounds based on the limited available data. Further discussion of these topics can be found in Appendix E.

Masking

Odontocetes are considered less sensitive to masking by low-frequency sounds than are mysticetes (Richardson et al. 1995a; Southall et al. 2007). The low frequencies that dominate seismic survey sounds generally do not fall within the most sensitive hearing ranges of odontocetes, whereas they do with mysticetes (see Table 3.7-2 and Appendix E). Masking of odontocete calls and other natural sounds by pulsed sounds (even from large arrays of airguns) is expected to be limited. The duty cycle of airguns is low. In most situations, high-level airgun sound will only be emitted and thus potentially received for a brief period (approximately 0.1 sec), with these sound pulses being separated by typically 20 or 240 sec (see Section 2.4.3.1). Studies indicate that of the odontocetes studied, most continue calling in the presence of seismic surveys and can often can be heard between the seismic pulses (Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, 2005b, 2006) (reviewed in Appendix E). There has been one report that sperm whales ceased calling when exposed to pulses from a very distant seismic ship, though at other times sperm whales were heard calling between these pulses (Bowles et al. 1994). More recent studies report that sperm whales continued to call in the presence of seismic pulses (Madsen et al. 2002; Tyack et al. 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2006; Jochens et al. 2008). Some of these differences may be related to the degree of habituation of the animals to seismic sounds. Delphinids are also commonly heard calling while airguns are operating (e.g., Gordon et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, b; Potter et al. 2007; Hauser et al. 2008).

As with baleen whales, odontocete communications will not be masked appreciably by MBES, SBP, or pinger signals given their low duty cycles, the brief period (i.e., seconds) when an individual mammal would potentially be within the downward-directed MBES or SBP beam from a transiting vessel, and the relatively low source level of a pinger.

Sound from the vessel itself also has masking potential for marine mammals. From the ocean-level perspective, vessels are the greatest contributors to overall noise in the sea, producing broadband sound that overlaps the known hearing and sound production ranges of odontocetes (Richardson et al. 1995a). Masking by intense ship sound has been shown or hypothesized to adversely affect behavior of some odontocetes. Lee et al. (2005) observed negative responses by rough-toothed dolphins to heavy engine sound from large boats. Aguilar de Soto et al. (2006) theorized that ship sound could reduce maximum sonar detection and maximum communication ranges of Cuvier's beaked whales by 43% and 18%, respectively; they hypothesized that this could effectively reduce foraging ability by up to 50%.

Table 3.7-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sounds on Odontocetes*

Species or Groups of Concern	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Sperm whale	Heard calling between seismic pulses (Madsen et al. 2002; Tyack et al. 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2006; Jochens et al. 2008).	Variable reactions to seismic, but mostly tolerant and possible disruption of foraging (Mate et al. 1994; Madsen et al. 2002; Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006; Jochens et al. 2008).	Unlikely. Brief, mild TTS estimated to occur at received level of single seismic pulse (with no frequency weighting) of approx. 186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Finneran et al. 2002). Equivalent M_{mf}-weighted SEL value 183 dB (Southall et al.2008). Likely avoidance of seismic vessels before TTS.	Unlikely. PTS threshold likely approx. 198 dB re 1 μPa^2-s SEL (Southall et al. 2007). Likely avoidance of seismic vessels before PTS.	Unlikely.	Studies show variability in reactions to seismic vessels; short-term Level B exposures likely; potential injury not expected due to behavioral avoidance.
Kogia spp.– pygmy sperm & dwarf sperm whale	Unknown.	Disturbance unlikely as tend to avoid vessels (Richardson et al. 1995a; Würsig et al. 1998).	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.
Beaked whales – *Berardius* spp., *Hyperoodon* spp., *Mesoplodon* spp., *Ziphius* spp., Shepherd's beaked whale, Longman's beaked whale	Theoretically, vessel sound may reduce maximum sonar detection and communication range in Cuvier's beaked whales (Aguilar de Soto et al. 2006). N bottlenose whale clicks heard between seismic pulses (Gosselin and Lawson 2004; Laurinolli and Cochrane 2005; Simard et al. 2005).	Reactions mostly undocumented, likely to show strong avoidance based on documented vessel avoidance and associated increase in dive depth (Kasuya 1986; Würsig et al. 1998), except for N bottlenose whale (Reeves et al. 1993; Hooker et al. 2001).	See above.	See above.	One Cuvier's stranding event coincident with R/V *Ewing* seismic in Gulf of California but no evidence of cause/effect (Hogarth 2002; Yoder 2002).	Strandings and mortality associated with effects of MF military sonar but seismic pulse characteristics are very different from this sonar. Effects of airguns, MBES, and SBP uncertain and unproven. Beaked whales more difficult to monitor and mitigate for due to their deep-diving, vessel-avoidance behaviors (Barlow and Gisiner 2006); short-term Level B exposures likely; injury not expected due to behavioral avoidance and no documented injuries from airguns.

Table 3.7-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sounds on Odontocetes*

Species or Groups of Concern	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Beluga	Change in calls in response to strong sounds (Lesage et al. 1999).	Temporary avoidance or displacement can occur at 20 km of operating airgun array (Miller et al. 2005; Harris et al. 2007).	See sperm whale above.	See sperm whale above.	Neural-immune changes in captive belugas in response to non-impulse sound exposure of up to 228 dB re 1 μPa (rms) were minimal and returned to normal within 24 hr (Romano et al. 2004).	Short-term Level B exposures likely; injury not expected due to behavioral avoidance.
Narwhal	Unlikely.	Unknown, but likely.	See sperm whale above.	See sperm whale above.	See sperm whale above.	See above.
Orca - Killer whale (**S Resident**)	Change in calls in response to vessel sounds (Foote et al. 2004; Ashe and Williams 2006 *in* Dolman and Simmonds 2006).	Temporary avoidance or displacement likely; appear more tolerant of seismic in deep water (Stone 2003; Gordon et al. 2004).	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.
Blackfish – false killer whale, pygmy killer whale, melon-headed whale, *Globicephala* spp.	Heard calling between seismic pulses (Hauser et al. 2008).	Temporary avoidance or displacement possible; however, short-finned pilot whales showed little reaction to seismic surveys (Stone 2003; Gordon et al. 2004); false killer whales approached active seismic vessel within <250 m (Holst et al. 2005b); captive false killer whales showed no obvious reaction to single noise pulses with a received level of approx. 185 dB re 1 μPa (rms) (Akamatsu et al. 1993).	See above. Brief TTS possible if remain close to seismic vessel/bow ride below surface during airgun operation.	See above.	See above.	See above.

Table 3.7-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sounds on Odontocetes*

Species or Groups of Concern	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Risso's dolphin	Unidentified small delphinids heard calling between seismic pulses (Holst et al. 2005b), including possible Risso's dolphins (Smultea et al. 2004).	Small odontocetes show limited avoidance of ≤1 km (Goold 1996a; Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006; Gordon et al. 2004); delphinid densities are typically lower during seismic vs. non-seismic periods when large arrays are used (Holst et al. 2006; Richardson et al. 2009).	See above.	See above.	See above.	Reactions to large airgun arrays seem to be confined to smaller radius than often observed for mysticetes; a more appropriate threshold for onset of disturbance for delphinids and Dall's porpoise is considered to be 170 dB re 1 µPa (rms) (L-DEO and NSF 2003); also see beluga above.
Common dolphins- *Delphinus* spp.	Heard calling between seismic pulses (Smultea et al. 2004); increase in mean calling frequency during seismic operations (Wakefield 2001).	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.
Fraser's dolphin	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.
Bottlenose dolphin - *Tursiops* spp.	Unidentified small delphinids heard calling between seismic pulses (Holst et al. 2005b), including possible bottlenose dolphins (Smultea et al. 2004)	See Risso's dolphin above; multiple individuals approached active seismic vessels to <15 m (Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005b).	See above.	See above.	See above; auditory impairment or other non-auditory physical effects limited to short distances.	See above.
Stenella spp.	Heard calling between seismic pulses (Smultea et al. 2004).	See Risso's dolphin above; multiple individuals approached active seismic vessels to <5 m and some bow rode (Haley and Koski 2004; Holst et al. 2005b; Smultea et al. 2004).	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.
Lagenorhynchus spp.	Unlikely	See Risso's dolphin above.	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.
Steno - Rough-toothed dolphin	See Fraser's dolphin above.	See Risso's dolphin above.	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.
Lissodelphis spp.	Unlikely.	Unknown.	See above.	See above.	See above.	See above.

Table 3.7-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sounds on Odontocetes*

Species or Groups of Concern	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Porpoises - *Phocoena* spp.	Harbor porpoises were silent or left area during pulsed pile-driving sound (Tougaard et al. 2005).	Avoidance reported at <145 dB re 1 µPa (rms) at >70 km (Bain and Williams 2006).	See above; threshold may be lower in harbor porpoises (Lucke et al. 2009).	See above; threshold may be lower in harbor porpoises (Lucke et al. 2009).	See above.	See beluga above.
Dall's porpoise	Unlikely.	Limited avoidance (Calambokidis and Osmek 1998); individuals approached active seismic vessels to <15 m and bow rode (MacLean and Koski 2005); more tolerant of seismic surveys and vessel traffic than harbor porpoise (MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006).	See above.	See above.	See above.	A more appropriate threshold for onset of disturbance for Dall's porpoise is considered to be 170 dB re 1 µPa (rms) (L-DEO and NSF 2006a); also see beluga above.
Shallow water dolphins - Finless porpoise, Irrawady dolphin, Tucuxi and humpback dolphin	Unknown.	Unknown.	See above.	See above.	See above.	See beluga above.

*See text and Appendix E for review of effects on odontocetes from MF and HF sonar as relevant to proposed MBES, SBPs, and pingers. **bold** = ESA listed.

Van Parijs and Corkeron (2001 in MMS 2006a) reported that vessel presence can affect the acoustic behavior of dolphins, particularly mother/calf pairs, which showed an increased rate of vocalization (perhaps in an attempt to maintain group cohesion) when vessels were present. Foote et al. (2004) reported that in the presence of whale watch boat traffic, killer whales extended the duration of their calls presumably to compensate for increasing anthropogenic sound once it reached a critical level. In summary, temporary localized masking of odontocete calls by project vessel sound is possible. However, potential effects are considered insignificant since the dominant low-frequency components of vessel sounds do not overlap dominant frequencies produced by odontocetes and vessels would be transient. Masking effects in general are discussed further in Appendix E.

Disturbance

Little systematic information is available about reactions of odontocetes to sound pulses. Some examples are provided below and in Table 3.7-5 with a full review and references provided in Appendix E. However, a series of systematic studies on sperm whales exposed to airgun sound have been done (e.g., Gordon et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). Information about responses of various odontocetes to seismic surveys based on monitoring studies is also increasing (Stone 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Moulton and Miller 2005; Bain and Williams 2006; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Potter et al. 2007; Weir 2008; Richardson et al. 2009).

Delphinids show some limited avoidance of seismic vessels operating large airgun arrays (Appendix E). Small odontocetes sometimes move away or maintain a greater distance from the vessel when a large array of airguns is operating vs. when it is silent (e.g., Goold 1996a, b, c; Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; Stone 2003; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008; Richardson et al. 2009). In most cases, the avoidance radii for delphinids appear to be small, on the order of 0.6 mile (1 km) or less (see Table 3.7-2 and Appendix E). The beluga may be a species that (at least at times) shows long-distance avoidance of seismic vessels (Miller et al. 2005; Harris et al. 2007). Aerial surveys during seismic operations in the southeastern Beaufort Sea recorded much lower sighting rates of beluga whales within 6-12 mi (10–20 km) of an active seismic vessel (Miller et al. 2005); these results were consistent with the low number of beluga sightings reported by observers aboard the seismic vessel, suggesting that some belugas might be avoiding the seismic operations at distances of 6-12 mi (10–20 km) (Miller et al. 2005). Nonetheless, seismic operators and marine mammal observers sometimes see dolphins, porpoises, and other small toothed whales near operating airgun arrays. Some dolphins and porpoises may be attracted to the seismic vessel and/or floats, as they sometimes ride the bow wave of the vessel even when airguns are firing (e.g., Haley and Koski 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005b; MacLean and Koski 2005) (Table 3.7-5).

Results for porpoises, which are HF specialists, appear to vary by species. Dall's porpoises seem relatively tolerant of airgun operations (MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006; Hauser and Holst 2009), whereas the limited available data suggest that harbor porpoises show stronger avoidance (Stone 2003; Bain and Williams 2006). Studies off British Columbia and Washington using large airgun arrays showed that the harbor porpoise appeared to be affected by the lowest level of sound whereas another HF specialist, the Dall's porpoise, appeared less sensitive (Bain and Williams 2006). This apparent difference in responsiveness of these two porpoise species is consistent with their relative responsiveness to boat traffic in general (Richardson et al. 1995a).

Most studies of sperm whales exposed to airgun sounds indicate that this species shows considerable tolerance of airgun pulses. In most cases, the whales do not show strong avoidance (i.e., they do not leave the area) and they continue to call (see Appendix E for review). However, controlled exposure

experiments in the Gulf of Mexico indicate that foraging effort is apparently somewhat reduced upon exposure to airgun pulses from a seismic vessel operating in the area, and there may be a delay in diving to foraging depth (Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009; Tyack 2009).

There are few specific data on the behavioral reactions of beaked whales to seismic surveys. Most beaked whales tend to avoid approaching vessels of other types (Würsig et al. 1998). They may also dive for an extended period when approached by a vessel (Kasuya 1986). Thus, it is likely that beaked whales would also show avoidance of an approaching seismic vessel, regardless of whether or not airguns are operating. However, visual and acoustic studies indicated that some northern bottlenose whales remained in the general area and continued to produce high-frequency clicks when exposed to sounds from distant seismic surveys (Gosselin and Lawson 2004; Laurinolli and Cochrane 2005; Simard et al. 2005).

Overall, odontocete reactions to large arrays of airguns are variable and, at least for delphinids and some porpoises, seem to be confined to a shorter distance than has been observed for mysticetes (see Tables 3.6-5 vs. 3.7-5 and Appendix E). A ≥170 dB re 1 µPa disturbance criterion (rather than ≥160 dB) is considered appropriate for delphinids, which tend to be less responsive to LF anthropogenic sounds than are many other cetaceans (see Appendix E). However, other data suggest that some odontocete species with poor LF hearing may be more sensitive than previously thought. This may be the case under certain environmental conditions, when the output from seismic airguns includes energy at higher frequencies (DeRuiter et al. 2005; Goold and Coates 2006; Tyack et al. 2006; Potter et al. 2007). Also, where odontocetes are encountered in channels and inlets that are sufficiently narrow so as to be strongly ensonified across their width, the received levels may exceed the threshold for the onset of disturbance. If animals are unable to swim far enough to the side of the trackline, disturbance could be more severe, and they might be driven ahead of the ship, increasing the scale of geographic displacement (Bain and Williams 2006).

As for the presence of the vessel itself, some odontocetes are expected to respond behaviorally though responses are anticipated to be variable. The occurrence and nature of responses vary with species, location, animal activity, novelty of the sound, vessel "behavior", and habitat, among many others (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995a; Wartzok et al. 2004; see also Appendix E). Some species, especially delphinids, commonly approach vessels while others, including most beaked whales, avoid approaching vessels (Würsig et al. 1998). Others appear to show no reaction to a passing vessel (Richardson et al. 1995a; Würsig et al. 1998). All three species of sperm whales have shown avoidance reactions to standard vessels not emitting airgun sounds (Richardson et al. 1995a; Würsig et al. 1998), and thus are likely to avoid a seismic survey vessel whether the airguns are active or inactive. In all oceans of the world, large vessel traffic is currently so prevalent that it is commonly considered a usual source of ambient sound (McDonald et al. 2006). Project vessel sounds would not be at levels expected to cause anything more than possible localized and temporary behavioral changes (Richardson et al. 1995a). Routine vessel sounds are not expected to result in significant negative effects on individuals or at the population level (see review in Richardson et al. [1995a] and Appendix E).

Behavioral reactions of free-ranging odontocetes to echosounders such as the proposed MBESs and SBPs, and to pingers, appear to vary by species and circumstance. Gerrodette and Pettis (2005) assessed odontocete reactions to an echosounder and an ADCP operated from oceanographic vessels in the ETP during 1998-2000. Results indicated that when the echosounder and ADCP were on, spotted and spinner dolphins were detected slightly more often and beaked whales less often during visual surveys (Gerrodette and Pettis 2005). Whalers were judicious in their use of sonar when following sperm whales because it tended to make them scatter (Richardson et al. 1995a). In response to MF pingers, some sperm

whales stopped emitting pulses (Watkins and Schevill 1975). In contrast, sperm whales usually continued calling and did not appear to otherwise react to continual pulsing from a 12-kHz echosounder (Backus and Schevill 1966; Watkins 1977). Various dolphin and porpoise species have been seen bowriding while the MBES, SBP, and airguns were operating during NSF-sponsored L-DEO seismic surveys (Smultea et al. 2004; MacLean and Koski 2005). Captive bottlenose dolphins and a beluga exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to 1-sec tonal signals at frequencies similar to those that would be emitted by the MBES and to shorter broadband pulsed signals. Behavioral changes typically involved what appeared to be deliberate attempts to avoid the sound exposure (Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002; Finneran and Schlundt 2004). The relevance of those data to free-ranging odontocetes is uncertain, and in any case, the test sounds were quite different in duration or bandwidth as compared with those from a MBES. The signals from SBPs are somewhat weaker than those from the MBES.

In summary, short-term and localized behavioral disturbance of some odontocetes is expected in response to seismic airgun operations. Disturbance of odontocetes due to operation of the MBESs and SBPs is also possible; however, exposure of individual odontocetes is likely brief in duration (<1 sec; 1 or at most 2 pings) given that these devices are located on a moving seismic vessel and the pings are intermittent and directed downward. The proposed pingers operate at sound levels expected to cause no more than localized behavioral changes for animals close to these battery-powered sound sources. Pinger sound levels drop quickly with increasing distance from the source through attenuation given their MF and HF characteristics and their relatively low source levels (see Appendix B). None of the aforementioned effects are considered significant for odontocetes at the population level.

Temporary Hearing Impairment

TTS is possible when marine mammals are exposed to high-level sounds (Southall et al. 2007). However, there has been no specific documentation that TTS occurs in free-ranging marine mammals exposed to sequences of airgun pulses during operational seismic surveys (for a full discussion of TTS see Appendix E). Also, TTS is (by definition) a temporary phenomenon, and does not constitute injury (Southall et al. 2007).

A few captive studies of odontocetes have reported on sound levels eliciting TTS (reviewed in Southall et al. 2007; Appendix B and Table 3.7-5). Given available data, the received energy level of a single seismic pulse (with no frequency weighting) might need to be approximately 186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$ (i.e., 186 dB SEL or 221-226 dB peak-peak) in order to produce brief, mild TTS (Finneran et al. 2002) (Table 2-8). After allowance for frequency content, this is equivalent to a TTS threshold of about 183 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$ (Southall et al. 2007). Exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each have received levels near 175-180 dB SEL (190 dB rms) might result in cumulative exposure of 183 dB SEL re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$ and thus slight TTS in a small odontocete assuming the TTS threshold is (to a first approximation) a function of the total received pulse energy; however, this 'equal-energy' concept is an oversimplification. Seismic pulses with received energy levels ≥175-180 dB SEL (190 dB rms) are expected to be restricted to radii no more than 860 ft (262 m) around the airguns (Table 2-11). The specific radius would depend on the depth of the water, the array size, the tow depth of the airgun array (30 vs. 39 ft [9 vs. 12 m]) and other factors (Appendix B). For an odontocete closer to the surface, the maximum radius with ≥175-180 dB SEL or ≥190 dB rms would be smaller than the same isopleth at depth, given pressure release effect at the water's surface (Greene and Richardson 1988; Richardson et al. 1995a) (see Appendix E).

The above TTS information for odontocetes is derived from studies on the bottlenose dolphin and beluga. For the one harbor porpoise tested, the received level of airgun sound that elicited onset of TTS was lower; based on the measurements at 4 kHz, TTS occurred upon exposure to one airgun pulse with

received level of approximately 200 dB re 1 μPa_{pk-pk} or an SEL of 164.3 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Lucke et al. 2009). If these results from a single animal are representative, it is inappropriate to assume that onset of TTS occurs at similar received levels in all odontocetes (Southall et al. 2007). Some cetaceans may incur TTS at lower sound exposures than are necessary to elicit TTS in the beluga or bottlenose dolphin.

NMFS (1995, 2000) concluded that cetaceans should not be exposed to pulsed underwater sound at received levels ≥180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). That criterion has been used in defining the safety (shut-down) radii for previous NSF-sponsored seismic surveys and, for comparative purposes, was also considered in this analysis. More recent data imply that TTS is unlikely to occur unless odontocetes are exposed to airgun pulses greater than 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) (see above). Southall et al. (2007) have recommended new noise exposure criteria for marine mammals that account for the now-available scientific data on TTS, the expected offset between the TTS and PTS thresholds, differences in the acoustic frequencies to which different marine mammal groups are sensitive, and other relevant factors (reviewed in Section 2.3.3.2). NMFS is considering adoption of new criteria (NMFS 2005c).

With a large airgun array, TTS is most likely in any odontocetes that linger near the airguns where sound levels are highest (Appendix B) and where received energy level would accumulate with duration of exposure. However, while bow-riding, odontocetes are at or above the surface, where sound pulses are weaker given the pressure-release effect at the surface. Nevertheless, bow-riding animals generally dive below the surface intermittently. If they did so while wake-riding near airguns, they would be exposed to high-level sound pulses, possibly repeatedly. Even if some cetaceans did incur TTS through exposure to airgun sounds, this would very likely be mild, temporary, and reversible. All TTS experiments done to date with marine mammals show that TTS disappears over time (see Appendix E).

The project MBESs, SBPs, and pingers are not expected to induce TTS. See mysticete Sections 3.7.4.3 *TTS* and *PTS* for further assessment based on operating characteristics of the project MBES, SBPs, and pingers.

Some odontocetes show avoidance of the area where received levels of airgun sound are high enough such that TTS could potentially occur (see above and Table 3.7-5). In those cases, the avoidance responses of the animals themselves reduce or (most likely) eliminate any possibility of TTS. If some odontocetes did experience temporary hearing impairment, the TTS effects would (by definition) be fully recoverable, most likely within minutes.

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

There are no measurements available to determine the sound exposure necessary to cause PTS in any marine mammal exposed to any type of sound but the general principles are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals (see Mysticetes Section 3.7.3.4 and Appendix E). The low-to-moderate levels of TTS that have been induced in captive odontocetes during controlled studies have shown no measurable residual PTS (Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002; Nachtigall et al. 2003, 2004). However, Southall et al. (2007) note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 230 dB re 1 µPa.

When exposure is measured in SEL units, Southall et al. (2007) estimate that received levels would need to exceed the TTS threshold by at least 15 dB for there to be risk of PTS. Thus, for cetaceans they estimate that the PTS threshold for impulse sound might be an SEL of about 198 dB re $(1\ \mu Pa)^2 \cdot sec$. Given the higher level of sound necessary to cause PTS as compared with TTS, it is even less likely that

PTS could occur through exposure to airgun sounds. In fact, even the levels immediately adjacent to the airguns may not be sufficient to induce PTS, especially because a mammal would be exposed to no more than one high-level pulse unless it swam immediately alongside the airgun for a period longer than the inter-pulse interval. Even for delphinids that may bowride active seismic vessels, PTS is unlikely to occur given surface release effects and other factors (see mysticete Section 3.7.4.3 *PTS*).

The possibility of PTS through exposure to MBES or SBP sounds is considered negligible and PTS via exposure to pingers is not anticipated. As discussed previously, many odontocetes avoid the immediate area around operating seismic vessels (e.g., Hildebrand 2005) (see Table 3.7-5 and Appendix E). Implementation of planned monitoring and mitigation measures, including visual (and, where warranted, acoustic) monitoring, ramp ups, and power downs or shut downs of the airguns when marine mammals are seen within the safety radii, will minimize the already-low probability of exposure of marine mammals to sounds high enough to induce PTS.

Strandings and Mortality

The association of strandings of beaked whales with naval exercises and, in one case, an L-DEO seismic survey, has raised the possibility that beaked whales exposed to strong sounds may be especially susceptible to injury and/or behavioral reactions that can lead to stranding (e.g., Hildebrand 2005; Southall et al. 2007) (reviewed in Appendix E). Hildebrand (2005) reviewed the association of cetacean strandings with high-intensity sound events and found that most of the afflicted species were deep-diving odontocetes. Cuvier's beaked whales comprised 81% of all stranded animals, while other beaked whales, including Gervais' beaked whale, Blainville's beaked whale and N Atlantic bottlenose whale accounted for 14%; other cetaceans, including striped dolphin, pygmy sperm whale, and *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*, comprised the remaining 5% (Hildebrand 2005).

Characteristics of seismic pulses are quite different from the MF sonar signals used by the military that have been associated with beaked whale strandings (see Mysticetes section 3.7.4.3). There is no conclusive evidence that cetacean strandings result from exposure to seismic surveys. In September 2002, there was a stranding of two Cuvier's beaked whales in the Gulf of California, Mexico, when the R/V *Ewing* was operating a 20-airgun, 8,490-in^3 airgun array in the general area. The link between the stranding and the seismic surveys was inconclusive and not based on any physical evidence (Hogarth 2002; Yoder 2002). Nonetheless, that plus the incidents involving beaked whale strandings near naval exercises suggest a need for caution in conducting seismic surveys in areas occupied by beaked whales. Mitigation and monitoring are considered cautionary measures and can be site-specifically modified in areas of high concern before an actual proposed survey in consultation with NMFS if warranted (e.g., where beaked whales are considered likely to occur). Based on available data, no strandings or mortality of beaked whales are anticipated during the proposed seismic study given the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, the airgun operating characteristics (pulsed and intermittent), and the lack of substantiated evidence that seismic operations cause cetacean strandings.

Other Physiological Effects

Until recently, it was assumed that diving marine mammals are not subject to the bends or air embolisms. However, recent studies have found associations between military MF sonar activity and beaked whale strandings with acute and chronic tissue damage that may (in some cases) have resulted from formation of *in vivo* gas bubbles (reviewed in Appendix E). There has been speculation that gas and fat embolisms may occur if deep-diving odontocetes ascend unusually quickly when exposed to aversive sounds, or if sound in the environment causes the destabilization of existing bubble nuclei within body tissues (Potter 2004; Arbelo et al. 2005; Fernández et al. 2005a, b; Jepson et al. 2005b; Cox et al. 2006). Even if gas and fat

embolisms can at times occur during exposure of beaked whales to MF Navy sonar, there is no evidence that this type of effect occurs in odontocetes exposed to airgun sounds or to echosounders or pingers of the types proposed for the NSF-funded seismic surveys. Given the expected brevity of exposure of any odontocete to high-level project sounds from a transiting seismic vessel, the intermittent nature and low duty cycle of airgun sounds, and implementation of monitoring and mitigation measures, these other physiological effects are considered unlikely to occur during the proposed seismic surveys.

Based on evidence from terrestrial mammals and humans, sound is also a potential source of stress, with potential to disrupt communication, navigational ability and social patterns (Richardson et al. 1995a); however, no information is available on the effect of sound on the long-term well-being or reproductive success of odontocetes (Fair and Becker 2000; Hildebrand 2005; Wright et al. 2007a, b). Such effects, if they occur at all, would be mainly associated with chronic noise exposure, which is not characteristic of a seismic survey.

3.7.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Refer to Section 3.7.4.4 for general information on entanglement, ingestion, ship strikes, and other ancillary project activities as related to cetaceans.

3.7.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Alternatives A and B consist of a combination of monitoring and mitigation measures developed in consultation with NMFS designed to minimize the potential effects of NSF-funded or USGS seismic survey operations on marine mammals (Sections 2.4.1 and 3.7.5). The measures for odontocetes are the same as those for mysticetes except that different M-weighted Level A and Level B exposure radii were used for odontocetes because of their different sensitivities to various sound frequencies (see Section 2.3.3 and Table 2-11). In addition, odontocetes are subdivided into two hearing groups (MF and HF) whereas all mysticetes are considered to be in one group (LF). The flat (unweighted) measures were also calculated.

3.7.5.1 Acoustic Effects

This section summarizes the various types and levels of potential acoustic effects on odontocetes in the analysis areas resulting from the seismic surveys under Alternative A or B. Table 2-11 shows the estimated mitigation radii for the exemplary seismic surveys that are assumed to occur in the five DAAs. Estimated exposures based on unweighted and M-weighting and percent of regional populations potentially impacted by proposed seismic survey activities within the DAAs under Alternative A and Alternative B are presented in Table 3.7-6 and in Appendix B Tables. After applying M-weighting, numbers of odontocete exposures are presented based on the discussion of exposure criteria in Section 2.3.3 and listed in Table 2-8. Modeled numerical estimates of exposure are considered precautionary (likely overestimated) because they do not account for individual whales that are expected to avoid the sounds. AIM assumes baseline "undisturbed" distribution and movement of animals whether or not airgun sounds are being emitted.

<u>Masking</u>

The potential for masking is considered minimal for odontocetes during the proposed seismic surveys, particularly for the HF-specialist porpoises. In general, although the potential for masking is low, proposed surveys with large airgun arrays in areas where densities of odontocetes are relatively high have greater potential for masking than surveys in other analysis areas where densities are low and/or a small array would be used. Regardless, masking attributable to an NSF-sponsored seismic survey is expected to

be limited and transitory for all odontocete species in Section 3.7.4.3. While masking may affect individual odontocetes in the short term, it is expected that implementation of Alternative A or B would not result in significant impacts to odontocete populations due to masking (Table 3.7-5).

Disturbance

Disturbance would be the primary type of effect resulting from the proposed seismic surveys under Alternative A (Tables 3.7-5 and 3.7-6). With the proposed mitigation and monitoring, disturbance is expected to be limited to short-term behavioral changes and localized avoidance by individual odontocetes responding to airgun sound. Short-term behavioral changes are likely for many of the individual odontocetes in the areas ensonified to the Level B criterion sound level of ≥160 dB re 1 μPa (rms). However, the ≥170 dB re 1 μPa (rms) sound criterion may be a better indicator of the received level at which odontocetes are likely to display behavioral changes based on available studies of odontocetes (e.g., L-DEO and NSF 2003f, h; Table 3.7-5; Appendix E). These effects may occur in any of the exemplary analysis areas where a given odontocete species occurs (Tables 3.7-3 and 3.7-4). However, no significant disturbance-related impacts to odontocetes are anticipated at the population level. The percentages of the regional populations estimated to be exposed (under Alternative A or B) to airgun sounds at levels equaling or exceeding Level B disturbance criteria are presented below and in Table 3.7-6 (B_p columns) based on population estimates for the ocean basin of interest.

Level B Exposure Estimates for ESA-listed Odontocetes

The sperm whale is the only ESA-listed odontocete occurring in any of the exemplary analysis areas. The estimated exposure predictions for sperm whales under Alternative A are described below based on the three mitigation criteria. These are precautionary exposure estimates because the modeling does not account for individual sperm whales that are expected to move away from actual seismic survey sounds. Discussion is organized by ocean-basin populations as done for mysticetes, since assessment of significance of effects of the exemplary seismic surveys is focused at the population level. Analyses are based on the DAA modeling results presented in Table 3.7-6 and Appendix B. The potential for Level A (rms) exposures is discussed below under *Injury*.

Three regional populations of sperm whales are considered herein based on their occurrence within four of the five DAAs and seven of the eight QAAs: the N Atlantic, N Pacific and S hemisphere populations (Tables 3.7-1, 3.7-3 and 3.7-4). Sperm whales are considered common in two DAAs and four QAAs during the season of the proposed seismic survey (Tables 3.7-3 and 3.7-4). Although there are sub-populations within these areas, the degree of reproductive intermixing is generally not well known.

DAAs. Under Alternative A, approximately 16 sperm whales are predicted to experience Level B exposures within the NW Atlantic (14) and Caribbean (2) DAAs. These numbers represent approximately 0.1% of the N Atlantic population within the NW Atlantic DAA and <0.01% within the Caribbean DAA (Table 3.7-6). In the NW Atlantic DAA, sperm whales are expected to be common during the proposed summer survey period, but at relatively low densities (Table 3.7-3). In the Caribbean DAA, sperm whales are also expected to be relatively common during the proposed late spring/summer survey period although, again, at low densities. Implementation of Alternative A would affect, but would not adversely affect regional populations of sperm whales within the NW Atlantic or Caribbean DAAs.

Sperm whales are expected to be rare in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA during the summer season of the proposed survey (Table 3.7-4), occurring there at very low densities. Only Level B exposures of <3 individuals are predicted based on modeling, representing <0.01% of the N Pacific sperm whale

population (Table 3.7-6). Implementation of Alternative A would affect, but would not adversely affect regional populations of sperm whales within the W Gulf of Alaska DAA.

In the Galapagos DAA, sperm whales are considered potentially common during the proposed S hemisphere summer survey (Table 3.7-3). Modeling results predict the Level B exposure of <1 whale, representing 0.01% of the S hemisphere sperm whale population. Implementation of Alternative A would affect, but would not adversely affect regional populations of sperm whales within the Galapagos DAA.

In conclusion, no serious injury or mortality of sperm whales is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of sperm whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B may affect and is likely to adversely affect sperm whales in the NW Atlantic, Caribbean, W Gulf of Alaska, and Galapagos Ridge DAAs. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding potential Level B exposures to sperm whales within the exemplary DAAs. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

QAAs. Because acoustic modeling was not conducted for the QAAs, the anticipated potential level of exposure of sperm whales was estimated qualitatively by comparison with modeled results from DAA(s) with similar species occurrence and/or acoustic environments. Sperm whales are considered common in four QAAs: Mid-Atlantic Ridge, Marianas, W India, and Sub-Antarctic (Table 3.7-4). The deep-channel, large array, and species abundance in the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA are considered most similar to the Caribbean DAA for the purpose of qualitative analysis (Table 2-7). Thus, exposure of sperm whales to seismic surveys is expected to be limited to a similarly small number (<3) of short-term Level B exposures for the Mid-Atlantic Ridge QAA. The acoustic conditions of the Marianas QAA are considered most similar to the Galapagos (deep water) and Caribbean (shallow water) DAAs (Table 2-7). Thus, similarly small numbers (<3 sperm whales) of Level B exposures could occur in the Marianas QAA. The W India QAA is also most similar to the Galapagos DAA deep-water site and the shallow-water portion of the Caribbean DAA site (Table 2-7). Modeling for these areas predicts small numbers (<3 sperm whales) of short-term Level B exposures. The Sub-Antarctic QAA has no good comparative DAA site, although its sound speed and profile are similar to the S California DAA (Table 2-7). Sperm whale abundance is uncertain in the SW Atlantic QAA (Table 3.7-1). Assuming that sperm whales are common there, the number of potential Level B exposures would be small (<3 individuals) and similar in number to the Galapagos and Caribbean DAAs given the acoustic similarities to the latter two DAAs.

Sperm whales are considered uncommon in the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA (Table 3.7-4). This QAA is most similar to the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. Both exemplary surveys involve all water depth categories, cold water, and similar SSP vs. depth (Table 2-7). However, the airgun array assumed for the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA is larger (36 vs. 18 airguns) and the sound channel near 328-ft (100-m) depth is considerably weaker than in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. Other factors being similar, the higher number of airguns in the QAA might lead to larger effects, but the weaker sound channel might lead to reduced effects. Overall, given the combination of factors, a small number (<3 individuals) of Level B exposures of this species, potentially similar to that estimated for the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, could occur within the N Atlantic/Iceland QAA (see Table 3.7-6).

Table 3.7-6. Estimated Number of Level A and Level B Exposures (Individuals) of Odontocetes to Seismic Survey Sound with Implementation of Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs Based on Modeling Results

	NW Atlantic (N Atlantic pop)[a]			*Caribbean (N Atlantic pop)*[a]			*S California (N Pacific pop)*[a]			*W Gulf of Alaska (N Pacific pop)*[a]			*Galapagos (ETP pop)*[a]		
	Exposure Criterion[b]			*Exposure Criterion*[b]			*Exposure Criterion*[b]			*Exposure Criterion*[b]			*Exposure Criterion*[b]		
Species[c]	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*
Sperm whale	14.0 *0.1*	0.3 *<0.01*	0.0	2.4 *0.02*	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	2.9 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.4 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0
Beaked whales[d]	3.1 *<0.09*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.9 *<0.05*	0.5 *<0.01*	0.0	2.2 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0
Common dolphin[e]	402.4 *<0.2*	8.0 *<0.01*	0.0	26.6 *<0.01*	3.0 *<0.01*	0.0	270.4 *<0.06*	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	2.9 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0
Bottlenose dolphin[f]	137.0 *<0.1*	2.1 *<0.01*	0.0	47.1 *<0.04*	2.0 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	10.1 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0
Stenella sp.[g]	307.7 *<2.6*	0.0	0.0	141.2 *<1.2*	13.4 *<0.1*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	641.2 *<0.04*	18.5 *<0.01*	0.0
Other MF odontocetes[h]	7.9 *<0.7*	0.0	0.0	25.5 *<0.5*	1.1 *<0.03*	0.0	13.1 *<0.02*	3.2 *<0.01*	0.0	23.2 *<0.1*	0.0	0.0	72 *<0.2*	0.0	0.0
HF Porpoises[i]	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	13.5 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	738.4 *<0.4*	10 *<0.01*	0.0	-	-	-

Notes: - = not present; *italics* = estimated percentage of regional population impacted; **bold** = ESA-listed species.

[a] Population estimates from Table 3.7-1. When a range of population estimates is available, the lowest is used, thus maximizing the estimated percent of population that might be exposed.

[b] Exposure Criteria (flat weighted): Bp = NMFS Level B harassment criterion -- pressure units (rms), corresponding to exposure to ≥160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) received sound level above which behavioral changes expected to occur. Ap = NMFS Level A criterion – pressure units (rms), corresponding to exposure to ≥180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) received sound level above which the potential for injury was suspected at the time this criterion was implemented by NMFS. Ae = Level A – cumulative energy (SEL) corresponding to Level A criterion of ≥ 198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot$ sec applied in this analysis to identify the level above which there is potential for injury (e.g., PTS), based on limited empirical results from a few small odontocete species (Southall et al. 2007). See also Appendix B. For the purpose of analysis, for non-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.5 animal as presented in Appendix B, Tables B-13 – B-17 are considered an actual exposure. For ESA-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.05 animal as presented in Appendix B, Tables B-13 – B-17 are considered an actual exposure.

[c] All odontocetes in this table are considered MF hearing specialists with presumed or documented functional hearing from 150 Hz to 160 kHz, except for the harbor and Dall's porpoise which are considered HF hearing specialists whose functional hearing abilities range from 200 Hz to 180 kHz (Miller et al. 2005).

[d] Includes the following species of beaked whales: Baird's, Cuvier's, Longman's, True's, Gervais', Sowerby's, pygmy, Hubb's, ginko-toothed, Stejneger's, Blainville's, and northern bottlenose (see Table 3.7-1).

[e] Includes short-beaked, long-beaked, and Arabian common dolphins (see Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-3).

[f] Includes only the common bottlenose dolphin as the Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin does not occur in the DAAs (see Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-3).

[g] Includes pantropical spotted, Atlantic spotted, spinner, clymene, and striped dolphins (see Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-3).

[h] Includes the following 18 MF odontocete species: pygmy and dwarf sperm whales (i.e., *Kogia* sp.), beluga, narwhal, killer whale, false killer whale, pygmy killer whale, melon-headed whale, long- and short-finned pilot whales, Risso's dolphin, Fraser's dolphin, white-beaked dolphin, Atlantic and Pacific white-sided dolphins, rough-toothed dolphin, northern right whale dolphin, and Tucuxi dolphin (see Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-3). *Kogia* has recently been re-classified as HF (Southall et al. 2007) but was considered MF when the acoustic modeling was done. Thus, actual numbers of *Kogia* affected would be somewhat less than predicted here.

[i] Numbers here only include Dall's and harbor porpoises, as all other porpoises may occur only in the QAAs (see Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-3).

Sperm whales are considered uncommon at the BC Coast QAA during the exemplary summer survey period (Table 3.7-4). The BC Coast QAA has shallow to intermediate water depths (<656 ft [<200 m]) and has no sound channel that could trap sound and reduce transmission loss. Acoustic conditions, in terms of SSP, are quite different from those in any of the DAAs (Table 2-7). However, among the DAAs, the W Gulf of Alaska site has the closest resemblance to the BC Coast QAA. Based on the latter, Level B exposures could be similar to the W Gulf of Alaska site (see above) and would thus be limited to a small number (<3 sperm whales) of behavioral changes.

In summary, based on acoustic modeling predictions for the DAAs and a qualitative analysis of the QAAs, no significant effects are expected to regional populations of sperm whales with implementation of Alternative A or B within the QAAs. No serious injury or mortality of sperm whales is reasonably foreseeable and no adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of sperm whale stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or B may affect and is likely to adversely affect sperm whales in the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, N Atlantic/Iceland, SW Atlantic, Marianas, BC Coast, W India, and Sub-Antarctic QAAs. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding potential Level B exposures to sperm whales within the exemplary QAAs. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Level B Exposure Estimates for Non-ESA Odontocetes

DAAs. Under Alternatives A and B, small numbers of behavioral changes are predicted for some individual odontocetes, not listed under the ESA, at all five of the DAAs (Table 3.7-6). Although the highest predicted numbers (up to approximately 600 individuals) of Level B exposures occur among a few porpoise and delphinid species, these species also have some of the highest densities and population sizes of all cetaceans in the analysis areas; some of these populations number in the tens to hundreds of thousands (Table 3.7-1). Thus, the proportions of the regional populations of delphinids and porpoises predicted to experience Level B exposures still represent relatively small numbers (<2.1% and <0.4%, respectively). Beaked whale densities are considerably smaller in the DAAs, so beaked whales would be affected in smaller overall numbers; temporary disturbance impacts to individual beaked whales under Alternatives A and B are predicted to be <0.09% of each regional population (Tables 3.7-1 and 3.7-6). Tables listing predicted exposures by species and estimated densities of species in each of the DAAs can be found in Appendix B.

In summary, implementation of Alternative A or B is expected to result in small numbers of Level B exposures of non-ESA listed MF and HF odontocetes within all of the DAAs (Table 3.7-6). No serious injury or mortality of odontocetes is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of odontocete stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B exposures. In accordance with the MMPA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding potential Level B exposures to odontocetes within the NW Atlantic, Caribbean, S California, W Gulf of Alaska, and Galapagos DAAs. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

QAAs. As with the DAAs, the most abundant populations at the eight QAAs are generally MF dolphins or HF porpoises (Table 3.7-4). Among the eight QAAs, the N Atlantic/Iceland, W Australia, W India, and Marianas QAAs are expected to have the highest potential for Level B exposures of odontocetes.

Dolphins are considered common to abundant within those QAAs; the most abundant of the dolphins are *Lagenorhynchus*, *Stenella*, and bottlenose dolphins. In the N Atlantic/Iceland and BC QAAs, two HF porpoises also occur at relatively high densities. Thus, the QAAs with the highest levels of potential Level B exposures would likely be those with relatively high densities of delphinids and/or porpoises combined with a large array of airguns operating in shallow water. Except for the W Australia QAA where a small airgun array is proposed, a large array is modeled in all other QAAs; four of the five aforementioned QAAs encompass shallow to deep water, while the BC QAA encompasses only shallow water (Table 2-7).

The W Australia QAA has dissimilar acoustic properties to all of the five DAAs (Table 2-7 and Appendix B). The W Australia QAA has a sound speed vs. depth profile that decreases slightly with water depth and has no sound channel; thus, the relatively shallow environment favors refraction of sound toward the bottom (Appendix B). This information, combined with the small airgun array assumed for the W Australia QAA, suggests that potential seismic exposures would be limited to a small number of odontocetes, primarily bottlenose dolphins. Furthermore, some odontocetes are expected to show avoidance of seismic sounds (Section 3.7.4, Table 3.7-5, Appendix E). Effects at the other four QAAs, where non-ESA listed odontocetes are considered common to abundant (see above paragraph and Table 3.7-4), would likely be similar to effects in shallow waters of the Caribbean DAA and/or deep waters of the Galapagos Ridge DAA. Overall, populations of the most abundant species are estimated to be in the millions worldwide and in the tens to hundreds of thousands regionally (Table 3.7-1). Thus, Level B exposures resulting from the exemplary seismic surveys are expected to represent a small proportion of the overall populations (Table 3.7-6).

In summary, based on acoustic modeling predictions for the DAAs and a qualitative analysis of the QAAs, no significant effects are expected to regional populations of non-ESA listed MF and HF odontocetes with implementation of Alternative A or B within the QAAs. No serious injury or mortality of odontocetes is reasonably foreseeable and no adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of non-ESA listed odontocete stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B exposures. In accordance with the MMPA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding potential Level B exposures to odontocetes within the exemplary QAAs. If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Temporary Hearing Impairment or TTS

Temporary hearing impairment or TTS as a result of implementing Alternative A or B is unlikely to occur, as described previously in Section 3.7.4.3. The only odontocetes that could incur TTS would be those that approach close to airguns at depth. Based on available studies, many odontocetes are expected to avoid close approaches to the seismic vessel where exposure to sound levels could potentially cause TTS (see Table 3.7-5 and Appendix E). Furthermore, implementation of mitigation and monitoring measures under Alternatives A and B, including ramp ups, power downs and shut downs, would reduce the potential for TTS, and in particular would reduce the potential for strong and longer-lasting TTS. The real-time monitoring necessary for effectively implementing power downs and shut downs is most effective at the close distances where stronger and longer lasting TTS might occur. Furthermore, TTS is (by definition) a temporary phenomenon that is very unlikely to have long-term consequences for the individual(s) involved (Southall et al. 2007). No significant impacts to populations of odontocetes are expected to occur under Alternative A or B as a result of potential TTS.

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

DAAs. Implementation of Alternative A or B within the exemplary DAAs is not anticipated to result in Level A exposures or PTS in odontocetes as described in Section 3.7.4.3 and Appendix E. As previously discussed for TTS, odontocetes are expected to avoid exposure to sound levels that could potentially cause PTS (Table 3.7-5 and Section 3.7.4.3). Furthermore, avoidance would likely begin well before odontocetes are within the NMFS-designated 180-dB re 1 µPa (rms) isopleth around an approaching seismic research vessel, and well before reaching the Level A cumulative exposure criterion applied in this analysis. Modeling results suggest that a small number of odontocetes could potentially receive ≥180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) in all the DAAs (Table 3.7-6, A_p columns). However, the model does not allow for the likelihood that exposed odontocetes would show avoidance of the airgun source, as most are expected to do during an actual seismic survey. These modeled exposures exceeding the "old" Level A rms pressure criterion account for <0.01% of each regional odontocete population, including resident populations and the ESA-listed sperm whale (Table 3.7-6). Furthermore, no odontocetes are predicted to be exposed to sound equaling or exceeding the cumulative energy exposure criterion for injury (198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$). The latter is currently considered a more realistic estimate of the exposure level above which injury to odontocetes might occur, allowing for recent research (Southall et al. 2007) (see A_e columns of Table 3.7-6, and below).

Potential exposure of odontocetes at or near the current 180-dB re 1 µPa (rms) criterion identified by NMFS for potential Level A effects is not expected to cause adverse effects. Recent research indicates that the 180-dB criterion for cetaceans appears to be lower than necessary to avoid TTS (a type of level B exposure), let alone PTS, at least for delphinids and other small odontocetes (Southall et al. 2007; see Appendix B). The minimum sound exposure necessary to cause PTS is higher than that inducing barely-detectable TTS (Appendix E). The level associated with the onset of TTS is considered a precautionary estimate of the level below which there is no danger of permanent damage (Richardson et al. 1995a; Southall et al. 2007).

Some delphinid species are attracted to vessels to bow ride; however, studies indicate that small odontocetes maintain a greater distance while airguns are operating than when they are silent (Gould 1996a, b, c; Calambokidis and Osmeck 1998; Stone 2003; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008; Richardson et al. 2009; see Appendix E). Dolphins and porpoises have sometimes approached the bow and occasionally the stern of the R/V *Ewing* while airguns were operating during previous NSF-sponsored seismic surveys. These observed approaches have resulted in immediate shut downs or power downs of the airguns, depending on the size of the array and the corresponding 180-dB re 1 µPa (rms) radius (Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005b; MacLean and Koski 2005). In general, animals that approach to bow ride normally should be visible during the daytime and, if inside the mitigation zone, would trigger a shutdown of the airguns. These individuals were at or near the water surface where the air-water interface results in considerably reduced sound levels (Richardson et al. 1995a). With implementation of proposed mitigation and monitoring measures under Alternatives A and B, combined with an expected tendency for many odontocetes to avoid close approaches to an operating airgun array, Level A exposures are highly unlikely and not expected to occur for any odontocete species in the analysis areas.

The only simulated possibility of Level A exposure of an ESA-listed species is in the NW Atlantic DAA where <1 sperm whale exposure is predicted when the 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) criterion is applied; however, no such exposures are predicted when the more meaningful energy-based criterion is applied

(Table 3.7-6). A similar pattern occurs for non-listed small odontocetes in the NW Atlantic, Caribbean, and Galapagos DAAs, including common, bottlenose and *Stenella* sp. dolphins as well as HF porpoises (Table 3.7-6).

No serious injury or mortality of any odontocete species is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of odontocete stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level A exposures. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A is likely to adversely affect sperm whales in the NW Atlantic DAA. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding Level A exposures to sperm whales and other odontocetes (Table 3.7-6). If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

QAAs. None of the QAAs is considered a close match to the NW Atlantic DAA where <1 ESA-listed sperm whale exposure is predicted when the Level A 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) criterion is applied; no such exposures are predicted when the energy-based criterion is applied (see above and Table 3.7-7). Australia is the only QAA with any resemblance to conditions at the NW Atlantic DAA (Table 2-7). Regardless, no actual Level A exposure of odontocetes is expected in the QAAs. This assessment is based on no modeled Level A cumulative energy exposures in the DAAs, relatively few Level A (rms) exposures, and factors described earlier (i.e., behavioral avoidance, etc.). PTS injury is highly unlikely and not expected to occur to sperm whales within the QAAs with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative).

PTS is not expected to occur to non-listed odontocetes in the QAAs during an actual seismic survey for the same reasons as described for the DAAs (see paragraph above and Appendix E). If the same modeling were applied to the QAAs, results in terms of numbers of exposures would likely be similar given the shared acoustic characteristics, etc. (Table 2-7). Thus, cumulative energy (SEL) exposures are not expected to exceed the Level-A criterion of 198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$. Modeling of the QAAs would also likely show small numbers of Level A (rms) exposures for the most abundant species. Examples include shallow-water areas with proposed large airgun arrays such as the N Atlantic/Iceland, BC Coast, and possibly the W India DAAs. Based on Table 2-7 and DAA modeling results, additional site-specific monitoring and mitigation may be required in these DAAs were an actual large-source survey proposed. Additional monitoring could also be required in QAAs where the occurrence and abundance of odontocetes has not yet been studied in detail (e.g., the Marianas and SW Atlantic QAAs). Level A (rms) modeled exposures are less likely where small airgun arrays are operated (especially in deep waters) and where odontocete densities are expected to be relatively low (e.g., W Australia, Marianas, Sub-Antarctic) (Table 3.7-4).

In summary, among the eight QAAs, PTS is highly unlikely to occur among odontocetes under Alternative A or Alternative B. This is based on combined available information, including no expected Level A cumulative energy (SEL) exposures, as described in Section 3.7.4.3 (Table 3.7-6). Implementation of proposed mitigation and monitoring measures under Alternatives A and B, along with expected avoidance of close approaches to the seismic array by most odontocetes, are expected to result in no Level A (PTS or injury) exposures to individual odontocetes.

Strandings and Mortality

No injury, strandings, or mortalities of odontocetes exposed to seismic (or other project) sounds are expected under Alternative A or B, as discussed in Section 3.7.4 and above. This is based on the expected avoidance behavior of some individuals, combined with mitigation and monitoring measures designed to

minimize potential impacts. As indicated earlier for mysticetes, injurious impacts to marine mammals have not been proven to occur near airgun arrays; a seismic cruise in the Gulf of California that was suspected to be related to a stranding of two beaked whales was not confirmed to have a connection to those strandings (see Appendix E).

Other Physiological Effects

Under Alternatives A and B, no other physiological effects on odontocetes are expected as a result of proposed seismic activities as described in Section 3.7.4.

3.7.5.2 Other Potential Effects

Under Alternatives A and B, the potential for non-acoustic types of effects (entanglement, ingestion, and ship strikes) are considered insignificant as described in Section 3.7.4.4. Many odontocetes tend to avoid approaching seismic vessels. Visual monitoring procedures reduce the risk of entanglement or ship strike because, during daylight, observers watch for any marine mammals or sea turtles near the vessel and equipment. Furthermore, there is no history of entanglement of marine mammals in gear towed by NSF-funded seismic vessels. Entanglement, ingestion of toxic or other materials, and ship strikes are very unlikely for either ESA-listed odontocete species (i.e., sperm whales) or for other odontocetes. It is expected that the proposed seismic survey activities under Alternative A within the analysis areas would have no significant impact on odontocete populations.

3.7.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research surveys using various acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, MBESs, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to odontocetes with implementation of Alternative C.

3.7.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Odontocetes

The potential impacts on odontocetes with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are summarized in Tables 3.7-7 and 3.7-8. With the planned monitoring and mitigation measures, impacts to odontocetes under Alternatives A and B are expected to be limited to behavioral disturbance and localized avoidance in the area near the active airguns. This is expected to have negligible short- and long-term impacts on individual odontocetes, their habitats, and regional populations within the exemplary analysis areas. However, because airgun operations are likely to result in localized behavioral avoidance by some ESA-listed sperm whales in some analysis areas, the proposed seismic surveys may affect and are likely to adversely affect this species. Nonetheless, no significant effects to sperm whale populations are anticipated.

Operation of MBESs, SBPs, and pingers is not likely to impact odontocetes. The intermittent and narrow downward-directed nature of the MBES and SBP acoustic sources would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures of any individual odontocete, given the movement and speed of the vessel; such brief exposure to this sound is not expected to cause injury or PTS based on results of limited studies of some odontocete species (reviewed in Appendix E). The streamer and core-mounted pingers are also highly unlikely to affect odontocetes given their intermittent nature, their short-term and transitory use from a moving vessel, their relatively low source levels, their brief ping durations, and in the case of ancillary core sampling their relatively infrequent use.

Modeling estimates that a small number of Level A (rms) exposures could occur under Alternative A in some analysis areas despite proposed mitigation and monitoring. However, such exposures are considered

unlikely to occur during an actual seismic survey because the model does not account for behavioral avoidance of source sounds. Studies indicate that many odontocetes are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sound levels ≥180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). These avoidance behaviors typically begin at lower received sound levels (reviewed in Section 3.7.4.3 and Table 3.7-5). Moreover, modeling indicates that no Level A exposures of odontocetes would occur under Alternative A and Alternative B based on the more realistic cumulative energy (SEL) exposure criterion (Tables 3.7-6 and 3.7-7 and Appendix E).

Overall, the primary anticipated impacts to odontocetes with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are:

- Small numbers of odontocetes are modeled or would be expected to experience Level B exposures at all five DAAs and potentially all eight QAAs. These numbers represent <1.0% of regional populations of most species. The exception is *Stenella* spp. in the NW Atlantic and Caribbean DAAs where up to approximately 2.7% of the regional population could experience Level B behavioral disturbance.
- In general, modeling results indicate that large airgun arrays operating in shallow water where odontocetes are common to abundant would cause the highest numbers of short-term Level B exposures.
- Modeling suggests that no cumulative energy exposures of odontocetes to ≥198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot sec$ (SEL), the Level A criterion used in this analysis, would occur in any of the analysis areas.
- Small numbers of individuals representing approximately <0.1% of regional populations of some odontocetes are predicted to be exposed to the NMFS Level A criterion of ≥180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Predicted Level A exposures would be similar for the two alternatives except for a few individuals of common to abundant delphinid species at the NW Atlantic and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs.
- No TTS and no potential injury (e.g., PTS) are expected to occur during the exemplary seismic surveys. Many odontocetes are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sound levels that could potentially cause these effects. The model used for analyses does not account for this expected behavioral avoidance and thus is precautionary.

In summary, implementation of Alternative A or B is likely to result in minor short-term and localized behavioral disturbance of small numbers of individual odontocetes. These temporary effects are not anticipated to result in any long-term or population-level effects on odontocete populations. The numbers of individual odontocetes modeled or estimated to be exposed to the current NMFS Level B criterion of ≥160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) during the exemplary surveys would be small in relation to regional population sizes. No TTS and no PTS or other potential injury of odontocetes is anticipated during an actual seismic survey under Alternative A or B with proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. No short- or long-term significant impacts are expected on odontocete populations or their habitats, including ESA-listed sperm whales, as a result of implementation of Alternative A or B.

Table 3.7-7. Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B in the DAAs

DAA	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
NW Atlantic	**Sperm whale**	Small number[(a)] of short-term Level B exposures. Negligible[(b)] NMFS Level A (rms) exposures primarily in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation and monitoring measures and behavioral avoidance, but analysis model does not account for avoidance. Further site-specific consultation with NMFS would be required for actual seismic survey due to ESA status.
	Beaked whales	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures in shallow water.
	Common, bottlenose, and Stenellid dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures primarily in shallow water. Small number[(a)] Level A (rms) exposures of common & bottlenose dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance but analysis model does not account for avoidance.
	Other MF odontocetes	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. No modeled Level A exposures.
	HF porpoises	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities. No modeled Level A or B exposures.
Caribbean	**Sperm whale**	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. No modeled Level A exposures.
	Beaked whales	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities. No modeled Level A or B exposures.
	Common , bottlenose, and Stenellid dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures primarily in shallow water. Small number Level A (rms) exposures of primarily Atlantic spotted dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance but analysis model does not account for avoidance (see Table 3.7-5).
	Other MF odontocetes	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures of mostly pilot whales primarily in shallow water. No Level A exposure modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
S California	Beaked whales	See above.
	Common dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures in shallow water. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
	Other MF odontocetes	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures and modeled Level A (rms) exposures of only Pacific white-sided dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance but analysis model does not account avoidance.
	HF porpoises	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures of only Dall's porpoises in shallow water. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.

Table 3.7-7. Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B in the DAAs

DAA	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
W Gulf of Alaska	**Sperm whale**	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
	Beaked whales	See sperm whale above.
	Other MF odontocetes	Small number[(a)] Level B behavioral effects of killer whales and Pacific white-sided dolphins primarily in shallow water. No Level A exposures modeled or expected due to planned mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance.
	HF porpoises	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures and small number modeled Level A (rms) exposures of primarily Dall's porpoises in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance but analysis model does not account for avoidance.
Galapagos	**Sperm whale**	See sperm whale above.
	Beaked whales	See sperm whale above
	Common, bottlenose, and Stenellid dolphins	Small number[(a)] short-term Level B exposures. Small number modeled Level A (rms) exposures of only stenellid dolphins in shallow water. No modeled Level A (SEL) cumulative energy exposures. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to proposed mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance but analysis model does not account for avoidance.
	Other MF odontocetes	See sperm whale above.

Notes: [(a)] Small number = ≤2.1% of estimated regional population size exposed. See Tables 3.7-6 and 3.7-7.
[(b)] Negligible number: for non-listed species = 0.5 - <1.0 individual exposed representing <1.0% of estimated regional population size; for ESA-listed species = 0.05 – <0.5 individual exposed representing <0.01% of estimated regional population size. See Tables 3.7-6 and 3.7-7.

Table 3.7-8. Summary of Potential Impacts to Odontocetes with Implementation of Alternative A or B in the QAAs

QAA	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
BC Coast	**Sperm whale,** beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	Small number[(b)] short-term Level B exposures likely. No Level A exposures expected in actual seismic survey due to planned mitigation measures and behavioral avoidance (see Table 3.7-5).
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	**Sperm whale,** beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.
Marianas	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.
Sub-Antarctic	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	See above.
N Atlantic/Iceland	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	See above.
SW Atlantic	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes, HF porpoises	See above.
W India	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.
W Australia	**Sperm whale**, beaked whales, other MF odontocetes	See above.

Notes: **bold** = ESA-listed species
[(a)] For the purpose of analysis, for non-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.5 animal as presented in Appendix Tables B-14 – B-25 are considered an actual exposure. For ESA-listed species, only predicted exposures ≥0.05 animal as presented in Appendix Tables B-14 – B-25 are considered an actual exposure.
[(b)] Small number = ≤2-3% of estimated regional population size. See Tables 3.7-6 and 3.7-7.

3.8 MARINE MAMMALS – PINNIPEDS

3.8.1 Overview of Pinniped Groups

Pinnipeds are seals, sea lions, and walruses. Of the approximately 31 species of pinnipeds occurring in marine waters worldwide (Rice 1998), 14 species may occur in one or more of the 13 analysis areas during the season(s) of the exemplary seismic studies. The status, global population estimates, general ecology, distribution and migratory movements of these 14 species are summarized in Table 3.8-1 and discussed below. Ecological considerations, known hearing, and call characteristics of pinnipeds are also discussed.

3.8.1.1 Taxonomic Groups of Pinnipeds

Pinnipeds are classified into three taxonomic groups or families: Odobenidae (the walrus), Phocidae (the "true" or earless seals), and Otariidae (the "eared" seals). The walrus lacks external ear flaps but has foreflippers similar to those of the fur seals and sea lions. Its hindflippers resemble those of phocids but can be rotated underneath the body to walk on ice or land. The three subspecies of walrus occur only in polar and sub-polar waters. The *Phocidae* or phocids lack external ear flaps. They cannot use their hindflippers to walk, but use their foreflippers to pull themselves along. Of the 16 species of phocids occurring in marine waters worldwide, 6 species may potentially occur in 7 of the 13 analysis areas. The *Otariidae* or otariids include the sea lions and fur seals and are known as eared seals because they have external ear flaps. They can also walk on land using their fore- and hindflippers. Of the 14 species of otariids occurring worldwide, 7 species potentially occur in 5 of the 13 analysis areas.

3.8.1.2 Distribution and Movements

Pinnipeds are widely distributed through all major oceans (Table 3.8-1). Many pinnipeds undertake seasonal migrations between breeding/pupping grounds and feeding areas, often at higher latitude (e.g., the N fur seal, elephant seals, California sea lion, and walrus) (Reeves et al. 2002; Jefferson et al. 2008; Table 3.8-1). Walruses and some phocids migrate with the seasonally-changing location of pack ice. However, some pinniped species remain year-round in a general region. Ice-breeding phocids tend to be solitary or form dispersed breeding aggregations. In contrast, other phocids, many otariids, and the walrus aggregate in large groups to breed, pup, or molt (e.g., the elephant seals, Steller sea lion, California sea lion). Most pinnipeds have a coastal distribution, but some occur further offshore, including foraging N fur seals and Steller sea lions. Elephant seals and some other pinnipeds are pelagic much of the year.

3.8.1.3 Important Ecological Considerations

The primary ecological considerations for pinnipeds relative to the exemplary seismic surveys are (1) locations and periods of breeding and pupping, particularly on offshore ice and islands within the analysis areas, (2) locations of important haul-outs and feeding areas, and (3) depths and durations of foraging dives. Breeding and pupping periods that overlap the exemplary seismic periods analyzed in this PEIS are discussed by analysis area in Sections 3.8.2 and 3.8.3. The following discussion provides a brief summary of the dive trends exhibited by pinnipeds.

Table 3.8-1. Summary of the Status, Population Trends, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution & Movement of Pinnipeds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status*[1-4] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*US MMPA Stock*[1]*	*Global Population Size[2, 5-7]*	*General Ecology & Prey [5-13]*	*General Distribution Migratory Movements[5-13]*
Phocids (True or Earless Seals)					
Harbor seal	-/- LC/-	W.N. Atlantic; Gulf of Alaska; CA/OR/WA	>500,000	Coastal waters; prey – fish and cephalopods.	Coastal areas of N Pacific and N Atlantic; seasonal migrants south to New England, New York, and New Jersey.
Gray seal	-/- LC/-	W.N. Atlantic	approx. 300,000	Coastal; prey – herring, demersal and benthic fish, and cephalopods.	Northern N Atlantic Ocean.
Harp seal	-/- LC/-	W.N. Atlantic	6 million	Pack ice; prey – polar and arctic cod in summer; capelin, herring, and krill during migration in spring & fall.	Arctic & N Atlantic Ocean; migrate N to feed during summer, return S with advancing ice.
Hooded seal	-/- VU/-	W.N. Atlantic	approx. 650,000	Associated with sea ice, shelf areas, maybe deep oceanic waters in autumn and winter; prey – small schooling fish, krill.	Central and W N Atlantic Ocean; breeding in Gulf of St. Lawrence, E Newfoundland, Davis Strait, and Jan Mayen Island.
S elephant seal	-/- LC/II	NA	approx. 600,000	Oceanic islands, coastal to pelagic during foraging; prey – deepwater, pelagic fish and squid.	Breeding on oceanic islands in subantarctic regions and S Argentina; during non-breeding season, some migrate S to forage near Antarctica and haul out there.
N elephant seal	-/- LC/-	Calif. breeding stock	approx. 115,000	Coastal to pelagic during foraging and migrating; prey – mesopelagic fish and squid, skates, rays, sharks, and rockfish.	NE Pacific; large breeding colonies at Channel Islands off S Calif., smaller colonies off central Calif., and W Baja Calif.; breed in winter, migrate N to forage in the central and NE Pacific (as far N as Alaska).
Leopard seal	-/- LC/-	NA	approx. 200,000	Pack and landfast ice, pelagic during foraging; prey – seals, penguins, fish, squid, and krill.	S Ocean around Antarctica; migrate N during winter.

Table 3.8-1. Summary of the Status, Population Trends, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution & Movement of Pinnipeds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status*[1-4] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*US MMPA Stock*[1]*	*Global Population Size[2, 5-7]*	*General Ecology & Prey [5-13]*	*General Distribution Migratory Movements[5-13]*
Otariids (Eared Seals)					
Antarctic fur seal	-/- LC/II	NA	1.5-4 million	Oceanic islands, coastal to pelagic during foraging; prey – krill in summer, pelagic and deepwater lanternfish and squid in fall and winter, some males eat penguins.	Breeding colonies on oceanic islands in subantarctic and near Antarctica (95% of pop. breeds on South Georgia); during non-breeding season, some migrate S to forage near Antarctica and haul out there.
Subantarctic fur seal	-/- LC/II	NA	>310,000	Oceanic islands, pelagic during foraging; prey – mostly lanternfish.	Subantarctic breeding colonies in S Atlantic, S Indian, and S Pacific Oceans; most breed on temperate islands of Gough in S Atlantic and Amsterdam in Indian Ocean.
Guadalupe fur seal	T/SS NT/I	Mexico	approx. 7408	Coastal, shelf, pelagic during foraging; prey – pelagic squid, mackerel, and lanternfish.	NE Pacific off Calif. and Baja Calif.; breed almost exclusively on Guadalupe Island, Mexico, but also on San Benito Island.
N fur seal	-/SS VU/II	E.N. Pacific	1.2-4 million 888,120	Pelagic, offshore; prey – nearshore and pelagic fish and squid.	Temperate areas; N Pacific Ocean, Bering Sea, and Sea of Okhotsk; primary breeding colonies are at the Pribilof and Commander Islands; in fall, males remain in Bering Sea, females migrate and feed in central N Pacific and along Calif. coast.
N fur seal	-/- VU/II	San Miguel Island	7,784	Pelagic, offshore; prey – nearshore and pelagic fish and squid.	Temperate region; N Pacific Ocean; one breeding colony on San Miguel Island, Calif.; may occur there year-round.
California sea lion	-/- LC/-	U.S.	approx. 240,000	Coastal, shelf; prey – in particular northern anchovy, squid, sardines, Pacific and jack mackerel, and rockfish.	Temperate region; N Pacific Ocean; breed at Channel Islands, Calif. and Baja Calif. including Guadalupe Island.
Steller sea lion	E, CH/SS E/-	W U.S. stock	34,779 W U.S. stock	Coastal, shelf; prey – walleye Pollock; males may consume N fur seal pups, harbor and ringed seals, sea otters.	Temperate regions, N Pacific Ocean and S Bering Sea; W stock includes animals west of 144ºW, along the Aleutian Islands.

Table 3.8-1. Summary of the Status, Population Trends, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution & Movement of Pinnipeds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Status*[1-4] ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*US MMPA Stock*[1]*	*Global Population Size[2, 5-7]*	*General Ecology & Prey [5-13]*	*General Distribution Migratory Movements[5-13]*
Steller sea lion	T, CH/SS E/-	E U.S. stock	31,028 E U.S. stock	Coastal, shelf; prey – walleye Pollock, herring, rockfish, cod, squid, and octopus; males may take harbor seals and otters.	Temperate regions, NE Pacific Ocean; E stock includes animals east of 144ºW.
Australian sea lion	-/- E/-	NA	10,000-12,000	Offshore islands and coastal; prey – fish, small sharks, cephalopods, and penguins.	Temperate, S Australia; largest colonies on offshore island in eastern S Australia.

Notes: *CH = critical habitat; E = endangered; LC = least concern, NT = near threatened; SS = Strategic Stock; T = threatened; VU = vulnerable; - = not listed; NA = reliable data not available or uncertain, species status was not assessed, or not applicable.

Sources: [1]NOAA Fisheries 2010; [2]Carretta et al. 2008; Angliss and Allen 2009; Waring et al. 2009; [3]IUCN 2010; [4]CITES 2010; [5]Seal Conservation Society 2006; [6]Reeves et al. 1992, 2002; [7]U.S. Navy 2007; [8] L-DEO and NSF 2004a; [9]Koski et al. 1998; [10]L-DEO and NSF 2003b; [11]L-DEO and NSF 2006a; [12]UAF and NSF 2005; [13]L-DEO and NSF 2004d.

Nearly all pinnipeds consume prey for which they must dive. Depths and durations of dives are considered an important ecological consideration with respect to the proposed project because they may affect the proportion and period of potential exposure time of pinnipeds to underwater sounds. Depths and durations of foraging dives by pinnipeds vary with species and age class and are related to the depths at which the prey is found. Pinnipeds generally consume a variety of fish, squid, and other prey (Table 3.8-1). However, some pinnipeds, such as leopard seals, may also eat birds (e.g., penguins) and other marine mammals. While many pinnipeds forage near the water surface, others make deep and prolonged foraging dives of hundreds of meters. Elephant seals are the deepest-diving pinnipeds. They routinely dive to depths of 1,312-1,640 ft (400–500 m) (DeLong and Stewart 1991; Hindell et al. 1991; Stewart and Huber 1993) for an average period of approximately 23 min (Le Boeuf et al. 1986, 1989; DeLong and Stewart 1991). Maximum dive depths reported for elephant seals exceed 4,920 ft (1,500 m), with the longest dive of 77 min (DeLong and Stewart 1991; Stewart and Huber 1993). Other relatively deep-diving pinniped species include the Weddell and hooded seals (Elsner 1999; U.S. Navy 2007). In contrast, other species typically dive to much shallower depths. Unlike cetaceans, pinnipeds are primarily solitary hunters and feeding aggregations are uncommon. Pinnipeds tend to be more generalist feeders and typically do not have specialized feeding areas.

3.8.1.4 Special-Status Species

The Guadalupe fur seal is listed as threatened and the W and E U.S. stocks of the Steller sea lion are listed as endangered and threatened, respectively, under the ESA (Table 3.8-1). The N and Guadalupe fur seals are listed as vulnerable by the IUCN (NOAA Fisheries 2006b).

3.8.1.5 Acoustic Capabilities

The known hearing and sound production characteristics of pinnipeds are summarized in Table 3.8-2. Pinnipeds produce both in-air and underwater sounds. Some phocid seals produce high-level underwater sounds, whereas others produce faint and infrequent sounds (Richardson et al. 1995a). These underwater sounds mainly appear to be associated with mating, mother-pup interactions, and territoriality. The frequencies of pinniped calls range from 90 Hz to 16 kHz, although pinniped clicks can include higher frequency components (Table 3.8-2). Otariids use in-air vocalizations to defend territories, attract females, and maintain the mother-pup bond, while underwater calls are mainly used to establish dominance. For example, California sea lions produce underwater barks at <2 kHz; airborne sounds are at <8 kHz.

Underwater audiograms are available for several species of phocids and otariids (Richardson et al. 1995a; Kastelein et al. 2002). Compared to odontocetes, pinnipeds tend to have their most sensitive hearing at lower frequencies, lower high-frequency cutoffs (i.e., the maximum frequencies they are capable of hearing are lower), better auditory sensitivity at low frequencies, and poorer sensitivity at their most sensitive frequencies (Richardson et al. 1995a). Below 30–50 kHz, the hearing thresholds of most pinniped species that have been tested are essentially flat down to about 1 kHz, and range between 60 and 85 dB re 1 µPa (Table 3.8-2). Measurements for harbor seals indicate that, below 1 kHz, their thresholds deteriorate gradually with decreasing frequency (Kastelein et al. 2009). For otariids, the high-frequency cutoff is lower than in most phocids, and sensitivity at low frequencies (e.g., 100 Hz) is poorer than for phocids (harbor or elephant seal) (Richardson et al. 1995a).

Table 3.8-2. Summary of Underwater Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Pinnipeds Potentially Occurring within the Analysis Areas

Species	*Sound Production**			*Hearing***	
	Frequency Range (kHz)	*Dominant Frequencies (kHz)*	*Source Level (dB re 1 µPa-m)*	*Overall Frequency Range of Hearing (kHz)*	*Threshold at Frequency of Best Sensitivity (dB re 1 µPa)*
Harbor seal	Clicks: 8-150 Other: <0.1-4	Clicks: 12-40 Roar: 0.4-0.8 Growl: <0.1-0.25 Creak: 0.7-2	-	<1-180	60-85
Gray seal	Clicks, hiss: 0-40 Calls: 0.1-5 Knocks: to 16	Calls: 0.1-3 Knocks: to 10	-	20-25	-
Harp seal	Clicks: 30-120 Other: <0.1 to >16	Other: 0.1-3	Clicks: 131-164 Other: 130-140	0.75-100	60-80
Hooded seal	Clicks: 30-120 Buzz: to 6	Clicks: 93 Grunt: 0.2-0.4 Snort: 0.1-1 Buzz: 1.2	-	3-60	-
S elephant seal	Drumming: 0.1-0.8 Continuous: 0.1-2.5	Drumming: 0.35 Continuous: 0.41	135	-	-
N elephant seal	0.2-6	0.7-2.5	-	<1-55	58 (at 6.4 kHz)
Leopard seal	Ultrasonic: to 164 Other: <0.04-7	Ultrasonic: 50-60	Low	-	-
Antarctic fur seal	-	-	-	-	-
Subantarctic fur seal	0.35 to 6.5	-	-	-	-
Guadalupe fur seal	-	-	-	-	-
N fur seal	-	-	-	0.5-40	60 (at 4-28 kHz)
California sea lion	Barks <8 Whinny: <1-3 Buzz: <1-4	Barks <3.5 Buzz <1 Clicks: 0.5-4	-	0.75-64	80 (at 2-16 kHz)
Steller sea lion	Female: 0.03-3	Female: 0.15-1	-	Male: <0.5 to >32 Female: <4 to >32	Male: 77 (at 1 kHz) Female: 73 (at 25 kHz)
Australian sea lion	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: - = Not available/unknown.

Sources: *Richardson et al. 1995a; Wartzok and Ketten 1999; Sanvito and Galimberti 2000a, b; Campbell et al. 2002; Charrier et al. 2002, 2003; U.S. Navy 2007.

**Richardson et al. 1995a; Kastak and Schusterman 1999; Kastelein et al. 2005, 2009; U.S. Navy 2007.

Pinnipeds occurring in the analysis areas are all members of the same functional hearing group: pinnipeds in water (see Section 2.3.3.3 and Appendix B for more details). Functional hearing for pinnipeds in water is considered to range from 75 Hz to 75 kHz (Southall et al. 2007), although some individual species–especially the otariids–do not have that broad an auditory range (Richardson et al. 1995a).

3.8.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

This section summarizes the region-specific occurrence of pinnipeds within the five DAAs for which acoustic modeling was conducted. Discussion is limited to those species present during the season(s) of the exemplary marine seismic surveys (Table 3.8-3). Discussion is focused on species with special status (e.g., ESA) and those that are expected to be most abundant/common. No species of pinniped are expected within the Galapagos Ridge DAA.

Table 3.8-3. Potential Occurrence of Pinnipeds within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

*Species**	*NW Atlantic (N Sum)*[a-c]*	*Caribbean (N Spr or Sum)*[d]*	*S California (N Spr or Sum)*[e, f]*	*W Gulf of Alaska (N Sum)*[e, g]*
Harbor seal	F u	-	B F a	FB? c
Gray seal	F u	-	-	-
Harp seal	F? r	-	-	-
Hooded seal	F? r	r	-	-
N elephant seal	-	-	F a	F r
Guadalupe fur seal	-	-	F u	-
Northern fur seal	-	-	B c	F?M c
California sea lion	-	-	B a	F? r
Steller sea lion	-	-	B? r	B a

Notes: ***bold** = ESA-listed species. (Season) = N hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; **Sum** = summer, **Spr** = spring, **Win** = winter. **B** = known to breed or calve within the area; **F** = known to feed within the area; **M** = known to migrate through the area; **?** = unknown / possible; **a** = abundant - the species is expected to be encountered during a single visit to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit may be as many as hundreds or more; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon: the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area during the relevant season; **r** = rare: the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years during the relevant season; **-** = species does not occur there.

Sources: Reeves et al. 2002; also see following:
[a] U.S. Navy 2005; [b] L-DEO and NSF 2003c; [c] Waring et al. 2006; [d] L-DEO and NSF 2003e; Smultea et al. 2004; [e] Koski et al. 1998; [f] Carretta et al. 2005; [g] L-DEO and NSF 2004d.

3.8.2.1 NW Atlantic

Two species, the harbor and gray seals, are likely to occur in the NW Atlantic DAA during the summer exemplary seismic survey period. However, because the analysis area is located at the southern limit of their range, they are considered uncommon there (Table 3.8-3).

Gray seals could occur in the analysis area in small numbers during summer; however, their frequency of occurrence at that time of year would be low (U.S. Navy 2005). Gray seals in the western Atlantic breed from December to February on Sable Island, Nova Scotia, and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. They also range south to the northeastern U.S., with known strandings as far south as North Carolina (Hammill et al. 1998; Waring et al. 2006). Adult gray seals have also been observed to haul out in New York waters (Hoover et al. 1999), and there have been sightings and strandings in Long Island Sound.

Harbor seals typically occur south of Maine from late September through late May (U.S. Navy 2005), and have been known to overwinter in New Jersey (Slocum et al. 1999). Small numbers of harbor seals may occur in the DAA in summer.

Harp seals and hooded seals could occur in the analysis area in summer on rare occasion only as extralimital strays. These two species breed in eastern Canadian waters in late winter/spring, and most migrate north from there for the summer. However, a few have been documented from stranding data in northeastern U.S. waters (U.S. Navy 2005).

3.8.2.2 Caribbean

No pinnipeds are known to currently occur regularly in the Caribbean. However, vagrant hooded seals have been sighted there in the past (Mignucci Giannoni and Odell 2001), but hooded seals would be rare in the DAA. The Caribbean or West Indian monk seal, formerly a resident of this DAA, is extinct (Adam and Garcia 2003).

3.8.2.3 S California

Five pinniped species are likely to occur in the S California DAA during the exemplary spring or summer analysis period (Table 3.8-3). These include harbor seal, N elephant seal, Guadalupe fur seal, N fur seal, and California sea lion. The Guadalupe fur seal is listed under the ESA as threatened. The occurrence of threatened Steller sea lions would be rare in the DAA, as they typically breed and pup north of California; thus, they are not discussed further (Table 3.8-3).

Foraging Guadalupe fur seals could occur in the analysis area in small numbers from spring through approximately mid-summer (Table 3.8-3). By late summer, some individuals travel north to the Channel Islands. However, their whereabouts from fall to spring are mostly unknown. The ESA-listed threatened Guadalupe fur seal breeds almost exclusively on Guadalupe Island off Baja California. However, in 1997, a second rookery was discovered at San Benito Island (Maravilla-Chavez and Lowry 1999), and a pup was born at San Miguel Island, California (Melin and DeLong 1999). The population is now recovering from being exploited in the past and is estimated to be growing at approximately 14% per year (Gallo 1994).

Northern fur seals are common in the analysis area during spring and early summer (Table 3.8-3). However, Bonnell et al. (1992) noted they are 5–6 times more abundant in offshore waters than over the shelf or slope. A small percentage of N fur seals (recognized as a separate stock) breed in the summer at San Miguel Island off S California and occur there year-round. However, the great majority of the N fur seals breed and pup off Alaska (Table 3.8-1). After reproduction, adult females and pups from the Pribilof Islands migrate to offshore waters of Oregon and California (Kajimura 1984) and spend the next 7–8 months feeding at sea (Roppel 1984).

Harbor seal, California sea lion, and N elephant seal are not ESA-listed and are the most abundant pinniped species in the DAA. The harbor seal breeds and pups in the analysis area during spring, while the California sea lion breeds and pups in the area during spring and summer. Feeding N elephant seals are abundant in the S California DAA during spring and summer; they breed in winter (Table 3.8-3).

3.8.2.4 W Gulf of Alaska

Three pinniped species are expected to be encountered frequently in the W Gulf of Alaska, particularly in coastal areas and near islands. These are the harbor seal, N fur seal, and Steller sea lion (Table 3.8-3). Of these, the harbor seal and Steller sea lion are hunted by native peoples in that area. Harbor seals commonly feed and may breed in the analysis area. The western U.S. stock of Steller sea lions (occurring

west of 144ºW, including waters of this analysis area) is listed as endangered under the ESA and Critical Habitat has been designated in the Gulf of Alaska. The N fur seal is listed as vulnerable by IUCN and as a Strategic Stock under the MMPA. Another two species potentially occur in the analysis area, but their occurrence is considered rare: N elephant seal and California sea lion. Because neither is likely to occur in the analysis area, they are not further discussed here; however, their general ecology is summarized in Table 3.8-1. The remaining discussion for the W Gulf of Alaska DAA focuses on the Steller sea lion and N fur seal.

The western U.S. stock of Steller sea lions has been declining since the mid-1970s; however, the causes of the decline are unknown. A number of hypotheses have been proposed for this decline, including food stress, direct human interaction, indirect effects from human activities, natural climatic variation, and long-term shifts due to past human activities (see summary in NRC 2003b; Springer et al. 2003). The western U.S. stock of Steller sea lions includes animals west of Cape Suckling, Alaska (144ºW), including the analysis area. Critical habitat for Steller sea lions was designated in 1993 and 1994 and includes 66 specific sites (26 rookeries and 40 haulouts) in Alaska; 4 rookeries and 5 haulouts are located in or adjacent to the analysis area (NMFS 1993, 1994b, 2006b). In addition, Critical Habitat at the Shelikof Strait Foraging Area occurs along the northeastern edge of the analysis area. Critical habitat includes land 3,000 ft (0.9 km) inshore from the baseline or basepoint of each major rookery and major haulout in Alaska. It also includes waters 3,000 ft (0.9 km) seaward in state- and federally-managed waters from every major rookery and haulout east of 144ºW, and 20 nm (37 km) seaward from every major rookery and haulout west of 144ºW. In addition, "no approach" zones have been identified wherein no vessel may approach within 3 nm (5.6 km) of listed rookeries. Breeding adults occupy rookeries from late May to early July, but disperse thereafter (NMFS 1992).

Most N fur seals breed from June to September on the Pribilof and Bogoslof islands in the Bering Sea. Although the Pribilof Islands have always had the greatest number of fur seals, numbers are now declining there and increasing on Bogoslof Island (NMFS 2004a). Pups travel through the Aleutian passes and spend the first 2 years at sea before returning to their islands of origin. When not on rookery islands, N fur seals are primarily pelagic. Northern fur seals are considered most likely to occur in the analysis area during late summer when they frequently forage in offshore areas (Table 3.8-3).

3.8.2.5 Galapagos Ridge

No pinnipeds are known to occur in the Galapagos Ridge DAA, although there is a remote possibility that a Galápagos sea lion or fur seal could potentially occur within the analysis area. General information on these species is summarized in Table 3.8-1.

3.8.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific occurrence of pinnipeds within the eight QAAs. In general, these summaries address broader analysis areas than considered above for the DAAs for which acoustic modeling was conducted. Fewer data are available on distribution, occurrence, and particularly abundance of pinnipeds for some of the QAAs as compared to most of the DAAs. As done for the DAAs, discussion herein is limited to those species occurring within each region during the season when a marine seismic survey would potentially occur (Table 3.8-4). The following discussion focuses on species with special status (e.g., ESA, IUCN, etc.) and those that are expected to be most abundant/common.

Table 3.8-4. Potential Occurrence of Pinnipeds within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

*Species**	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (N Sum)**	*BC Coast (N Fall)*[a]*	*SW Atlantic (Any)**	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (N Spr, Sum or Fall)*[b]*	*W Australia (S Spr or Fall)**	*W India (N Spr or Fall)**	*Mariana Islands (N Spr)**	*Sub-Antarctic (S Sum)*[c]*
Harbor seal	F a	F a	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gray seal	F a	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hooded seal	F c	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S elephant seal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	F r
N elephant seal	-	F u	-	-	-	-	-	-
Leopard seal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	F r
Northern fur seal	-	F u	-	-	-	-	-	-
California sea lion	-	F u	-	-	-	-	-	-
Steller sea lion	-	F a	-	-	-	-	-	-
Australian sea lion	-	-	-	-	sp F? r	-	-	-
Antarctic fur seal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	F r
Subantarctic fur seal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	F r

Notes: ***bold** = ESA-listed species. (Season) = N hemisphere season or S hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; **sp** = spring, **F** = known to feed within the area, **a** = abundant, **c**= common, **u** = uncommon, **r** = rare, - = does not occur.

Sources: Reeves et al. 2002; see also following footnotes:

[a] L-DEO and NSF 2006a.

[b] L-DEO and NSF 2003c; Holst 2004.

[c] Bannister et al. 1996.

3.8.3.1 N Atlantic/Iceland

Three species of seals potentially occur in the analysis area off the S coast of Iceland during the exemplary summer analysis period: hooded, gray, and harbor seal (Table 3.8-4). None of these seals is listed as threatened or endangered under ESA. Seals are hunted in Iceland.

Harbor seals are considered abundant foragers in coastal habitats off Iceland during the summer. The peak in pupping occurs in mid-June (Härkönen and Heide-Jørgensen 1990). Harbor seals forage inshore, usually <27 nm (<50 km) from their haul-out sites (Thompson 1993); however, some seals have been shown to forage 27–54 nm (50–100 km) from shore (Bjørge et al. 1995).

Gray seals occur around Iceland, Norway, and the British Isles and are considered abundant foragers in the analysis area (Table 3.8-4). Gray seal colonies form on rocky islands or mainland beaches. Near Iceland, pups are born from September through November (Reeves et al. 2002).

Hooded seals commonly occur in the QAA from June-August where they rest and molt on pack ice and forage in open water along the ice edge. Breeding seals aggregate elsewhere in the North Atlantic to breed and pup on ice from mid-March to early April (Table 3.8-1). Hooded seals are considered deep divers and typically forage repeatedly at depths of 330-1,980 ft (100-600 m) but also up to 3,300 ft (1,000 m); they often remain underwater for over 50 min (Gale Group 2006).

3.8.3.2 BC Coast

Five pinniped species feed off the BC coast during fall and could potentially occur in the analysis area (Table 3.8-4). Two of these species (harbor seal and Steller sea lion) are seen frequently in the area, whereas another three species (N elephant seal, N fur seal, and California sea lion) are expected to be uncommon there (Bigg 1985; Olesiuk 1999; Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada [COSEWIC] 2003). However, marine foraging ranges are poorly understood. The eastern U.S. stock of

Steller sea lions occurring in this area is listed as threatened under the ESA and as endangered by the IUCN. The N fur seal is listed as vulnerable by IUCN and as a Strategic Stock under the MMPA.

Steller sea lions commonly feed off BC during the fall, and traditional summer breeding and pupping sites are located in the analysis area. During June and July, Steller sea lions gather at rookeries to give birth and breed. In BC, major rookeries are situated at Cape St. James, North Danger Rocks, and on the Scott Islands. Some adults and juveniles are also found on sites known as year-round haulouts during the breeding season. In late summer and autumn, individuals on rookeries disperse along the coast to numerous wintering sites. Similar to the western population of Steller sea lions, Critical Habitat has been designated in SE Alaska for the eastern population and the same buffers and guidelines apply (refer to W Gulf of Alaska DAA discussion). However, the BC Coast QAA lies approximately 200 mi (322 km) south of the closest designated Steller sea lion Critical Habitat.

It is possible that N fur seals could be present in the analysis area during a fall seismic survey, though the numbers present are expected to be low. The E Pacific stock of N fur seals ranges from the Pribilof and Bogoslof islands in the Bering Sea (summer range) to the Channel Islands in southern California during winter. When not on rookery islands, N fur seals are primarily pelagic but occasionally haul-out on rocky shorelines. Adult males are thought to remain in the North Pacific, whereas adult females and some juveniles migrate southward as far as California, passing through BC waters in early winter and returning northward in late spring. Off the Canadian west coast, females and subadult males typically occur off the continental shelf during winter (Bigg 1990).

Harbor seals are abundant in the analysis area and forage there during fall (Table 3.8-4). Harbor seals inhabit estuarine and coastal waters, hauling out on rocks, reefs, and beaches. From May to June, female harbor seals give birth to a single pup while hauled out on shore. When molting, which occurs from late-June to October, seals spend the majority of the time hauled out on shore. During late autumn and winter, seals can forage at sea continuously for several weeks to regain weight lost during the mating and molting seasons.

3.8.3.3 W Australia

One species of pinniped, the Australian sea lion, may occur in the W Australia QAA (Table 3.8-4). This species is not listed by the ESA, IUCN, or CITES. The breeding range of the Australian sea lion extends from central W Australia (south of the analysis area) southward and eastward along the south coast of Australia. The largest colonies occur on offshore islands in eastern S Australia. The breeding season is highly variable among colonies; however, most pups are born from January to October, and most births occur in June. When animals are not breeding, they range more widely along the W Australia coast. Non-breeding individuals have been sighted as far north as Shark Bay (Reeves et al. 2002), located just south of the analysis area. Occurrence of this species in the analysis area would be rare.

3.8.3.4 Sub-Antarctic

Four pinniped species could potentially occur in the Sub-Antarctic QAA during the exemplary austral summer (= N winter) analysis period (Table 3.8-4). These include the S elephant seal, leopard seal, and subantarctic and Antarctic fur seals. The range of the crabeater seal is to the far south of the analysis area, so its occurrence there would be extremely rare. Therefore, this species was not included in Table 3.8-4 and is not discussed.

The Antarctic fur seal could potentially occur in the analysis area, although its occurrence there would be rare. Breeding colonies occur on oceanic islands in the subantarctic and near Antarctica. Most (95%) of the population breeds on South Georgia Island. Pups are born from mid-November to late December.

During the non-breeding season, some Antarctic fur seals migrate south to forage near Antarctica. However, the distribution of most individuals during winter is unknown (Reeves et al. 2002).

It is possible that a subantarctic fur seal could occur in the analysis area, although this would be considered rare (Table 3.8-4). Breeding colonies occur in the South Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific sectors of the S Ocean. Most breed on the temperate islands of Gough in the South Atlantic and Amsterdam in the Indian Ocean. Pups are born in November and December (Reeves et al. 2002). During the non-breeding season, some seals may forage farther north.

It is also possible that a S elephant seal could occur in the analysis area, although this would also be rare. Southern elephant seals breed on oceanic islands in subantarctic regions and southern Argentina. Pups are born in September and October (Reeves et al. 2002). During the non-breeding season, some migrate south to forage near Antarctica, but others may forage farther north.

The leopard seal rarely occurs in the analysis area (Table 3.8-4). The leopard seal distribution extends around Antarctica. However, in the austral winter, these seals migrate north to forage.

3.8.4 Environmental Consequences – General

The following sections provide a synopsis of available information on the potential effects of sound associated with seismic surveys on pinnipeds. Few studies on the reactions of pinnipeds to airguns or echosounders have been published, and the biological significance of any effects and potential effects at the population scale are largely unknown. Criteria used to assess effects are first described, followed by a comparison of the overlap between the sound frequencies of acoustic sources used in seismic surveys with what is known about pinniped in-water hearing sensitivity (Table 3.8-2 and Section 3.8.1.5).

3.8.4.1 Criteria and Approach

The criteria used to evaluate and quantify the potential impacts on pinnipeds were described in detail in Section 2.3.3 (see also Appendix B). However, when evaluating the potential for Level A effects (injury) based on cumulative energy, the M_{pw}-weighting function, as appropriate for pinnipeds in water (see Section 2.3.3.3), was used. This down-weights low (and extremely high) frequency sound components to which pinnipeds listening in water are less sensitive. The functional hearing range for pinnipeds in water is considered to extend from 75 Hz to 75 kHz (Southall et al. 2007), although some individual species—especially the eared seals—do not have that broad an auditory range (Richardson et al. 1995a). See Section 3.8.1.5 and Table 3.8-2 for a summary of what is known regarding pinniped hearing.

3.8.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

Pinnipeds have best hearing sensitivity, and produce most of their sounds, at frequencies higher than those predominantly produced by airguns. Most of the energy in the sound pulses emitted by airgun arrays is at low frequencies, with strongest spectrum levels below 200 Hz, considerably lower spectrum levels above 1000 Hz, and small amounts of energy emitted up to approximately 150 kHz (Goold and Fish 1998; Sodal 1999; Goold and Coates 2006; Potter et al. 2007) (Appendix E). The predominant frequencies of airgun sound are below the frequencies most important to pinnipeds, but the two frequency ranges overlap, and some pinnipeds exhibit limited avoidance behavior to seismic operations. This is discussed further below in Section 3.8.4.3, *Acoustic Effects*.

The MBES proposed for the *Langseth* is the Kongsberg EM122 which operates in the range of approximately 10.5–13 (usually 12) kHz with a maximum source level of approximately 242 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) (Table 2-5). Four other MBESs proposed for other project vessels, also operate near this range (12–15.5 kHz), with maximum source levels of approximately 234 to 237 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) (Table 2-

5). Another proposed MBES operates at 30-kHz (Table 2-5). These frequency ranges overlap the documented frequency sensitivity range of pinnipeds (approximately 75 Hz to 75 kHz, considering all species as a group; Southall et al. 2007). Another proposed MBES operates at 95 kHz, and is thus very likely outside the frequency range audible to pinnipeds.

The SBPs associated with the proposed marine seismic activities operate in the MF range of approximately 3.5 kHz with a maximum source output of 222 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms). The frequency range of the SBPs is within the frequency band audible to pinnipeds.

Omnidirectional pingers would also be used during proposed marine seismic surveys as described in Chapter 2 and Section 3.7.4.2. The peak output of the omnidirectional pingers used for multi-streamer 3-D surveys is 183 dB re 1 µPa-m at 55–110 kHz, with a maximum rate of 3 pings per 10 sec. Sounds from these pingers are within the upper part of the known hearing range of pinnipeds (maximum approximately 75 kHz; Southall et al. 2007) (Table 3.8-2). Those pingers are more likely to be heard by hair seals than by eared seals, given the generally lower limit of hearing in the latter two groups (Richardson et al. 1995; Kastak and Schusterman 1998; Table 3.8-2). In addition, the battery-powered coring pingers produce omnidirectional 12-kHz signals with a source output of approximately 192 dB re 1 µPa-m with one ping of 0.5, 2, or 10 ms duration per second. This source frequency is within the frequency range audible to pinnipeds (Table 3.8-2).

Ship engines and the vessel hull itself emit broadband sounds with frequencies and amplitudes that would allow them to be heard by pinnipeds. The source level of vessel sound would be considerably less than that of the airguns, MBESs, and SBPs, but vessel sound (unlike those other sources) would be emitted continuously (Richardson et al. 1995a).

In summary, airgun and vessel sounds are audible to pinnipeds, although pinnipeds are considered less sensitive to the predominant low frequencies produced by these sound sources than they are to mid- to high-frequency sounds. Sound frequencies produced by the SBPs, pingers, and all but one of the planned MBESs overlap the range of pinniped hearing; thus pinnipeds can presumably hear these sounds if sufficiently close.

Types of effects that the aforementioned sound sources could potentially have on pinnipeds are described below and summarized in Table 3.8-5. For more detailed information refer to Appendix E. In general, the potential for adverse effects from exposure to the project sound sources can be reduced by implementing a mitigation and monitoring program. With effective mitigation, no significant effects are anticipated to pinnipeds on a population scale through exposure to project sound sources. While short-term behavioral effects and possibly some instances of temporary hearing impairment are expected during exemplary seismic survey operations, no adverse effects are expected on the viability of any pinniped population.

3.8.4.3 Acoustic Effects

The following sections discuss the types of potential acoustic effects that may occur to pinnipeds exposed to sounds similar to those proposed for the project, including airgun pulses, MF and HF echosounder signals, and other anthropogenic sounds relevant to the project based on the limited available data. Further discussion of these topics can be found in Appendix E.

Table 3.8-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Airgun Sounds on Pinnipeds*

Species or Group	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*Temporary Hearing Impairment or TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
ESA-LISTED						
Steller sea lion W U.S. stock (E)	No data – non-existent or negligible short-term effects expected.	No data – some short-term changes in behavior and/or localized avoidance possible based on other pinniped species (see non-ESA Listed below).	No data – may avoid sounds before TTS occurs. TTS thresh-olds in California sea lion are higher (less sensitive) than for the harbor seal.	No data – highly unlikely to occur; expected to avoid sounds before PTS occurs.	No data – no effects expected.	Disturbance impacts expected to be similar to those for non-ESA listed species.
Steller sea lion E U.S. stock (T)	Same as above.	No data – see above.	No data – see above.	No data – see above.	No data – no effects expected.	Same as above.
Guadalupe fur seal (T)	Same as above.	No data – see above.	No data – see above. TTS thresholds in N fur seal are higher (less sensitive) than for harbor seal.	No data – see above.	No data – no effects expected.	Same as above.
NON-ESA LISTED (17 species/ subspecies	Few data – expected to hear sounds well in noisy environments.[(1)] Non-existent or negligible short-term effects expected.	Usually tolerant; some show changes in behavior and/or short-term, localized avoidance.[(2-6)]	Has not been demonstrated for brief pulses as produced by airguns.[(7)] See above. TTS thresh-old for pulsed sound estimated to be ≥171 dB re 1 μPa^2-s in harbor seal; higher in N elephant seal or N fur seal (Southall et al. 2007).†	Has not been demonstrated. See above. PTS thresh-old for pulsed sound estimated to be ≥186 dB re 1 μPa^2-s in harbor seal; higher in N elephant seal or N fur seal (Southall et al. 2007).†	No data – no effects expected.	Some short-term behavioral changes and/or localized avoidance.

Notes: *See text and Appendix E for review of effects on pinnipeds from echosounders as relevant to the proposed MBESs, SBPs, and pingers. E = endangered, T = threatened.
Sources: [(1)]Southall et al. 2000; [(2)]Arnold 1996; [(3)]Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; [(4)]Harris et al. 2001; [(5)]Moulton and Lawson 2002; [(6)]Miller et al. 2005; [(7)]Finneran et al. 2003.
†Estimated TTS and PTS thresholds are for the harbor seal, and are M_{pa}-weighted SEL values cumulated across a sequence of received pulses. Corresponding values for northern fur seal and California sea lion are expected to be higher given the higher TTS thresholds in those species as compared to the harbor seal (Southall et al. 2007).

Masking

Masking of pinniped calls by pulsed sounds, such as those from airguns, is expected to be limited given the intermittent nature of the pulses. In addition, the low frequencies that dominate seismic survey sounds generally do not fall within the most sensitive hearing ranges of pinnipeds. Although some pinnipeds are expected to hear the airgun sounds, this does not necessarily mean that those sounds will have any appreciable masking effects. Several species of pinnipeds, including harp and bearded seals, have been shown to produce distinct calls to reduce masking by one another's calls (e.g., Watkins and Schevill 1979; Terhune 1994, 1999; Serrano and Terhune 2001, 2002).

Masking effects due to MBES, SBP, or pinger signals are expected to be minimal or non-existent given their low duty cycles, the brief period when an individual mammal would potentially be within the downward-directed MBES or SBP beam from a transiting vessel, and the relatively low source level of a pinger. Masking effects in general are discussed further in Appendix E.

Disturbance

Few studies have been published on the reactions of pinnipeds to sounds from open-water seismic exploration (for review, see Richardson et al. 1995a). However, pinnipeds have been observed during a number of seismic monitoring studies (Table 3.8-5). Visual monitoring from seismic vessels has shown only slight (if any) avoidance of airguns by pinnipeds, and only slight (if any) changes in behavior (see Appendix E). Ringed seals frequently do not avoid the area within a few hundred meters of operating airgun arrays (Harris et al. 2001; Moulton and Lawson 2002; Miller et al. 2005). However, telemetry work suggests that avoidance and other behavioral reactions by two other species of seals exposed to small airgun sources may at times be stronger than evident to date from visual studies of pinniped reactions to airguns (Thompson et al. 1998). Reiser et al. (2009) noted reduced sighting rates of phocid seals during seismic vs. non-seismic periods. Even if reactions of any pinnipeds that might be encountered in the present analysis areas are as strong as those evident in the telemetry study, reactions are expected to be confined to relatively small distances and durations, with no anticipated long-term effects on pinniped individuals or populations.

As for delphinids, a 170-dB re 1 μPa (rms) disturbance criterion is considered a more realistic and appropriate criterion above which some pinnipeds are likely to react behaviorally to airgun sounds. However, for the purposes of analysis, a 160 dB re 1 μPa (rms) potential disturbance criterion was used based on current NMFS exposure criteria (Table 2-8).

There are currently no data on the potential disturbance effects of echosounders, such as MBESs and SBPs, on pinnipeds (see Appendix E). Based on observed pinniped responses to other types of sounds, and the likely brevity of exposure to these sound sources, pinniped reactions are expected to be limited to startle or otherwise brief responses of no lasting consequence to the animals. The signals from the SBP are somewhat weaker than those from the MBES. Therefore, behavioral responses are not expected unless marine mammals are very close to the source. NMFS (2001b) has concluded that momentary behavioral reactions "do not rise to the level of taking". Thus, brief exposure of pinnipeds to small numbers of signals from the MBES or SBP would not result in a "take" by harassment as defined by NMFS and the ESA (see Chapter 1).

Temporary Hearing Impairment or TTS

TTS is possible when marine mammals are exposed to high-level sounds (Southall et al. 2007). Studies of TTS in pinnipeds showed varying results dependent on duration and received levels of sound (Kastak et al. 1999; Schusterman et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2003). TTS thresholds associated with exposure to brief

pulses (single or multiple) of underwater sound have not been measured in pinnipeds. Evidence from prolonged exposures suggests that some pinnipeds, e.g., the harbor seal, may incur TTS at somewhat lower received levels than do small odontocetes exposed for similar durations (Kastak et al. 1999, 2005; Ketten et al. 2001; Southall et al. 2007). However, TTS onset in the California sea lion and northern elephant seal may occur at a similar sound exposure level as in odontocetes (Kastak et al. 2005).

For the past several years, NMFS policy regarding exposure of marine mammals to high-level sounds is that pinnipeds should not be exposed to impulsive sounds ≥190 dB re 1 μPa (rms) (NMFS 2000) (see Section 3.2). That criterion has been used in defining the safety (shut-down) radii for previous NSF-sponsored seismic surveys and, for comparative purposes, was also considered in this analysis. Currently available data imply that, for a harbor seal exposed to a sequence of airgun pulses, TTS onset may occur upon exposure to a peak pressure of approximately 212 dB re 1 μPa (peak) or to an SEL, accumulated across successive pulses, of approximately 171 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Southall et al. 2007). NMFS is considering adoption of these new criteria (NMFS 2005c). It is assumed that the TTS threshold for California sea lions or northern elephant seals exposed to high-level airgun pulses would be higher than that for the harbor seal, given their higher TTS thresholds (as compared to the harbor seal) upon exposure to longer-duration non-impulse sound (Kastak et al. 2005).

The project MBESs, SBPs, and pingers are not expected to induce TTS. See mysticete Sections 3.7.4.3 *TTS* and *PTS* for further assessment based on operating characteristics of these sound sources.

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

There is no evidence that exposure to airgun pulses (even from large airgun arrays) or echosounders can cause PTS in any marine mammal. However, given the possibility that mammals close to an airgun array might incur TTS, there has been further speculation about the possibility that some individuals occurring very close to airguns might incur PTS. Southall et al. (2007) note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a pinniped received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 218 dB re 1 μPa (peak). When exposure is measured in SEL units, Southall et al. (2007) estimate that received levels would need to exceed the TTS threshold by at least 15 dB for there to be risk of PTS. Thus, for pinnipeds in water they estimate that the PTS threshold might be an SEL of about 186 dB re $(1 \mu Pa)^2 \cdot s$, at least for the harbor seal. Given the higher level of sound necessary to cause PTS as compared with TTS, it is less likely that PTS could occur through exposure to airgun sounds. Also, given the significantly higher TTS thresholds in northern fur seals and California sea lions than in harbor seals, PTS thresholds in those other species are expected to be higher than in the harbor seal.

Strandings and Mortality

No mortalities or strandings of pinnipeds have been linked to acoustic sources that would be used during the proposed seismic surveys (see Section 3.8.4 and Appendix E). Based on that, and the proposed mitigation and monitoring measures designed to minimize potential impacts, no strandings or mortality of pinnipeds are expected during the proposed marine seismic surveys within the exemplary analysis areas.

Other Physiological Effects

Non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that might, in theory, occur in marine mammals exposed to high-level underwater sound include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, and other types of organ or tissue damage (Cox et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007; see Appendix E). To date, there have been no studies on the potential physiological effects of airgun or echosounder sounds on pinnipeds. Marine

mammals that show behavioral avoidance of seismic vessels, including some pinnipeds, are especially unlikely to incur auditory impairment or other physiological effects.

3.8.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Entanglement

Entanglements occur when cables, lines, nets, or other objects suspended in the water column become wrapped around marine mammals. Incidents of entanglement of pinnipeds in fishing gear and other marine debris are well known (Arnould and Croxall 1995; Hanni and Pyle 2002; Page et al. 2004). Northern fur seals have been particularly susceptible to entanglement. In some years, over 50,000 fur seals in Alaskan waters were killed from entanglement in fishing nets and strapping bands. So great was the mortality of northern fur seals, that their population was deemed directly threatened by entanglement; because their population was in decline, any mortality was considered unsustainable (NRC 1995). Many of the entanglements of pinnipeds with fishing gear are presumably a result of attraction of pinnipeds to fish concentrations.

During seismic operations, numerous cables, lines, and other objects primarily associated with the airgun array and hydrophone streamers will be towed behind the survey ship near the water's surface. No cases of entanglement of pinnipeds or other marine mammals with this gear have been documented during previous NSF-sponsored seismic surveys. The tendency of marine mammals to avoid approaching seismic vessels (in contrast with their tendency to congregate around fishing vessels) presumably reduces the risk of entanglement.

Ingestion of/Coating by Oil

In the highly unlikely event of an oil/fuel spill associated with the planned program, pinnipeds could be coated with oil, could ingest oil with water or contaminated food, or could absorb oil components through the respiratory tract (Geraci and Smith 1976; Engelhardt et al. 1977; Geraci and St Aubin 1990). Oil can destroy the insulating qualities of hair or fur, resulting in hypothermia. Thus, pinnipeds that depend on fur rather than a thick layer of fat for insulation, such as fur seals and newborn pups, are most sensitive to oiling. Heavy oiling may also cause a decrease in mobility, and the animal may be unable to swim or forage. For example, the flippers of young harp and gray seal pups have been shown to become impeded by a heavy coating of oil, becoming stuck to their sides, resulting in the drowning of the gray seal pups (Davis and Anderson 1976; Sergeant 1991).

If oil is ingested, some of it would be voided in vomit or feces or metabolized at rates that prevent significant bioaccumulation (Neff 1985), but some would be absorbed and could cause toxic effects (Geraci 1990). These effects may include minor kidney, liver, and brain lesions (Geraci and Smith 1976; Spraker et al. 1994). When returned to clean water, contaminated animals can expel this internal oil through urine or feces (Engelhardt 1978, 1982, 1985). Seals exposed to an oil spill are unlikely to ingest enough oil to cause serious internal damage (Geraci and St. Aubin 1980, 1982), and in most cases effects are likely to be reversible (Spraker et al. 1994).

Seals are also at risk from hydrocarbons and other chemicals that evaporate from spills (Geraci 1990). Seals generally keep their nostrils close to the water surface when breathing, so they are likely to inhale vapors if they surface in a contaminated area. Grey seals that presumably inhaled volatile hydrocarbons from the Braer oil spill exhibited a discharge of nasal mucous, but no causal relationship with the oil was determined (Hall et al. 1996). Laboratory studies of ringed seals indicate that the inhalation of hydrocarbons may cause more serious effects like kidney and liver damage (St. Aubin 1990), although exposure conditions were much higher than would be expected in a natural setting.

Ship Strikes

Pinnipeds can probably move quickly enough to avoid collisions with ships. However, when feeding, pinnipeds may be distracted and thus inattentive to vessels. Fur seals are attracted to fishing vessels to feed, and some are killed by propellers (Richardson et al. 1995a). Sea lions and seals have also been seen with wounds and disfigurements caused by the propellers of powerboats. Between 1996 and 2000, two northern elephant seals were known to have been struck and killed due to ship strikes off California (Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary 2006).

The risk of collision with marine mammals exists but is extremely unlikely due to the slow operating speed of 4–5 kt (7.4–9.3 km/h) of the seismic vessel.

3.8.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Alternatives A and B consist of a combination of monitoring and mitigation measures developed in consultation with NMFS and designed to minimize the potential effects of academic seismic operations on marine mammals (Sections 2.6.1 and 3.7.5). The measures for pinnipeds are similar to those for mysticetes except that different M-weighted Level A and Level B exposure radii are used for pinnipeds because of their different sensitivities to various sound frequencies (see Section 2.3.3 and Table 2-8). The flat (unweighted) measures were also calculated.

3.8.5.1 Acoustic Effects

This section summarizes the various types and levels of potential acoustic effects on pinnipeds in the analysis areas anticipated to occur during the seismic surveys under Alternatives A and B. Table 2-8 shows the estimated mitigation radii under Alternative A for the exemplary seismic surveys that are assumed to occur in the five DAAs. Estimated exposures and percent of regional populations potentially impacted by proposed seismic survey activities within the DAAs under the proposed action alternatives are presented in Table 3.8-6 and in Appendix B. Both before and after applying M-weighting appropriate for pinnipeds "in-water", the numbers of pinniped exposures are presented based on the discussion of exposure criteria in Section 2.3.3 and listed in Table 2-8. Predicted estimates of exposure are considered precautionary (likely overestimated) because they do not account for individual pinnipeds that may avoid the sounds. The AIM model assumes baseline "undisturbed" distribution and movement of animals whether or not airgun sounds are being emitted.

Masking

Masking attributable to NSF-sponsored seismic surveys is expected to be limited and short-term for all pinniped species in all areas considered: airgun sounds are intermittent with a low duty cycle, and much of the airgun sound energy is outside the frequency range of best hearing by pinnipeds. The degree of potential masking depends on the strength of the sound source used, propagation conditions, and the frequencies of the potentially masked sounds relative to the predominant airgun frequencies. Therefore, the proposed surveys in the W Gulf of Alaska and off the BC Coast with large airgun arrays, where ESA-listed Steller sea lions may be encountered, could potentially have a greater masking impact than surveys in other areas with smaller sound sources and similar numbers of ESA-listed pinnipeds. Although threatened Steller sea lions and Guadalupe fur seals may occur at the exemplary S California site, this survey is assumed to employ a small airgun source and would be expected to have fewer potential impacts. Thus, masking is not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed pinnipeds, and no significant effects are expected to pinniped populations.

Disturbance

Disturbance would be the primary type of effect resulting from the seismic surveys under Alternative A or B (Table 3.8-5). Disturbance-related impacts, although variable, likely depend on the strength of the sound source and water depth in the survey area as well as other acoustic properties. In general, large-source surveys in shallow water with high concentrations of pinnipeds would have potentially a greater overall impact than those in deep water, because the zone of influence is expected to be larger in shallow water. For example, the surveys in the W Gulf of Alaska and off the BC Coast, where the ESA-listed Steller sea lion occurs, could potentially have a greater impact on ESA-listed species than smaller-source surveys in other areas where ESA-listed species occur. However, potential effects of small-source surveys where ESA-listed species and/or high densities of pinnipeds occur are also of concern (e.g., S California DAA).

Although the degree of impact would vary among analysis areas, potential disturbance impacts are expected to be short-term and limited to small numbers of individuals for all pinniped species in all analysis areas where they occur, especially given the mitigation measures such as immediate power- or shut-downs and ramp-ups. Because small numbers of ESA-listed Steller sea lions may be disturbed as described below, the ESA determination is "may affect, likely to adversely affect" for this species. However, disturbance of relatively small numbers of both ESA-listed and non-listed individual pinnipeds during the proposed seismic survey activities is not expected to result in significant impacts to pinniped populations.

Level B Exposure Estimates for ESA-listed Pinnipeds

This section focuses on ESA-listed species at the ocean-basin population level. It concentrates on areas where the highest numbers of pinnipeds are predicted to be exposed to sufficient airgun sound for there to be Level B exposure, and discusses the reasons for differences among DAAs and QAAs in the potential number of exposures. DAA analyses are based on modeling results summarized in Table 3.8-6 and Appendix B; QAA analyses are based on similarities between the DAAs and QAAs as summarized in Table 2-7. Modeled exposure estimates are precautionary, because the model does not account for individual pinnipeds that are expected to move away from the seismic survey sounds (based on available studies to date as summarized in Section 3.8.4.3).

Only two ESA-listed pinniped species (Guadalupe fur seal and Steller sea lion) are likely to occur in the 13 analysis areas, and those two species are expected to occur in only two DAAs and one QAA, as described below (Tables 3.8-3 and 3.8-4).

Guadalupe fur seal. The Guadalupe fur seal may rarely occur in the S California DAA (Table 3.8-1). Under Alternatives A and B, no Guadalupe fur seals are expected to be affected by the proposed seismic surveys within this DAA because they are highly unlikely to occur there (density = 0.0 seals/km^2; Appendix B, Annex 4 – Table A4-5). Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on Guadalupe fur seal individuals or populations.

Table 3.8-6. Estimated Number of Level A and Level B Exposures (Individuals) of Pinnipeds to Seismic Survey Sound with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) in the DAAs, Based on Modeling Results

Species	*S California DAA[(a)] – N Pacific population*			*W Gulf of Alaska DAA[(a)] – N Pacific population*		
	Exposure Criterion[(b)]			*Exposure Criterion[(b)]*		
	Bp	*Ap*	*Ae*	*Bp*	*Ap*	*Ae*
Harbor seal	38.5 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0	174.9 *0.6*	2.8 *<0.01*	1.4 *<0.01*
N elephant seal	137.1 *0.1*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guadalupe fur seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-
N fur seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0 *<0.01*	0.0	0.0
California sea lion	2,371.6 *0.1*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Steller sea lion	0.0	0.0	0.0	109.4 *0.7*	0.9 *<0.01*	0.4 *<0.01*

[(a)]Pinnipeds are not expected to occur or their densities are expected to be very low or zero at the three remaining DAAs: Caribbean, Galapagos Ridge, and NW Atlantic; thus no exposures to sound associated with those exemplary seismic survey activities are anticipated to occur (see Tables 3.8-1, 3.8-3, and 3.8-4; and Appendix B, Annex 4). Population estimates are from Table 3.8-1. Where a range of population estimates is available, the lowest is used, thus precautionarily maximizing the estimated percent of population that might be exposed. - = not present; *italics* = estimated percent of regional population impacted; **bold** = ESA-listed species.

[(b)]Exposure Criteria (flat weighted): *Bp* = Level B harassment -- pressure units (rms), corresponding to exposure to $\geq$160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) received sound level above which NMFS assumes that behavioral changes may occur. *Ap* = Level A harassment – pressure units (rms), corresponding to exposure to $\geq$190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) received sound level above which the potential for injury was suspected at the time this criterion was implemented by NMFS. *Ae* = Level A harassment – cumulative energy (SEL), corresponding to exposure to $\geq$186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, applied in this analysis to identify the level above which there is potential for injury (e.g., PTS), based on limited empirical results from a few pinniped species plus various assumptions (Southall et al. 2007). See also Section 3.2 and Appendix B.

For non-listed species, only predicted exposures of $\geq$0.5 animal, as presented in Appendix B, Tables B-13 – B-17, are considered to be actual exposures. For ESA-listed species, only predicted exposures of $\geq$0.05 animals, as presented in Appendix B, Tables B-13 – B-17, are considered to be actual exposures.

Steller sea lion. Two Steller sea lion populations may occur within the analysis areas: W and E U.S. stocks (Table 3.8-1). Steller sea lions could occur in two DAAs (S California and W Gulf of Alaska) and one QAA (BC Coast) (Tables 3.8-3 and 3.8-4). Under Alternatives A and B, the E stock of Steller sea lions are not likely to be affected by the proposed seismic surveys in the S California DAA due to their extremely low density (0.0 seals/km^2) in the area. In the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, modeling data indicate that approximately 109 Steller sea lions of the endangered W stock could experience Level B exposures (potential behavioral disturbance; approximately 86 in shallow water and approximately 23 in deep water) (Table 3.8-6 and Appendix B, Table B-16). These numbers represent approximately 0.7% of the estimated E North Pacific population (Tables 3.8-1 and 3.8-6). The E stock of Steller sea lions can be considered abundant in the BC Coast QAA during the period of the exemplary seismic survey; however, the QAA lies approximately 200 mi (322 km) south of the closest designated critical habitat for Steller sea lion. The airgun array proposed for this exemplary QAA is large and would be operated in relatively shallow water. Thus, the potential for Level B exposures at the BC Coast QAA would be similar to the W Gulf of Alaska DAA site (see above).

No serious injury or mortality of Steller sea lions is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of Steller sea lion stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or B may affect, is likely to adversely affect Steller sea lions in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA and BC Coast QAA. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding Level B exposures to Steller sea lions (Table 3.8-6). If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Exposure Estimates for Non-ESA Listed Pinnipeds

Seventeen species and subspecies of pinnipeds not listed under the ESA may occur in the DAAs or QAAs (Tables 3.8-1, 3.8-3, and 3.8-4). Nine of these species occur in three of the five DAAs, but exposures are possible for two DAAs: S California, and W Gulf of Alaska (Table 3.8-6). Estimates of Level B behavioral exposures (i.e., numbers of pinnipeds receiving airgun sounds ≥160 dB re 1 µPa [rms]) represent <0.7% of each of these regional species populations, and the majority of the species would experience Level B exposures of <0.1% of their regional populations (Table 3.8-6). No serious injury or mortality of non-ESA listed pinnipeds is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of pinniped stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level B harassment. In accordance with the MMPA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding Level B exposures to non-ESA listed pinnipeds within the S California and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs (Table 3.8-6). If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Although 12 pinniped species not listed under the ESA could potentially occur in four of the eight QAAs, only three species (harbor, gray and hooded seals) are expected to occur regularly and only in the N Atlantic/Iceland and/or BC Coast QAAs (Table 3.8-4). Pinnipeds are considered rare or extralimital in the remaining six QAAs and thus are not expected to be affected by the proposed seismic survey activities within those QAAs. Only small numbers of harbor, gray and hooded seals are predicted to potentially experience Level B behavior exposures within the N Atlantic/Iceland and/or BC Coast sites. Both of these QAAs involve a large airgun array, similar in size to that in the W Gulf of Alaska, suggesting that a

similarly small number of these pinnipeds could experience Level B behavioral exposures within these two QAAs. None of the anticipated short-term behavioral effects would result in any significant impacts to non-ESA listed pinnipeds at the population level.

Temporary Hearing Impairment or TTS

To date, TTS has not been demonstrated for any pinniped species exposed to the brief pulses produced by airguns or echosounders (e.g., Finneran et al. 2003). The probability of TTS is potentially greatest during surveys using large-source arrays if a pinniped approaches very close to the airgun(s), particularly in areas where pinnipeds are common (e.g., W Gulf of Alaska, BC Coast, N Atlantic/Iceland). In contrast, the potential is lower in areas where pinnipeds occur in small numbers and/or a small airgun array is proposed (e.g., Sub-Antarctic, S California, W Australia). The probability that a pinniped would approach close enough, and remain there long enough, for TTS to occur is reduced through implementation of the proposed mitigation and monitoring procedures and mitigation measures, such as immediate power- or shut-downs and ramp-ups, and the transiting movement of the seismic vessel. Furthermore, TTS is (by definition) a temporary phenomenon that does not constitute injury, and is very unlikely to have long-term consequences for the individual(s) or populations involved (Southall et al. 2007). No significant impacts to populations of pinnipeds are expected to occur under Alternative A or B as a result of potential TTS (Table 3.8-6).

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

PTS has not been demonstrated in any pinniped species exposed to non-explosive sound in the field or in captivity. The possibility of PTS occurring during the proposed seismic surveys within the exemplary analysis areas is considered less than the possibility of TTS as described above, since a pinniped would need to receive even more sound energy to potentially experience PTS as compared to TTS. It is considered unlikely that a pinniped would approach close enough, and remain there long enough, for PTS to occur given that pinnipeds are likely to avoid airgun(s) before receiving sound levels that could result in PTS. Furthermore, implementation of proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, such as immediate power- or shut-downs when marine mammals are sighted within the mitigation radii, would further reduce the possibility of PTS. In general, PTS is not expected to occur during exposure to brief intermittent sound pulses associated with the proposed seismic surveys within the analysis areas.

Although modeling results suggest that a few individual pinnipeds could potentially receive ≥190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) and experience Level A exposures under Alternative A or B in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, these exposures would be <0.01% of the regional populations of these species (Table 3.8-6). However, the model does not allow for the likelihood that some of the exposed pinnipeds would show avoidance of the airgun source, as would be expected during an actual seismic survey. Avoidance behavior would reduce the number of exposures to the 190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) Level A radius.

Of more direct relevance, very few (if any) individual pinnipeds are predicted to be exposed to sound equaling or exceeding the cumulative energy exposure criterion for injury (186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$) during the exemplary seismic surveys (Table 3.8-6, *Ae* columns). The 186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ criterion is currently considered a more realistic estimate of the exposure level above which auditory injuries might occur in the more susceptible pinniped species (e.g., harbor seal), allowing for recent research (Southall et al. 2007) (see Section 3.2). Of the five exemplary seismic surveys analyzed in detail, only one survey (W Gulf of Alaska) was predicted to expose ≥1 pinniped to ≥186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Table 3.8-6). The numbers of pinnipeds that would receive such levels of airgun sound are predicted to constitute <0.01% of any

regional population of a pinniped species. Also, those calculations overestimate numbers that might be injured partly, because some species of pinnipeds (e.g., California sea lion; northern fur seal) apparently have higher injury thresholds than assumed in the calculations, and partly because the model does not allow for avoidance reactions.

Under Alternatives A and B, modeling for the DAAs simulates that <4 Level A (rms) exposures and <3 Level A cumulative energy (SEL) exposures of two pinniped species could occur in the W Gulf of Alaska; including 0.9 (rms) or 0.4 (SEL) endangered Steller sea lions (Table 3.8-6). A total of 2.8 or 1.4 individual harbor seals could incur Level A rms or cumulative energy (SEL) exposure, respectively (Table 3.8-6). These figures are likely to overestimate actual Level A exposures, for reasons noted above.

In summary, Level A exposures are unlikely to occur during a seismic survey under Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) within the exemplary analysis areas. Some pinnipeds are expected to avoid Level A exposure before they reach the 190-dB re 1 μPa (rms) criterion isopleth or the 186-dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ cumulative energy criterion isopleth. Furthermore, implementation of proposed mitigation and monitoring would reduce and minimize potential exposures. No serious injury or mortality of pinnipeds is reasonably foreseeable. No adverse effects on the annual rates of recruitment or survival of pinniped stocks are expected as a result of the estimated incidents of Level A harassment. Under the ESA, implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B may affect and is likely to adversely affect individual Steller sea lions in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. In accordance with the MMPA and section 7 of the ESA, Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) requires consultation with NMFS regarding Level A exposures to Steller sea lions and harbor seals within the W Gulf of Alaska (Table 3.8-6). If and when a specific NSF-funded survey or a survey to be conducted by USGS is proposed for the area in the future, site-specific consultations with NMFS would occur as well as any other tiered supporting environmental documentation.

Strandings and Mortality

Analysis areas with large airgun arrays where pinnipeds are common are the W Gulf of Alaska, BC Coast, and NW Atlantic/Iceland sites (Tables 3.8-1, 3.8-3, and 3.8-6). However, strandings or mortalities of pinnipeds have not been linked to airgun or echosounder sounds that would be used during the proposed seismic surveys (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995a; Southall et al. 2007; see Appendix E). It is considered highly unlikely that pinniped strandings or mortalities would occur as a result of airgun surveys, especially when mitigation and monitoring is implemented (e.g., shut-downs, power-downs, ramp-ups, etc.). Furthermore, some pinnipeds are expected to avoid close approaches to the airguns where exposure levels might potentially cause injuries, as described earlier. Thus, the proposed seismic survey activities within the exemplary analysis areas are not expected to result in strandings or mortality of any pinniped species.

Other Physiological Effects

Under Alternatives A and B, no other physiological effects on pinnipeds are expected as a result of proposed seismic activities as described in Section 3.8.4.3.

3.8.5.2 Other Potential Effects

Entanglement, Ingestion, and Ship Strikes

Under Alternatives A and B, the potential for non-acoustic types of effects (entanglement, ingestion/coating, and ship strikes) are considered insignificant as described in Section 3.8.4.4. An oil or fuel spill is considered highly unlikely to occur during the proposed seismic surveys. Each research vessel

used for NSF-funded marine seismic surveys has a spill prevention plan or similar document outlining procedures and policies to prevent a fuel or oil spill and to address such spills in the highly unlikely instance that one did occur. None of the equipment proposed for in-water use during the seismic surveys is considered potentially ingestible by a marine mammal due to its size and composition. In addition, there has never been a recorded oil/fuel spill, ship strike, or entanglement of any marine mammal in the survey equipment in over 54,000 nm (100,000 km) of previous NSF-funded seismic surveys (e.g., Smultea and Holst 2003; Haley and Koski 2004; Holst 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a; Haley and Ireland 2006; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008). Visual monitoring procedures further reduce the risk of entanglement or ship strike because observers watch for any marine mammals or sea turtles near the vessel and equipment. Therefore, entanglement and ship strikes are expected to be very unlikely.

Thus, it is expected that the proposed seismic activities within the exemplary analysis areas would have no significant impact on individual pinnipeds or pinniped populations and would not adversely affect ESA-listed species due to entanglement with seismic gear, ingestion of toxic or other materials, and ship strikes.

3.8.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research surveys using various acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, MBESs, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to pinnipeds with implementation of Alternative C.

3.8.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Pinnipeds

The potential impacts on pinnipeds with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are summarized in Table 3.8-7. Pinnipeds are absent or rare in the areas where some seismic surveys would occur. With implementation of the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, impacts to pinnipeds under Alternative A or B in areas where pinnipeds do occur are expected to be limited to behavioral disturbance and, in some cases, localized avoidance of the area near the active airguns. A few cases of temporary hearing impairment are possible, with full recovery of hearing occurring subsequently. These effects are expected to have negligible short- and long-term impacts on individual pinnipeds and their habitats, and regional populations of pinnipeds within the analysis areas. However, because airgun operations are likely to result in localized avoidance by some ESA-listed species in some analysis areas, Alternatives A and B may affect, and is likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species (Table 3.8-7).

Although the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers can presumably be heard by pinnipeds, their operation is not likely to affect pinnipeds. The intermittent and narrow downward-directed nature of the MBESs and SPBs would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures of any individual pinniped given the movement and speed of the vessel and animal; such brief exposure to this sound is not expected to cause injury or PTS based on results of limited studies of some pinniped species (reviewed in Appendix E). The streamer-mounted pingers and pingers used during coring are also highly unlikely to affect pinnipeds given their intermittent nature, their short-term and transitory use from a moving vessel, their relatively low source levels, their brief ping durations, and (in the case of ancillary core sampling) their relatively infrequent use.

Modeling estimates that a small number of Level A (rms) exposures could occur under Alternative A in some analysis areas despite proposed mitigation and monitoring. However, such exposures are considered unlikely to occur during an actual seismic survey, because the model does not account for behavioral

avoidance by pinnipeds of seismic survey sound levels ≥190 dB re 1 µPa (rms). Furthermore, not all of the pinnipeds exposed to ≥190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) are likely to incur auditory or other injury. If consultation with NMFS demonstrated the need, potential site-specific mitigation measures could, in addition to the standard mitigation measures, be identified.

Overall, the primary anticipated impacts to pinnipeds with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) are:

- Small numbers of individual pinnipeds are predicted to be exposed to ≥160 dB re 1 µPa rms at three of the five DAAs; these numbers represent <1.0% of regional populations. However, many of these exposed pinnipeds would not show any overt disturbance. These exposures are not expected to result in any long-term or significant consequences to the affected individuals or their populations.
- In general, modeling results indicate that large airgun arrays operating in shallow water where pinnipeds are common to abundant would cause the highest numbers of short-term Level B exposures.
- Small numbers of individuals representing <0.01% of regional populations of some pinnipeds are predicted to be exposed to the NMFS Level A criterion of ≥190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) or SEL ≥186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ in certain exemplary project areas under the simplifying assumptions of the modeling.
- PTS and other injurious effects are not expected to occur during the actual seismic surveys. Most pinnipeds are expected to avoid exposure to seismic sound levels that could potentially cause these effects. The model used for analysis overestimates Level A exposures, because it does not account for this expected behavioral avoidance and also does not allow for the higher TTS and PTS thresholds of some pinnipeds.

In summary, implementation of Alternative A or B is likely to result in minor short-term and localized behavioral disturbance of small numbers of individual pinnipeds. These temporary effects are not anticipated to result in any long-term or population-level effects on pinniped populations. The numbers of individual pinnipeds estimated to be exposed to the current NMFS Level B criterion of ≥160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) during the exemplary surveys would be small in relation to regional population sizes. No PTS or other potential injury of pinnipeds is anticipated during an actual seismic survey under Alternative A with proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. No short- or long-term significant impacts are expected on pinniped populations or their habitats, including ESA-listed species, as a result of implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative). Alternative C would have no impacts on pinnipeds, because the proposed marine seismic surveys would not occur.

Table 3.8-7. Summary of Potential Impacts to Pinnipeds with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Species or Group*[1]	*Alternative A or B*[1]
DAA		
NW Atlantic	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities.[2]
Caribbean	No pinniped species	-
S California	**Steller sea lion, Guadalupe fur seal**	Effects highly unlikely given expected zero densities.[2] No effect on ESA-listed species or their populations.
	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	No significant impacts; limited to small number[3] of short-term Level B behavioral exposures. No modeled Level A exposures.
W Gulf of Alaska	**Steller sea lion**	May affect, likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species; consultation with NMFS required. Limited to small number[3] of short-term Level B behavioral exposures; <1 modeled Level A exposure but highly unlikely to occur in actual seismic survey as pinnipeds expected to avoid such exposure (see text).
	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	Limited to small number[3] of short-term Level B behavioral exposures; small number of modeled Level A exposures are highly unlikely to occur in actual seismic survey as pinnipeds expected to avoid such exposure (see text).
Galapagos Ridge	No pinniped species	-
QAA		
BC Coast	**Steller sea lion**	See W Gulf of Alaska DAA.
	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	See above
Mid-Atlantic Ridge	No pinniped species	-
Marianas	No pinniped species	-
Sub-Antarctic	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	Level B behavioral effects possible but unlikely; Level A effects highly unlikely as species are rare and expected to avoid such exposure.
N Atlantic/Iceland	Non-ESA listed pinnipeds	See BC Coast QAA.
SW Atlantic	No pinniped species	-
W India	No pinniped species	-
W Australia	Australian sea lion	See Sub-Antarctic QAA.

[1]No significant effects expected at population level for any species (see text and Table 3.8-6). **Bold** = ESA-listed species.
[2]See Appendix B, Annex 4 for estimated marine mammal densities in the DAAs.
[3] Small number (<1%) of estimated regional population size exposed. See Table 3.8-6, footnote (a). See Tables 3.7-8 and 3.7-9 and Appendix B for modeled numbers of Level A and B exposures and percent of population exposed.

3.9 OTHER MARINE MAMMALS (SEA OTTER AND W INDIAN MANATEE)

Marine mammals are classified into four orders: Carnivora, Pinnipedia, Cetacea, and Sirenia (Nowak 1999). The Cetacea and Pinnipedia were addressed in Sections 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8. Within the order Carnivora are two species of marine mammals, the sea otter in the family Mustelidae and the polar bear in the family Ursidae. The order Sirenia encompasses four extant species (three species of manatees and the dugong). Of these six living species, only two potentially occur in the offshore waters of the analysis areas: N sea otter and W Indian manatee (Reeves et al. 2002; Jefferson et al. 2008) (Table 3.9-1).

The remaining three sirenian species that do not occur in the project analysis areas are the Amazonian manatee, the W African manatee and the dugong. The Amazonian manatee is limited to freshwater riverine habitat of the Amazon and its tributaries in Brazil, the W African manatee occurs off W Africa, while the dugong occurs in coastal marine waters that include the Indian Ocean, Arabian Sea, Australia, Indonesia, Malaysia and E Africa. Off W Australia, the dugong occurs in shallow nearshore protected waters (e.g., bays) characterized by its primary seagrass forage (Reeves et al. 2002; Jefferson et al. 2008). The dugong is thus not expected to occur in the deeper offshore waters of the exemplary W Australia analysis area or other project areas.

Therefore, the following discussion addresses only the sea otter and W Indian manatee. The status, global population estimates, general ecology, and general distribution and migratory movements of these species are summarized in Table 3.9-1 and discussed briefly below. Both these species are under the jurisdiction of the USFWS.

Table 3.9-1. Summary of the Status, Global Population Size, General Ecology, and General Distribution and Movement of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee

Species	*Status* ESA/MMPA IUCN/CITES*	*U.S. MMPA Stock*	*Global Population Size**	*General Ecology*	*General Distribution/ Migratory Movements*
Sea otter	T^/- E/II	California; S Central Alaska	>150,000	Shallow, coastal, kelp forests; feeds on abalones, sea urchins, crabs.	W North Pacific, central and SE coastal Alaska, BC, central Calif., with small numbers in S Calif.; non-migratory; local movements.
W Indian manatee	E/- VU/I	Antilean	Unknown	Subtropical and tropical freshwater systems, shallow nearshore coastal; feeds on aquatic plants.	Florida, Greater Antilles, N and E South America, Central America, E Mexico; possible long-range migrations between population centers.

Notes: *E = endangered, T = threatened, VU = vulnerable, I = Appendix I, II = Appendix II.
^Southwest Alaska DPS and S California population only.
Sources: Nowak 1999; USFWS 2004a, b; CITES 2010; IUCN 2010.

3.9.1 Overview of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee

3.9.1.1 Sea Otter

The sea otter is the largest of the mustelids. Male sea otters reach maximum lengths of 4.9 ft (1.5 m) and weigh 48-99 lbs (22-45 kg); females are smaller, measuring approximately 4.6 ft (1.4 m) long and weighing 33-70 lbs (15-32 kg) (Kenyon 1975; Estes 1980). The sea otter differs from most marine mammals in that it lacks an insulating subcutaneous layer of fat. For protection against cold water it depends on a layer of air trapped among its hair. The underfur is the densest mammalian fur.

Sea otters mate at all times of the year, and young may be born in any season. However, in Alaska most pups are born in late spring. Like other marine mammals, they usually have only one pup during each

breeding cycle. The female's maternal instinct is very strong and she seldom leaves her pup except when diving for food. When a mother and pup are traveling, sleeping, or grooming, the pup usually rides its mother's chest as she floats on her back. Females can produce one pup a year, but in areas where food is limited, they may produce pups every other year. Bald eagles prey on newborn pups and killer whales may take adults (Doroff et al. 2003; Springer et al. 2003).

General Distribution and Movements

Sea otters were originally found in coastal waters off Hokkaido, Sakhalin, Kamchatka, the Commander Islands, the Pribilof Islands, the Aleutians, S Alaska, British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, California, and western Baja California. Today, there are three recognized subspecies of sea otter. Of the two northern sea otter subspecies, the Alaskan sea otter is found in the western North Pacific from the Kamchatka Peninsula through the Kuril Islands, and the Northern sea otter is distributed in the Commander Islands, the Aleutian Islands, and throughout central and SE coastal Alaskan waters and BC waters. The southern sea otter primarily occupies waters off central and more recently south-central California (Wilson et al. 1991; Cronin et al. 1996; USFWS 2003a). The USFWS recognizes five stocks in U.S. waters under the MMPA guidelines; these include single stocks in California and Washington and three in Alaska (Southeast, Southcentral, and Southwest) (USFWS 2005b).

Before commercial exploitation, the worldwide population of sea otters was estimated to be between 150,000 (Kenyon 1969) and 300,000 (Johnson 1982). Commercial exploitation reduced the total sea otter population to as low as 2,000 animals in 13 locations. In 1911, sea otters received protection under the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention, and sea otter populations recovered quickly (Kenyon 1969). Sea otters were reintroduced into Southeast Alaska from 1965 to 1969 when 412 otters were transplanted from Amchitka Island and Prince William Sound, Alaska. As of 2008, it was estimated that there were 73,329 sea otters in three stocks in Alaskan waters: the Southwest Alaska stock with 47,676, the Southcentral Alaska stock with 15,090, and the Southeast Alaska stock with 10,563 (Allen and Angliss 2010). However, Doroff et al. (2003) reported that sea otters in the Aleutian archipelago declined by 75% between 1965 and 2000 (see also Estes et al. 1998; Springer et al. 2003). As few as 6,000 sea otters may remain in the Aleutians today (USFWS 2000). On the other hand, both the Southeast and Southcentral Alaska stocks appear to be growing (Irons et al. 1988, Pitcher 1989; Agler et al. 1995; Bodkin and Udevitz 1999). Several thousand sea otters were killed in Alaska by the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill in Prince William Sound in 1989, and the detrimental effects of the spill may have persisted into the 1990s (Estes and Bodkin 2002). Currently, approximately 2,700 sea otters inhabit California coastal waters (USGS 2010b), and approximately 2,500 inhabit BC coastal waters (Watson 2000; Sea Otter Recovery Team 2004). In total, there are now >150,000 sea otters worldwide (Table 3.9-1).

Sea otters generally occur in shallow (<115 ft [35 m]) nearshore waters in areas with sandy or rocky bottoms. They feed on a wide variety of sessile and slow moving benthic invertebrates (Rotterman and Simon-Jackson 1988). The sea otter's diet varies with the physical and biological characteristics of the habitats in which it lives (Table 3.9-1; reviews by Riedman and Estes 1990; Estes and Bodkin 2002). Sea otters exhibit individual differences not only in prey choice, but also in choice and method of tool use, area in which they tend to forage, and water depth (Riedman and Estes 1990; Estes et al. 2003). In rocky-bottom habitats, sea otters generally forage for large-bodied prey offering the greatest caloric reward. In soft-bottom habitats, prey is smaller and more difficult to find and they feed on a variety of burrowing invertebrates.

Although sea otters are generally found within 0.6 mi (1 km) of shore and in shallow waters (Rotterman and Simon-Jackson 1988), in the Aleutians they commonly forage at depths of 131 ft (40 m) or more; the

maximum recorded dive depth was 318 ft (97 m). Dives are usually short (52-90 sec), with the longest on record being 4 min 25 sec. Sea otters can reach swimming speeds of 5.6 mi/hr (9 km/hr) over short distances (Estes 1980; Riedman and Estes 1990) and are diurnal, with crepuscular peaks in activity. During their typical midday rest period, sea otters often rest in kelp beds, where they also spend the night.

Most sea otters do not migrate and do not disperse over long distances, although some migrate and are capable of long-distance movements of >62 mi (100 km) (Garshelis and Garshelis 1984). However, movements are likely limited by geographic barriers, high-energy requirements of animals, and social behavior. Sea otters are gregarious and may become concentrated in an area, sometimes resting in groups containing less than 10 to over 1,000 animals. Breeding males drive nonbreeding males out of areas where females are concentrated. In some areas, the nonbreeding males will concentrate in "male areas" which are usually off exposed points of land where shallow water extends offshore.

Important Ecological Considerations

Important ecological considerations for sea otters with respect to activities considered in this analysis are the duration and timing of breeding and pupping, as well as the locations of nearshore feeding areas. An additional ecological consideration is that little is known about sea otter hearing capabilities, including their sensitivity to the low-frequency sound characteristic of seismic surveys (see Section 3.9.1.4).

Status

The SW Alaska DPS (Aleutian Islands, Alaska Peninsula coast, and Kodiak Archipelago) and California stocks of sea otters are listed as threatened under the ESA (USFWS 2010) and as endangered on the IUCN Red List (IUCN 2010). The species is also in Appendix II of CITES (CITES 2010) and is protected under the MMPA (Table 3.9-1). The global population size is estimated at >150,000 and regional populations in many areas are poorly known; in areas where population monitoring has been conducted, declines have been documented. The primary threats to sea otters include entanglement in fishing gear and debris, oil spills, harvesting for pelts, conflicts with commercial fishing interests, and coastal development.

3.9.1.2 W Indian Manatee

The W Indian manatee is a rotund, slow-moving animal that ranges in length from 6.9-15 ft (2.1 to 4.6 m) (Ripple and Perrine 1999). The back is often covered with distinctive scars from boat propeller cuts. There are two subspecies of W Indian manatee: the Florida manatee and the Antillean manatee.

General Distribution and Movements

W Indian manatees occur in warm, subtropical and tropical waters of the western North Atlantic from the SE U.S. to Central and northern South America, the Caribbean, and the West Indies, primarily in freshwater systems, estuaries, and shallow, nearshore, coastal waters (Lefebvre et al. 1989). The species appears to prefer water above approximately 20ºC but can endure water as cold as 13.5ºC (Hartman 1979). Although largely coastal in nature, there is evidence of long-range offshore migrations between population centers. In Florida, there are movements to and from warm-water refuge areas during winter. Individuals have been caught up to 4.6 mi (15 km) off the coast of Guyana (Husar 1977). Most manatees appear to be nomadic and may travel hundreds of miles.

Florida manatees comprise the largest known group of W Indian manatees anywhere in the species' range. The population size of the Florida manatee is unknown, but aerial surveys provide the highest minimum count at 3,276 (in January 2001) (USFWS 2001). The smaller population of Antillean manatees occurs in the Greater Antilles, northern and eastern South America, as well as Central America and

eastern Mexico (Lefebvre et al. 1989). The manatee occurs along the south and east coasts of Puerto Rico (Waring et al. 2002). It is also thought to occur in relatively small numbers in the SE Caribbean Sea, including Columbia, Venezuela, and Trinidad and Tobago (Reynolds and Odell 1991; InfoNatura 2005). Manatees are not found along the extensive coastline of Venezuela, but rather occur in eastern Venezuela, along the Gulf of Paria and in the Orinoco River system (Reynolds and Odell 1991). The population of Antillean manatees has been estimated at 86 in Puerto Rico and 340 in Belize (Reeves et al. 2002).

Important Ecological Considerations

Important ecological considerations for sirenians with respect to activities considered in this analysis are the duration of breeding, and the locations of migration routes and concentrated feeding areas. Although largely coastal, manatees could on infrequent occasions be encountered over continental shelf waters deep enough for a seismic survey. Occasional long-range migrations by W Indian manatees could place them far from shore (Husar 1977). Since sirenians swim slowly just below or at the surface of the water, they are vulnerable to collisions with boats. Such collisions account for an average of 24% of known manatee deaths in Florida annually (USFWS 2001).

Status

The W Indian manatee is listed as endangered under the ESA, Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List, and in Appendix I of CITES (Table 3.9-1). Detailed population information is lacking; however, declines are apparent in many areas (IUCN 2010). The primary threats to manatees include vessel collisions, entanglement in fisheries gear and marine debris, hunting, coastal development, and oil spills (Lefebvre et al. 1989).

3.9.1.3 Acoustic Capabilities of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee

Sea Otter. Sea otter vocalizations are considered to be most suitable for short range communication among individuals (McShane et al. 1995). Airborne sounds include screams, whines or whistles, hisses, deep-throated snarls or growls, soft cooing sounds, grunts, and barks (Kenyon 1975; McShane et al. 1995). No data are available on the hearing abilities of this species (Table 3.9-2) (Ketten 1998).

W Indian Manatee. Available information indicates that W Indian manatees are capable of detecting sounds and low-frequency vibrations from 15 Hz to 46 kHz with best sensitivity at 6-20 kHz (Table 3.9-2) (Gerstein et al. 1999). A more recent study found that, in one Florida manatee, auditory sensitivity extended up to 90.5 kHz (Bauer et al. 2009). Based on measurements of evoked potentials, Bullock et al. (1982) reported that manatee hearing is apparently best around 1-1.5 kHz. However, behavioral tests suggest that best sensitivities are at 6-20 kHz (Gerstein et al. 1999) or 8-32 kHz (Bauer et al. 2009). The ability to detect high frequencies may be an adaptation to shallow water, where the propagation of low-frequency sound is limited (Gerstein et al. 1999).

Table 3.9-2. Summary of Underwater or In-Air Hearing and Sound Production Characteristics of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee

	Sound Production	*Hearing*	
Species	*Frequency Range (Hz)*	*Overall Frequency Range (Hz)*	*Threshold or Frequency Range of Best Hearing Sensitivity (dB re 1 µPa)*
Sea otter	In air: 3,000-5,000[(a)] 2,000-8,000[(b)]	-	-
W Indian manatee	-	Underwater: 15-46,000[(c)]	Underwater: 48-50 (at 6-20 kHz)[(a)] 8-32 kHz[(d)]

Note: - = not available/unknown.
Sources: [(a)]Richardson et al. 1995a; [(b)]Ghoul et al. 2009; [(c)]Gerstein et al. 1999; [(d)]Bauer et al. 2009.

3.9.2 Affected Environment: Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific use and unique habitat features for the two species that potentially occur within one or more of the five DAAs during the seasons when the exemplary marine seismic surveys could occur there (Table 3.9-3). Only the sea otter is found in more than one of these DAAs (S California and W Gulf of Alaska). The W Indian manatee is found in only the Caribbean DAA. The two species are not found within the NW Atlantic and Galapagos Ridge DAAs. Data from monitoring conducted during previous NSF-funded seismic surveys are also included as relevant.

Table 3.9-3. Potential Occurrence of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee within the DAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Species	*NW Atlantic (N Sum)**	*Caribbean (N Spr or Sum)*[a]*	*S California (N Spr or Sum)*[b]*	*W Gulf of Alaska (N Sum)*[c]*	*Galapagos Ridge (S Sum)**
Sea otter	-	-	BF r?	BF u?	-
W Indian manatee	-	BF r	-	-	-

Notes: *(Season) = N or S hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; Sum = summer. **B** = known to breed or pup within the area; **F** = known to feed within the area; **M** = known to migrate through the area; **?** = unknown/possible; **c** = common - the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **u** = uncommon - the species is expected to be encountered at most a few times a year assuming many visits to the area; **r** = rare - the species is not expected to be encountered more than once in several years; **-** = species does not occur there.
Sources: [(a)]Lefebvre et al. 1989. [(b)]USFWS 2003a; NMFS 1995. [(c)]Doroff et al. 2003; Angliss and Lodge 2004; L-DEO and NSF 2004c, d.

3.9.2.1 Caribbean

One species of sirenian, the W Indian manatee (Antillean subspecies), is expected to occur rarely in the Caribbean DAA during the exemplary spring or summer seismic period (Table 3.9-3). The Antillean manatee inhabits rivers, estuaries, lagoons, and coastal waters in the Caribbean and along the coasts of eastern Mexico and Central America, and northern South America (Waring et al. 2002). It is also thought to occur in relatively small numbers in the SE Caribbean Sea, including the coast of Columbia, Venezuela, and Trinidad and Tobago (Reynolds and Odell 1991; InfoNatura 2001). Lefebvre et al. (1989) indicated that W Indian manatees have a patchy coastal distribution dependent on the availability of suitable habitat, including vegetation and fresh water. Few manatees would be expected to occur in

marine waters >328 ft (100 m) deep. However, long-range migrations by W Indian manatees have resulted in sightings of animals 9 mi (15 km) off the coast of Guyana (Husar 1977).

3.9.2.2 S California

Of the species considered in this section, only the sea otter may occur within the shallow coastal or island waters of the S California DAA during the spring; during summer, these sea otters, unlike most other sea otter populations, migrate (north) out of the area (Table 3.9-3) (Estes et al. 2006). The southern sea otter historically ranged from N California or Oregon to approximately Punta Abreojos, Baja California (Kenyon 1975). Harvest of sea otters during the 1700s and 1800s reduced the species throughout its range. In 1914, the total California population was estimated to be approximately 50 animals (California Department of Fish and Game 1976). The 2010 California population is currently estimated at approximately 2,700 otters (USGS 2010b).

The geographic range of the California sea otter population continues to expand to the north and south (Estes et al. 2006). The present normal range is between Half Moon Bay and Point Conception along the coast of central and southern California (Leatherwood et al. 1978; Gallo-Reynoso and Rathbun 1997; USFWS 2003a). However, individuals frequently travel southward beyond Point Conception. The southward boundary of the current range represents a seasonal redistribution of several hundred otters believed to be predominantly non-territorial males (Estes et al. 2006). The majority of these otters gather during the winter/spring near Cojo Cove, approximately 3 mi (5 km) southeast of Point Conception. During summer and autumn, these individuals are believed to rejoin the main population to the north; however, their exact whereabouts are not known (Estes et al. 2006). This population ranges along the mainland coast from Pt. Ano Nuevo, Santa Cruz County, south to Purisima Point, Santa Barbara County. Also, a small translocated population currently exists at San Nicolas Island, Ventura County. The initial translocation of sea otters to San Nicolas Island occurred in August 1987 (NMFS 1995). Counts of sea otters at San Nicolas Island during 1994 and 1995 ranged between 10 and 17 individuals. Sea otters have also been reported at San Clemente Island (Leatherwood et al. 1978).

Southern sea otters breed and give birth in California year round. However, breeding is not highly synchronous and the birth peak may extend over several months (Siniff and Ralls 1991; Riedman et al. 1994). Sea otters in California prefer rocky shoreline with kelp beds, although this is not an essential habitat requirement (Riedman and Estes 1990; USFWS 2003a). They more often associate with giant kelp as opposed to bull kelp. Individuals seldom range >0.6-1.2 mi (1 to 2 km) from shore; however, some individuals, particularly juvenile males, travel farther offshore (Riedman and Estes 1990; Ralls et al. 1995, 1996; USFWS 2003a). The width of habitat they occupy is defined by the intertidal zone and extends offshore to about the 328-656-ft (100-200-m) isobath (Bodkin and Udevitz 1999; Bodkin 2003). However, most individuals occur between the shore and the 65-ft (20-m) isobath (Riedman and Estes 1990; USFWS 2003a), and are therefore expected to be rare within the S California DAA.

3.9.2.3 W Gulf of Alaska

The northern sea otter is expected to be uncommon in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA during the exemplary summer seismic period (Table 3.9-3). There are currently an estimated 73,329 sea otters in three stocks in Alaskan waters: the Southwest Alaska stock with 47,676, the Southcentral Alaska stock with 15,090, and the Southeast Alaska stock with 10,563 (Allen and Angliss 2010). The Southwest Alaska DPS that potentially occurs within the DAA is listed as threatened under the ESA (USFWS 2005b). Sea otters in Alaska are generally not migratory and do not disperse over long distances.

Doroff et al. (2003) reported that sea otters in the Aleutian Archipelago declined by as much as 75% between 1965 and 2000 (see also Estes et al. 1998; Springer et al. 2003). The eastward extent of the decline lies somewhere between the Kodiak Archipelago and Prince William Sound. In 2000, the minimum population size for the Aleutian Islands was estimated at 8,742 (Doroff et al. 2003). The major cause of the decline in the Aleutians appears to be predation by killer whales (Estes et al. 1998; Doroff et al. 2003).

An NSF-funded L-DEO seismic survey conducted in the Aleutian Islands in July-August 2005 (Ireland et al. 2005) reported no sightings of sea otters, but this survey generally avoided shallow areas where otters would be most likely to occur. Several sightings of sea otters were made during NSF-funded L-DEO seismic surveys in the eastern Gulf of Alaska in the summer of 2005 (MacLean and Koski 2005) and the fall of 2008 (Hauser and Holst 2009).

3.9.3 Affected Environment: Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)

This section summarizes the known region-specific use and occurrence of sea otters and W Indian manatees within the eight QAAs (as indicated in Section 3.9.1.1, no other sirenians are likely to occur in the more offshore exemplary analysis areas). Among the eight exemplary QAAs, only one (BC Coast) contains one of the two species (sea otter) addressed in this section (Table 3.9-4).

Table 3.9-4. Potential Occurrence of Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee within the QAAs during the Period of Proposed Exemplary Seismic Surveys

Species	*N Atlantic/ Iceland (N Sum)**	*BC Coast (N Fall)*[(a)]*	*SW Atlantic (Any)**	*Mid-Atlantic Ridge (N Spr, Sum, or Fall)**	*W India (N Late Spr Or Early Fall)**	*W Australia (S Spr or Fall)**	*Mariana Islands (N Spr)**	*Sub-Antarctic (S Sum)**
Sea otter	-	F M c	-	-	-	-	-	-
W Indian manatee	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: *(Season) = N or S hemisphere season during which the exemplary seismic cruise would occur within the analysis area; **F** = known to feed within the area; Sum = summer, Spr = spring. **M** = known to migrate through the area; **c** = common: the species is expected to be encountered once or more during 2-3 visits to the area and the number of individuals encountered during an average visit is unlikely to be more than a few 10s; **-** = species does not occur there.
Sources: [(a)]Watson 1993, 2000; Sea Otter Recovery Team 2004.

3.9.3.1 BC Coast

The sea otter is expected to be common in the BC Coast QAA during the exemplary fall seismic period (Table 5.10-4). Sea otters once occupied most of the nearshore habitats of the Pacific Rim from Mexico to Japan but were largely extirpated by hunting (Sea Otter Recovery Team 2004). A total of 89 otters from California were reintroduced to BC from 1969 to 1972. They now occur mainly off Vancouver Island, but are also found 78 mi (125 km) north near the Goose Island Group, within the BC Coast QAA. The Goose Island Group is presently the only part of the study area occupied by sea otters. The BC population has grown by an average of 18.6% per year, exceeding 1,500 otters by 1995 and is presently estimated to be approximately 2,500 individuals: 2,000 along Vancouver Island and 500 along the central coast (Watson 2000; Sea Otter Recovery Team 2004). Sea otters occur in nearshore waters in groups ("rafts") of up to 100 individuals, usually segregated by sex and age class. Those groups typically consist of females and pups or of males (Watson 1993).

Habitat use varies with weather and ocean conditions. Off Vancouver Island, otters move somewhat offshore during extended periods of favorable weather and congregate in sheltered inshore areas during storms (Sea Otter Recovery Team 2004). The most suitable potential otter habitat occurs on the outer

west coast of Vancouver Island, on the mainland coast north of Vancouver Island (including the analysis area), and around the Queen Charlotte Islands (Sea Otter Recovery Team 2004); however, sea otters do not presently occur around the Queen Charlotte Islands. Mating occurs year-round and peak pupping occurs in March and April (Watson 1993).

Under the requirements of the Canadian Species at Risk Act, DFOC formed a recovery team to develop and implement a National Recovery Strategy and Action Plan for the Sea Otter in BC (DFOC 2004a). In addition to recovery planning this act also prohibits killing, harming, harassing, capturing, and taking sea otters, and damaging or destroying sea otter residences and any part of the sea otter's 'critical habitat'. The Canadian designation of critical habitat is ongoing and is presently incomplete. The sea otter is listed as a species of Special Concern by COSEWIC.

3.9.4 Environmental Consequences – General

The following sections provide a general synopsis of the potential effects on sea otters and W Indian manatees from sounds and activities associated with the proposed seismic survey operations (due to limited data on W Indian manatees, the only sirenian expected to possibly occur in the project areas, the discussion also includes other sirenian species). Existing information on the impacts of seismic survey and other sounds on these species is sparse to non-existent. Data are generally limited to a small number of individuals. Furthermore, studies conducted in captivity have typically involved sounds presented to the subjects in air rather than in water (with the exception of sirenians). For analysis purposes, project effects are assessed at the individual level and the population level. Prior to discussing potential effects, the criteria and approach used to assess effects are described. This is followed by a comparison of the overlap between the sound frequencies of acoustic sources used in seismic surveys with presumed and documented hearing sensitivity of sea otters and manatees (Section 3.9.1.5 and Table 3.9-2). Acoustic and non-acoustic effects are then described below.

3.9.4.1 Criteria and Approach

The ability to apply empirically-based criteria in assessing impacts of project-related underwater sound on sea otters and sirenians is limited by our very limited understanding of their hearing sensitivities when compared to the other marine mammals addressed in this analysis. What is known about hearing sensitivity is based upon a few studies on in-air sound production in sea otters, or underwater auditory capability of the manatee, and knowledge of their auditory anatomy (Table 3.9-2). Sea otters are known to produce in-air sounds of 2 to 8 kHz (Ghoul et al. 2009). Underwater hearing of manatees is reported to extend from 15 Hz to 46 kHz; Gerstein et al. (1999) noted that the most sensitive hearing is at 6 to 20 kHz. While these species are presumed to be capable of hearing sounds they produce, they likely also hear some sounds at lower or higher frequencies.

With such limited data, it is not possible to determine how far away a particular airgun array may be audible to sea otters or manatees. Furthermore, it is not possible to identify sound exposures above which TTS, PTS, or injury could occur. For analyses in this PEIS, a more precautionary criterion of 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) has been adopted as the "do not exceed" sound level criterion for the sea otter and W Indian manatee so as to prevent potential physical injury.

3.9.4.2 Sound Sources and Characteristics

The sparse information available suggest that sea otters and W Indian manatees have best hearing sensitivity and/or produce most of their sounds, at frequencies higher than those predominantly produced by airguns (see Section 3.9.4.1). Most of the energy in the sound pulses emitted by airgun arrays is at low frequencies, with strongest spectrum levels below 200 Hz, considerably lower spectrum levels above

1000 Hz, and small amounts of energy emitted up to approximately 150 kHz (Goold and Fish 1998; Sodal 1999; Goold and Coates 2006; Potter et al. 2007) (Appendix E). The predominant low frequencies of airgun sound appear to be below what little is known about the frequencies most important to sea otters and W Indian manatees, but these frequency ranges overlap.

Sea otters and manatees are known or likely to use the mid- to high frequencies produced by most of the MBESs and SBPs. The MBES proposed for the *Langseth* is the Kongsberg EM122 which operates in the range of approximately 10.5–13 (usually 12) kHz (rms) with a maximum source level of approximately 242 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) (Table 2-5). The other MBESs proposed for other project vessels also operate near this frequency range (12–15.5 kHz), with maximum source levels of approximately 234 to 237 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms) (Table 2-5). These frequencies overlap the known or suspected frequency sensitivity range of manatees and possibly sea otters, and are within the range of greatest sensitivity reported for manatees (see above and Table 3.9-2). The other two MBESs proposed for use operate at 30 and 95 kHz (Table 2-5). The 30-kHz MBES is presumably inaudible to sea otters and is certainly audible to manatees. In contrast, the 95 kHz MBES is well above the known or suspected frequency range of both species (Table 3.9-2).

The SBPs associated with the proposed seismic activities operate in the MF range of approximately 3.5 kHz, with a maximum source output of 222 dB re 1 µPa-m (rms). This frequency range is within the known or suspected frequency band audible to sea otters in air and manatees underwater (Table 3.9-2).

The peak output of the omnidirectional pingers used for multi-streamer 3-D surveys is 183 dB re 1 µPa-m at 55–110 kHz, with a maximum rate of 3 pings per 10 sec. Sounds from these pingers are within the upper known hearing range of manatees (Table 3.9-2). In addition, the battery-powered coring pingers produce omnidirectional 12-kHz signals with a source output of approximately 192 dB re 1 µPa-m with one ping of 0.5, 2, or 10 ms duration per second. This source frequency is within the frequency range known or presumed to be audible to the W Indian manatee and probably audible to sea otters as well (Table 3.9-2).

Ship engines and the vessel hull itself emit broadband sounds at frequencies and amplitudes that would allow them to be heard by all the species underwater (Table 3.8-2). The source level of vessel sound would be considerably less than that of the airguns, MBESs, and SBPs, but vessel sound (unlike those other sources) would be emitted continuously (Richardson et al. 1995a).

In summary, airgun and vessel sounds are presumably audible to sea otters and especially manatees underwater, although sea otters may be less sensitive to the predominant low frequencies produced by these sound sources than they are to mid- to high-frequency sounds. Sound frequencies produced by the SBPs, pingers and all but one of the planned MBESs overlap the range of manatee hearing; thus W Indian manatees can presumably hear these sounds if sufficiently close. In-air sound production by sea otters overlaps all but the highest-frequency MBESs and pingers.

Types of effects that the aforementioned sound sources could potentially have on sea otters and sirenians (and thus W Indian manatees) are described below and summarized in Table 3.9-5. In general, the potential for adverse effects from exposure to the project sound sources can be reduced by implementing mitigation and monitoring program. Short-term behavioral effects are possible to the sea otter and W Indian manatee during exemplary seismic survey operations, although such effects may be reduced for sea otters as they do not appear to rely heavily on underwater communication and spend considerable time out of water. Regardless, with effective mitigation, no adverse effects are expected on the viability of any populations of these species.

Table 3.9-5. Summary of Known and Anticipated General Effects of Seismic Survey Sounds on Sea Otters and W Indian Manatees

Species	*Masking*	*Disturbance*	*TTS*	*Injury or PTS*	*Other Physiological Effects*	*Comments*
Sea otter	Unknown, unlikely.	Yes – Short term.	No	No	No	No studies available.
W Indian manatee	Yes – Short term.	Yes – Short term.	Unknown	Unlikely	Unlikely	Potential for limited impacts due to overlapping frequency of sources (seismic and SBP) and manatee hearing.

3.9.4.3 Acoustic Effects

The following sections discuss the types of potential acoustic effects that may occur to sea otters and W Indian manatees exposed to sounds similar to those proposed for the project, including airgun pulses, MF and HF echosounder signals, and other anthropogenic sounds, based on the limited available data. Further discussion of these topics can be found in Appendix E.

Masking

Masking effects of seismic pulses are expected to be negligible in the case of sea otters due to their use of in-air calls rather than underwater calls. Masking of sirenian calls by pulsed sounds, such as those from airguns, is expected to be limited given the intermittent nature of the pulses. In addition, the low frequencies that dominate seismic survey sounds do not fall within the most sensitive hearing range of sirenians. W Indian manatees are presumed to be capable of hearing the airgun sounds; however, this does not necessarily mean that those sounds will have any appreciable masking effects. Furthermore, W Indian manatees are closely associated with seagrass beds in shallow coastal waters and exemplary seismic activity would not be conducted in this habitat in the one analysis area where they occur (SE Caribbean DAA). Recent modeling and field verification studies on underwater sound transmission loss relative to manatee habitat off Florida found that sounds attenuated more quickly in seabed habitat than in dredged areas, particularly for sounds at frequencies less than 2 kHz such as the dominant sounds from vessels (Miksis-Olds and Miller 2006). Manatees, particularly mothers with calves, may be selecting quieter habitats that attenuate high noise levels, facilitating their ability to tolerate high noise levels and meet nutritional needs while foraging in seagrass beds (Miksis-Olds and Miller 2006; Gannon et al. 2007). These studies suggest that the potential for masking of manatee sounds by seismic and other relatively low-frequency anthropogenic sounds is reduced in seagrass foraging habitats.

Masking effects due to the MBES, SBP, or pinger signals are expected to be minimal or non-existent given their low duty cycles, the brief period when an individual mammal would potentially be within the downward-directed MBES or SBP beam from a transiting vessel, and the relatively low source level of a pinger. Manatees are very unlikely to occur in water deep enough to be within the beam of an MBES or SBP from a seismic vessel passing nearby. Masking effects in general are discussed further in Appendix E.

Disturbance

Very few studies have been conducted on the effects of seismic survey activities on sea otters, and no such studies on sirenians are known. Thus, summaries of vessel effects are also included in the review of relevant literature below (also see Appendix E).

The behavior of sea otters along the California coast was monitored while they were exposed to a single 100-in^3 airgun and a 4,089-in^3 array (Riedman 1983, 1984). No disturbance reactions were evident when the airgun array was as close as 0.55 mi (0.9 km) and sea otters did not respond noticeably to the single airgun. These results suggest that sea otters may be less responsive to marine seismic survey pulses than other marine mammals such as mysticetes and odontocetes as discussed above. Also, sea otters spend a great deal of time at the surface feeding and grooming (Riedman 1983, 1984). While at the surface, the potential exposure of sea otters to underwater sound would be much reduced by the pressure-release effect at the surface (Greene and Richardson 1988; Richardson et al. 1995a).

We are unaware of any studies on the impacts of airgun sounds or other project-related sounds on manatees. However, a few studies have reported effects of vessels on manatees (see review in Appendix E). Manatees have been found to reduce their use of important habitats when continually disturbed by boats in some areas (Provancha and Provancha 1988). In other areas such as the Belize River, manatee density is higher in areas with the greatest boat traffic (Auil 2004). According to Aragones (1990), dugongs in Calauit in the Philippines appear to have adapted to boat disturbance by concentrating their feeding between dusk and dawn when boat traffic and/or fishing activities are low. In Florida, manatees may select habitats where underwater vessel sounds are reduced (Miksis-Olds and Miller 2006; Miksis-Olds et al. 2007).

Given the above varied results, it is possible that individual W Indian manatees (and to a lesser extent sea otters) could respond to seismic pulses, including at times localized avoidance or other short-term behavioral reactions. However, we are not aware of any information that would indicate that these species show more than localized avoidance of marine activity as described above and in Appendix E. Sea otters, in particular, are apparently not very responsive to airgun pulses.

There are currently no data on the potential disturbance effects of echosounders, such as MBESs and SBPs, on sea otters or sirenians (see Appendix E). Based on the likely brevity of exposure to these sound sources, reactions are expected to be limited to startle or otherwise brief responses of no lasting consequence to the animals. The signals from the SBP are somewhat weaker than those from the MBES. Therefore, behavioral responses are not expected unless animals are very close to the source. NMFS (2001b) has concluded that momentary behavioral reactions "do not rise to the level of taking". Thus, brief exposure of the species considered here to small numbers of signals from echosounders would not result in a "take" by harassment as defined by NMFS and the ESA (see Chapter 1).

Temporary Hearing Impairment or TTS

TTS is possible when marine mammals are exposed to high-level sounds (Southall et al. 2007). TTS thresholds associated with exposure to brief pulses (single or multiple) of underwater sound have not been measured in sea otters or sirenians. Several aspects of the monitoring and mitigation measures that have and would be implemented during NSF-funded seismic surveys are designed to detect marine mammals occurring near the airgun array to avoid exposing them to sound pulses that might cause hearing impairment (see Section 2.4). In addition, many marine mammals are likely to show some avoidance of the area with ongoing seismic operations (see Appendix E). In these cases, the avoidance response of the animals themselves reduces the possibility of hearing impairment.

TTS is considered highly unlikely to occur in sea otters as a result of project activities. TTS in sirenians is also considered unlikely as sirenians tend to inhabit quite shallow coastal habitats whereas proposed seismic surveys would be located further offshore.

The project MBESs, SBPs, and pingers are not expected to induce TTS. See mysticete Sections 3.7.4.3 for further assessment based on operating characteristics of the project MBES, SBPs, and pingers.

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

There is no specific evidence that exposure to airgun pulses (even with large airgun arrays) or echosounders can cause PTS in any marine mammal. However, given the possibility that some types of marine mammals close to an airgun array might incur TTS, there has been further speculation about the possibility that some individuals occurring very close to airguns might incur PTS. There have been no such studies involving sea otters or sirenians. Given that project activities are unlikely to cause TTS in the marine mammals considered in this section, and given the higher level of sound necessary to cause PTS as compared with TTS (Southall et al. 2007), PTS is not expected to occur through exposure of these species to airgun sounds.

Strandings and Mortality

No mortalities or strandings of sea otters or manatees have been linked to acoustic sources that would be used during the proposed seismic surveys (see Section 3.9.4 and Appendix E). Some individual marine mammals are likely to avoid an approaching seismic vessel and associated acoustic sources. Based on that likely avoidance, and the proposed mitigation and monitoring measures designed to minimize potential impacts, no strandings or mortality of these species are expected during the proposed marine seismic surveys within the analysis areas.

Other Physiological Effects

Non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that might, in theory, occur in marine mammals exposed to high-level underwater sound include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, and other types of organ or tissue damage (Cox et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007; see Appendix E). To date, there have been no studies on the potential physiological effects of airgun or echosounder sounds on sea otters or sirenians. Marine mammals that show behavioral avoidance of seismic or other vessels, as documented for some manatees, are especially unlikely to incur auditory impairment or other physiological effects.

3.9.4.4 Other Potential Effects

Entanglement

Entanglements occur when cables, lines, nets, or other objects suspended in the water column or on the bottom become wrapped around marine mammals. Sea otters and sirenians are known to be vulnerable to entanglements with fishing gear (Lance et al. 2004; Estes 1990; USFWS 1993; Estes et al. 2003; Wendell et al. 1985), although it is considered highly unlikely that they could become entangled in seismic gear. During seismic operations, numerous cables, lines, and other objects primarily associated with the airgun array and hydrophone streamers will be towed behind the survey ship near the water's surface. No cases of entanglement of any marine mammals with this gear have been documented during previous NSF-sponsored seismic surveys. The tendency of many marine mammals to avoid approaching seismic vessels (in contrast with their tendency to congregate around fishing vessels) presumably reduces the risk of entanglement. The typical nearshore, shallow-water distribution of sea otters and W Indian manatees also further reduces the likelihood that they would occur close to proposed seismic survey equipment in generally deeper offshore waters.

Ingestion

An oil/fuel spill associated with the planned program is considered a highly unlikely event given the strict adherence to related regulations and safety protocols. Mortality associated with the ingestion of chemicals or marine debris has been documented in sea otters and manatees (e.g., Geraci and St. Aubin 1990). Oil spills and their associated impacts (e.g., death, habitat degradation, prey contamination and death) represent a significant anthropogenic threat to these species, but NSF's or USGS's proposed operations carry very little risk of causing such effects.

Sea otters can be adversely impacted by oil spills when oil compromises the insulative property of their fur, by inhaling volatile oil components, and through ingestion while grooming, resulting in gastro-intestinal disorders and death (Geraci and Williams 1990; Bonnell et al. 1996).

Sirenians are expected to be less vulnerable to oil spills due to their lack of insulating fur and thus their inability to ingest oil by intense fur grooming. However, sirenians have reportedly died following ingestion of fishing gear and other materials, although mortality from such causes is very low (USFWS 2001).

Ship Strikes

Ship strikes are not known to be a significant cause of sea otter mortality (Lance et al. 2004). However, the relatively slow-moving sirenians are known to be at great risk of mortality from boat strikes. For example, in Florida, the largest known cause of manatee deaths is collisions with the hulls and/or propellers of boats and ships (Wright et al. 1995). From 1976 to 2000, watercraft-related deaths accounted for 24% of the total mortality and were increasing at an average rate of 7.2% per year (Ackerman et al. 1995; USFWS 2001; Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, unpublished data). Watercraft-related deaths were much lower in 1992 and 1993, but increased thereafter. From 1996 to 2000, watercraft-related deaths were the highest on record (USFWS 2001). Dugongs are vulnerable to ship strikes when feeding in shallow water (State of Queensland, Environmental Protection Agency 1999). Though sirenians are susceptible to vessel strikes, sirenians are unlikely to be encountered at the water depths where proposed seismic survey activities would occur.

3.9.5 Environmental Consequences – Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Alternatives A and B consist of a combination of monitoring and mitigation measures developed in consultation with NMFS and designed to minimize the potential effects of NSF-funded or USGS seismic survey operations on marine mammals, including sea otters and W Indian manatees (Sections 2.6.1 and 3.7.5). An additional mitigation measure specific to these species under the action alternatives is the precautionary adoption of 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) as the sound level criterion to which exposure should be avoided to prevent potential physical injury. Thus, the acoustic assessment criterion for analysis of Alternative A consists of evaluating the potential for sea otters and W Indian manatees to be exposed to received levels ≥180 dB re 1 µPa (rms). The estimated distances to the unweighted (i.e., not M-weighted) 180-dB re 1 µPa (rms) isopleth in each of the DAAs can be found in Appendix B, Tables B-7 – B-12. These radii were estimated based on results of the site-specific acoustic modeling conducted for the analysis areas. However, because there are few reliable data on the at-sea distribution and density of sea otters and W Indian manatees, it is not possible to estimate the numbers of these species that may be potentially exposed to sound levels ≥180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) in any of the analysis areas. Therefore, only qualitative estimates of the relative numbers of sea otters and W Indian manatees that may be exposed to airgun sounds during the proposed seismic surveys can be made. Furthermore, these estimates are based

on limited or sometimes non-existent data on the occurrence, abundance, and distribution of these marine mammals in the analysis areas addressed.

3.9.5.1 Acoustic Effects

This section summarizes the various types and levels of potential acoustic effects on sea otters and W Indian manatees in the analysis areas during the seismic surveys under Alternative A or B. Assessment of effects is based on the review provided in the previous section and Appendix E. Anticipated effects are summarized in Table 3.9-6.

Masking

The potential for masking attributable to NSF-sponsored seismic surveys is expected to be limited and short-term for sea otters and sirenians in the three DAAs and one QAA where they occur (Table 3.9-6): airgun sounds are intermittent with a low duty cycle, and much of the airgun sound energy is below and outside the frequency range of best hearing or sound production by these species. Masking by project sounds is unlikely to cause adverse effects to sea otters given their primary reliance on in-air communications and the pulsed nature of the main project sounds. The potential for masking of manatee sounds is considered minimal given the intermittent and short-duration nature of project sounds. Furthermore, this species occurs only in the SE Caribbean analysis area where it tends to inhabit shallow coastal waters with seagrass beds, and project activities are not anticipated to occur in such areas (i.e., surveys would occur in deeper offshore waters). The potential for masking effects for both species is expected to be limited to no more than a small number of individuals in the short term, with no significant effects on populations.

Disturbance

Short-term Level B exposure involving behavioral disturbance and/or localized avoidance would be the primary type of effect resulting from the seismic surveys under Alternative A or B. Anticipated short-term impacts would be limited to very small numbers of sea otters and W Indian manatees depending on the analysis area and other factors as described below, especially given the mitigation measures such as immediate power- or shut-downs and ramp-ups (Table 3.9-6). In general, seismic operations in or near analysis areas where sea otters or sirenians are common and where large airgun arrays are proposed for use in shallow water are likely to have the greatest relative potential for acoustic impacts (as described in Chapter 2 and Appendix B). The sea otter is found in only two of the DAAs (S California and W Gulf of Alaska), and the W Indian manatee occurs only in the Caribbean DAA (Table 3.9-3). Within the eight QAAs, sea otters are known to occur in one (BC Coast), while W Indian manatees do not occur in any of the QAAs (Table 3.9-4). Although dugongs occur in shallow protected coastal waters of W Australia, they are not expected to occur in the more offshore waters of the exemplary W Australia QAA

Within the two DAAs where sea otters may be encountered, a large airgun array is proposed for use in intermediate to deep water (W Gulf of Alaska) and a small airgun array is proposed in shallow to intermediate-depth water (S California) (Table 2-11). In addition, in the BC Coast QAA, sea otters may occur where a large airgun array is proposed in shallow and intermediate-depth waters. Sea otters spend most of their time at or near the water surface, favor shallow coastal waters, and rarely range >0.6-1.2 mi (1-2 km) from shore. These factors serve to reduce any potential impacts of the proposed seismic surveys on sea otters. Furthermore, sea otters did not react strongly upon exposure to airgun pulses in a study off California (Riedman 1983, 1984). Close encounters with sea otters in both DAAs are expected to be infrequent due to the relatively low population of sea otters and their largely coastal, shallow-water distribution in these areas. In the BC Coast QAA, sea otters would be present during the exemplary fall

seismic period, but would be concentrated in nearshore habitats that would be largely avoided by the survey vessel.

The W Indian manatee is found only in the Caribbean DAA where a large airgun array is proposed for use in water depths ranging from shallow to deep. This species is expected to occur only rarely in the specific area of the exemplary project (Table 3.9-3). The species has a patchy coastal distribution in this DAA and is usually confined to nearshore waters <330 ft (<100 m) deep. Therefore, few manatees are expected to occur close enough to the proposed vessel track for sound levels would reach levels that could result in behavioral disturbance

Because sea otters are ESA-listed as threatened and W Indian manatees are endangered (Table 3.9-1), and because short-term Level B exposure of these species may occur under Alternative A or B, the proposed activities may affect and are likely to adversely affect these species (3.9-6). However, the potential disturbance of relatively small numbers of these individuals during the planned seismic survey activities is not expected to result in significant impacts to their populations.

Temporary Hearing Impairment or TTS

TTS is not likely for sea otters near proposed seismic operations as they spend most of their time at or near the water surface. TTS is also unlikely for W Indian manatees in the one analysis area where they occur (SE Caribbean DAA) as they inhabit primarily shallow coastal seagrass beds where seismic activities are not planned to occur. Furthermore, the probability that a sea otter or W Indian manatee would approach close enough, and remain there long enough, for TTS to occur is reduced through application of the planned monitoring procedures and mitigation measures. These measures include ramp-ups, and immediate power- or shut-downs. Moreover, TTS is (by definition) a temporary phenomenon that does not constitute injury, and is very unlikely to have long-term consequences for the individual(s) involved. No significant impacts to populations of sea otters or W Indian manatees are expected to occur under Alternative A or B as a result of potential TTS (Table 3.9-6).

Injury

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

The possibility of PTS occurring during the proposed seismic surveys within the analysis areas is less than the already-low possibility of TTS, since an individual would need to receive more sound energy to experience PTS. It is considered unlikely that a sea otter or W Indian manatee would approach close enough (and remain there long enough) for PTS to occur. In addition, proposed seismic surveys within the analysis areas with sea otters or W Indian manatees are not expected to be conducted in the coastal nearshore habitats favored by these two species. Furthermore, monitoring procedures and mitigation measures, such as immediate power- or shut-downs when marine mammals are sighted within the safety radii, would further reduce the possibility of PTS in the unlikely event that it might otherwise occur. In general, PTS is not expected to occur during exposure to brief intermittent sound pulses associated with the proposed project acoustic sources.

Strandings and Mortality

Strandings or mortalities of sea otters or sirenians have not been linked to airgun or echosounder sounds that would be used during the proposed seismic surveys (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995a; see Appendix E). It is considered highly unlikely that strandings or mortalities of these species would occur as a result of the exemplary airgun surveys, especially when mitigation and monitoring is implemented (e.g., shut-

downs, power-downs, ramp-ups, etc.). Furthermore, some individuals are expected to avoid close approaches to the airguns.

Other Physiological Effects

Under Alternative A, no other physiological effects on sea otters or W Indian manatees are expected as a result of proposed seismic activities, as described in Section 3.9.4.3.

3.9.5.2 Other Potential Effects

Under Alternative A or B, the potential for non-acoustic effects (entanglement, ingestion, and ship strikes) is considered very unlikely, as described in Section 3.8.4.4. Visual monitoring procedures further reduce the risk of entanglement or ship strike because, during daylight, observers watch for any marine mammals near the vessel and equipment. No related significant impacts on sea otter or W Indian manatee populations are anticipated under Alternative A or Alternative B.

3.9.6 Environmental Consequences – Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research surveys using various acoustic sources (e.g., airguns, MBESs, SBPs, and pingers) would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to sea otters or W Indian manatees with implementation of Alternative C.

3.9.7 Summary of Environmental Consequences – Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee

In summary, Alternatives A and B may result in minor short-term and localized behavioral disturbance of individual sea otters and W Indian manatees (Table 3.9-6). The number of individuals of these species estimated to be closely approached during the proposed seismic surveys is expected to be very small to none and limited to the three DAAs and one QAA where they occur (Table 3.9-6). No PTS or other potential injury of these species is anticipated during an actual seismic survey under Alternative A or B with proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. No short- or long-term significant impacts are expected on ESA-listed species populations or their habitats as a result of implementation of Alternative A or B. Alternative C would have no impacts on the species considered here because the project would not occur.

Sounds from some of the MBESs and SBPs are within the frequency ranges detectable to W Indian manatees and presumed detectable to sea otters. Short-term behavioral disturbance of these species may occur during proposed seismic activities. However, no Level A exposures are expected. W Indian manatees typically inhabit quite shallow coastal areas characterized by seabeds where seismic surveys are not proposed to occur. Furthermore, the intermittent and downward-directed nature of the echosounder signals emitted from the transiting seismic vessel would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures to an animal that happened to occur under the vessel.

Table 3.9-6. Summary of Potential Impacts to Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Species*	*Alternative A or B*
DAA		
Caribbean	West Indian manatee	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.
S California	Sea otter	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.
W Gulf of Alaska	Sea otter	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.
QAA		
BC Coast	Sea otter	Potential short-term disturbance and localized displacement of individuals possible, but species unlikely to occur in areas where seismic surveys would occur. Potential for TTS unknown, considered possible close to airguns but highly unlikely to occur. No significant impacts or adverse effects expected on individuals or regional populations.

3.10 SOCIOECONOMICS

In accordance with NSF policy and EO 12114, socioeconomic activities are addressed for the three DAAs that are located within the 200-nm (370-km) EEZ of the U.S. (NW Atlantic, S California, and W Gulf of Alaska). The three other DAAs and the eight QAAs are not discussed in this section because they are outside of the U.S. EEZ.

Socioeconomics comprise the basic attributes and resources associated with the human environment, particularly economic activity and social welfare. Data were collected for socioeconomic characteristics within each of the DAAs including: commercial fisheries, commercial shipping, research and exploration activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, recreational fishing, and recreational boating (e.g., diving, whale watching, etc.). All of these activities may not occur in each of the DAAs examined.

Commercial fisheries activities are measured by the amount of fish landed annually and the dollar value of that catch. Commercial shipping is represented by the number of vessel trips to and from ports nearest the DAAs. Research and exploration activities usually involve academic and U.S. government oceanographic research and oil and gas exploration. The economic and cultural value of subsistence hunting and fishing is described in terms of the types of fish and marine mammals that are taken. Where applicable, recreational fishing is expressed in dollar value, number of recreational fishing trips, or amount of fish caught. Finally, a description is provided for recreational boating within the DAAs in addition to the types of activities conducted during recreational boat trips.

3.10.1 Affected Environment

3.10.1.1 NW Atlantic

Socioeconomic characteristics of the NW Atlantic DAA are largely reflected in commercial and recreational activities that occur along the coastline and offshore areas of New Jersey and New York.

Commercial Fisheries

New Jersey. New Jersey generally ranks in the top 10 states nationally in terms of total pounds and dollar value of commercial fish and shellfish landed. In 2004, the dockside value of commercial fish landings in New Jersey was almost $146 million for 188 million pounds (Table 3.10-1). Some of the more important commercially fished species include bluefish, striped bass, black sea bass, silver hake, porgy, menhaden, Atlantic mackerel, monkfish, tuna, fluke, weakfish, squid, lobster, blue crab, and scallops (NOAA Fisheries 2006a).

Table 3.10-1. Pounds and Value of Landings for New Jersey Commercial Fisheries (2001-2004)

Year	*Pounds*	*Value*
2001	168,540,752	$110,246,318
2002	162,138,648	$112,708,180
2003	170,133,407	$120,671,702
2004	187,827,273	$145,937,709

Source: NOAA Fisheries 2006a.

New York. Commercial fishing ports are located along the South and North shores of Long Island from Brooklyn and the Bronx in New York City to the eastern tip of the Island's North and South Forks (New York Seafood Council 2004).

The dockside value of commercial fish landings in New York was more than $46 million in 2004, down from a high of $55 million in 2001 (Table 3.10-2). Some of the more important commercially fished species include silver hake, porgy, whiting, tilefish, summer flounder, fluke, squid, lobster, surf clam, hard clam, and scallops (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation 2006).

Table 3.10-2. Pounds and Value of Landings for New York Commercial Fisheries (2001-2004)

Year	*Pounds*	*Value*
2004	34,519,376	$46,901,150
2003	39,435,432	$51,655,997
2002	38,595,483	$51,345,058
2001	42,459,833	$55,187,128

Source: NOAA Fisheries 2006a.

The commercial fishing ports of New York host a diverse assemblage of fishing vessels. Vessels range from small 15-ft clam boats that work in nearshore bays to large 90-ft deep-sea trawlers or longliners that often fish hundreds of miles from shore in the Atlantic Ocean (New York Seafood Council 2004).

Commercial Shipping

Due to their location along the NW Atlantic coast, New Jersey and New York are important commercial shipping centers. New York/New Jersey has the largest port complex on the east coast of North America and is located at the hub of the most concentrated consumer market in the world (The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey 2006).

Major freight traffic in the ports of New York/New Jersey consists primarily of petroleum, petroleum products, inedible crude materials (e.g., forest products, soil, rock, iron ore, etc.), manufactured equipment and machinery, primary manufactured goods, and food and farm products. Over 380,000 vessel trips were recorded for the New York/New Jersey port area in 2004 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers [USACE] 2006a).

In addition to the ports of New York/New Jersey, commercial shipping from the Delaware River is also within the vicinity of the NW Atlantic DAA. The Delaware River and Bay is home to the fifth largest port complex in the United States in terms of total waterborne commerce. Every year, over 70 million tons of cargo move through the tri-state (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) port complex. It is the second largest oil port in the United States, handling about 85% of the East Coast's oil imports (University of Delaware 2004). Major freight traffic in the Delaware River and Bay consists primarily of petroleum, petroleum products and primary manufactured goods. Over 44,000 vessel trips were recorded for the New Delaware River port area in 2004 (USACE 2006a).

Research and Exploration Activities

Oceanographic Research. The European Consortium for Ocean Research Drilling (ECORD) has undertaken a program of international research in Earth science since 1968 with the DSDP and later, from 1985 to 2003, the ODP. Begun in October 2003, Europe and Canada, jointly with the U.S. and Japan, have helped to shape research using scientific ocean drilling with the Initial Science Plan for the IODP. This program involves several drilling platforms for advanced sampling of the ocean floor and provides a critically needed data-base for understanding the complex functioning of the Earth system. ECORD completed a drilling program on the New Jersey Shallow Shelf, referred to as Expedition 313, between April and July 2009 (Figure 3.10-1) (ECORD Science Operator 2010).



Source: ECORD 2008.

Figure 3.10-1. ECORD Drilling on the New Jersey Shallow Shelf

Oil and Gas Production. There is currently a moratorium on oil and gas leasing activities on the Outer Continental Shelf in the region of the NW Atlantic DAA. This moratorium has been in effect since 1982 and is included annually in Department of the Interior appropriations acts. President Clinton extended the moratorium through 2012.

Subsistence Hunting and Fishing

Subsistence hunting and fishing is not known to occur in New Jersey or in its coastal waters (New Jersey Historic Preservation Office 2006).

Recreational Fisheries

Recreational fisheries also play an important role in New Jersey's economy. In 1991, about 950,000 people spent more than $630 million fishing in New Jersey's waters, generating more than $44 million in state sales tax. This resulted in $400 million in earnings and supported 16,750 jobs. In 2004, recreational fishing landed over 10 million pounds of fish (NOAA Fisheries 2006b). Although no dollar value was offered for the 2004 recreational landings, combined commercial and recreational fish revenues generate about $2 billion annually in the State of New Jersey (NJDEP 2006b). The majority of recreational fishing in the State of New Jersey was conducted using private charters and approximately 2 million trips were conducted in 2004 (NOAA Fisheries 2006b).

Recreational Boating

Tourism is one of New Jersey's largest industries. It brings in more than $5.5 billion in tax revenues, provides jobs to more than 836,000 people and generates more than $16.6 billion in wages. Much of the tourism revenues are generated as a result of summer-oriented activities associated with New Jersey's

shoreline and beach areas. These activities include scuba diving, boating, fishing, and marine mammal watching, which occur primarily close to shore and not within the DAA.

3.10.1.2 S California

Socioeconomic characteristics of the S California DAA are largely reflected in commercial and recreational activities that occur along the coastline and offshore areas of Santa Barbara, California.

Commercial Fisheries

A summary of the reported poundage and value of commercial fish landings in the Santa Barbara area from 2001-2004 is presented in Table 3.10-3. Out of eight major ports in the Santa Barbara area, the ports of Hueneme and Ventura landed the largest total poundage of commercial fish species in the Santa Barbara area (California Department of Fish and Game [CDFG] 2006a). The major commercially fished species and a calendar of commercial fishing open seasons are listed in Table 3.10-4.

Table 3.10-3. Pounds and Value of Landings for Santa Barbara Area Ports (2001-2004)

Year	*Pounds*	*Value*
2001	109,956,541	$17,600,165
2002	62,086,380	$17,232,731
2003	60,373,854	$22,906,278
2004	77,883,986	$24,258,956

Source: CDFG 2006a.

Table 3.10-4. Major Commercially Fished Species in S California DAA

Species	*Season*
Surf perch	September – April 30
White seabass	July – March 14
Spiny lobster	October 4 – March 21st
Clams	September 1 – April 30
Dungeness crab (pots and traps)	December 1 – July 15
Spot prawn	February 2 – October 30
Coonstripe shrimp (trapping)	May 1 – October 30
California halibut	Open All Year Long
Pink shrimp (trawling)	April 1 – October 31
Ridgeback prawn (trawling)	October 1 – May 30
Sea urchin	Seasons vary
King salmon (Chinook)	Regulated by Federal Government
Silver salmon (coho)	Regulated by Federal Government
Pacific halibut	Regulated by Federal Government

Source: CDFG 2006b.

Commercial Shipping

Commercial shipping in the S California DAA is dominated by cargo transports, oil tankers, and tow/tugs (U.S. Navy 2002). Information was obtained for the following port areas that are located closest to the S California DAA.

- Port of Los Angeles – the Port of Los Angeles features 26 cargo terminals, including dry and liquid bulk, container, breakbulk, and automobile and omni facilities (Port of Los Angeles 2006).

- Port Hueneme – The Port of Hueneme is the only deep water harbor between Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay area and the main commodities moved through the port include: automobiles, fresh fruit and produce, and forest products. Its unique positioning near the Santa Barbara Channel has also made the Port of Hueneme the primary support facility for the offshore oil and gas industry in California's Central Coast area (Port of Hueneme 2006).
- Santa Barbara Harbor – the Santa Barbara Harbor is home to over 1,000 pleasure and commercial vessels, providing access to the Channel Islands, the open seas, and the last harbor before rounding Point Conception (Sailor's Choice 2006).

Over 26,000 vessel trips were recorded for these three ports in 2004, with the Port of Los Angeles making up over 74% of the trips. Vessels traveling inbound and outbound of the Port of Los Angeles and Port Hueneme are primarily passenger or dry cargo vessels, but the Port of Los Angeles also has a considerable amount of tanker traffic compared to Port Hueneme (USACE 2006b).

Research and Exploration Activities

Oceanographic Research. Research and exploration activities off the coast of S California have been extensive. Various seismic surveys have been conducted and study programs have been developed by research institutes, the USGS, and the MMS. For example, the USGS conducted multibeam mapping in the eastern Santa Barbara Channel in August 2004 aboard the R/V *Ewing*. The survey was funded by MMS, whose staff are interested in maps of hardbottom habitats, particularly natural outcrops that support reef communities in areas affected by oil and gas activity (USGS 2005).

The MMS Environmental Studies Program supplies the scientific and technical information needed to predict, assess, and manage the potential impact of OCS activities on the marine, coastal, and human environments. The MMS focuses studies in this region to assess and manage ongoing operations and predict the effects of future decommissioning of offshore facilities. Cooperative research programs have been established with the State of California; the University of California-Santa Barbara, -San Diego, and -Berkley; SIO; and various federal agencies to address physical, chemical, and biological oceanography; atmospheric studies; marine mammals, fisheries, turtle and seabird studies; and studies of the sociology and economic factors and impacts related to OCS and marine mineral activities (MMS 2003).

Oil and Gas Production. Santa Barbara County and its offshore areas have been an oil and gas producing region for over a century. Oil production in Santa Barbara County, including offshore production landed in the county, reached a high of almost 69 million barrels in 1995. The focus in production has shifted from onshore and near-shore fields to fields underlying federal waters 3 or more miles from shore. Currently, there is one platform located 2.1 mi (3.3 km) from shore and there are 19 platforms in the OCS ranging from 3.7-10.5 mi (6-17 km) offshore. These platforms are positioned in water depths ranging from 154 to 1,075 ft (47 to 328 m) (County of Santa Barbara 2006).

Subsistence Hunting and Fishing

Subsistence hunting and fishing may occur to a limited degree, but it is not extensive enough for the CDFG to keep official records (CDFG 2006c).

Recreational Fishing

Southern California is the leading recreational fishing area along the U.S. Pacific Coast. Modes of recreational fishing include shore and pier activities, as well as private and charter boats. Inner waters from Santa Barbara to Point Conception are lined with kelp beds and reefs that provide recreational fishing opportunities for kelp bass, yellowtail, bonito, rockfish, barracuda, and other fish. The Channel

Islands sport fishing areas are concentrated around the offshore kelp beds and reefs and open ocean south of Anacapa and Santa Cruz islands (U.S. Navy 2002).

The California Recreational Fisheries Survey (CRFS) is the new method for estimating total marine recreational finfish catch and effort in California. The 2005 Annual Review of the CRFS shows that approximately 48,000 angler trips occurred in the Channel District, which includes Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. The amount of fish caught by marine recreational anglers, for all possible species of fish and for all modes of fishing in the Channel District, was 642,000 pounds (CDFG 2006d).

Recreational Boating

The Santa Barbara Channel and the associated California Channel Islands are used by the public for many recreational purposes including boating, diving, bird watching, and whale watching, all of which are important to the local economy. Recreational diving at shipwrecks around the Channel Islands is very popular and is discussed in Section 3.12.

3.10.1.3 W Gulf of Alaska

The socioeconomic characteristics of the W Gulf of Alaska DAA are mainly influenced by the commercial and recreational activities that occur in the Chignik Management Area, which includes the south side of the Alaska Peninsula from Kodiak to the Aleutian Islands**.**

Commercial Fisheries

Fishing is the basis of the cash economy for the W Gulf of Alaska, including Kodiak, Chignik, and the Aleutian Islands. Table 3.10-5 lists the pounds and value of commercial landings for the Kodiak, Chignik, and the Aleutian Islands from 2001-2004.

Table 3.10-5. Pounds and Value of Landings for W Gulf of Alaska Ports (2001-2004)

Year	*Pounds*	*Value*
2001	103,830,000	$28,419,000
2002	104,193,000	$18,805,000
2003	100,443,000	$23,893,000
2004	126,560,000	$26,851,000

Source: ADFG 2006b.

The commercial salmon season in Chignik, Kodiak, and the Aleutian Islands is open by regulation from 1 June to 31 October. However, the actual in-season fishing time and area is regulated via emergency order (ADFG 2006c). The type of gear varies, using purse seines in Chignik, and seines or gillnets in Kodiak and the Aleutian Islands. The herring season is open for sac roe from 15 April through 30 June and for food and bait from 15 August through 28 February, using trawl, seine, or gillnet.

Commercial Shipping

Commercial shipping data are available for two ports within the W Gulf of Alaska DAA: Kodiak Harbor and Unalaska Island. Approximately 2,500 vessel trips originated within these two ports in 2004. The primary vessels in the Kodiak Harbor are passenger or dry cargo (65%) and tug (20%). Vessels traveling inbound and outbound of Unalaska Island are also primarily passenger or dry cargo vessels, but Unalaska Island has more tanker traffic compared to Kodiak Harbor (USACE 2006b).

Research and Exploration Activities

Oceanographic Research. No oceanographic research is taking place in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA at this time (MMS 2006b).

Oil and Gas Production. Currently, there is no oil and gas production in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA or offshore state and federal waters (MMS 2006b). The last well drilled in 1983 gave no indications of oil and gas in this area. As a result, oil companies have not shown an interest in conducting exploration in this area. Furthermore, the Western Gulf of Alaska has been excluded from the MMS 5-year oil and gas leasing program in Alaska for over 15 years.

Subsistence Hunting and Fishing

Subsistence fishing and hunting is common in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, specifically in the Chignik village network, which consists of Chignik, Chignik Lagoon, and Chignik Lake. Ocean waters in the vicinity of Chignik are abundant with fish species that have both subsistence and commercial value to Chignik residents, including all five species of Pacific salmon, halibut, herring, Pacific cod, and smelt. A wide variety of invertebrates are found in the region, including octopus, crab, clams, and mussels. Seal oil and/or seal fat are subsistence foods used by many Chignik Natives. Over 25% of household diets in Chignik consist of subsistence-harvested proteins. Seafood resources rather than land mammals make up the majority of the subsistence foods consumed by the people of Chignik (MMS 1993).

Recreational Fishing and Boating

Due to its remoteness and distance from land, the W Gulf of Alaska DAA is not generally used for recreational fishing or boating activities.

3.10.1.4 Summary of Socioeconomic Activities

A summary of the socioeconomic activities within each of the four DAAs is presented in Table 3.10-6.

Table 3.10-6. Summary of Socioeconomic Activities within the DAAs

Activity	*DAA*		
	NW Atlantic	*S California*	*W Gulf of Alaska*
Commercial Fisheries	Large	Large	Large
Commercial Shipping	Large	Large	Small
Research & Exploration	Extensive	Extensive	None
Subsistence Hunting/Fishing	None	Limited	Extensive
Recreational Fishing/Boating	Large	Large	Uncommon

3.10.2 Environmental Consequences

This section addresses the potential impact to commercial fisheries, commercial shipping, research and exploration activities (including oil and gas), and recreational fishing and boating that could result from implementing the proposed seismic survey activities in the three DAAs within the U.S. EEZ.

Commercial Fisheries. Commercial fishing could be affected by seismic surveys in three ways:

- Seismic surveys could cause behavioral changes in target species that could make them more difficult to catch.
- Survey vessels and towed cables could temporarily preclude fishers from productive fishing grounds.
- Survey vessels and towed cables could interfere with commercial fishing gear.

Fish can undergo three types of potential effects when exposed to underwater seismic sounds: pathological, physiological, and behavioral. Proposed seismic surveys are not likely to cause either pathological or physiological effects to fish. This is primarily because the pathological (mortality) zone for fish would be expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source. Moreover, primary and secondary stress responses of fish after exposure to seismic survey sound (physiological) appear to be temporary (see Section 3.3.4 and Appendix D). Instead, potential impacts to commercial fisheries are more likely from behavioral effects to fish from sounds associated with the seismic surveys.

There is a general concern about the potential reduction in the catchability of fish due to behavioral effects to fish from seismic survey operations, including changes in distribution, migration, and reproduction. Disturbances to fish populations and distributions could result in reduced catch of one or more target species for the duration of seismic survey operations. For some fish species, behavioral changes from seismic survey operations may result in changes in vertical or horizontal distribution. However, for some fisheries, there has been no significant effect on distribution or evidence of reduced catch rates (Table 3.3-6). Short-term behavioral effects to fish resulting from seismic surveys would be localized and not expected to significantly impact commercial fisheries (Section 3.3.4).

Preclusion of fishers from productive fishing grounds constitutes a space-use conflict. The size of the area precluded to fishing would depend upon the overall area of the geophysical survey. Seismic information is collected along predetermined tracklines that form a larger spatial grid. Typically, the seismic vessel operates on a 24-hour basis, for 2 to 8 weeks, towing as many as four parallel streamers that are up to 3.7 mi (6 km) long. These vessels operate under a "restricted ability to maneuver" designation, which means other vessels in the path of the survey vessel must give way. Further, because of the length of the hydrophone array, the survey vessel requires considerable turning room between tracklines. Thus, the area precluded to fishing would extend beyond the planned geophysical survey area when appropriate allowances are made for maneuvering the vessel.

The degree of impact would depend upon the relative mobility of the fishing operation (MMS 2004). Fixed gear such as traps is most vulnerable, and mobile gear such as hook-and-line fishing from drifting (or trolling) boats is least vulnerable. Common fishing practices such as bottom trawling, purse netting, and surface longlining would also be vulnerable. These gear types are not very mobile and require considerable time to deploy and retrieve. The potential for conflicts would increase with increasing water depth along with decreasing mobility of fishing vessels.

Surface currents and wind greatly influence the movement of longlines and other drifting gear (e.g., gill nets and purse nets) and must be taken into account when assessing potential impacts. A longline deployed upstream of a geophysical survey grid could drift into the path of the survey vessel. Surface longlines are generally allowed to drift for 4-5 hr before a 10- to 12-hr retrieval period (MMS 2004). Minimizing potential adverse effects on fisheries can generally be accomplished through adjusting tracklines and timing of surveys.

Commercial Shipping. Preclusion of cargo or other commercial ships from shipping lanes constitutes a space-use conflict. As previously stated, seismic research vessels operate under a "restricted ability to maneuver" designation, which means other vessels in the path of the survey vessel must give way. Further, because of the length of the hydrophone array, the survey vessel requires considerable turning room between tracklines. Thus, the shipping lanes precluded to cargo ships could extend beyond the planned survey areas when appropriate allowances are made for maneuvering the vessel. However, proposed seismic surveys would use one vessel for a survey that would operate for a limited duration.

Moreover, commercial shipping vessels would be notified of research activities in advance of any seismic surveys.

Research and Exploration Activities. The proposed seismic surveys have the potential to impact other research and exploration activities by altering marine faunal behavior, obscuring natural marine seismic occurrences, and interfering with other seismic research or exploration efforts. Coordination with other researchers would minimize or eliminate the potential for interference with other marine research and exploration activities.

Subsistence Hunting and Fishing. Seismic surveys areas are usually in deeper waters while subsistence hunting and fishing generally occur closer to the shore. However, the proposed seismic surveys could impact the behavior of both fish and marine mammals, which could affect subsistence hunting and fishing. Seismic surveys would be planned to minimize potential impacts to marine mammals and fish. This will include avoidance of breeding, rearing, or feeding areas critical to the reproductive success of the population for those species of concern.

Recreational Fishing. Impacts to recreational fishing would typically be similar to those described for commercial fishing. However, since most recreational fishing utilizes mobile gear such as hook-and-line fishing from drifting (or trolling) boats, the potential for impacts would generally be less than those described for commercial fishing operations.

Recreational Boating. Impacts to recreational boating would typically be similar to those described for commercial shipping. However, since recreational boats are generally smaller in size than commercial cargo ships, and can easily avoid the seismic research vessel, potential impacts to recreational boating would generally be less than those described for commercial shipping.

3.10.2.1 Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

NW Atlantic

Commercial Fishing. Commercial fisheries in the NW Atlantic DAA could experience temporary, localized reduced catch for some fish species. Survey vessels and towed cables could potentially interfere with commercial fishing gear for the duration of the seismic survey, which ranges from days to months. Overall, the impact on commercial fisheries under Alternative A would not be significant because the potential effects of seismic survey sounds on fisheries would likely be temporary and localized during the period of seismic survey operations (see Section 3.4.5). Minimizing potential impacts to commercial fisheries, due to interference with fishing grounds or fishing gear, could be accomplished through adjustments to tracklines and timing of surveys. During the planning phase of proposed seismic surveys, NSF and the project proponents or USGS would schedule and 'fine-tune' the ship track, as best as possible, to minimize potential adverse impacts to critical life stages of species of concern including fish and marine invertebrates. Communication with fishers during the surveys would serve to further minimize any potential impacts.

Commercial Shipping. At least three commercial shipping lanes occur within the NW Atlantic DAA. However, seismic research activities would take place in deeper waters of the Atlantic shelf. Commercial shipping vessels would be notified of research activities in advance of any surveys. Proposed seismic surveys under Alternative A or Alternative B would not result in significant impacts to commercial shipping because of the limited duration of the surveys and prior notification to commercial vessels.

Research and Exploration Activities. Coordination with other researchers and the oil and gas industry would minimize or eliminate the potential for interference of the proposed NSF-funded or USGS seismic

surveys with other marine research activities. Therefore, proposed seismic surveys under Alternative A or Alternative B would not result in significant impacts to research and exploration activities.

Subsistence Hunting and Fishing. Since there are no subsistence hunting and fishing areas in the NW Atlantic DAA, the proposed seismic research surveys would have no impact on these resources.

Recreational Fishing. Impacts to recreational fishing could occur within the NW Atlantic DAA from proposed seismic surveys. As previously discussed regarding potential impacts to commercial fisheries, impacts would primarily be related to potential short-term behavioral changes of fish due to acoustic sources associated with the seismic surveys. Also, survey vessels could interfere with recreational fishing gear. However, most recreational fishing utilizes mobile gear such as hook-and-line fishing from drifting (or trolling) boats, which is less prone to disruption from marine seismic surveys. Therefore, there would be no significant impacts to recreational fishing with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B.

Recreational Boating. Impacts to recreational boating could occur within the NW Atlantic DAA. However since recreational boats are generally small in size, stay closer to shore than the proposed survey area, and can easily avoid the research vessel, there would be no significant impacts to recreational boating with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B.

S California

Commercial Fisheries. There are more than 14 major commercially fished species in the S California DAA. These commercial fisheries could experience temporary localized reduced catch for some fish species. Survey vessels and towed cables could potentially interfere with commercial fishing gear for the duration of the seismic survey, which ranges from days to months. Overall, the impact on commercial fisheries under Alternative A would not be significant because the potential effects of seismic survey sounds on fisheries would likely be temporary and localized during the period of seismic survey operations (see Section 3.4.5). Minimizing potential impacts to commercial fisheries, from interference with fishing grounds or fishing gear, could be accomplished through adjustments to tracklines and timing of surveys. During the planning phase of proposed seismic surveys, NSF and the project proponents or USGS would schedule and 'fine-tune' the ship track, as best as possible, to minimize potential adverse effects to critical life stages of species of concern including fish and marine invertebrates. Communication with fishers during the surveys would serve to further minimize any potential impacts.

Despite other numerous research and exploration activities and commercial shipping throughout the S California DAA that may affect catchability, the number of fish landings have steadily increased in this area since 2000. Implementation of Alternative A or B would not result in significant impacts to commercial fisheries in the S California DAA.

Commercial Shipping. Commercial shipping vessels would be notified of research activities in advance of any surveys to allow for adjustments to shipping routes and schedules. It is anticipated that if the proposed seismic survey vessel were in the Channel when commercial vessels were in route, that the commercial vessels would avoid the seismic survey vessel. Impacts to commercial shipping would not be significant under Alternative A or Alternative B.

Research and Exploration. The proposed seismic survey could potentially affect other concurrent oceanographic research activities and oil and gas exploration. Under Alternative A or Alternative B, significant impacts to research and exploration would not occur because coordination would take place with other researchers to prevent overlapping schedules and interference with other research or exploration.

Subsistence Hunting and Fishing. There is no known subsistence fishing and hunting in the S California DAA. Therefore, the proposed seismic survey would have no impact on subsistence activities.

Recreational Fishing. Southern California is the leading recreational fishing area along the U.S. Pacific Coast. The proposed seismic surveys may cause temporary and localized changes in fish behavior, which could result in reduced catch. However, recreational fishermen could select alternate locations away from the seismic survey vessel, without substantially affecting their activities. Impacts to recreational fishing under Alternative A or B would not be significant.

Recreational Boating. The proposed seismic survey under Alternative A or B would not have a significant impact on recreational boating because most recreational boaters would select an alternate route without substantially affecting their activities.

W Gulf of Alaska

Commercial Fisheries. Commercial fishing remains the basis of the cash economy in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. These commercial fisheries could experience temporary, localized reduced catch for some fish species. Survey vessels and towed cables could potentially interfere with commercial fishing gear for the duration of the seismic survey, which ranges from days to months. Overall, the impact on commercial fisheries under Alternative A or Alternative B would not be significant because the potential effects of seismic survey sounds on fisheries would likely be temporary and localized during the period of seismic survey operations (see Section 3.4.5). Minimizing potential impacts to commercial fisheries, from interference with fishing grounds or fishing gear, could be accomplished through adjustments to tracklines and timing of surveys. During the planning phase of proposed seismic surveys, NSF and the project proponents or USGS would schedule and 'fine-tune' the ship track, as best as possible, to minimize potential adverse effects to critical life stages of species of concern including fish and marine invertebrates. Communication with fishers during the surveys would serve to further minimize any potential impacts.

Commercial Shipping. The vessel traffic in the waters of the W Gulf of Alaska DAA is limited to passenger or dry cargo vessels and tugboats. Seismic surveys under Alternative A or Alternative B would not result in significant impacts to commercial vessel traffic because surveys would use one vessel that would operate for a limited duration. Moreover, commercial vessels would be notified of research activities in advance of any seismic surveys.

Research and Exploration. Currently, there is no oceanographic research or oil and gas production in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. Therefore, proposed seismic surveys under Alternative A or Alternative B would not impact other research programs or exploration.

Subsistence Hunting and Fishing. Subsistence fishing and hunting is common in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA, specifically in the Chignik village network, which consists of Chignik, Chignik Lagoon, and Chignik Lake. Ocean waters in the vicinity of Chignik are abundant with fish species that have both subsistence and commercial value to Chignik residents. The majority of the hunting of marine mammals occurs close to shore by subsistence hunters, while the seismic source vessel is expected to conduct the seismic survey farther offshore.

Seismic surveys may potentially cause temporary changes in fish behavior and therefore, can reduce catchability. However, most fishing occurs close to shore and the proposed seismic survey would be further offshore. Therefore, given that the planned seismic survey is far offshore of hunting and fishing areas, proposed seismic surveys under Alternative A or Alternative B would have no significant impact on the availability of marine mammals or fish for subsistence harvest.

Recreational Fishing and Boating. The W Gulf of Alaska is somewhat of a remote area particularly in the area of the proposed seismic survey. Recreational fishing and boating is expected to be minimal within the DAA. Therefore, no significant impacts to recreational fishing and boating are anticipated under Alternative A or Alternative B.

3.10.2.2 Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research surveys would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to socioeconomics with implementation of Alternative C.

3.10.3 Summary of Environmental Consequences

Based on available information, there would be no significant impacts to socioeconomics with implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) within the exemplary analysis areas (Table 3.10-7).

Table 3.10-7. Summary of Potential Impacts to Socioeconomics with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

Analysis Area	*Alternative A or Alternative B*
NW Atlantic	• Temporary, localized reduced fish catch to some species – not significant to commercial fisheries. • No significant impacts to commercial shipping, research and exploration activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and recreational fishing and boating.
S California	• Temporary, localized reduced fish catch to some species – not significant to commercial fisheries. • No significant impacts to commercial shipping, research and exploration activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and recreational fishing and boating.
W Gulf of Alaska	• Temporary, localized reduced fish catch to some species – not significant to commercial fisheries. • No significant impacts to commercial shipping, research and exploration activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and recreational fishing and boating.

3.11 CULTURAL RESOURCES

In accordance with NSF policy and EO 12114, cultural resources are addressed for the three DAAs that are located within the 200-nm (370-km) EEZ of the U.S. (NW Atlantic, S California, and W Gulf of Alaska). The three other DAAs and the eight QAAs are not discussed in this section because they are outside of the U.S. EEZ.

Background research and inventories of cultural resources located within each of the DAAs were consulted to assist in complying with NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, and as implemented by 36 CFR Part 800. Section 106 of NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties before undertaking a project. A historic property is defined as any prehistoric or historic site, building, structure, object, or district included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Criteria set forth in federal regulation 36 CFR Part 60 are used to evaluate whether a property is eligible for listing in the NRHP. To qualify for listing in the NRHP, a site, building, structure, object, or district generally should be at least 50 years old; must possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association; and must meet one of the four following criteria:

- Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The types of cultural resources applicable to the offshore locations of the DAAs include prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and traditional cultural properties.

Archaeological resources are sites "where the remnants of a past culture survive in a physical context that allows for the interpretation of these remains" (Little et al. 2000). Sites may include surface or subsurface elements of cultures from prehistory (pre-contact with Europeans) or history (post-contact). The material cultural remains may consist of artifacts (e.g., fragments of tools, arrow points, ceramic vessels), features (e.g., remnants of foundations, hearths, trash middens), or other materials (e.g., ecological remains). Archaeological sites present within the proposed DAAs may include submerged isolated artifacts from prehistoric or historic voyages, and historic shipwrecks.

Traditional cultural properties are sites, districts, buildings, structures, or objects associated with the cultural beliefs, practices, or customs of a living community that are "rooted in that community's history, and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community" (Parker and King 1998). Traditional cultural properties may include locations of historic events, locations where sacred or ceremonial rituals, practices, or activities are or were performed, locations associated with the traditional beliefs or history of a cultural group, traditional hunting or gathering areas of economic and cultural importance, and sources of raw materials used to produce tools or sacred objects. The community may consider these properties significant to the cultural values, identity, and persistence of their traditional culture.

Like other cultural resources, the significance of traditional cultural properties is evaluated by applying the NRHP Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR Part 60). These criteria primarily must be applied through consultation with the cultural group to which the property may have traditional cultural significance.

Consultation with other affected cultural groups also may be necessary to establish the significance of the property. Traditional cultural properties that potentially occur in the DAAs may include subsistence hunting and fishing areas of cultural groups, and locations where Native Americans performed ceremonial activities.

3.11.1 Affected Environment

3.11.1.1 NW Atlantic

Archaeological Resources

There are no recorded archaeological sites in the NW Atlantic DAA. The New Jersey State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) does not have any information on cultural resources beyond 3 mi (4.8 km) of the shoreline. However, there is the potential that prehistoric archaeological sites may be present in the DAA on the continental shelf. At the beginning of the Early Archaic period 10,000 years ago, the relative sea level was approximately 81 to 85 ft (25 to 26 m) lower than at present and the New Jersey shoreline extended approximately 50 mi (80.5 km) beyond its current position (New Jersey SHPO 2006). Prehistoric archaeological deposits could potentially exist if landforms beneath the seafloor are well preserved.

There is also the potential for historic archaeological resources in the NW Atlantic DAA. The Automated Wreck and Obstruction Information System (AWOIS) is a catalogue of reported submerged shipwrecks and obstructions in U.S. coastal waters. This database indicates 29 shipwrecks and obstructions are within the DAA (NOAA 2006). Additional data sources maintained by the recreational scuba diving community in the New Jersey area estimate the number of shipwreck sites off the coast of New Jersey to be between 4,000 to 7,000 (New Jersey Scuba Diver 2006). The majority of these wrecks are located along the coastline and are not within the NW Atlantic DAA.

Traditional Cultural Resources

There are no known traditional cultural properties or subsistence use areas in the NW Atlantic DAA. Because the DAA is more than 25 mi (40 km) offshore, it is unlikely that any traditional cultural properties would be present (New Jersey SHPO 2006).

3.11.1.2 S California

Archaeological Resources

Little information is available on submerged prehistoric archaeological sites in the S California DAA. However, there is the potential that prehistoric archaeological sites may be present in the DAA. Native California peoples settled in villages along the Pacific coast. Along the Santa Barbara Channel, coastal groups developed watercraft for widespread trading expeditions, including travel to the Channel Islands to get steatite to make bowls and effigies. At least 25 individual artifact sites from prehistoric seafaring have been reported between Ventura Beach and Point Conception (Foster 2004).

Historic archaeological resources in the S California DAA consist of submerged shipwrecks and one submerged aircraft. Two shipwreck databases were consulted to identify reported shipwreck sites in this DAA. The NOAA AWOIS indicates numerous reported shipwrecks in the DAA (NOAA 2006). All but one of these sites is within 5 mi (8 km) of the coast.

The California State Lands Commission's (CSLC) online database of California shipwrecks was also searched for known shipwreck sites. The database includes 69 shipwrecks in Santa Barbara County, 41 of which are in the S California DAA. The earliest of these shipwrecks occurred in 1846, and the most

recent in 1968. The most common causes of the wrecks were burning, collision, or stranding (CSLC 2006).

Traditional Cultural Resources

The California Native American Heritage Commission was contacted to identify any potential traditional cultural properties in the S California DAA. The Commission has no recorded properties of traditional cultural significance located offshore; all are located on land (California Native American Heritage Commission 2006).

3.11.1.3 W Gulf of Alaska

Archaeological Resources

There are no recorded prehistoric archaeological sites in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. However, there is the potential that prehistoric archaeological sites may be present on the continental shelf (Alaska Office of History and Archaeology 2006a). The relative sea level 12,000 years ago was probably between 164 to 197 ft (50 to 60 m) lower than at present. Prehistoric archaeological deposits could potentially exist on well-preserved landforms of the continental shelf shoreward of the 197-ft (60-m) bathymetric contour, which roughly approximates the shoreline 12,000 years ago BP (MMS 2006a).

Historic archaeological resources in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA comprise submerged shipwrecks. Two shipwreck databases were consulted to identify reported shipwreck sites in this DAA. The NOAA AWOIS database indicates 22 reported shipwreck and obstruction sites in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA (NOAA 2006). The majority of the sites are within 25 mi (40 km) of the shoreline of the Alaska Peninsula. The MMS database lists 85 shipwrecks near the Alaska Peninsula and in the Gulf of Alaska (MMS 2000). This database lacks precise locational data to accurately determine how many of these shipwrecks may be in the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. However, MMS maps indicate that known shipwrecks are scattered throughout the DAA, with the heaviest concentration within Chignik Bay (10 shipwrecks) (Alaska Office of History and Archaeology 2006b).

Traditional Cultural Resources

The W Gulf of Alaska DAA includes subsistence use areas of traditional cultural significance to Alaska Peninsula Native people, who are ancestors of the maritime hunting cultures of Pacific and Yupi'k Eskimos and Aleuts (Fall and Utermohle 1995). Today, these Native Alaskans live in a network of villages, of which the three principal ones are Chignik, Chignik Lagoon, and Chignik Lake. Their primary subsistence activity is fishing all five species of Pacific salmon, halibut, cod, and other fish species. These resources hold both subsistence and commercial value to the Chignik Native population. Other subsistence activities of the Chignik-area Natives include hunting marine and coastal animals such as harbor seals, clams, and waterfowl (MMS 1993; Fall and Utermohle 1995).

The Chignik villages have a village-kinship network formed from four major extended families. The family networks take part in traditional activities, including fishing, hunting, and gathering subsistence resources. Native families primarily share or give away resources to other families within the Chignik village network, but they also share resources with many other communities on the Alaska Peninsula. Sharing resources has been a fundamental value of the Chignik Native population (MMS 1993). The nutritional value of the subsistence resources is also important to the Chignik Native population, who believe a diet consisting of entirely store-bought food is not healthy (Fall and Utermohle 1995).

The subsistence use areas of the Chignik Native population overlap with the northwestern portion of the W Gulf of Alaska DAA. The subsistence use areas for harvesting fish and marine and coastal animals are

along the Pacific coast of the Alaska Peninsula, including Chignik Bay (Fall and Utermohle 1995). The off-shore distances of these harvest areas are not known. Nonetheless, the DAA extends along the coast, and thus, would include these subsistence use areas.

3.11.1.4 Summary of Cultural Resources

A summary of cultural resources within each of the four DAAs is presented in Table 3.11-1.

Table 3.11-1. Summary of Occurrence of Cultural Resources within the DAAs

Cultural Resource	*DAA*		
	NW Atlantic	*S California*	*W Gulf of Alaska*
Prehistoric Archaeological	None recorded; potential for sites on continental shelf.	None recorded; sites likely occur in Santa Barbara Channel.	None recorded; potential for sites on continental shelf shoreward of 197-ft (60-m) bathymetric contour.
Historic Archaeological	At least 29 reported shipwrecks.	Numerous reported shipwrecks.	Numerous reported shipwrecks.
Traditional Cultural Properties	None recorded.	None recorded.	Subsistence use areas of Chignik Native population overlap NW portion of DAA.

3.11.2 Environmental Consequences

Criteria set forth in 36 CFR 800 are used to evaluate the effects of an undertaking on historic properties. The regulation defines an effect as an alteration to the characteristics of a historic property that qualify it for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Project activities may directly or indirectly affect significant cultural resources. Potential effects of the proposed seismic research surveys may include the following:

- Physical destruction of or damage to all or part of the property.
- Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its significance.
- Introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features.

Elements of the proposed action that may affect archaeological resources include: ground-disturbing activities from seismic research cruises (e.g., placing certain types of equipment on the ocean floor) and scientific dredging, drilling, and coring. Potential impacts to traditional cultural properties include increased noise over traditional use areas and disturbances to subsistence resources.

3.11.2.1 Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

NW Atlantic

Archaeological Resources. As described in Section 3.11.1.1, there are several known historic shipwreck sites in the deep ocean waters of the NW Atlantic DAA, but no other known or recorded archaeological sites. Although equipment (e.g., OBS/H) may be released from the research vessel as part of proposed seismic survey activities and sink to the ocean floor, it is improbable that the equipment would come into contact with a shipwreck because of the sparse distribution of these sites across the DAA. If the equipment were to land on a shipwreck, it would have minimal to no effect on the historical integrity of the shipwreck. The OBS/H is designed to be deployed and recovered. After an OBS/H has been on the

bottom for a period of time (days to months), it would release from its anchor and float to the surface for recovery by the research vessel.

The proposed seismic research surveys could also include limited scientific dredging, drilling, or coring. Any of these three research activities could directly impact submerged archaeological sites. If dredging, drilling, or coring is part of any research cruise, then the project proponent would obtain the necessary permits and fulfill permit requirements, including initiating consultation with the New Jersey SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA. A tiered, cruise-specific EA would address any potential site-specific impacts to cultural resources.

Traditional Cultural Resources. No traditional cultural properties or subsistence use areas have been identified in the NW Atlantic DAA.

S California

Archaeological Resources. As described in Section 3.11.1.3, there is the potential that prehistoric archaeological sites may be present in the S California DAA, although none have been formally recorded. This DAA also contains numerous historic archaeological sites, including dozens of shipwrecks and one submerged aircraft, the majority of which are within 5 mi (8 km) of the mainland and 6 nm (11 km) of the coasts of San Miguel, Santa Rosa, and Santa Cruz Islands of Channel Islands National Park. Segments of the proposed trackline of the seismic survey would come within approx. 3.7 mi (6 km) of the mainland and the coast of Santa Cruz Island.

Although equipment (e.g., OBS/H) may be released from the research vessel as part of proposed seismic survey activities and sink to the ocean floor, it is improbable that the equipment would come into contact with a shipwreck because of the sparse distribution of these sites across the DAA. If the equipment were to land on a shipwreck, it would have minimal to no effect on the historical integrity of the shipwreck. The OBS/H is designed to be deployed and recovered. After an OBS/H has been on the bottom for a period of time (days to months), it would release from its anchor and float to the surface for recovery by the research vessel.

The proposed seismic research surveys could also include limited scientific dredging, drilling, or coring. Any of these three research activities could directly impact submerged archaeological sites. If dredging, drilling, or coring is part of any research cruise, then the project proponent would obtain the necessary permits and fulfill permit requirements, including initiating consultation with the California SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA. A tiered, cruise-specific EA would address any potential site-specific impacts to cultural resources.

Traditional Cultural Resources. No traditional cultural properties or subsistence use areas have been identified in the S California DAA.

W Gulf of Alaska

Archaeological Resources. The W Gulf of Alaska DAA does not include any recorded prehistoric archaeological sites, although there is the potential that prehistoric archaeological deposits may be present on certain areas of the continental shelf, as described in Section 3.11.1.4. Historic archaeological sites in the DAA consist of numerous shipwrecks, most of which are near the shoreline of the Alaska Peninsula. Portions of the projected trackline of the W Gulf of Alaska cruise would come within 10 mi (16 km) of the peninsula shore.

Although equipment (e.g., OBS/H) may be released from the research vessel as part of proposed seismic survey activities and sink to the ocean floor, it is improbable that the equipment would come into contact

with a shipwreck because of the sparse distribution of these sites across the DAA. If the equipment were to land on a shipwreck, it would have minimal to no effect on the historical integrity of the shipwreck. The OBS/H is designed to be deployed and recovered. After an OBS/H has been on the bottom for a period of time (days to months), it would release from its anchor and float to the surface for recovery by the research vessel.

The proposed seismic research surveys could also include limited scientific dredging, drilling, or coring. Any of these three research activities could directly impact submerged archaeological sites. If dredging, drilling, or coring is part of any research cruise, then the project proponent would obtain the necessary permits and fulfill permit requirements, including initiating consultation with the Alaska SHPO in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA. A tiered, cruise-specific EA would address any potential site-specific impacts to cultural resources.

Traditional Cultural Resources. The W Gulf of Alaska DAA includes subsistence use areas of traditional cultural significance to Alaska Peninsula Native people. The Chignik Native population harvests fish and hunts marine and coastal mammals along the Pacific coast of the Alaska Peninsula, including Chignik Bay. The off-shore distances of these harvest areas are indeterminate; nonetheless, the DAA extends along the coast, and thus, would potentially include these subsistence use areas.

Potential effects from a seismic research survey could result in reductions in subsistence resources and in changes in subsistence resource distribution patterns. For instance, sounds from airguns during seismic research surveys can sometimes cause changes in the distribution and catchability of fish. They can also alter the migration route of some marine mammals to avoid the disturbance. Harbor seals are the primary marine mammal hunted by the Chignik Native population, but studies vary as to the degree of avoidance of pinnipeds within an area of operating airguns. Nonetheless, avoidance reactions of pinniped species are expected to be of short duration and limited to relatively small distances, and with no long-term behavioral reactions (LGL 2005).

The potential impacts of the seismic research survey would likely be localized and temporary. However, an interruption or temporary reduction of subsistence resources may still impact certain Chignik-area communities. A reduction in the Chignik population's primary subsistence resources of fish and harbor seals would reduce their opportunities to share the subsistence resources with other families and communities and also impact the diets of Chignik Native people, who depend upon and believe in the nutritional value of subsistence resources in their diets.

Disturbances to subsistence resources and increased noise over traditional subsistence use areas have been cited by Native Americans as potentially significant impacts (U.S. Navy 2002). When a project proponent has identified a specific area within the W Gulf of Alaska within which a seismic research survey is proposed, then a site-specific EA would be prepared as a tiered-NEPA document and supplement this PEIS. The project proponent would consult with the affected Chignik Native population to develop appropriate measures to mitigate any potential impacts that the seismic research survey may have on subsistence resources.

One of the most effective measures for minimizing or eliminating impacts to subsistence resources is to schedule the research cruise before or after the primary periods of subsistence hunting and fishing. Regardless of the season of the seismic cruise, Alternatives A and B would implement measures to reduce impacts to marine mammals (refer to Section 2.6.1.1 for detailed descriptions of these mitigation measures).

3.11.2.2 Alternative C (No-Action Alternative)

Under the No-Action Alternative, NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research surveys would not occur. Therefore, baseline conditions would remain unchanged and there would be no impacts to cultural resources with implementation of Alternative C.

3.11.3 Summary of Environmental Consequences

Based on available information, there would be no significant impacts to cultural resources with implementation of Alternative A or B within the exemplary analysis areas (Table 3.11-2).

Table 3.11-2. Summary of Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources with Implementation of Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)

DAA	*Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative)*	
NW Atlantic	• No significant impacts to archaeological resources. • No traditional cultural resources present.	
S California	• No significant impacts to archaeological resources. • No traditional cultural resources present.	
W Gulf of Alaska	• Adverse but not significant impacts to archaeological and traditional cultural resources.	

CHAPTER 4
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS AND IRREVERSIBLE/IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

4.1 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

CEQ regulations (40 CFR §§1500 – 1508) implementing the provisions of NEPA, as amended (42 USC §§4321 *et seq*.) provide the definition of cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are defined as:

> "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions." (40 CFR §1508.7)

Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. A cumulative impact results from the additive effect of all projects in the same geographical area. Generally, an impact can be considered cumulative if: a) effects of several actions occur in the same locale, b) effects on a particular resource are the same in nature, and c) effects are long-term in nature. The common factor key to cumulative assessment is identifying any potential temporally and/or spatially overlapping or successive effects that may significantly affect individual or populations of marine resources occurring in the analysis areas.

4.1.1 Potential Cumulative Effects Issues

Marine seismic research surveys funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS may occur in various study areas distributed across the world's oceans including the Atlantic, Pacific, Arctic, Indian, and S Oceans, as well as peripheral seas such as the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea, Bering Sea, Gulf of Alaska, Mediterranean Sea, etc. The overall time frame for the analysis of the cumulative effects is assumed to be 5 years. In any given year, NSF may typically fund 4-7 seismic surveys per year and the USGS may conduct 8-12 seismic surveys per year, all in different locations. The duration of a cruise would range from days to 7 weeks with approx. 1 to 2 weeks of transit and/or preparation between cruises. Seismic operations may last 30-800 hr during a seismic survey. Some seismic surveys could be conducted simultaneously on different vessels, but would occur in different locations. Once a cruise has been completed, the next cruise would typically occur far from the previous site or in a different region. However, consecutive cruises may occasionally occur in the same location or the same region (e.g., the N Pacific), but they would not be expected to occur simultaneously in the same location.

4.1.1.1 Underwater Noise

Chapter 3 describes the affected environment of the exemplary analysis areas along with the environmental consequences of implementing the proposed seismic surveys. Direct and indirect effects of the proposed marine seismic research would result from noise from airgun arrays and other acoustic sources, vessel traffic, and scientific dredging or coring. From a cumulative effects perspective, the notable issue associated with marine seismic research centers around the noise generated during seismic surveys. The addition of underwater noise to ambient noise levels in the ocean could have impacts on marine invertebrates, fish, seabirds, sea turtles, and marine mammals.

There are several categories of other past, present, and future planned actions with noise-producing activities that must be considered when analyzing the cumulative impacts of the proposed seismic surveys. These actions generally include commercial shipping, oil and gas exploration and production, aircraft flights, naval operations, research, commercial fishing, and recreational activities. It is worthwhile

to note that many of these actions are thought to have contributed to increases in the ambient sound levels in the world's oceans (US Navy 2001; McDonald et al. 2006).

The number of commercial ships on the world's oceans significantly increases from year to year. From 1995 to 1999, it is estimated that the commercial fleet increased from approximately 73,000 vessels in 1995 to approximately 82,000, a 12% in just 4 years (NRC 2003a). To get a sense of how the number of cruises (five to seven a year) under the proposed action compares with commercial shipping vessel traffic, some of the commercial shipping data from Section 3.10 is repeated here. Commercial shipping records for the NW Atlantic DAA show more than 380,000 vessel trips in 2004 and more than 26,000 vessel trips for the S California DAA. Another document reports 279,000 vessel trips for the Gulf of Mexico per year. These vessel trips portray only a portion of the global commercial shipping industry, which is one of the greatest contributors of overall noise in the world's oceans (MMS 2004). When one considers the extremely low number of vessel trips per year (five to seven) proposed by NSF and the USGS, this amounts to less than 0.001% of the total vessel trips for only the NW Atlantic, S California, and Gulf of Mexico areas. If the total vessel trips worldwide are included, the percentage would be significantly smaller.

Another contributor to underwater noise is the oil and gas industry where it is estimated that there are approximately 100 ships worldwide, with 15-20 operating at any one time (Jopling et al. 2006). It should be noted that the proposed NSF-funded marine seismic activities assessed in this PEIS, due to their proposed location and types of activities, generally occur in areas that are not subject to oil and gas exploration. Underwater sounds generated from passing aircraft are transient in nature with peak received noise levels in the water occurring as an aircraft passes directly overhead (MMS 2004). Altogether, these other actions may include multiple causes and multiple effects, which may occur in more than one locale.

4.1.2 Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

4.1.2.1 Marine Invertebrates, Fish, and Seabirds

Some decapod crustaceans and cephalopods might detect the particle displacement/motion caused by airgun and airgun array sounds. A lesser number of invertebrate species might similarly detect the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers. Acoustic impacts on marine invertebrates from the exemplary seismic program would likely include adverse pathological and physiological effects only within a few meters from an active source operating at high levels. Behavioral effects on marine invertebrates would potentially extend to somewhat greater ranges. On a population level, these potential effects are considered insignificant.

The principal impacts to marine fish from the exemplary seismic program are expected to be short-term behavioral or physiological effects from airguns and airgun array sounds. Potential impacts to fish from exposure to the MBESs, SBPs, and pingers would be considerably less because few fish are capable of detecting the high-frequency sounds produced by these two acoustic sources. Impacts to marine fish from the proposed action are not predicted to be significant.

Acoustic impacts of airguns or sonar devices on seabirds are unlikely to occur under the proposed marine seismic research. There would be no significant impacts to individual seabirds or their populations from the proposed seismic surveys.

A variety of other activities occur to various degrees in each of the exemplary regions that have the potential to affect marine invertebrates, fish, and seabirds. Marine fish and, to a much lesser extent, seabirds may be impacted by vessel traffic and noise from commercial shipping, the oil and gas industry,

and military activities, among others. Moreover, many marine fish species are impacted by the commercial fishing industry.

In any given year, there would typically be from 4-7 seismic surveys funded by NSF or 8-12 seismic surveys conducted by USGS. This represents a very minor (short-term) incremental increase in the overall level of human activity. Moreover, the planned monitoring and mitigation measures, which include avoiding sensitive habitats and/or seasons, visual monitoring, and safety radii, would all serve to reduce the level of impact and the likelihood of cumulative effects. Impacts to marine invertebrates and fish from the Proposed Action in combination with other cumulative activities are expected to be very limited, consisting of primarily short-term behavior. Cumulative impacts to seabirds would be negligible. Significant cumulative impacts to marine invertebrates, fish, and seabirds are not expected in the exemplary analysis areas or elsewhere.

4.1.2.2 Sea Turtles

There is some overlap between sea turtle hearing and the frequencies of the acoustic sources proposed for the exemplary surveys. Acoustic impacts on individual sea turtles from the exemplary seismic program are expected to consist of short-term behavioral disturbance if an individual were close to an operating airgun. There are no data with respect to the potential for PTS, injury or mortality. No sea turtle mortality has been documented during seismic operations funded by NSF or conducted by USGS and none is expected during the proposed surveys.

In each of the exemplary regions, a variety of human activities occur, including, to various degrees, commercial and recreational vessel traffic, fisheries, oil and gas exploration and development, coastal development, and hunting. Some of these activities lead directly to sea turtle mortality. Threats to sea turtles include beach development, sand mining, oil spills, ship strikes, entanglement in fishing gear, ingestion of marine garbage, and destruction of feeding habitat. These activities, when conducted separately or in combination with other activities, including the exemplary seismic surveys, could affect sea turtles in the study areas.

In all of the regional areas of interest, the planned exemplary seismic surveys represent a very minor (short-term) incremental increase in the overall level of human activity. Furthermore, the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, including avoiding sensitive habitats and/or seasons, serve to reduce the level of impact and the likelihood of cumulative effects. Any cumulative effects that are incurred are expected to result in no more than a negligible impact on sea turtle populations in the 13 exemplary analysis areas or elsewhere.

4.1.2.3 Marine Mammals

Cumulative impacts to marine mammals are based on (1) those that undertake localized and/or long-distance migrations (e.g., pinnipeds, mysticetes, and odontocetes) and (2) those that tend to be more resident and/or occur in only one of the analysis areas (e.g., sea otter, and manatee). Given the oftentimes wide distribution and migratory distances characteristic of many marine mammals and the global-ocean occurrence of the proposed marine seismic research, cumulative effects are addressed on an ocean-region basis as done for the environmental consequences sections. This is considered an appropriate scale in relation to the ranges of many migratory populations of marine mammals. While multiple genetically distinct or separate populations of marine mammals may occur within each region, there is also genetic interchange within and even sometimes across these regions. This is the context and level within which cumulative effects on marine mammals are addressed below.

Mysticetes, Odontocetes, and Pinnipeds

No significant cumulative effects are anticipated on pinnipeds, mysticetes or odontocetes with respect to NSF-funded or USGS seismic survey cruises in the exemplary analysis areas. Effects of each exemplary survey within each DAA were modeled and impacts to marine mammals within all 13 analysis areas are expected to be limited to localized and short-term behavioral changes. Thus no impacts are anticipated at the regional population level. The few, relatively short, localized NSF or USGS cruises in the context of the ocean-region basis would not have more than a negligible cumulative effect on marine mammals at the individual or population level. Possible exceptions are local non-migratory populations or populations highly concentrated in one area at one time of year (e.g., for breeding). However, the latter scenario would be mitigated by timing and locating proposed seismic surveys to avoid sensitive seasons and/or locations important to marine mammals, especially those that are ESA-listed. This is a standard mitigation procedure that has been followed during past NSF-funded seismic surveys and would continue to be implemented.

It is possible that a long-migrating animal or population exposed during one NSF cruise could be exposed to a subsequent cruise(s) during migration of the same or different years at another location or region (e.g., a summer survey could occur in the W Gulf of Alaska followed by a fall survey off the BC Coast); this is the same seasonal migration pattern of some mysticetes, pinnipeds, and odontocetes, including the humpback whale, sperm whale, and Steller sea lion. However, such exposure would be considered a series of short-term behavioral changes. There is no evidence that such short-term effects, whether considered alone or in succession, result in long-term adverse impacts to individuals or populations assuming important habitats or activities are not disturbed. Furthermore, long-migrating marine mammals in particular have undoubtedly been exposed to many anthropogenic underwater sound activities for decades in all ocean basins. Many of these populations continue to grow despite a preponderance of anthropogenic marine activities that have been documented to disturb some individuals behaviorally (e.g., Hildebrand 2004; see Appendix E).

With respect to non-NSF or non-USGS marine seismic research activities within the 13 analysis areas, there is wide variation in levels and types of human-related activities that are currently ongoing and/or planned for the foreseeable future. Those activities with potential to affect marine mammals in addition to the proposed NSF-funded or USGS seismic survey operations include seismic and other activities involved with oil and gas exploration, recreation, tourism and commercial vessel traffic, military exercises and operations, fishing activity, hunting and/or incidental mortality, and pollution, among others.

Cumulative impacts to mysticetes, odontocetes, and pinnipeds are expected to be negligible and insignificant in all 13 exemplary analysis areas. This is particularly so in areas that lack or have limited amounts of human-related activities. These include the mid-ocean Galapagos Ridge and Caribbean DAAs, and the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, Sub-Antarctic, and Marianas QAAs. The SW Atlantic and W India QAAs are considered areas with mid-level anthropogenic activities. In contrast, the potential for cumulative impacts could be elevated in areas with increased human activity such as the NW Atlantic, S California, and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs, and the BC Coast, N Atlantic/Iceland, and W Australia QAAs. In the latter areas, careful pre-cruise planning to avoid sensitive locations and periods, and coordination with other activities that may have adverse impacts, along with mitigation and monitoring, can avoid and minimize the potential for cumulative impacts. In general, along with NMFS permitting requirements, NSF-funded cruises also coordinate with and oftentimes obtain permits or conduct country-specific impact assessments as required to operate in waters near foreign countries. Through this process, potential

operational conflicts or overlaps with other human-related activities that may affect marine mammals can be identified, minimized, and/or avoided. Cumulative impacts are anticipated to be insignificant given the pre-cruise planning and coordination with other ongoing and planned activities as well as mitigation and monitoring during proposed seismic operations.

Other Marine Mammals (Sea Otter and W Indian Manatee)

Sea Otter. Sea otters occur in the S California and W Gulf of Alaska DAAs, and in the BC Coast QAA; all three areas fall within the N Pacific region and represent different sea otter populations. Human activities in the N Pacific region are extensive and include fishing, commercial, recreational and to a lesser extent scientific vessel traffic, coastal development, oil and gas exploration and production, and military activities.

Cumulative effects from the planned exemplary surveys are considered unlikely and insignificant in all three areas. The S California DAA involves the use of a small array in shallow to intermediate water depth, while the W Gulf of Alaska DAA and BC Coast QAA would involve a large array. Sea otters spend most of their time at the surface of the water and favor shallow coastal waters that would be avoided by the survey vessels. Both of these latter factors would mitigate any potential for negative or cumulative effects. Proposed mitigation measures would also ensure that sea otters were not exposed to sounds >180 dB re 1 µPa (rms).

The exemplary proposed seismic surveys would be expected to provide no more than a very minor, localized (and short-term) increment in the level of regional human activity within each study area. Furthermore, timing of exemplary surveys would be coordinated with NMFS and USFWS and other potential stakeholders to minimize potential spatial and temporal overlap with other anthropogenic activities that may affect the same sea otter populations. Simultaneous NSF-funded or USGS seismic surveys would be planned so that they would not overlap in time and space where there could be additive impacts to sea otters.

W Indian Manatee. The W Indian manatee is considered rare and is affiliated with nearshore coastal waters in the one analysis area where it could occur, the Caribbean DAA. Human activities in this region include oil and gas exploration and production, commercial and recreational vessel traffic including tourism, as well as fishing and hunting of marine mammals. These activities, when conducted separately or in combination with other activities such as the exemplary seismic program, could and are known to affect marine mammals. Thus, in theory, these activities could potentially affect manatees that may occasionally occur in the study area. However, no manatees were seen during a seismic survey in the Caribbean in the spring of 2004 (Smultea et al. 2004).

Although an exemplary large array is considered at the Caribbean DAA, potential impacts are expected to be limited and highly localized as manatees are typically confined to nearshore waters <100 m deep characterized by vegetation (see section 3.8.5.1). This habitat would be avoided by the survey vessel as seismic operations would occur primarily in more offshore waters. Mitigation measures would further ensure that manatees were not exposed to sound levels >180 dB re 1 µPa (rms).

In summary, the potential of encountering a manatee is rare at best at the Caribbean DAA. Furthermore, the proposed generally offshore seismic surveys would be short-term and transient and localized in nature. Thus, associated cumulative impacts are highly unlikely and would be insignificant to individuals or the population of manatees in the region.

4.1.2.4 Socioeconomics and Cultural Resources

None of the socioeconomic characteristics evaluated would experience significant impacts from the proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research. Commercial fisheries could be impacted by the localized short-term behavioral effects to fish from the seismic surveys. Commercial vessels would be notified of research activities in advance of any seismic surveys, which would operate for a limited duration in any one location. Coordination with other researchers would minimize or eliminate the potential for interference with other marine research and exploration activities. Seismic surveys are usually in deeper waters while subsistence hunting and fishing generally occur closer to the shore; cruises would be planned to avoid breeding, rearing, or feeding areas critical to the species of concern to subsistence hunting and fishing. Recreational fishing and boating activities can easily avoid seismic research vessels so potential impacts are negligible.

Similarly, the proposed seismic surveys would not result in significant impacts to cultural resources. Prehistoric archaeological deposits, such as shipwrecks or submerged aircraft, may be present within certain areas of the exemplary analysis areas. If a particular cruise would include limited scientific dredging or coring, then coordination would be conducted with the appropriate SHPO when tiered cruise-specific EAs are developed to obtain any necessary site-specific data on the locations of submerged cultural resources (e.g., shipwrecks) so as to avoid said cultural resources. Potential impacts to traditional cultural resources, which include subsistence areas of traditional cultural significance, would be avoided by scheduling cruises before or after the primary periods of subsistence hunting and fishing.

Various other human activities have the potential to affect both socioeconomic characteristics and cultural resources. These resources tend to be rather localized and the potential for significant impact from the proposed marine seismic research is rather unlikely. Further, the planned monitoring and mitigation measures, including coordination with other organizations responsible for other ongoing and planned activities (e.g., commercial vessels) all serve to reduce the level of impact and the likelihood of cumulative effects. Any cumulative effects to socioeconomic characteristics and cultural resources are expected to be negligible.

4.1.2.5 Other Potential Cumulative Effects Issues

In addition to the expected primary impact to marine fauna associated with underwater noise from implementation of the Proposed Action, a number of additional factors may cumulatively impact marine invertebrates, fish, sea turtles, and mammals. These include, but are not limited to, disease, natural and man-made toxins, predation, climate change, and debris ingestion. These factors, as appropriate, would be examined in detail during the preparation of site-specific environmental documents and the associated cumulative effects analyses.

4.1.3 Summary of Cumulative Impacts

The results of this cumulative impacts analysis indicate that there would not be any significant cumulative effects to marine resources from the proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research. All seismic cruises would be permitted according to the rules and regulations of the applicable agencies of U.S. federal, state, and foreign governments.

While there are uncertainties about the location and timing of future human activities in combination with the proposed seismic surveys at the programmatic level, cruise-specific EAs would be prepared when a particular seismic research activity is proposed. A more detailed, cruise-specific cumulative effects analysis would be conducted at the time of the preparation of the cruise-specific EAs, allowing for the identification of other potential activities in the area of the proposed seismic survey that may result in

cumulative impacts to environmental resources. These cruise-specific EAs would also take into consideration the seasonal distribution of marine resources and acoustic properties of a proposed site to develop site-specific mitigation measures. These additional mitigation measures would be followed to ensure that potential cumulative impacts do not become significant. For example, if noise modeling results indicate that Level A (injury) harassment impacts to marine mammals or threatened and endangered marine mammal species may occur, then additional mitigation measures would be added to the cruise parameters to reduce and eliminate the potential for Level A harassment impacts to marine mammals that may occur in the project area.

4.2 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

In accordance with Section 102 (c)(v) of NEPA, an EIS should identify "any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented." The proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would allow academic or U.S. government scientists, respectively, to conduct marine seismic surveys to investigate the geology and geophysics of the seafloor. In terms of renewable resources, the proposed research would not result in the destruction of marine resources such that the range of potential uses of the marine environment would be limited. Nonrenewable resources that would be consumed during the operation of seismic research vessels include fuel and oil. The proposed seismic surveys would also require a commitment of human labor and financial resources. Since the reuse of these resources may not be possible, they would be irreversibly and irretrievably committed as part of the proposed marine seismic research. Nonetheless, commitment of these resources would not be considered significant.

4.3 POSSIBLE CONFLICTS BETWEEN THE PROPOSED ACTION AND THE OBJECTIVES OF FEDERAL LAND USE POLICIES, PLANS, AND CONTROLS

The proposed NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research would comply with applicable federal, state, regional, and local laws and regulations. Therefore, there would be no conflicts between proposed marine seismic research and the objectives of federal, state, regional, and local land use plans, policies, and controls. The numerous environmental statutes and their requirements that have been considered throughout this analysis include:

- NEPA
- MMPA
- ESA
- MSA
- Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)
- Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)
- Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships
- CWA

4.3.1 National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

This PEIS has been prepared in accordance with CEQ regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR Part 1500-1508) and NOAA Environmental Review Procedures for Implementing NEPA (NOAA Administrative Order Series 216-6, May 20, 1999). Similarly, public involvement and review are also being conducted in compliance with NEPA.

4.3.2 Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA)

The proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would be conducted in compliance with the MMPA. At the cruise-specific stage, and if applicable, NSF or the USGS would submit an application for an IHA or LOA to NMFS and/or USFWS under Section 101(a)(5) of the MMPA to incidentally take marine mammals during activities associated with the proposed marine seismic research. An IHA or LOA would only be issued if the required findings and determinations described in Section 101(a)(5) of the MMPA could be met.

4.3.3 Endangered Species Act (ESA)

The proposed marine seismic research would not adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or species proposed as such, and would not adversely modify designated critical habitat. The information in this PEIS will be used by NSF or the USGS to support ESA section 7 consultations with NMFS and the USFWS regarding marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by USGS.

4.3.4 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA)

The proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would have no adverse effects on EFH or reduce the productive capacity of any fish stock. This PEIS will be used by NSF or the USGS to support a determination of no adverse effects on EFH for the conduct of the proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research.

4.3.5 Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)

Under the CZMA, "any federal activity within or outside of the coastal zone that affects any land or water use or natural resource of the coastal zone" shall be "consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies" of a state's coastal management plan. NSF and the USGS have, respectively, determined that the proposed NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research would be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with relevant state coastal management policies. When a specific marine seismic research cruise has been funded by NSF, NSF would submit a coastal consistency determination to the appropriate state agency when a site-specific EA is prepared.

4.3.6 Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act

The Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 prohibits the transport of any material from the U.S. for the purpose of dumping it into ocean waters without a permit. The proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would not involve any ocean dumping. A reauthorization of Title III in 1992 resulted in the renaming of this section to the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. The first two titles of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act continue to provide protection to the ocean by preventing ocean dumping of toxic materials. This Act also authorizes National Marine Sanctuaries. NSF has determined that its marine seismic research would not destroy, cause the loss of or injure any sanctuary resource. As a result, consultation with the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management is not necessary.

4.3.7 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA)

The MBTA was designed to protect migratory birds (including their eggs, nests, and feathers) and their habitats. Migratory birds are viewed as a shared resource, and collaboration with other nations (Canada, Mexico, Russia, and Japan) is aimed at cooperatively protecting this resource. The proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would not result in the taking or killing of any migratory birds.

4.3.8 Clean Water Act (CWA)

The CWA is intended to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological properties of U.S. waters. This is accomplished in part through the permitted discharges of pollutants to navigable and ocean waters. The proposed NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research would not result in discharges of any pollutants to ocean waters. The operation of research vessels would only result in discharges incidental to normal operations of a surface vessel.

4.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES AND LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

NEPA requires consideration of the relationship between short-term use of the environment and the impacts that such use could have on the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity of the impacted environment. The proposed marine seismic research would allow academic scientists to investigate the geology and geophysics of the seafloor. This research would require both short-term and long-term commitments of human labor and financial resources. Nonrenewable resources that would be consumed during the operation of seismic research vessels include fuel and oil. The planned monitoring and mitigation measures, which include avoiding sensitive habitats and/or seasons, visual monitoring, and safety radii, would all serve to minimize the effects of the proposed marine seismic research. The majority of effects from marine seismic research would be temporary in nature. As a result, implementation of the proposed marine seismic research would not result in any environmental impacts that would significantly affect the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity of the marine environment.

4.5 COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER EOS

4.5.1 EO 12114, *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions*

This EO requires an analysis of environmental impacts in cases where a federal agency's actions could significantly affect the global commons, the environment of a foreign nation, or protected global resources. Thus, this PEIS has been prepared in accordance with EO 12114.

4.6 GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION

NSF would consult with the governments of other nations in cases where cruises would be planned in their territorial waters. This government-to-government consultation would be conducted after a cruise-specific EA or other appropriate environmental documentation is prepared so that the results of the impact analysis may be made available to that nation's government.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

CHAPTER 5
LITERATURE CITED

Ackerman, B.B. 1995. Aerial surveys of manatees: a summary and progress report. Pages 13–33 *in* T.J. O'Shea, B.B. Ackerman, and H.F. Percival, eds. Population Biology of the Florida Manatee (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*). Information and Technology Report 1. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Biological Service, Washington, DC.

Adam, P.J. and G.G. Garcia. 2003. New information on the natural history, distribution, and skull size of the extinct (?) West Indian monk seal, *Monachus tropicalis*. Marine Mammal Science 19:297-317.

ADEH. 2001. Guidelines on the Application of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act to Interactions between Offshore Seismic Operations and Larger Cetaceans. October. http://www.deh.gov.au/epbc/policy/seismic/#download. Last updated 6 May 2006, accessed 10 May 2006.

ADEH. 2005. Draft Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia. http://www.deh.gov.au/biodiversity/threatened/publications/recovery/marine-turtles/index.html. Last updated 6 May 2006, accessed 3 June 2006.

ADEH. 2006. Marine Species Conservation: Marine Turtles. http://www.deh.gov.au/coasts/species/turtles/index.html. Last updated 13 April, accessed 13 June.

ADFG. 2005. Turtle. http://www.adfg.state.ak.us/pubs/notebook/amphibia/turtle.php. Last updated 23 May 2005, accessed 1 June 2006.

ADFG. 2006a. Personal communication via telephone, Jeff Estensen, Fisheries Biologist, Nome, AK. 7 June.

ADFG. 2006b. COMFISH 2006, March 16 ,17, and 18, 2006. Prepared by ADFG, Division of Commercial Fisheries, Westward Region.

ADFG. 2006c. Personal communication via telephone, Ken Bouwens, Fisheries Biologist, Kodiak, AK. 13 June.

Advanced Research Projects Agency. 1995. Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the California Acoustic Thermometry of Ocean Climate (ATOC) Project and its Associated Marine Mammal Research Program. Volume 1.

Agler, B.A., S.J. Kendall, P.E. Seiser, and J.R. Lindell. 1995. Estimates of marine bird and sea otter abundance in southeast Alaska during summer 1994. Migratory Bird Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, AK.

Agudo, A.I. 1995. Varamentos de cetaceos mariños e de esteiro en Venezuela (Caribe Sudoriental, America do Sur). Eubalaena 6:7-22.

Aguilar de Soto, N., M. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, P.L. Tyack, A. Bocconcelli, and F. Borsani. 2006. Does intense ship noise disrupt foraging in deep-diving Cuvier's beaked whales (*Ziphius cavirostris*)? Marine Mammal Science 22:690-699.

Airame, S., J.E. Dugan, K.D. Lafferty, H. Leslie, D.A. McArdle, and R.R. Warner. 2003. Applying ecological criteria to marine reserve design: A case study from the California Channel Islands. Ecological Applications 13:S170-S184.

Akamatsu, T., Y. Hatakeyama, and N. Takatsu. 1993. Effects of pulsed sounds on escape behavior of false killer whales. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 59:1297-1303.

Akematsu, T., A. Nanami, and H.Y. Yan. 2003. Spotlined sardine *Sardinops melanosticus* listens to 1-kHz sound by using its gas bladder. Fisheries Science 69:348-354.

Alaska Office of History and Archaeology. 2006a. Personal communication via email, Joan Dale, Archaeologist/Forensic Consultant, Anchorage, AK. 14 June.

Alaska Office of History and Archaeology. 2006b. Personal communication via email, Dave McMahan, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer/State Archaeologist, Anchorage, AK. 16 June.

Allen, B.M. and R.P. Angliss. Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2010. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-206. NMFS, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA. February.

Alstrup, J. and B. Møhl. 1993. Detection of intense ultrasound by the cod *Gadus morhua*. Journal of Experimental Biology 182:71-80.

Alstrup, J. and B. Møhl. 1998. Discrimination between high and low repetition rates of ultrasonic pulses by the cod. Journal of Fish Biology 52:205-208.

Alvarado, J. and A. Figueroa. 1995. East Pacific green turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. Pages 24-36 *in* P.T. Plotkin, ed. Status Reviews of Sea Turtles Listed Under the Endangered Species Act of 1973: Loggerhead Turtle, *Caretta caretta*; East Pacific Green Turtle, *Chelonia mydas*; Leatherback Turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*; Hawksbill Turtle, *Eretmochelys imbricata*; Kemp's Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii*; Olive Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea*. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD, and USFWS, Washington, DC.

American Cetacean Society. 2004. American Cetacean Society Fact Sheet: Sei Whale & Bryde's Whale, *Balaenoptera borealis* & *Balaenoptera edeni*. http://www.acsonline.org/factpack/SeiBrydesWhales.htm. Last updated March 2004, accessed 26 March 2007.

Amoser, S., L.E. Wysocki, and F. Ladich. 2004. Noise emission and potential impact during the first powerboat race in an Alpine lake and potential impact on fish communities. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 116:3789-3797.

André, M., M. Solé, M. Lenoir, M. Durfort, C. Quero, A. Mas, A. Lombarte, M. van der Schaar, M. López-Bejar, M. Morell, S. Zaugg, and L. Houégnigan. 2011. Low-frequency sounds induce acoustic trauma in cephalopods. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment: (e-View) doi:10.1890/100124.

Andrew, R.K., B.M. Howe, J.A. Mercer, and M.A. Dzieciuch. 2002. Ocean ambient sound: comparing the 1960s with the 1990s for a receiver off the California coast. Acoustic Research Letters Online 3:65-70.

Andriguetto-Filho, J.M., A. Ostrensky, M.R. Pie, U.A. Silva, and W.A. Boeger. 2005. Evaluating the impact of seismic prospecting on artisanal shrimp fisheries. Continental Shelf Research 25:1720-1727.

Andriolo, A., P.G. Kinas, M.H. Engel, and C.C. Albuquerque Martins. 2006a. Monitoring humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) population in the Brazilian breeding ground, 2002 to 2005. Paper SC/58/SH15 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts and Nevis.

Andriolo, A., C.C.A. Martins, M.H. Engel, J.L. Pizzorno, S. Mas-Rosa, A.C. Freitas, M.E. Morete, and P.G. Kinas. 2006b. The first aerial survey to estimate abundance of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the breeding ground off Brazil (breeding stock A). Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 8:307-311.

Angliss, R.P. and B.M. Allen. 2009. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2008. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-193. April.

Angliss, R.P. and K.L. Lodge. 2002. Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2002. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-133. NMFS, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA.

Angliss, R.P. and K.L. Lodge. 2004. Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2003. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-144. NMFS, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA.

Angliss, R.P. and R.B. Outlaw. 2005. Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2005. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-161. NMFS, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA.

Angliss, R.P. and R.B. Outlaw. 2007. Alaska Marine Mammal Stock Assessments, 2006. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-168. NMFS, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA. January.

Aragones, L. 1990. The status, distribution and basic feeding ecology of the dugong in Calauit Island, Busuanga. Thesis, Marine Science Institute, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.

Arbelo, M., M. Méndez, E. Sierra, P. Castro, J. Jaber, P. Calabuig, M. Carrillo, and A. Fernández. 2005. Novel "gas embolic syndrome" in beaked whales resembling decompression sickness. Page 17 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Arenas, P. and M. Hall. 1991. The association of sea turtles and other pelagic fauna with floating objects in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Pages 7-10 *in* M. Salmon and J. Wyneken, compilers. Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-302. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Arnold, B.W. 1996. Visual monitoring of marine mammal activity during the Exxon 3-D seismic survey: Santa Ynez Unit, offshore California 9 November to 12 December 1995. Prepared by Impact Sciences Inc., San Diego, CA, for Exxon Company, U.S.A., Thousand Oaks, CA.

Arnould, J.P.Y. and J.P. Croxall. 1995. Trends in entanglement of Antarctic fur seals (*Arctocephalus gazella*) in man-made debris at South Georgia. Marine Pollution Bulletin 30:707–712.

Ash, C. 1962. Whaler's Eye. Macmillan, New York, NY.

Astrup, J. and B. Møhl. 1993. Detection of intense ultrasound by the cod *Gasdus morhua*. Journal of Experimental Biology 182:71-80.

Astrup, J. and B. Møhl. 1998. Discrimination between high and low repetition rates of ultrasonic pulses by the cod. Journal of Fisheries Biology 52:205-208.

Atema, J., R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga. 1988. The Sensory Biology of Aquatic Animals. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Au, W.W.L. 1993. The sonar of dolphins. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Au, W.W.L. and K. Banks. 1998. The acoustics of snapping shrimp *Synalpheus parneomeris* in Kaneohe Bay. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 103: 41-47.

Au, W.W.L., A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay. 2000. Hearing by Whales and Dolphins. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research Volume 12. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Au, W.W.L., A.A. Pack, M.O. Lammers, L.M. Herman, M.H. Deakos, and K. Andrews. 2006. Acoustic properties of humpback whale songs. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120:1103-1110.

Auil, N.E. 2004. Abundance and distribution trends of the West Indian manatee in the coastal zone of Belize: Implications for conservation. Thesis, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Avens, L.A., J.B. Neill, S.P. Epperly, and K.J. Lohmann. 2003. Site fidelity and homing behavior in juvenile loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*). Marine Biology 143:211-220.

Backus, R.H. and W.E. Schevill. 1966. Physeter clicks. Pages 510-528 *in* K.S. Norris, ed. Whales, Dolphins, and Porpoises. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Bain, D.E. and R. Williams. 2006. Long-range effects of airgun noise on marine mammals: responses as a function of received sound level and distance. Paper SC/58/E35 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts and Nevis.

Baird, R.W. 2001. Status of killer whales, *Orcinus orca*, in Canada. Canadian Field-Naturalist 115:676-701.

Baird, R.W. 2003. Updated COSEWIC status report on the humpback whales *Megaptera novaeangliae* in Canada. Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada, Ottawa, ONT.

Baird, R.W. and L.M. Dill. 1995. Occurrence and behaviour of transient killer whales: seasonal and pod-specific variability, foraging behaviour and prey handling. Canadian Journal of Zoology 73:1300-1311.

Baird, R.W. and H. Whitehead. 2000. Social organization of mammal-eating killer whales: group stability and dispersal patterns. Canadian Journal of Zoology 78:2096-2105.

Baker, C. S., L. Medrano-Gonzalez, J. Calambokidis, A. Perry, F. Pichler, H. Rosenbaum, J. M. Straley, J. Urban-Ramirez, M. Yamaguchi, and O. von Ziegesar. 1998. Population structure of nuclear and mitochondrial DNA variation among humpback whales in the North Pacific. Molecular Ecology 7:695-708.

Balazs, G.H., P. Siu, and J-P Landret. 1995. Ecological aspects of green turtles nesting at Scilly Atoll in French Polynesia. Pages 7-10 *in* J.I. Richardson and T.H. Richardson, compilers. Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-361. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Balcomb, K.C. 1989. Baird's beaked whales - *Berardius bairdii* Stejneger, 1883; Arnoux beaked whale - *Berardius arnuxii* Duvernoy, 1851. Pages 261-288 *in* S.H. Ridgway and S.R. Harrison, eds. Handbook of Marine Mammals, Vol. 4: River Dolphins and the Larger Toothed Whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Balcomb, K.C., III and D.E. Claridge. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. Bahamas Journal of Science 8(2):2-12.

Baldwin, R., K. Van Waerebeek, and M. Gallagher. 1998. A review of small cetaceans from waters off the Arabian Peninsula. Paper SC/50/SM6 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 16-20 May, Muscat, Oman.

Baldwin, R.M. 1995. New Discoveries in the Arabian Gulf. Sonar 13:7

Ballance, L.T. and R.L. Pitman. 1998. Cetaceans of the western tropical Indian Ocean: Distribution, relative abundance, and comparisons with cetacean communities of the two other tropical ecosystems. Marine Mammal Science 14:429-459.

Banner, A. 1967. Evidence of sensitivity to acoustic displacements in the lemon shark, *Negaprion brevirostris* (Poey). Pages 265-273 *in* P.H. Cahn, ed. Lateral Line Detectors. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN.

Banner, A. 1972. Use of sound in predation by young lemon sharks, *Negaprion brevirostris*. Bulletin of Marine Science 22:251-283.

Bannister, J. L. 1985. Southern right (*Eubalaena australis*) and humpback (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) whales off Western Australia: some recent survey work. Pages 105-113 *in* J.K. Ling and M.M. Bryden, eds. Studies of Sea Mammals in South Latitudes. South Australian Museum, South Australia.

Bannister, J. 2001. Status of southern right whales (*Eubalaena australis*) off Australia. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management Special Issue 2:103-110.

Bannister, J.L. and S.L. Hedley. 2001. Southern Hemisphere Group IV humpback whales: their status from recent aerial surveys. Memoirs of the Queensland Museum 47:587-598.

Bannister, J.L., C.M. Kemper, and R.M. Warneke. 1996. The Action Plan for Australian Cetaceans. Biodiversity Group, Environment Australia.

Barlow, J. 1984. Reproductive seasonality in pelagic dolphins (*Stenella* spp.): implications for measuring rates. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6:191-198.

Barlow, J. 1994. An assessment of the 1994 status of harbor porpoise in California. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-205. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Barlow, J. 1995. The abundance of cetaceans in California waters. Part I: ship surveys in summer and fall of 1991. Fishery Bulletin 93:1-14.

Barlow, J. 2003. Preliminary estimates of the abundance of cetaceans along the U.S. west coast: 1991-2001. Southwest Fisheries Science Center Administrative Report LJ-03-03. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Barlow, J. 2004a. Splash 2004: NOAA ship *McArthur* weekly science report. Science summary: Thursday, 12 August to Wednesday, 18 August 2004. 19 August 2004. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Barlow, J. 2004b. Splash 2004: NOAA ship *McArthur* weekly science report. Science summary: Thursday, 19 August to Wednesday, 25 August 2004. 26 August 2004. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

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

Barlow, J. and T. Gerrodette. 1996. Abundance of cetaceans in California waters based on 1991 and 1993 ship surveys. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-233. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Barlow, J. and R. Gisiner. 2006. Mitigating, monitoring and assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 7:239-249.

Barlow, J. and B.L. Taylor. 2001. Estimates of large whale abundance off California, Oregon, Washington, and Baja California based on 1993 and 1996 ship surveys. Southwest Fisheries Science Center Administrative Report LJ-01-03. NMFS, La Jolla, CA.

Barlow, J., R.W. Baird, J.E. Heyning, K. Wynne, AM. Manville, L.F. Lowry, D. Hanan, J. Sease, and V.N. Burkanov. 1994. A review of cetacean and pinniped mortality in coastal fisheries along the west coast of the USA and Canada and the east coast of the Russian Federation. Reports of the International Whaling Commission (Special Issue) 15:405-426.

Barlow, J., K.A. Forney, P.S. Hill, R.L. Brownell Jr., J.V. Carretta, D.P. DeMaster, F. Julian, M.S. Lowry, T. Ragen, and R.R. Reeves. 1997. U. S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 1996. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-248. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Barlow, J., M.C. Ferguson, W.F. Perrin, L. Ballance, T. Gerrodette, G. Joyce, C.D. Macleod, K. Mullin, D.L. Palka, and G. Waring. 2006. Abundance and densities of beaked and bottlenose whales (family Ziphiidae). Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 7:263-270.

Barmes, T., K.L. Eckert, and J. Sybesma. 1993. WIDECAST Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Aruba. CEP Technical Report No. 25. UNEP Caribbean Environment Program, Kingston, Jamaica.

Barnes, R.D. 1980. Invertebrate Zoology. Saunders College/Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Philadelphia, PA.

Bartol, S.M. and D.R. Ketten. 2006. Turtle and tuna hearing. Pages 98-103 *in* Y. Swimmer and R. Brill, eds. Sea Turtle and Pelagic Fish Sensory Biology: Developing Techniques to Reduce Sea Turtle Bycatch in Longline Fisheries. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-PIFSC-7. NMFS, Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center, Honolulu, HI.

Bartol, S., J.A. Musick, and M.L. Lenhardt. 1999. Auditory evoked potentials of the loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*). Copeia 1999:836-840.

Barton, P., J. Diebold, and S. Gulick. 2006. Balancing mitigation against impact: a case study from the 2005 Chicxulub seismic survey. Eos Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Supplement, Abstract OS41A-04. 23-26 May, Baltimore, MD.

Bauer, G.B., J.C. Gaspard, K. Dziuk, A. Cardwell, L. Read, R.L. Reep, and D.A. Mann. 2009. The manatee audiogram and auditory critical ratios. Pages 27-28 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Beasley, I., K.N.M. Robertson, and P. Arnold. 2005. Description of a new dolphin, the Australian snubfin dolphin *Orcaella heinsohni* sp. N. (Cetacea, Delphinidae). Marine Mammal Science 21:365-400.

Benson, S.R., K.A. Forney, P.H. Dutton, and S.A. Eckert. 2003. Occurrence of leatherback sea turtles off the coast of central California. Page 27 *in* J.A. Seminoff, compiler. Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-503. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Berkson, H. 1967. Physiological adjustments to deep diving in the Pacific green turtle (*Chelonia mydas agassizii*). Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology 21:507-524.

Bermudez-Villapol, L.A. and A.J. Sayegh. 2005. Cetaceans strandings in Nueva Esparta State, Venezuela, period 2000-2004. Page 33 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Bertram, D.F. 1995. The roles of introduced rats and commercial fishing in decline of ancient murrelets on Langara Island, British Columbia. Conservation Biology 9:865-872.

Best, P.B. 1979. Social organization in sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*. Pages 227-289 *in* H.E. Winn and B.L. Olla, eds. Behavior of Marine Animals, Volume 3. Plenum Press, New York, NY.

Best, P.B. and C.H. Lockyer. 2002. Reproduction, growth and migrations of sei whales *Balaenoptera borealis* off the west coast of South Africa in the 1960s. South African Journal of Marine Science 24:111-133.

Best, P.B., P.A.S. Canham, and N. Macleod. 1984. Patterns of reproduction in sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6:51-79.

Bigg, M.A. 1985. Status of the Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*) and California sea lion (*Zalophus californianus*) in British Columbia. Canadian Special Publication of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 77:1-20.

Bigg, M.A. 1990. Migration of northern fur seals (*Callorhinus ursinus*) off western North America. Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 1764.

Bjørge, A., D. Thompson, P.S. Hammond, M.A. Fedak, E.B. Bryant, H. Aarefjord, R. Roen, and M. Olson. 1995. Habitat use and diving behaviour of harbour seals in a coastal archipelago in Norway. Pages 211-223 *in* A.S. Blix, L. Walloe, and O. Ulltang, eds. Whales, Seals, Fish and Man. Development in Marine Biology Volume 4. Elsevier Science, B.B., Amsterdam.

Bjorndal, K.A. 1995. The consequences of herbivory for the life history pattern of the Caribbean green turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. Pages 111-116 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, ed. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Revised edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Bjorndal, K.A. 1997. Foraging Ecology and Nutrition of Sea Turtles. Pages 189-231 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Bjorndal, K.A., A.B. Bolten, and H.R. Martins. 2000. Somatic growth model of juvenile loggerhead sea turtles *Caretta caretta*: duration of the pelagic stage. Marine Ecology Progress Series 202:265-272.

Black, A. 2005. Light induced seabird mortality on vessels operating in the Southern Ocean: incidents and mitigation measures. Antarctic Science 17:67-68.

Blackwell, S.B., R.G. Norman, C.R. Greene Jr. and W.J. Richardson. 2007. Acoustic measurements. Pages 4-1 – 4-52 in Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by Shell Offshore Inc. in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, July-September 2006: 90-day report. LGL Report P891-1. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Shell Offshore Inc., Houston, TX, National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD, and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Anchorage, AK.

Blackwell, S.B., C.R. Greene, T.L. McDonald, C.S. Nations, R.G. Norman, and A. Thode. 2009a. Beaufort Sea bowhead whale migration route study. Chapter 8 *in* D.S. Ireland, D.W. Funk, R. Rodrigues, and W.R. Koski, eds. 2009. Joint Monitoring Program in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, Open Water Seasons, 2006-2007. LGL Alaska Report P971-2. Report from LGL Alaska Research Associates, Anchorage, AK for Shell Offshore Inc., Anchorage, AK.

Blackwell, S.B., C.S. Nations, T.L. McDonald, A.M. Thode, K.H. Kim, C.R. Greene, and M.A. Macrander. 2009b. Effects of seismic exploration activities on the calling behavior of bowhead whales in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Page 35 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Blaxter, J.H.S. 1981. The swim bladder and hearing. Pages 61-69 *in* W.N. Tavolga, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Hearing and Sound Communication in Fishes. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

BLI. 2006. Data Zone: Search for Species. www.birdlife.org/datazone/species/index.

Bodkin, J.L. 2003. Sea otter: *Enhydra lutris*. Pages 735-743 *in* G.A. Feldhamer, B.C. Thompson, and J.A. Chapman, eds. Wild Mammals of North America. Second editon. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Bodkin, J.L. and M.S. Udevitz. 1999. An aerial survey method to estimate sea otter abundance. Pages 13-26 *in* G.W. Garner, S.C. Amstrup, J. L. Laake, B.F. J. Manly, L.L. McDonald, and D.G. Robertson, eds. Marine Mammal Survey and Assessment Methods. A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, Netherlands.

Boeger, W.A., M.R. Pie, A. Ostrensky, and M.F. Cardoso. 2006. The effect of exposure to seismic prospecting on coral reef fishes. Brazilian Journal of Oceanography 54:235-239.

Bolten, A., K.A. Bjorndal, and H.R. Martins. 1994. Biology of Pelagic-Stage Loggerheads in the Atlantic. Pages 19-20 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson, and P.J. Eliazar, eds. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-351. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Bolten, A.B., K.A. Bjorndal, H.R. Martins, and G.H. Balazs. 1996. Satellite telemetry of pelagic-stage juvenile loggerheads in the Eastern Atlantic. Pages 39-41 *in* J.A. Keinath, D.E. Barnard, J.A. Musick, and B.A. Bell, compilers. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-351. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Bolton, A.B. and H.R. Martins. 1990. Kemp's ridley captured in the Azores. Marine Turtle Newsletter 48:23.

Bonnell, M. L. and M. D. Dailey. 1993. Marine Mammals. Pages 604-681 *in* M. D. Dailey, D. J. Reish, and J. W. Anderson, eds. Ecology of the Southern California Bight. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Bonnell, M.L., C.E. Bowlby, and G.A. Green. 1992. Pinniped distribution and abundance off Oregon and Washington, 1989-1990. *In* J.J. Brueggeman, ed. Oregon and Washington Marine Mammal and Seabird Surveys. Minerals Management Service Contract Report 14-12-0001-30426.

Bonnell, M.L., R.G. Ford, and A.J. Brody. 1996. Assessing the threat of oil spills to southern sea otters. Endangered Species Update 13(12):38-42.

Booman, C., J. Dalen, H. Leivestad, A. Levsen, T. van der Meeren, and K. Toklum. 1996. Effecter av luftkanonskyting på egg, larver og yngel. Fisken Og Havet 1996(3):1-83 (Norwegian with English summary).

Borsani, J.F. C.W. Clark, and L. Tedesco. 2005. Does pile-driving noise withdraw fin whales from their habitat? Page 40 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Boudreau, M., S.C. Courtenay, and K. Lee (eds.). 2009. Potential Impacts of Seismic Energy on Snow Crab: An Update to the September 2004 Review. Proceedings of a workshop held 23 January 2007 at the Gulf Fisheries Center, Moncton, NB, Canada. Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2836.

Bowlby, C.E., G.A. Green, and M.L. Bonnell. 1994. Observations of leatherback turtles offshore of Washington and Oregon. Northwest Naturalist 75:33-35.

Bowles, A.E., M. Smultea, B. Würsig, D.P. DeMaster, and D. Palka. 1994. Relative abundance and behavior of marine mammals exposed to transmissions from the Heard Island Feasibility Test. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 96:2469-2484.

Boyd, I.L., C. Lockyer, and H.D. March. 1999. Reproduction in marine mammals. Pages 218-286 *in* J.E. Reynolds, III and S.A. Rommel, eds. Biology of Marine Mammals. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Bradford, A.L., P.R. Wade, D.W. Weller, A.M. Burdin, Y.V., Ivashchenko, G.A. Tsidulko, G.R. VanBlaricom, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2006. Survival estimates of western gray whales *Eschrichtius robustus* incorporating individual heterogeneity and temporary emigration. Marine Ecology Progress Series 315:293-307.

Bradley, D.L. and R. Stern. 2008. Underwater Sound and the Marine Mammal Acoustic Environment. Prepared for the U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, Bethesda, MD. July.

Brady, S. and J. Boreman. 1994. Sea turtle distributions and documented fishery threats off the northeastern United States coast. Pages 31-34 *in* B.A. Schroder and B.E. Witherington, compilers. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-341. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Braham, H.W., B.D. Krogman, and G.M. Carroll. 1984. Bowhead and white whale migration, distribution, and abundance in the Bering, Chukchi, and Beaufort seas, 1975-78. NOAA Technical Report NMFS-SSRF-778. Rockville, MD.

Braithwaite, L.F., M.G. Aley, and D.L. Slater. 1983. The effects of oil on the feeding mechanism of the bowhead whale. Report from Brigham Young University, Salt Lake City, UT, for Minerals Management Service, Anchorage, AK.

Branch, T.A. and D.S. Butterworth. 2001. Estimates of abundance south of 60°S for cetacean species sighted frequently on the 1978/79 to 1997/98 IWC/IDCR-SOWER sighting surveys. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 3:251-279.

Branch, T.A.; K.M. Stafford, D.M. Palacios, C. Allison, J.L. Bannister, C.L.K. Burton, E. Cabrera, C.A. Carlson, B. Galletti Vernazzani, P.C. Gill, R. Hucke-Gaete, K.C.S. Jenner, M.-N.M. Jenner, K. Matsuoka, Y.A. Mikhalev, T. Miyashita,M.G. Morrice, S. Nishiwaki, V.J. Sturrock, D. Tormosov, R.C. Anderson, A.N. Baker, P.B. Best, P. Borsa, R.L. Brownell, Jr, S. Childerhouse,K.P. Findlay, T. Gerrodette, A.D. Ilangakoon, M. Joergensen, B. Kahn, D.K. Ljungblad, B. Maughan, R.D. McCauley, S. McKay, T.F. Norris, S. Rankin, F. Samaran,D. Thiele, K. Van Waerebeek, and R.M. Warneke. 2007. Past and present distribution, densities and movements of blue whales *Balaenoptera musculus* in the Southern Hemisphere and northern Indian Ocean. Mammal Review 37:116-175.

Breithaupt, T. 2002. Sound perception in aquatic crustaceans. Pages 548-558 *in* K. Wiese, ed. Crustacean Nervous System. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, Germany.

Brill, R.W., G.H. Balazs, K.N. Holland, R.K.C. Chang, S. Sullivan, and J. George. 1995. Daily movements, habitat use, and submergence intervals of normal and tumor-bearing juvenile green turtles (*Chelonia mydas* L.) within a foraging area in the Hawaiian Islands. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 185:203-218.

Broderick, D., C. Moritz, J.D. Miller, M. Guinea, R.I.T. Prince, and C.J. Limpus. 1994. Genetic studies of the hawksbill turtle *Eretmochelys imbricata*: evidence for multiple stocks in Australian waters. Pacific Conservation Biology 1:121-131.

Brongersma, L.D. 1995. Marine Turtles of the Eastern Atlantic Ocean. Pages 407-416 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, ed. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Revised Edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Brueggeman, J.J., G.A. Green, R.A. Grotefendt, and D.G. Chapman. 1987. Aerial surveys of endangered cetaceans and other marine mammals in the northwestern Gulf of Alaska and southeastern Bering Sea. Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment Program, Final Report. OCS Study MMS 89-0026. Minerals Management Service, Anchorage, AK.

Brueggeman, J.J., G.A. Gren, K.C. Balcomb, C.E. Bowlby, R.A. Grotefendt, K.T. Briggs, M.L. Bonnell, R.G. Ford, D.H. Varoujean, D. Heinemann, and D.G. Chapman. 1990. Oregon-Washington Marine Mammal and Seabird Survey: Information synthesis and hypothesis formulation. OCS Study MMS 89-0030.

Buchanan, J.B., D.H. Johnson, E.L. Greda, G.A. Green, T.R. Wahl, and S.J. Jeffries. 2001. Wildlife of coastal and marine habitats. Pages 389-422 *in* D.H. Johnson and T.A. O'Neil, eds. Wildlife-Habitat Relationships in Oregon and Washington. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, OR.

Buchanan, R.A., J.R. Christian, S. Dufault, and V.D. Moulton. 2004. Impacts of underwater noise on threatened or endangered species in United States waters. Report No. SA791. Report prepared by LGL Ltd. for American Petroleum Institute, Washington, DC.

Budelmann, B.U. 1992. Hearing in crustacea. Pages 131-139 *in* D.B. Webster, R.R. Fay, and A.N. Popper, eds. Evolutionary Biology of Hearing. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Budelmann, B.U. 1996. Active marine predators: the sensory world of cephalopods. Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology 27:59-75.

Budelmann, B.U. and R. Williamson. 1994. Directional sensitivity of hair cell afferents in the Octopus statocyst. Journal of Experimental Biology 187:245-259.

Bullock, T.H., T.J. Oshea, and M.C. McClune. 1982. Auditory evoked-potentials in the West Indian manatee (Sirenia, *Trichechus manatus*). Journal of Comparative Physiology 148:547-554.

Burghardt, G.M. and R.A. Stanley, eds. 1982. Iguanas of the World: Their Behavior, Ecology and Conservation. Noyes Publications, Park Ridge, NJ.

Burkhardt, E., O. Boebel, H. Bornemann, and C. Ruholl. 2008. Risk assessment of scientific sonars. Bioacoustics 17:235-237

Burton, C.L.K. 2001. Historical and recent distribution of humpback whales in Shark Bay, Western Australia. Memoirs of the Queensland Museum 47:599-611.

Byles, R.A. 1988. Behavior and Ecology of Sea Turtles from Chesapeake Bay, Virginia. Dissertation, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.

Calambokidis, J. 1995. Blue whales off California. Whalewatcher 29(1):3-7.

Calambokidis, J. 2003. Grey whale photographic identification in 2002: Collaborative research in the Pacific Northwest. Draft report prepared by Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA for National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Seattle, WA. September.

Calambokidis, J. and S.D. Osmek. 1998. Marine mammal research and mitigation in conjunction with air gun operation for the USGS `SHIPS' seismic surveys in 1998. Final Report. Prepared by Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA, for U.S. Geological Survey, NMFS, and MMS. July.

Calambokidis, J., G.H. Steiger, J.M. Straley, T.J. Quinn, II, L.M. Herman, S. Cerchio, D.R. Salden, M. Yamaguchi, F. Sato, J. Urbán R., J. Jacobsen, O. von Ziegesar, K.C. Balcomb, C.M. Gabriele, M.E. Dahlheim, N. Higashi, S. Uchida, J.K.B. Ford, Y. Miyamura, P. Ladrón de Guevara, S.A. Mizroch, L. Schlender, and K. Rasmussen. 1997. Abundance and population structure of humpback whales in the North Pacific Basin. Final Contract Report 50ABNF500113 to NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Calambokidis, J., T. Chandler, K. Rasmussen, L. Schlender, and G.H. Steiger. 2000. Humpback and blue whale photo-identification research off California, Oregon and Washington in 1999. Final Contract Report to NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Calambokidis, J., G.H Steiger, J.M Straley, L.M. Herman, S. Cerchio, D.R. Salden, J. Urbán R., J.K. Jacobsen, O. von Ziegesar, K.C. Balcomb, C.M. Gabriele, M.E. Dahlheim, S. Uchida, G. Ellis, Y. Miyamura, P. Ladrón de Guevara P., M. Yamaguchi, F. Sato, S.A. Mizroch, L. Schlender, K. Rasmussen, J. Barlow, and T.J. Quinn II. 2001. Movements and population structure of humpback whales in the North Pacific. Marine Mammal Science 17:769-794.

Calambokidis, J., J.D. Darling, V. Deecke, P. Gearin, M. Gosho, W. Megill, C.M. Tombach, D. Goley, C. Toropova, and B. Gisborne. 2002. Abundance, range and movements of a feeding aggregation of gray whales (*Eschrichtius robustus*) from California to southeastern Alaska in 1998. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 4:267-276.

Calambokidis, J., T. Chandler, L. Schlender, G.H. Steiger, and A. Douglas. 2003. Research on humpback and blue whales off California, Oregon, and Washington in 2002. Final Report prepared by Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA to NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Calambokidis, J., T. Chandler, E. Falcone, and A. Douglas. 2004. Research on large whales off California, Oregon and Washington in 2003. Prepared by Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA for NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Calambokidis, J., E.A. Falcone, T.J. Quinn, A.M Burdin, P.J. Clapham, J.K.B. Ford, C.M. Gabriele, R. LeDuc, D. Mattila, L. Rojas-Bracho, J.M. Straley, B.L. Taylor, J. Urban R., D. Weller, B.H. Witteveen, M. Yamaguchi, A. Bendlin, D. Camacho, K. Flynn, A. Havron, J. Huggins, and N. Maloney. 2008. SPLASH: Structure of Populations, Levels of Abundance and Status of Humpback Whales in the North Pacific. Final Report for Contract AB133F-03-RP-0078. Prepared for U.S. Department of Commerce, Western Administrative Center, Seattle, WA. May.

Calambokidis, J., J. Barlow, J.K.B. Ford, T.E. Chandler, and A.B. Douglas. 2009. Insights into the population structure of blue whales in the eastern North Pacific from recent sightings and photographic identification. Marine Mammal Science 25:816-832.

Caldwell, J. and W. Dragoset. 2000. A brief overview of seismic air-gun arrays. The Leading Edge 2000(8, Aug.):898-902.

California Native American Heritage Commission. 2006. Personal communication via telephone. 15 June.

Campbell, G.S., R.C. Gisiner, D.A. Helweg, and L.L. Milette. 2002. Acoustic identification of female Steller sea lions (*Eumetopias jubatus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 111:2920-2928.

Cardona-Maldonado, M.A. and A.A. Mignucci-Giannoni. 1999. Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with a review of *Kogia* in the Caribbean. Caribbean Journal of Science 35:29-37.

Caribbean Conservation Corporation & Sea Turtle Survival League. 1998. 566 sea turtles found dead along Florida shores from January to June 1998. http://www.cccturtle.org/pressreleases.php?page=n_boats. Posted 31 August 1998; accessed August 2006.

Carr, A. 1987. New perspectives on the pelagic stage of sea turtle development. Conservation Biology 1:103-121.

Carr, A., M.H. Carr, and A.B. Meylan. 1978. The ecology and migrations of sea turtles: The west Caribbean green turtle colony. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 162:1-46.

Carretta, J. V., M. S. Lynn, and C. A. LeDuc. 1994. Right whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*) sighting off San Clemente Island, California. Marine Mammal Science 10:101-105.

Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, M.M. Muto, J. Barlow, J. Baker, and M. Lowry. 2004. U.S. Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2003. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-358. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, M. M. Muto, J. Barlow, J. Baker, B. Hanson, and M.S. Lowry. 2005. U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2004. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-375. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, M.M. Muto, J. Barlow, J. Baker, B. Hanson, and M.S. Lowry. 2006. U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2005. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-388. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA. March.

Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, M.M. Muto, J. Barlow, J. Baker, B. Hanson, and M.S. Lowry. 2007. U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2006. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-TM-SWFSC-398. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA. January.

Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, M.S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. Baker, D. Johnston, B. Hanson, M.M. Muto, D. Lynch, and L. Carswell. 2008. U.S. Pacific Marine Mammal Stock Assessments: 2008. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-434. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Casper, B.M., P.S. Lobe, and H.Y. Yan. 2003. The hearing sensitivity of the little skate *Raja erinacea*: A comparison of two methods. Environmental Biology of Fishes 68:371-379.

Cawardine, M. 1998. Whales and Whale Watching in Iceland. Iceland Review, Reykjavik, Iceland.

Cawthorn, M.W. 1990. New Zealand: Progress report cetacean research, April 1988 to May 1989. Report of the International Whaling Commission 40:202-205.

CCC. 2003. An introduction to sea turtles. http://www.cccturtle.org/overview.htm. Accessed 13 June 2006.

CDFG. 1976. A proposal for sea otter protection and research, and request for return of management to the State of California, January. 2 Vols. Unpublished Report. Sacramento, CA.

CDFG. 2006a. Fishing: California Commercial Landings. Final Data for 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/fishing.html#commercial. Accessed 20 June.

CDFG. 2006b. Fishing: Laws and Regulations. Commercial Ocean Fishing. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/licensing/pdffiles/2006CommercialDigestCalendar.pdf. Accessed 20 June.

CDFG. 2006c. Personal communication via telephone, Dave Owno, Santa Barbara, CA. 28 June.

CDFG. 2006d. California Recreational Fisheries Survey (CRFS). http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mrd/crfs.html. Accessed 20 June.

CephBase. 2006. CephBase. www.cephbase.utmb.edu.

CETAP. 1982. Characterization of marine mammals and turtles in the mid- and North Atlantic areas of the U.S. outer continental shelf. Final report to the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Washington, DC, from the Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI.

Chapman, C.J. 1973. Field studies of hearing in teleost fish. Helgoländer wiss. Meersunters 24:371-390.

Chapman, C.J. and A.D. Hawkins. 1969. The importance of sound in fish behaviour in relation to capture by trawls. FAO Fisheries Report 62:717-729.

Chapman, C.J. and A.D. Hawkins. 1973. A field study of hearing in the cod, *Gadus morhua* L. Journal of Comparative Physiology 85:147-167.

Chapman, C.J. and O. Sand. 1974. Field studies of hearing in two species of flatfish, *Pleuronectes platessa* and *Limanda limanda*. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A. 47: 371-385.

Charest, S., J. Founier, and C. Tarver. 2003. Research and monitoring program: marine mammals. Field season report 2003. Laskeek Bay Conservation Society. www.laskeekbay.org/index.php?contentid=121.

Charrier, I., N. Mathevon, and P. Jouventin. 2002. How does a fur seal mother recognize the voice of her pup? An experimental study of *Arctocephalus tropicalis*. Journal of Experimental Biology 205:603-612.

Charrier, I., N. Mathevon, and P. Jouventin. 2003. Individuality in the voice of fur seal females: an analysis study of the pup attraction call in *Arctocephalus tropicalis*. Marine Mammal Science 19:161-172.

Chaytor and ten Brink, submitted, Tectonophysics.

Chittleborough, R.G. 1965. Dynamics of two populations of the humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Borowski). Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 16:33-128.

Christensen, I., T. Haug, and N. Øien. 1992. Seasonal distribution, exploitation and present abundance of stocks of large baleen whales (Mysticeti) and sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) in Norwegian and adjacent waters. ICES Journal of Marine Science 49:341-355.

Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, D.H. Thomson, D. White, and R.A. Buchanan. 2003. Effect of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 144. Calgary, AB, Canada. November.

Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, and R.A. Buchanan. 2004. Chronic effects of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 158, Calgary, AB. March.

Christie, K., C. Lyons, W.R. Koski, D.S. Ireland, and D.W. Funk. 2009. Patterns of bowhead whale occurrence and distribution during marine seismic operations in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Page 55 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

CITES. 2010. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna: Appendices I, II and III (valid from 24 June 2010). http://www.cites.org/eng/app/appendices.shtml.

Clapham, P. 2001. Why do baleen whales migrate? A response to Corkeron and Connor. Marine Mammal Science 17:432-436.

Clapham, P.J., S.B. Young, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 1999. Baleen whales: conservation issues and the status of the most endangered populations. Mammal Review 29:35-60.

Clapham, P.J., C. Good, S.E. Quinn, R.R. Reeves, J.E. Scarff, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2004. Distribution of North Pacific right whales (*Eubalaena japonica*) as shown by 19th and 20th century whaling catch and sighting records. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 6:1-6.

Clark, C.W. and W.T. Ellison. 2004. Potential use of low-frequency sounds by baleen whales for probing the environment: Evidence from models and empirical measurements. Pages 564-589 *in* J.A. Thomas, C.F. Moss, and M. Vater, eds. Echolocation in Bats and Dolphins. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Clark, C.W., P. Tyack, and W.T. Ellison. 2001. Revised Overseas Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Statement for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) Sonar Technical Report 1: Low frequency Sound Scientific Research Program Technical Report (Responses of four species of whales to sounds of SURTASS LFA sonar transmissions). Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Navy. January.

Clarke, J.T., S.E. Moore, and M.M. Johnson. 1993. Observations on beluga fall migration in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 198287, and northeastern Chukchi Sea, 198291. Report of the International Whaling Commission 43:387-396.

Clay, C.S. and H. Medwin. 1977. Acoustical oceanography. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY.

Clifton, K., D.O. Cornejo, and R.S. Felger. 1995. Sea turtles of the Pacific coast of Mexico. Pages 199-209 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, ed. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Revised edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Cogger, H.G. and D.A. Lindner. 1969. Marine turtles in northern Australia. Australian Zoology 15:150-159.

Coles, W.C. and J.A. Musick. 2000. Satellite sea surface temperature analysis and correlation with sea turtle distribution off North Carolina. Copeia 2000:551-554.

Collin, S.P. and N.J. Marshall, eds. 2003. Sensory Processing in Aquatic Environments. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Collins, T., G. Minton, R. Baldwin, K. Van Waerebeek, A. Hywell-Davies, and V.A. Cockcroft. 2002. Preliminary assessment of the frequency, distribution and causes of mortality of beach cast cetaceans in the Sultanate of Oman, January 1999 to February 2002. Paper SC/54/04 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 20-24 May 2002, Shimonoseki, Japan.

Cook, M.L.H., R.A. Varela, J.D. Goldstein, S.D. McCulloch, G.D. Bossart, J.J. Finneran, D. Houser, and A. Mann. 2006. Beaked whale auditory evoked potential hearing measurements. Journal of Comparative Physiology A 192:489-495.

Cook, S.L. and T.G. Forrest. 2005. Sounds produced by nesting leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). Herpetelogical Review 36:387-390.

Coombs, S. and J.C. Montgomery. 1999. The enigmatic lateral line system. Pages 319-362 *in* R.R. Fay and A.N. Popper, eds. Comparative Hearing: Fish and Amphibians. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research 11. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Coombs S., J. Jansen, and J.F. Webb. 1988. Diversity of lateral line systems: evolutionary and functional considerations. Pages 267-288 *in* J. Atema., R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga, eds. The Sensory Biology of Aquatic Animals. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Coombs, S, P. Görner, and H. Münz, eds. 1989. The Mechanosensory Lateral Line: Neurobiology and Evolution. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Corkeron, P.J. and R.C. Connor. 1999. Why do baleen whales migrate? Marine Mammal Science 15:1228-1245.

Cornelius, S.E. and D.C. Robinson. 1986. Post-nesting movements of female olive ridley turtles tagged in Costa Rica. Vida Silvestre Neotropical 1:12-23.

COSEWIC. 2003. COSEWIC assessment and update status report on the Steller sea lion *Eumetopias jubatus* in Canada. Ottawa, ONT, Canada.

Cottingham, D. 1988. Persistent marine debris: Challenge and response. The federal perspective. Alaska Sea Grant Report No. 88-01.

County of Santa Barbara. 2006. Planning and Development, Energy Division: Offshore Platforms. http://www.countyofsb.org/energy/information/offshorePlatforms.asp#grace. Accessed 21 June.

Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'amico, G. D'spain, A. Fernández, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hildebrand, D. Houserp, R. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. Macleod, P. Miller,S. Moore, D.C. Mountain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Meads, and L. Benner. 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 7:177-187.

Craig, A.S., L.M. Herman, and A.A. Pack. 2002. Male mate choice and male-male competition coexist in the humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 80:745-755.

Croll, D.A., B.R. Tershy, A. Acevdeo, and P. Levin. 1999. Marine vertebrates and low frequency sound. Technical Report for LFA EIS. Marine Mammals and Seabird Ecology Group, Institute of Marine Sciences, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA.

Cronin, M.A., J. Bodkin, B. Ballachey, J. Estes, and J.C. Patton. 1996. Mitochondrial-DNA variation among subspecies and populations of sea otters (*Enhydra lutris*). Journal of Mammalogy 77:546-557.

Crum, L.A., M.R. Bailey, J. Guan, P.R. Hilmo, S.G. Kargl, and T.J. Matula. 2005. Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue *ex vivo* and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. Acoustic Research Letters Online 6:214-220.

CSLC. 2006. California Shipwrecks: Online Database of California Shipwrecks. http://shipwrecks.slc.ca.gov/. Accessed 7 June 2006.

Culik, B.M. 2004. Review of small cetaceans. Distribution, behavior, migration and threats. UNEP/CMS Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.

Cummings, W.C. 1985. Byrde's whale *Balaenoptera edeni* (Anderson, 1878). *In* S.H. Ridgway and R Harrison, eds. Handbook of Marine Mammals Vol. 3: The Sirenians and Baleen Whales. Academic Press, London, UK.

Dahlheim, M.E. 1987. Bio-acoustics of the gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*). Dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

Dahlheim, M.E. 1988. Killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) depredation on longline catches of sablefish (*Anoplopoma fimbria*) in Alaskan waters. NWAFC Processed Report 88-14. NMFS, Northwest and Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA.

Dalen, J. and G.M. Knutsen. 1986. Scaring effects in fish and harmful effects on eggs, larvae and fry by offshore seismic explorations. Symposium on Underwater Acoustics, Halifax.

Dalen, J. and A. Raknes. 1985. Scaring effects on fish from three dimensional seismic surveys. Institute of Marine Research Report FO 8504/8505, Bergen, Norway (Norwegian with English summary).

Dalen, J., E. Ona, A.V. Soldal, and R. Saetre. 1996. Seismiske undersøkelser til havs: en vurdering av konsekvenser for fisk og fiskerier [Seismic investigations at sea; an evaluation of consequences for fish and fisheries]. Fisken og Havet 1996:1-26. (Norwegian with English summary).

Danil, K. and S. Chivers. 2005. Habitat-based spatial and temporal variability in life history characteristics of female common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) in the eastern tropical Pacific. Page 67 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

d'Auvergne, C. and K.L. Eckert. 1993. WIDECAST Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for St. Lucia. CEP Technical Report No. 26. UNEP Caribbean Environment Program, Kingston, Jamaica.

Davenport, J. 1988. Do diving leatherbacks pursue glowing jelly? British Herpetological Society Bulletin 24:20-21.

Davenport, J. 1997. Temperature and the life-history strategies of sea turtles. Journal of Thermal Biology 22:479-488.

Dávila, J.M., U. ten Brink, J. Payero, J.L. Granja, C. Von Hilldebrandt, D. Córdoba, A. Muñnoz Martín, A. Pazos, M. Catalán, and M. Gómez. 2005. Survey Explores Active Tectonics in Northeastern Caribbean. Eos Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 86(51):537.

Davis, J.E. and S.S. Anderson. 1976. Effects of oil pollution on breeding grey seals. Marine Pollution Bulletin 7:115-118.

Davis, R.W., G.S. Fargion, N. May, T.D. Leming, M. Baumgartner, W.E. Evans, L.J. Hansen, and K. Mullin. 1998. Physical habitat of cetaceans along the continental slope in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico. Marine Mammal Science 14:490-507.

de Boer, M.N., R. Baldwin, C.L.K. Burton, E.L. Eyre, K.C.S. Jenner, M-N.M. Jenner, S.G. Keith, K.A.McCabe, E.C.M. Parsons, V.M. Peddemors, H.C. Rosenbaum, P. Rudolph, and M. P. Simmonds, eds. 2003. Cetaceans in the Indian Ocean Sanctuary: a review. Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society Science Report. Whiltshire, UK.

Debrot, A.O. and N.B. Barros. 1992. Notes on a Gervais' beaked whale, *Mesoplodon europaeus* and a dwarf sperm whale, *Kogia simus,* stranded in Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles. Marine Mammal Science 8:172-178.

Deffenbaugh, M. 2002. Mitigating seismic impact on marine life: Current practice and future technology. Bioacoustics 12: 316-18.

del Hoyo, J., A. Elliot, and J. Sargatal, eds. 1992. Handbook of the Birds of the World. Volumes 1 and 3. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain.

DeLong, R.L. and B.S. Stewart. 1991. Diving patterns of northern elephant seal bulls. Marine Mammal Science 7:369-384.

DeMaster, D.P. and I. Stirling. 1981. *Ursus maritimus*. Mammalian Species 145:1-7.

Denton, E.J., J.A.B. Gray, and J.H.S. Blaxter. 1979. The mechanics of the clupeid acoustico-lateralis system: frequency responses. Journal of the Marine Biological Association UK 59:27-47.

DeRuiter, S.L., Y-T. Lin, A.E. Newhall, P.T. Madsen, P.J.O. Miller, J.F. Lynch, and P.L. Tyack. 2005. Quantification and acoustic propagation modeling of airgun noise recorded on DTAG-tagged sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico. Page 73 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December, San Diego, CA.

DFOC. 2004a. Proceedings of the National Marine Mammal Peer Review Committee; 20-23 April 2004, St. Andrews, New Brunswick. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Proceedings Series 2004/009.

DFOC. 2004b. Potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Habitat Status Report 2004/003.

DFOC. 2005a. Ecological Geography of the Sea. http://www.mar.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/science/ocean/BedfordBasin/Papers/Longhurst1998/Provinces/EcologicalGeographyOfTheSea.htm. Accessed 21 September.

DFOC. 2005b. Mitigation of Seismic Noise in the Marine Environment. Statement of Canadian Practice. http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/canwaters-eauxcan/infocentre/media/seismic-sismique/pdf/statement_e.pdf. Last updated 19 February 2005, accessed 10 February 2006.

DFOC. 2005c. Personal communication to LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, from J. Ford, Pacific Biological Station, Nanaimo, BC.

Diebold, J.B., M. Tolstoy, P.J. Barton, and S.P. Gulick. 2006. Propagation of exploration seismic sources in shallow water. Eos Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Supplement, Abstract OS41A-03. 23-26 May, Baltimore, MD.

Doksæter, L., E. Olsen, and L. Nøttestad. 2005. Distribution and ecology of dolphins along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge between Iceland and the Azores. Page 76 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Dolman, S.J. and M.P. Simmonds. 2006. An updated note on the vulnerability of cetaceans to acoustic disturbance. Paper SC/58/E22 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts and Nevis.

Dolman, S., M. Green, E. Heskett, J. Reynolds, and N. Rose. 2006. Statement C: Environmental Caucus Statement for the Report of the Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals to the Marine Mammal Commission. Marine Mammal Commission, Bethesda, MD. 1 February. Available at: http://www.mmc.gov/sound/.

Domico, T. 1988. Bears of the World. Facts on File, New York, NY.

Donovan, G.P. 1991. A review of IWC stock boundaries. Report of the International Whaling Commission 13:39-68.

Dooling, R. 2002. Avian hearing and avoidance of wind turbines. Technical Report NREL/TP-500-30844. National Energy Laboratory, Golden, CO.

Dooling, R.J. and A.N. Popper. 2000. Hearing in birds and reptiles: an overview. Pages 1-12 *in* R.J. Dooling, R.R. Fay, and A.N. Popper, eds. Comparative Hearing: Birds and Reptiles. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research. Springer-Verlag New York, NY.

Dooling, R.J., B. Lohr, and M.L. Dent. 2000. Hearing in birds and reptiles. Pages 308-359 *in* R.J. Dooling, R.R. Fay, and A.N. Popper, eds. Comparative Hearing: Birds and Reptiles. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research. Springer-Verlag New York, NY.

Doroff, A.M., J.A. Estes, M. T. Tinker, D.M. Burn, and T.J. Evans. 2003. Sea otter population declines in the Aleutian Archipelago. Journal of Mammalogy 84:55-64.

Dorsey, E. M., S. J. Stern, A. R. Hoelzel, and J. Jacobsen. 1990. Minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) from the west coast of North America: individual recognition and small-scale site fidelity. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 12:357-368.

Dufault, S. and H. Whitehead. 1995. An assessment of changes with time in the marking patterns used for photoidentification of individual sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*. Marine Mammal Science 11:335-344.

Dow, W.E., D.A. Mann, T.T. Jones, S.A. Eckert, and C.A. Harms. 2008. In-water and in-air hearing sensitivity of the green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). Abstract, Acoustic Communication by Animals, 2nd International Conference, 12-15 August 2008, Corvallis, OR.

Dunn, R.A. and O. Hernandez. 2009. Tracking blue whales in the eastern tropical Pacific with an ocean-bottom seismometer and hydrophone array. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126:1084-1094.

Dutton, P.H., and D.L. McDonald. 1990a. Status of sea turtles in San Diego Bay, 1989-1990. Final report. Sea World Research Institute Technical Report #90-225. San Diego, CA.

Dutton, P.H., and D.L. McDonald. 1990b. Sea turtles present in San Diego Bay. Pages 139-141 *in* T.H. Richardson, J.I. Richardson, and M. Donnelly, compilers. Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-278. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Dutton, D., P. Dutton, R. Leroux, and J. Seminoff. 2002. Ultrasonic tracking of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) in south San Diego Bay: 2001-2002 Report. Submitted to the San Diego Bay Port Authority, San Diego, CA.

Eckert, K.L. 1993. The biology and population status of marine turtles in the North Pacific Ocean. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-186. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, San Diego, CA.

Eckert, K.L. 1995a. Hawksbill sea turtle, *Eretmochelys imbricata*. Pages 76-108 *in* P.T. Plotkin, ed. Status Reviews of Sea Turtles Listed Under the Endangered Species Act of 1973: Loggerhead Turtle, *Caretta caretta*; East Pacific Green Turtle, *Chelonia mydas*; Leatherback Turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*; Hawksbill Turtle, *Eretmochelys imbricata*; Kemp's Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii*; Olive Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea*. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD, and USFWS, Washington, DC.

Eckert, K.L. 1995b. Leatherback sea turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*. Pages 37-75 *in* P.T. Plotkin, ed. Status Reviews of Sea Turtles Listed Under the Endangered Species Act of 1973: Loggerhead Turtle, *Caretta caretta*; East Pacific Green Turtle, *Chelonia mydas*; Leatherback Turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*; Hawksbill Turtle, *Eretmochelys imbricata*; Kemp's Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii*; Olive Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea*. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD, and USFWS, Washington, DC.

Eckert, K.L. and S.A. Eckert. 1988. Pre-reproductive movements of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) nesting in the Caribbean. Copeia 1988:400-406.

Eckert, K.L., S.A. Eckert, T.W. Adams, and A.D. Tucker. 1989. Inter-nesting migrations by leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in the West Indies. Herpetologica 45:190-194.

Eckert, S.A. 2000. Letter to M. James, Nova Scotia Leatherback Turtle Working Group, regarding possible impacts of seismic exploration off Nova Scotia on sea turtles. Hubbs-Sea World Research Institute, San Diego, CA.

Eckert, S.A. 2002. Distribution of juvenile leatherback sea turtle *Dermochelys coriacea* sightings. Marine Ecology Progress Series 230:289-293.

Eckert, S.A., K.L. Eckert, and G.L. Kooyman. 1986. Diving patterns of two leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during the internesting intervals at Sandy Point, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands. Herpetologica 42:381-388.

Eckert, S.A., K.L. Eckert, P. Ponganis, and G.L. Kooyman. 1989. Diving and foraging behavior of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 67:2834-2840.

Eckert, S.A., H-C. Liew, K.L. Eckert, and E-H. Chan. 1996. Shallow water diving by leatherback turtles in the South China Sea. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2:237-243.

Eckert, S.A., A. Bowles, and E. Berg. 1998. The effect of seismic airgun surveys on leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during the nesting season. Report from Hubbs-Sea World Research Institute, San Diego, CA, for BHP Petroleum (Trinidad) Ltd.

ECORD Science Operator. 2010. Expedition 313 – New Jersey Shallow Shelf. http://www.eso.ecord.org/expeditions/313/313.php. Accessed 6 June.

Ehrhart, L.M. 1995. A Review of Sea Turtle Reproduction. Pages 29-38 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, ed. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Revised Edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Eisenberg, J.F. and J. Frazier. 1983. A leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) feeding in the wild. Journal of Herpetology 17:81-82.

Eldredge, L.G. 2003. The marine reptiles and mammals of Guam. Micronesica 35-36: 653-660.

Elsner, R. 1999. Living in water: solutions to physiological problems. Pages 73-116 *in* J.E. Reynolds, III and S.A. Rommel, eds. Biology of Marine Mammals. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Engås, A, S. Løkkeborg, E. Ona, and A.V. Soldal. 1996. Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (*G. morhua*) and haddock (*M. aeglefinus*). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 53:2238-2249.

Engel, M.H., M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F.O. Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos. 2004. Are seismic surveys responsible for cetacean strandings? An unusual mortality of adult humpback whales in Abrolhos Bank, northeastern coast of Brazil. Paper SC/56/E28 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 19-22 July, Sorrento, Italy.

Enger, P.S. 1967. Hearing in herring. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology 22:527-538.

Enger, P.S., H.E. Karlsen, F.B. Knudsen, and O. Sand. 1993. Detection and reaction of fish to infrasound. ICES Marine Science Symposium 196:108-112.

Engelhardt, F.R. 1978. Petroleum hydrocarbons in arctic ringed seals, *Phoca hispida*, following experimental oil exposure. Pages 614-628 *in* Proceedings of the Conference on the Assessment of the Ecological Impacts of Oil Spills, 14-17 June 1978, Keystone, CO. American Institute of Biological Science.

Engelhardt, F.R. 1982. Hydrocarbon metabolism and cortisol balance in oil-exposed ringed seals, *Phoca hispida*. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology 72C:133-136.

Engelhardt, F.R. 1985. Effect of petroleum on marine mammals. Pages 217-243 *in* F.R. Engelhardt, ed. Petroleum Effects in the Arctic Environment. Elsevier Applied Science Publishers, London.

Engelhardt, F.R., J.R. Geraci, and T.G. Smith. 1977. Uptake and clearance of petroleum hydrocarbons in the ringed seal, *Phoca hispida*. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 34:1143-1147.

Environment Canada. 2006. Species at Risk: Sei Whale – Pacific Population. http://www.speciesatrisk.gc.ca/search/speciesDetails_e.cfm?SpeciesID=755. Last updated 8 May 2006, accessed 18 March 2007.

Epperly, S.P., J. Braun, and A.J. Chester. 1995. Aerial surveys for sea turtles in North Carolina inshore waters. Fishery Bulletin 93:254-261.

Ernst, C.H., R.W. Barbour, and J.E. Lovich. 1994. Turtles of the United States and Canada. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Estes, J.A. 1980. *Enhydra lutris*. Mammalian Species 133:1-8.

Estes, J.A. 1990. Action plan for sea otters. Pages 22-28 *in* P. Foster-Turley, S. Macdonald, and C. Mason, eds. Otters: An Action Plan for Their Conservation. IUCN/SSC Publication, Kelvyn Press, Broadview, IL.

Estes, J.A. and J.L. Bodkin. 2002. Otters. Pages 842-858 *in* W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G. M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Estes, J.A., M.T. Tinker, T.M. Williams, and D.F. Doak. 1998. Killer whale predation on sea otters linking oceanic and nearshore ecosystems. Science 282:473-476.

Estes, J.A., M.L. Riedman, M.M. Staedler, M.T. Tinker, and B.E. Lyon. 2003. Individual variation in prey selection by sea otters: patterns, causes and implications. Journal of Animal Ecology 72:144-155.

Estes, J., T. Williams, D. Costa, K. Ralls, and D. Siniff. 2006. Population dynamics and biology of the California sea otter at the southern end of its range. Coastal Marine Institute, Coastal Research Center, University of Santa Barbara, Current Research. http://coastalresearchcenter.ucsb.edu/cmi/seaotters. Accessed 3 July 2006.

EuroTurtle. 2006. Sea turtle outlines. http://www.euroturtle.org. Accessed 13 June.

Evans, P.G.H. 1987. Natural History of Whales & Dolphins. Facts on File, Inc., New York, NY.

Fair, P.A. and P.R. Becker. 2000. Review of stress in marine mammals. Journal of Aquatic Ecosystem Stress and Recovery 7:335-354.

Falk, M.R. and M.J. Lawrence. 1973. Seismic exploration: its nature and effects on fish. Canada Technical Report Series No. CEN/T-73-9. Department of the Environment, Fisheries and Marine Service, Resource Management Branch, Fisheries Operations Directorate, Central Region (Environment), Winnipeg, MB.

Fall, J.A. and C.J. Utermohle, eds. 1995. An Investigation of the Sociocultural Consequences of Outer Continental Shelf Development in Alaska. Vol. V, Alaska Peninsula and Arctic. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Division of Subsistence, Anchorage, AK.

Fay, C., M. Bartron, S. Craig, A. Hecht, J. Pruden, R. Saunders, T. Sheehan, and J. Trial. 2006. Status Review for Anadromous Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) in the United States. Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. July.

Fay, R.R. 1988. Hearing in Vertebrates: A Psychophysics Databook. Hill-Fay Associates, Winnetka, IL.

Fay, R.R. 2005. Sound source localization by fishes. Pages 36-66 *in* A.N. Popper and R.R. Fay, eds. Sound Source Localization. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Fay, R.R. and A.N. Popper. 2000. Evolution of hearing in vertebrates: The inner ears and processing. Hearing Research 149: 1-10.

Fay, R.R. and A.M. Simmons. 1999. The sense of hearing in fishes and amphibians. Pages 269-318 *in* R.R. Fay and A.N. Popper, eds. Comparative Hearing: Fish and Amphibians. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research 11. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Ferguson, M.C. and J. Barlow. 2001. Spatial distribution and density of cetaceans in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean based on summer/fall research vessel surveys in 1986-96. Administrative Report LJ-01-04. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Fernandez, P.G., A.S. Brierley, E.J. Simmonds, N.W. Millard, S.D. McPhail, F. Armstron, P. Stevenson, and M. Squires. 2003. Fish do not avoid survey vessels. Nature 404:35-36.

Fernández, A., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, E. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and P.D. Jepson. 2004. Pathology: whales, sonar and decompression sickness (reply). Nature 428(6984).

Fernández, A., J.F. Edwards, F. Rodriquez, A.E. de los Monteros, P. Herráez, P. Castro, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, and M. Arbelo. 2005a. "Gas and fat embolic syndrome" involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. Veterinary Pathology 42:446-457.

Fernández, A., M. Méndez, E. Sierra, A. Godinho, P. Herráez, A.E. De los Monteros, F. Rodrigues, and M. Arbelo. 2005b. New gas and fat embolic pathology in beaked whales stranded in the Canary Islands. Page 90 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Fertl, D. and G.L. Fulling. 2007. Interactions between marine mammals and sea turtles. Marine Turtle Newsletter 115:4-8.

Finley, K.J. 1982. The estuarine habitat of the beluga or white whale, *Delphinapterus leucas*. Cetus 4:4-5.

Finley, K.J., J.P. Hickie, and R.A. Davis. 1987. Status of the beluga, *Delphinapterus leucas*, in the Beaufort Sea. Canadian Field-Naturalist 101:271-278.

Finneran, J.J. and C.E. Schlundt. 2004. Effects of intense pure tones on the behavior of trained odontocetes. Technical Report 1913. Space and Naval Warfare (SPAWAR) Systems Center, San Diego, CA. February.

Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2002. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 111:2929-2940.

Finneran, J.J., R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2003. Auditory and behavioral responses of California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*) to single underwater impulses from an arc-gap transducer. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 114:1667-1677.

Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt, and S.H. Ridgway. 2005. Temporary threshold shift in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to mid-frequency tones. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 118:2696-2705.

Finneran, J.J., D.S. Houser, B. Mase-Guthrie, R.Y. Ewing and R.G. Lingenfelser. 2009. Auditory evoked potentials in a stranded Gervais' beaked whale (*Mesoplodon europaeus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126:484-490.

Fiscus, C.H. and K. Niggol. 1965. Observations of cetaceans of California, Oregon, and Washington. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Special Scientific Report 498:1-27.

FishBase. 2006. FishBase: A Global Information System on Fishes. http://www.fishbase.org/home.htm. Accessed April.

Flinn, R.D., A.W. Trites, E.J. Gregr, and R.I. Perry. 2002. Diets of fin, sei, and sperm whales in British Columbia: An analysis of commercial whaling records, 1936-1967. Marine Mammal Science 18:663-679.

Foote, A.D., R.W. Osbourne, and A.R. Hoelzel. 2004. Whale-call response to masking boat noise. Nature 428:910.

Ford, J.K.B., K. Heise, L.G. Barrett-Lennard, and G.M. Ellis. 1994. Killer whales and other cetaceans of the Queen Charlotte Islands/Haidi Gwaii. Prepared for South Moresby/Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve, Parks Canada, Queen Charlotte City, BC.

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

Forney, K.A. 2007. Preliminary estimates of cetacean abundance along the U.S. West Coast and within four National Marine Sanctuaries during 2005. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-TM-406. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Forney, K. A. and J. Barlow. 1998. Seasonal patterns in the abundance and distribution of California cetaceans, 1991-92. Marine Mammal Science 14:460-489.

Forney, K.A. and Brownell, R.L., Jr. 1996. Preliminary report of the 1994 Aleutian Island Marine Mammal Survey. Paper SC/48/O11 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 24-28 June 1996, Aberdeen, UK.

Forney, K. A., J. Barlow, and J. Carretta. 1995. The abundance of cetaceans in California coastal waters. Part II: Aerial surveys in winter and spring of 1991 and 1992. Fishery Bulletin 93:15-26.

Foster, John W. 2004. California's Ancient Maritime Heritage. http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=23712. Accessed June 2006.

Francois, R.E. and G.R. Garrison. 1982a. Sound absorption based on ocean measurements. Part I: Pure water and magnesium sulfate contributions. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 72:896-907.

Francois, R.E. and G.R. Garrison. 1982b. Sound absorption based on ocean measurements. Part II: Boric acid contribution and equation for total absorption. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 72:1879-1890.

Frankel, A.S. 2005. Gray whales hear and respond to a 21–25 kHz high-frequency whale-finding sonar. Page 97 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Frankel, A.S., W.T. Ellison, and J. Buchanan. 2002. Application of the Acoustic Integration Model (AIM) to predict and minimize environmental impacts. Pages 1438-1443 in Oceans '02, Vol. 3. Marine Technology Society & IEEE.

Frazier, J. G. and T. Mundkur. 1990. Dugong *Dugong dugon* Muller in the Gulf of Kutch, Gujarat. Journal of the Bombay Natural History Society 87:368-379.

Freitas, A.C., P.G. Kinas, C.C.A. Martins, and M.H. Engel. 2004. Abundance of humpback whales on the Abrolhos Bank wintering ground, Brazil. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 6:225-230.

Fretey, J. 2001. Biogeography and Conservation of Marine Turtles of the Atlantic Coast of Africa. UNEP/CMS Technical Publication No. 6. UNEP/CMS Secretariat, Bonn, Germany. February.

Frick, M.G., A. Ross, K.L. Williams, A.B. Bolten, K.A. Bjorndal, and H.R. Martins. 2003. Epibiotic associates of oceanic-stage loggerhead turtles from the southeastern North Atlantic. Marine Turtle Newsletter 101:18-20.

Frisk, G, D. Bradley, J. Caldwell, G. D'Spain, J. Goron, D. Ketten, J. Miller, D.L. Nelson, A.N. Popper, and D. Wartzok. 2003. Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals. National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

Fritts, T.H., M.L. Stinson, and R. Márquez-M. 1982. Status of sea turtle nesting in southern Baja California, Mexico. Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences 81:51-60.

Frost, K.J., L.F. Lowry, and J.J. Burns. 1988. Distribution, abundance, migration, harvest, and stock identity of belukha whales in the Beaufort Sea. Pages 27-40 *in* P.R. Becker, ed. Beaufort Sea (Sale 97) Information Update. OCS Study MMS 86-0047. NOAA, Ocean Assessment Division, Anchorage, AK.

Fujieda, S., Y. Matsuno, and Y. Yamanaka. 1996. The auditory threshold of the bastard halibut *Paralichthys olivaceus*. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 62:201-204.

Gailey, G., B. Würsig, and T.L. McDonald. 2007. Abundance, behavior, and movement patterns of western gray whales in relation to a 3-D seismic survey, northeast Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134:75-91.

Gale Group. 2006. Hooded Seal. Grzimek's Animal Life Encyclopedia. http://www.answers.com/topic/hooded-seal. Accessed 17 June 2006.

Gallagher, M.D. 1991. Strandings of sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) on the shores of Oman, Eastern Arabia. Pages 241-245 *in* S. Leatherwood and G. P. Donovan, eds. Cetaceans and Cetacean Research in the Indian Ocean Sanctuary. Marine Mammal Technical Report No. 3. UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.

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

Gallo-Reynoso, J.P. and G. B. Rathbun. 1997. Status of sea otters (*Enhydra lutris*) in Mexico. Marine Mammal Science 13:332-340.

Gambell, R. 1985a. Fin whale *Balaenoptera physalus* (Linnaeus, 1758). Pages 171-192 *in* S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, eds. Handbook of Marine Mammals. Vol. 3. The Sirenians and Baleen Whales. Academic Press, London, UK.

Gambell, R. 1985b. Sei whale *Balaenoptera borealis.* Pages 155-170 *in* S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, eds. Handbook of Marine Mammals. Vol. 3. The Sirenians and Baleen Whales. Academic Press, London, UK.

Gannier, A. 2002. Cetaceans of the Marquesas Islands (French Polynesia): distribution and relative abundance as obtained from a small boat dedicated survey. Aquatic Mammals 28:198-210.

Gannier, A. 2004. The large-scale distribution of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) wintering in French Polynesia during 1997-2002. Aquatic Mammals 30:227-236.

Gannon, J.G., K.M. Scolardi, J.E. Reynolds, III, J.K. Koelsch, and T.J. Kessenich. 2007. Habitat selection by manatees in Sarasota Bay, Florida. Marine Mammal Science 23:133-143.

Garrigue, C., A. Aguayo, V.L.U. Amante-Helweg, C.S. Baker, S. Caballero, P. Clapham, R. Constantine, J. Denkinger, M. Donoghue, L. Flórez-González, J. Greaves, N. Hauser, C. Olavarría, C. Pairoa, H. Peckham, and M. Poole. 2002. Movements of humpback whales in Oceania, South Pacific. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 4:255-260.

Garshelis, D.L. and J.A. Garshelis. 1984. Movements and management of sea otters in Alaska. Journal of Wildlife Management 48:665-678.

Gaywood, M.J. 1997. Marine turtles in British and Irish waters. British Wildlife 9:69-78.

Gedamke, J., S. Frydman, and N. Gales. 2008. Risk of baleen whale hearing loss from seismic surveys: preliminary results from simulations accounting for uncertainty and individual variation. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/60/E9.

Gentry, R., ed. 2002. Report of the workshop on acoustic resonance as a source of tissue trauma in cetaceans. 24-25 April, NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Gentry, R., A. Bowles, W. Ellison, J. Finneran, C. Greene, Jr., D. Kastak, D. Ketten, J. Miller, P. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, B. Southall, J. Thomas and P. Tyack. 2004. Noise exposure criteria. Presentation to the Second Plenary Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Animals, 28-30 April, Arlington, VA. Available at http://mmc.gov/sound/plenary2/pdf/gentryetal.pdf.

Geraci, J.R. 1990. Cetaceans and oil: physiologic and toxic effects. Pages 167-197 *in* J.R. Geraci and D.J. St. Aubin, eds. Sea mammals and Oil: Confronting the Risks. Academic Press, San Diego.

Geraci, J.R. and T.G. Smith. 1976. Direct and indirect effects of oil on ringed seals (*Phoca hispida*) of the Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 33:1976-1984.

Geraci, J.R. and D.J. St. Aubin. 1980. Offshore petroleum resource development and marine mammals: a review and research recommendations. Marine Fisheries Review 42:1-12.

Geraci, J.R. and D.J. St. Aubin. 1982. Study of the effects of oil on cetaceans. Report from University of Guelph for Bureau of Land Management, Washington, DC.

Geraci, J.R. and D.J. St. Aubin. 1985. Expanded studies of the effects of oil on cetaceans, Part I. Report by University of Guelph for Minerals Management Service, Washington, DC.

Geraci, J.R. and D.J. St. Aubin, eds. 1990. Sea Mammals and Oil: Confronting the Risks. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Geraci, J.R., and T.D. Williams. 1990. Physiologic and toxic effects on sea otters. Pages 211-221 *in* J.R. Geraci and D.J. St. Aubin, eds. Sea Mammals and Oil: Confronting the Risks. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Gerletto, F. and P. Fréon. 1992. Some elements on vertical avoidance of fish schools to a vessel during acoustic surveys. Fisheries Research 14: 251-259.

Gerletto, F., J. Castillo, A. Saavedra, and M.A. Barbieri. 2004. Three-dimensional structure and avoidance behaviour of anchovy and sardine schools in central southern Chile. ICES Journal of Marine Science 61:1120-1126.

Gerrodette, T. and J. Pettis. 2005. Responses of Tropical Cetaceans to an Echosounder during Research Vessel Surveys. Page 104 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Gerstein, E.R., L. Gerstein, S.E. Forsythe, and J.E. Blue. 1999. The underwater audiogram of the West Indian manatee (*Trichechus manatus*). Journal of Acoustical Society America 105:3575-83.

Ghoul, A., C. Reichmuth, and J. Mulsow. 2009. Source levels and spectral analysis of southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) scream vocalizations. Page 90 in Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Gilmore, R.G., Jr. 2003. Sound production and communication in the spotted seatrout. Pages 177-195 *in* P.L. Lutz, ed. Biology of the Spotted Seatrout. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Gisiner, R.C., ed. 1999. Proceedings – Workshop on the Effects of Anthropogenic Noise in the Marine Environment, Bethesda, MD, 10-12 February 1998. Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA.

Goddard, P.D. and D.J. Rugh. 1998. A group of right whales seen in the Bering Sea in July 1996. Marine Mammal Science 14:344-349.

Godley, B., M. Gaywood, R. Law, C. McCarthy, C. McKenzie, I. Patterson, R. Penrose, R. Reid, and H. Ross. 1998. Patterns of marine turtle mortality in British waters 1992-96 with reference to tissue contaminant levels. Journal of the Marine Biological Association UK 78:973-984.

Goodall, C., C. Chapman, and D. Neil. 1990. The acoustic response threshold of the Norway lobster, *Nephrops norvegicus* (L.) in a free sound field. Pages 106-113 *in* K. Wiese, W.D. Krenz, J. Tautz, H. Reichert, and B. Mulloney, eds. Frontiers in Crustacean Neurobiology. Birkhäuser, Basel, Switzerland.

Goold, J.C. 1996a. Acoustic assessment of common dolphins off the west Wales coast, in conjunction with 16th round seismic surveying. Report from School of Ocean Sciences, University of Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Exploration (UK) Ltd., and Aran Energy Exploration Ltd.

Goold, J.C. 1996b. Acoustic assessment of populations of common dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in conjunction with seismic surveying. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the U.K. 76:811-820.

Goold, J.C. 1996c. Acoustic cetacean monitoring off the west Wales coast. Report from School of Ocean Sciences, University of Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Explororation (UK) Ltd, and Aran Energy Exploration Ltd.

Goold, J.C. and R.F.W. Coates. 2006. Near source, high frequency air-gun signatures. Paper SC/58/E30 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts and Nevis.

Goold, J.C. and P.J. Fish. 1998. Broadband spectra of seismic survey air-gun emissions, with reference to dolphin auditory thresholds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 103:2177-2184.

Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M.P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. 2004. A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. Marine Technology Society Journal 37(4):16-34.

Gordon, J., R. Antunes, N. Jaquet, and B. Würsig. 2006. An investigation of sperm whale headings and surface behaviour before, during and after seismic line changes in the Gulf of Mexico. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/58/E45.

Gosho, M. E., D.W. Rice, and J.M. Breiwick. 1984. The sperm whale. Marine Fisheries Review 46:54-64.

Gosselin, J.-F. and J. Lawson. 2004. Distribution and abundance indices of marine mammals in the Gully and two adjacent canyons of the Scotian Shelf before and during nearby hydrocarbon seismic exploration programmes in April and July 2003. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Proceedings Series 2004/133.

Gramentz, D. 1988. Involvement of loggerhead turtle with the plastic, metal, and hydrocarbon pollution in the Central Mediterranean. Marine Pollution Bulletin 19:11-13.

Green, D. and F. Ortiz-Crespo. 1995. Status of sea turtle populations in the central eastern Pacific. Pages 221-233 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, ed. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Revised edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Green, G., J.J. Brueggeman, R.A. Grotefendt, C.E. Bowlby, M.L. Bonnell, and K.C. Balcomb, III. 1992. Cetacean distribution and abundance off Oregon and Washington, 1989-1990. OCS Study 91-0093. Prepared by Ebasco Environmental, Bellevue, WA, and Ecological Consulting, Inc. , Portland, OR, for Minerals Management Service, Pacific OCS Region, Los Angeles, CA.

Green, G.A., R.A. Grotefendt, M.A. Smultea, C.E. Bowlby, and R.A. Rowlett. 1993. Delphinid aerial surveys in Oregon and Washington offshore waters. Final Report. Prepared by Ebasco Environmental, Bellevue, WA, for NMFS, National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Seattle, WA.

Greene, C.R., Jr. and W.J. Richardson. 1988. Characteristics of marine seismic survey sounds in the Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 836:2246-2254.

Greene, C.R., Jr. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. Pages 3-1 – 3-63 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Northstar Marine Mammal Monitoring Program, 1996: Marine Mammal and Acoustical Monitoring of a Seismic Program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. LGL Report 2121-2. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ON, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999a. Bowhead whale calls. Pages 6-1–6-23 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ONT, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman and W.J. Richardson. 1999b. The influence of seismic survey sounds on bowhead whale calling rates. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 106(4, Pt. 2):2280 (Abstract).

Greene, C.R., Jr., W.C. Burgess, R. Norman, and R.W. Blaylock. 2000. Physical acoustics measurements, 1999. Pages 3-1 – 3-45 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine Mammal and Acoustical Monitoring of Western Geophysical's Open-water Seismic Program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1999. LGL Report TA2313-4. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ON., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Gregory. J. and P. Claburn. 2003. Avoidance behaviour of *Alosa fallax fallax* to pulsed ultrasound and its potential as a technique for monitoring clupeid spawning migration in a shallow river. Aquatic Living Resources 16:313-316.

Gregr, E.J. 2002. Whales in northern B.C.: past and present. *In* T. Pitcher, M. Vasconcellos, S. Heymans, C. Brignall, and N. Haggan, eds. Information Supporting Past and Present Ecosystem Models of Northern British Columbia and the Newfoundland Shelf. Fisheries Centre Research Reports 10(1):1-116.

Gregr, E.J. and A.W. Trites. 2001. Predictions of critical habitat for five whale species in the waters of coastal B.C. Canadian Journal of Aquatic Sciences 58:1265-1285.

Gregr, E.J., L. Nichol, J.K.B. Ford, G. Ellis, and A.W. Trites. 2000. Migration and population structure of northeastern Pacific whales off coastal British Columbia: An analysis of commercial whaling records from 1908-1967. Marine Mammal Science 16:699-727.

Groch, K.R., M.E. Fabian, and J.T. Palazzo, Jr. 2003. Monitoring behavioral responses of southern right whales to whale watching activities in the southern Brazilian coast and an evaluation of its conservation implications. *In* 55th Meeting of the International Whaling Commission, Berlin, Germany.

Guerra, A., A.F. González, and F. Rocha. 2004. A review of the records of giant squid in the north-eastern Atlantic and severe injuries in *Architeuthis dux* stranded after acoustic explorations. Paper presented at the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Annual Science Conference, 22–25 September 2004, Vigo, Spain. ICES CM 2004/CC:29.

Guinea, M.L. 1990. Notes on sea turtle rookeries on the Arafura Sea Islands of Arnhem Land, Northern Territory. Northern Territory Naturalist 12:4.

Guinea, M.L. 1995. The sea turtles and sea snakes of Ashmore Reef Nature Reserve 67.

Guinea, M.L. and R. Chatto. 1992. Sea turtles killed in Australian shark fin fishery. Marine Turtle Newsletter 57:5.

Gunnlaugsson, T. and J. Sigurjónsson. 1990. NASS-87: estimation of whale abundance based on observations made onboard Icelandic and Faroese survey vessels. Report of the International Whaling Commission 40:571-580.

Gunnlaugsson, Th., G.A. Vikingsson, D.G. Pike, G. Desportes, B. Mikkelsen, and D. og Bloch. 2002. Fin whale abundance in the North Atlantic, estimated from Icelandic and Faroese NASS-2001 vessel surveys. North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission SC/10/AE/8.

Hain, J. 2007. Vampire facts and daylight truths. Right Whale News 14(4):6-7.

Hain, J.H.W., M.J. Ratnaswamy, R.D. Kenney, and H.E. Winn. 1992. The fin whale, *Balaenoptera physalus*, in waters of the northeastern United States continental shelf. Report of the International Whaling Commission 42:653-669.

Hale, P.T., A.S. Barreto, and G.J.B. Ross. 2000. Comparative morphology and distribution of the *aduncus* and *truncatus* forms of bottlenose dolphin *Tursiops* in the Indian and Western Pacific Oceans. Aquatic Mammals 26:101-110.

Haley, B. LGL. 2006. Marine Mammal Monitoring During University of Texas at Austin's Marine Geophysical Survey of the Western Canada Basin, Chukchi Borderland and Mendleev Ridge, Arctic Ocean, July – August 2006. LGL Report TA4285-3. November. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for University of Texas at Austin Institute for Geophysics, Austin, TX; NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, MD; and USFWS, Marine Mammals Management Office, Anchorage, AK.

Haley, B. and D. Ireland. 2006. Marine Mammal Monitoring during University of Alaska Fairbanks' Marine Geophysical Survey across the Arctic Ocean, August–September 2005. LGL Report TA4122-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Haley, B., and W.R. Koski. 2004. Marine Mammal Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's ADWBC Seismic Program in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, July–August 2004. LGL Report TA2822-27. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Hall, A.J., J. Watkins, and L. Hiby. 1996. The impact of the 1993 Braer oil spill on grey seals in Shetland. Science of the Total Environment 186:119-125.

Hamilton, E.L. 1980. Geoacoustic modeling of the sea floor. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 68:1313-1340.

Hammill, M.O., G.B. Stenson, R.A. Myers, and W.T. Stobo. 1998. Pup production and population trends of the grey seal (*Halichoerus grypus*) in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 55:423-430.

Handegard, N.O., K. Michalsen, and D. Tjøsthein. 2003. Avoidance behaviour in cod (*Gadus morhua*) to a bottom-trawling vessel. Aquatic Living Resources 16:265-270.

Hanni, K.D. and P. Pyle. 2002. Entanglement of pinnipeds in synthetic materials at Southeast Farallon Island, California, 1976-1998. Marine Pollution Bulletin 40:1076-1081.

Härkönen, T. and M.P. Heide-Jørgensen. 1990. Comparative life histories of east Atlantic and other harbour seal populations. Ophelia 32:211-235.

Harris, R.E., G.W. Miller, and W.J. Richardson. 2001. Seal responses to airgun sounds during summer seismic surveys in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Marine Mammal Science 17:795-812.

Harris, R.E., T. Elliott, and R.A. Davis. 2007. Results of mitigation and monitoring program, Beaufort Span 2-D marine seismic program, open-water season 2006. LGL Rep. TA4319-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for GX Technology Corp., Houston, TX.

Hart, P., H. Ryan, and D. Hogg. 2006. Marine Mammal Observation Report, U.S. Geological Survey Geophysical Research Cruise, Offshore Dana Point and San Francisco, California, September 2006. USGS Cruise ID S2-06-SC and L1-06-NC. Coastal and Marine Geology Team, U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, CA.

Hartman, D.S. 1979. Ecology and behaviour of the manatee (*Trichechus manatus*) in Florida. Special Publication No. 5, American Society of Mammalogists.

Harwood, J. and B. Wilson. 2001. The implications of developments on the Atlantic Frontier for marine mammals. Continental Shelf Research 21(8-10):1073-1093.

Harwood, L.A., F. McLaughlin, R.M. Allen, J. Illasiak Jr., and J. Alikamik. 2005. First-ever marine mammal and bird observations in the deep Canada Basin and Beaufort/Chukchi seas: expeditions during 2002. Polar Biology 28:250-253.

Hasbún, C.R. and M. Vásquez. 1999. Sea Turtles of El Salvador. Marine Turtle Newsletter 85:7-9.

Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, S. Løkkeborg, K. Skaar, Ø. Østensen, E.K. Haugland, M. Fonn, Å. Høines, and O.A. Misund. 2003. Reaction of sandeel to seismic shooting: A field experiment and fishery statistics study. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway.

Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, K. Skaar, S. Løkkeborg, O.A. Misund, O. Ostensen, M. Fonn, and E.K. Haugland. 2004. Influence of seismic shooting on the lesser sandeel (*Ammodytes marinus*). ICES Journal of Marine Science 61:1165-1173.

Hastings, M.C. and A.N. Popper. 2005. Effects of Sound on Fish. Prepared for Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, CA, for California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA. 28 January.

Hauser, D. and M. Holst. 2009. Marine Mammal Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Program in the Gulf of Alaska, September–October 2008. LGL Report TA4412-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, St. John's, NF and King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Hauser, N., H. Peckham, and P. Clapham. 2000. Humpback whales in the southern Cook Islands, South Pacific. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 2:159-164.

Hauser, D., M. Holst, and V.D. Moulton. 2008. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, April–August 2008. LGL Report TA4656/7-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, St. John's, NF and King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Hawkes, L.A., A.C. Broderick, M.S. Coyne, M.H. Godfrey, and B.J. Godley. 2007. Only some like it hot – quantifying the environmental niche of the loggerhead sea turtle. Diversity and Distributions 13:447-457.

Hawkins, A.D. 1981. The hearing abilities of fish. Pages 109-133 *in* W.N. Tavolga, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Hearing and Sound Communication in Fishes. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Hawkins, A.D. 1993 Underwater sound and fish behaviour. Pages 129-169 *in* T.J Pitcher, ed. Behaviour of Teleost Fishes. Second Edition. Chapman and Hall, London, UK.

Hawkins, A. 2006. Assessing the impact of pile driving upon fish. Pages 21-22 in C.L. Irwin, P. Garrett, and K.P. McDermott, eds. Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Ecology and Transportation, 29 August – 2 September 2005, San Diego, CA. Center for Transportation and the Environment, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC. (Abstract)

Hawkins, A.D. and A.D.F. Johnstone. 1978. The hearing of the Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*. Journal of Fish Biology 13:655-673.

Hawkins, A.D. and K.J. Rasmussen. 1978. The calls of gadoid fish. Journal of the Marine Biological Association UK 58:891-991.

Hays, G.C., C.R. Adams, A.C. Broderick, B.J. Godley, D.J. Lucas, J.D. Metcalfe, and A.A. Prior. 2000. The diving behaviour of green turtles at Ascension Island. Animal Behavior 59:577-586.

Hays, G.C., A.C. Broderick, B.J. Godley, P. Lovell, C. Martin, B.J. McConnell, and S. Richardson. 2002. Biphasal long-distance migration in green turtles. Animal Behavior 64:895-898.

Hazard, K. 1988. Beluga whale, *Delphinapterus leucas*. Pages 195-235 *in* J.W. Lentfer, ed. Selected Marine Mammals of Alaska. Marine Mammal Commission, Washington, DC.

Hazel, J., I.R. Lawler, H. Marsh, and S. Robson. 2007. Vessel speed increases collision risk for the green turtle *Chelonia mydas*. Endangered Species Research 3:105-113.

Heimlich, S. 1994. Killer Whales. Voyageur Press, McGregor, MN.

Heimlich-Boran, J.R. 1988. Behavioral ecology of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) in the Pacific Northwest. Canadian Journal of Zoology 66:565-578.

Helfman, G.S., B.B. Colette, and D.E. Facey. 1997. The Diversity of Fishes. Blackwell Science, Malsen, MA.

Henninger, H.P. and W.H. Watson, III. 2005. Mechanisms underlying the production of carapace vibrations and associated waterborne sounds in the American lobster, *Homarus americanus*. Journal of Experimental Biology 208:3421-3429.

Herata, H., ed. 2007. International Workshop, Impacts of Seismic Survey Activities on Whales and Other Marine Biota – Proceedings. 6-7 September 2006, Dessau, Germany.

Heyning, J. E., and T. D. Lewis. 1990. Fisheries interactions involving baleen whales off southern California. Report of the International Whaling Commission 40:427-431.

Hildebrand, J. 2004. Impacts of anthropogenic sound on cetaceans. Paper SC/56/E13 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 19-22 July, Sorrento, Italy.

Hildebrand, J.A. 2005. Impacts of anthropogenic sound. Pages 101-124 *in* J.E. Reynolds, W.F. Perrin, R.R. Reeves, S. Montgomery, and T. Ragen, eds. Marine Mammal Research: Conservation Beyond Crisis. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Hill, P.S., J. L. Laake, and E. Mitchell. 1999. Results of a pilot program to document interactions between sperm whales and longline vessels in Alaska waters. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-108. NMFS, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA.

Hill, R.D. 1985. Investigation of lightning strikes to water surface. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 78:2096-2099.

Hillis-Starr, Z-M., R. Boulon, and M. Evans. 1998. Sea turtles of the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. Pages 334-337 *in* M.J. Mac, P.A. Opler, C.E. Puckett Haeker, and P.D. Doran, eds. Status and Trends of the Nation's Biological Resources, Volume 1. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

Hindell, M.A., D.J. Slip, and H.R. Burton. 1991. The diving behaviour of adult male and female southern elephant seals, *Mirounga leonina.* Australian Journal of Zoology 39:595-619.

Hirsh, A.G. and P.G. Rodhouse. 2000. Impacts of geophysical seismic surveying on fishing success. Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries 10:113-118.

Hirth, H.F. 1980. Some aspects of the nesting behavior and reproductive biology of sea turtles. American Zoologist 20:507-523.

Hochscheid, S., B.J. Godley, A.C. Broderick, and R.P. Wilson. 1999. Reptilian diving: Highly variable dive patterns in the green turtle *Chelonia mydas*. Marine Ecology Progress Series 185:101-112.

Hodge, R.P. 1979. *Dermochelys coriacea schlegeli* (Pacific leatherback) USA: Alaska. Herpetological Review 10:102.

Hofman, R.J. 1995. The changing focus of marine mammal conservation. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 10:462-465.

Hoelzel, A.R. and S.J. Stern. 2000. Minke Whales. Voyager Press, Stillwater, MN.

Hogarth, W.T. 2002. Declaration of William T. Hogarth in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 23 October. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division.

Holliday, D.V., R.E. Pieper, M.E. Clarke, and C.F. Greenlaw. 1987. The effects of airgun energy releases on the eggs, larvae, and adults of the northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*). API Publication 4453. Report by Tracor Applied Sciences for American Petroleum Institute, Washington, DC.

Holst, M. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's TAG seismic study in the Mid-Atlantic Ocean, October–November 2003. LGL Report TA2822-21. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Holst, M. 2009a. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's TAIGER Marine Seismic Program near Taiwan, April – July 2009. LGL Rep. TA4553-4. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 15 December.

Holst, M. 2009b. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Program in the Southwest Pacific Ocean, January – March 2009. LGL Report TA4686-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 17 May.

Holst, M. and J. Beland. 2008. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Seismic Testing and Calibration Study in the Northern Gulf of Mexico, November 2007 – February 2008. LGL Report TA4295-2. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, and LGL Alaska Research Associates, Anchorage, AK, for L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Holst, M. and J. Beland. 2010. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's ETOMO Marine Seismic Program in the Northeast Pacific Ocean, August – September 2009 – February 2008. LGL Report TA4597-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT and LGL Alaska Research Associates, Anchorage, AK for L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY; NMFS, Silver Spring, MD; and Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Vancouver, BC. 20 January.

Holst, M. and F.C. Robertson. 2009. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during a Rice University Seismic Survey in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, August 2009. LGL Report TA4760-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Rice University, Department of Earth Science, Houston, TX; L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY; and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. June.

Holst, M. and M.A. Smultea. 2008. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Program off Central America, February–April 2006. LGL Report TA4342-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005a. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Program off the Northern Yucatán Peninsula in the Southern Gulf of Mexico, January–February 2005. LGL Report TA2822-31. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. June.

Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005b. Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean off Central America, November–December 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-30. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Holst, M., W.J. Richardson, W.R. Koski, M.A. Smultea, B. Haley, M.W. Fitzgerald, and M. Rawson. 2006. Effects of large- and small-source seismic surveys on marine mammals and sea turtles. Eos Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Supplement, Abstract OS42A-01. 23-26 May 2006, Baltimore, MD.

Hooker, S.K. 1999. Resource and habitat use of northern bottlenose whales in the Gully: ecology, diving and ranging behaviour. Dissertation, Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada.

Hooker, S.K., R.W. Baird, S. Al-Omari, S. Gowans and H. Whitehead. 2001. Behavioural reactions of northern bottlenose whales (*Hyperoodon ampullatus*) to biopsy darting and tag attachment procedures. Fisheries Bulletin 99:303-308.

Hoover, K., S.S. Sadove, and P. Forestell. 1999. Trends of harbor seal, *Phoca vitulina*, abundance from aerial surveys in New York waters: 1985-1999. Page 85 *in* Abstracts of the 13th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 28 November-3 December 1999, Wailea, Maui, HI.

Horrocks, J.A. 1992. WIDECAST Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Barbados. CEP Technical Report No. 12. UNEP Caribbean Environment Program, Kingston, Jamaica.

Houser, D.S. and J.J. Finneran. 2006. Variation in the hearing sensitivity of a dolphin population determined through the use of evoked potential audiometry. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120:4090-4099.

Houston, J. 1991. Status of Cuvier's beaked whale, *Ziphius cavirostris*, in Canada. Canadian Field Naturalist 105:215-218.

Howard J., W.M. Roberts, and A.J. Hudspeth. 1988. Mechanoelectrical transduction by hair cells. Annual Review of Biophysics and Biophysical Chemistry 17:99-124.

Hu, M.Y., H.Y. Yan, W.S. Chung, J.C. Shiao and P.P. Hwang. 2009. Acoustically evoked potentials in two cephalopods inferred using the auditory brainstem response (ABR) approach. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part A 153:278–283.

Hudspeth, A.J. and V.S. Markin. 1994. The ear's gears: mechanical transduction by hair cells. Physics Today February:22-28.

Husar, S. 1977. *Trichechus inunguis*. Mammalian Species 72:1-4.

Husavik Whale Centre. 2006. Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). http://www.icewhale.is/default.asp?Id=552. Accessed 21 December.

Hutchinson, D.R. and P.E. Hart. 2004. Cruise report for G1-03-GM, USGS gas hydrates cruise, R/V/ Gyre, 1-14 May 2003, Northern Gulf of Mexico. USGS Open-File Report 03-474.

Imber, M.J. 1975. Behaviour of petrels in relation to the moon and artificial lights. Notornis 22:302–306.

InfoNatura. 2005. Birds, mammals, and amphibians of Latin America. http://www.natureserve.org/infonatura.

IAGC. 2004. Further analysis of 2002 Abrolhos Bank, Brazil humpback whale strandings coincident with seismic surveys. Houston, TX.

Ireland, D., M. Holst, and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine Mammal Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Seismic Program off the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, July-August 2005. LGL Report TA4089-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Irons, D.B., D.R. Nysewander, and J.L. Trapp. 1988. Prince William Sound sea otter distribution in respect to population growth and habitat type. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Anchorage, AK.

IUCN. 1992. Crocodiles: An Action Plan for their Conservation. Compiled by J. Thorbjarnarson; edited by H. Messel, F.W. King, and J.P. Ross. IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group. Gland, Switzerland, and Cambridge, UK.

IUCN. 2010. 2006 IUCN Redlist of Threatened Species. Version 2010.2. http://www.redlist.org/. Accessed July.

Iverson, R.T.B. 1967. Response of yellowfin tuna to underwater sound. Pages 105-121 *in* W.N. Tavolga, ed. Marine Bioacoustics, Volume 2. Pergamon Press, New York.

Iverson, R.T.B. 1969. Auditory thresholds of the scombrid fish *Euthynnus affinis*, with comments on the use of sound in tuna fishing. FAO Fisheries Report 62:849-859.

IWC. 2001. Report of the workshop on the comprehensive assessment of right whales: a worldwide comparison. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management Special Issue 2:1-60.

IWC. 2006. Whale population estimates. http://www.iwcoffice.org/conservation/estimate.htm. Last updated 5 September 2006, accessed 26 March 2007.

IWC. 2007. Report of the standing working group on environmental concerns. Annex K to Report of the Scientific Committee. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 9(Suppl.):227-260.

Jackson, H.R. and K.J. DesRoches, eds. 2008. 2008 Louis S. St-Laurent Field Report, August 22 - October 3, 2008. Geological Survey of Canada Open File 6275.

Jaquet, N. and H. Whitehead. 1996. Scale-dependent correlation of sperm whale distribution with environmental features and productivity in the South Pacific. Marine Ecology Progress Series 135:1-9.

Jefferson, T.A., S. Leatherwood, and M.A. Webber. 1993. FAO Species Identification Guide: Marine Mammals of the World. UNEP/FAO, Rome, Italy.

Jefferson, T.A., M.A. Webber, and R.L. Pitman. 2008. Marine Mammals of the World: A Comprehensive Guide to Their Identification. Academic Press, St. Louis, MO.

Jeffs, A., N. Tolimieri, and J.C. Montgomery. 2003. Crabs on cue for the coast: the use of underwater sound for orientation by pelagic crab stages. Marine and Freshwater Research 54:841-845.

Jeffs, A.G., J.C. Montgomery, and C.T. Tindle. 2005. How do spiny lobster post-larvae find the coast? New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 39:605-617.

Jenner, K.C.S., M.N. Jenner, and K.A. McCabe. 2001. Geographical and temporal movements of humpback whales in Western Australian waters. APPEA Journal 41:749-765.

Jensen, A.S. and G.K. Silber. 2003. Large whale ship strike database. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-25. NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, MD.

Jepson, P.D., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, F. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and A. Fernández. 2003. Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans. Nature 425:575-576.

Jepson, P.D., D.S. Houser, L.A. Crum, P.L. Tyack, and A. Fernández. 2005a. Beaked whales, sonar and the "bubble hypothesis". Pages 141-142 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Jepson, P.D. R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, A.M. Pocknell, H.M. Ross, J.R. Baker, F.E. Howie, R.J. Reid, A. Colloff, and A.A. Cunningham. 2005b. Acute and chronic gas bubble lesions in cetaceans stranded in the United Kingdom. Veterinary Pathology 42:291-305.

Jerko, H., I. Turunen-Rise, P.S. Enger, and O. Sand. 1989. Hearing in the eel (*Anguilla anguilla*). Journal of Comparative Physiology 165A:455-459.

Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 2004. Guidelines for Minimising Acoustic Disturbance to Marine Mammals from Seismic Surveys (April). http://www.jncc.gov.uk/pdf/Seismic_survey_guidelines_200404.pdf.

Jochens, A.E. and D.C. Biggs, eds. 2003. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico; Annual Report: Year 1. OCS Study MMS 2003-069. MMS, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.

Jochens, A. D. Biggs, K. Benoit-Bird, D. Engelhaupt, J. Gordon, C. Hu, N. Jaquet, M. Johnson, R. Leben, B. Mate, P. Miller, J. Ortega-Ortiz, A. Those, P. Tyack, and B. Würsig. 2008. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/Synthesis report. OCS Study MMS 2008-006. Report from the Department of Oceanography, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, for the Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.

Johnson, A.M. 1982. Status of Alaska sea otter populations and developing conflicts with fisheries. Pages 293-299 *in* Transactions of the 47th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington, DC.

Johnson, M., P.T. Madsen, W.M.X. Zimmer, N. Aguilar de Soto, and P. Tyack. 2004. Beaked whales echolocate on prey. Proceedings of the Royal Society, London B (Suppl.) 271:S383-S386.

Johnson, S.R. 2002. Marine mammal mitigation and monitoring program for the 2001 Odoptu 3-D seismic survey, Sakhalin Island Russia: Executive summary. Prepared by LGL Ltd, Sidney, BC, for Exxon Neftegas Ltd., Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia. Also available as Working Paper SC/02/WGW/19, IWC Western Gray Whale Working Group Meeting, Ulsan, South Korea, 22-25 October 2002.

Johnson, S.R., W.J. Richardson, S.B. Yazvenko, S.A. Blokhin, G. Gailye, M.R. Jenkerson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, A.S. Perlov, S.A. Rutenko, B. Würsig, C.R. Martin, and D.E. Egging. 2007. A western gray whale mitigation and monitoring program for a 3-D seismic survey, Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134:1-19.

Johnstone, C.E and C.T. Phillips. 2003. Sound production in sturgeon *Scaphirhynchus albus* and *S. platorynchus* (Acipenseridae). Environmental Biology of Fishes 68:59–64.

Jonsgård, Å. 1966. The distribution of Balaenopteridae in the North Atlantic Ocean. Pages 114-124 *in* K.S. Norris, ed. Whales, Dolphins, and Porpoises. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Jonsgård, A. and K. Darling. 1977. On the biology of the eastern North Atlantic sei whale, *Balaenoptera borealis* Lesson. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 1:124-129.

Jopling, B.C., S.J. Dolman, and M.P. Simmonds. 2006. Paper SC/58/E11 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St Kitts and Nevis.

Jorgenson, J.K. and E.C. Gyselman. 2009. Hydroacoustic measurements of the behavioral response of arctic riverine fishes to seismic airguns. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126:1598-1606.

Jorgensen, R., N.O. Handegard, H. Gjosaeter, and A. Slotte. 2004. Possible vessel avoidance behaviour of capelin in a feeding area and on a spawning ground. Fisheries Research 69:251-261.

Kaifu, K., S. Segawa, and K. Tsuchiya. 2007. Behavioral responses to underwater sound in the small benthic octopus *Octopus ocellatus*. Journal of the Marine Acoustic Society of Japan 34:46-53.

Kaifu, K., T. Akamatsu, and S. Segawa. 2008. Underwater sound detection by cephalopod statocyst. Fisheries Science 74:781-786.

Kajimura, H. 1984. Opportunistic feeding of the northern fur seal, *Callorhinus ursinus*, in the eastern North Pacific Ocean and eastern Bering Sea. NOAA Technical Report NMFS-SSRF-779.

Kalb, H. and D. Owens. 1994. Differences between solitary and arribada nesting olive ridley females during the internesting period. Page 68 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson, and P.J. Eliazar, compilers. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-351. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Kalmijn, A.J. 1988. Hydrodynamic and acoustic field detection. Pages 83-130 *in* J. Atema, R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga, eds. The Sensory Biology of Aquatic Animals. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Kalmijn, A.J. 1989. Functional evolution of lateral line and inner ear systems. Pages 187-216 *in* S. Coombs P. Görner, and H. Münz, eds. The Mechanosensory Lateral Line: Neurobiology and Evolution. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Kannada, S. and A. Romero. 2005. Past and present distribution of marine mammals in the Caribbean: A historical analysis of causes and consequences. Page 146 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Kapoor, B.G. and T.J. Hara, eds. 2001. Sensory Biology of Jawed Fishes: New Insights. Science Publishers, Inc., Enfield, NH.

Karlsen, H.E. 1992. Infrasound sensitivity in the plaice (*Pleuronecta platessa*). Journal of Experimental Biology 171:173-187.

Kasamatsu, F., S. Nishiwaki, and H. Ishikawa. 1995. Breeding areas and southbound migrations of southern minke whales *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*. Marine Ecology Progress Series 119: 1-10.

Kastak, D. and R.J. Schusterman. 1998. Low-frequency amphibious hearing in pinnipeds: methods, measurements, noise, and ecology. Journal of the Acoustical Society of American 103:2216-2228.

Kastak, D. and R.J. Schusterman. 1999. In-air and underwater hearing sensitivity of a northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 77:1751-1758.

Kastak, D., R.L. Schusterman, B.L. Southall, and C.J. Reichmuth. 1999. Underwater temporary threshold shift induced by octave-band noise in three species of pinnipeds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 106:1142-1148.

Kastak, D., B.L. Southall, R.J. Schusterman, and C. Reichmuth Kastak. 2005. Underwater temporary threshold shift in pinnipeds: effects of noise level and duration. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 118:3154-3163.

Kastelein, R.A., M. Hagedoorn, W.W.L. Au, and D. de Haan. 2003. Audiogram of a striped dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 113:1130-1137.

Kastelein, R.A., R. van Schie, W.C. Verboom and D. de Haan. 2005. Underwater hearing sensitivity of a male and a female Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 118:1820-1829.

Kastelein, R.A., P.J. Wensveen, L. Hoek, W.C. Verboom and J.M. Terhune. 2009. Underwater detection of tonal signals between 0.125 and 100 kHz by harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*). Journal of Acoustical Society of America 125:1222-1229.

Kasuya, T. 1986. Distribution and behavior of Baird's beaked whales off the Pacific coast of Japan. Scientific Report of the Whales Research Institute 37:61-83.

Kasuya, T. 2002. Giant beaked whales. Pages 519-522 *in* W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Kasuya, T. and T. Miyashita. 1988. Distribution of sperm whale stocks in the North Pacific. Science Report of the Whale Research Institute 39:31-75.

Kasuya, T. and S. Ohsumi. 1984. Further analysis of Baird's beaked whales in the waters adjacent to Japan. Report of the International Whaling Commission 33:633-641.

Kato, H. 2002. Bryde's whales *Balaenoptera edeni* and *B. brydei*. Pages 171-177 *in* W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Keinath, J.A. 1993. Movements and behaviour of wild and head-started sea turtles. Dissertation, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.

Keitt, B.S., B.R. Tershy, and D.A. Croll. 2004. Nocturnal behavior reduces predation pressure on black-vented shearwaters *Puffinus opisthomelas*. Marine Ornithology 32:173–178.

Kemper, C.M. 2002. Pygmy right whale *Caperea marginata*. Pages 1010-1012 *in* W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Kenney, R.D. 1990. Bottlenose dolphins off the northeastern United States. Pages 369-386 *in* S. Leatherwood and R. R. Reeves, eds. The Bottlenose Dolphin. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Kenney, R.D. 1996. Preliminary assessment of competition for prey between leatherback turtles and ocean sunfish in northeast shelf waters. Pages 144-147 *in* J.A. Keinath, D.E. Barnard, J.A. Musick, and B.A. Bell, compilers. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-387. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Kenney, R.D. and H.E. Winn. 1987. Cetacean biomass densities near submarine canyons compared to adjacent shelf/slope areas. Continental Shelf Research 7:107-114.

Kenyon, K.W. 1969. The sea otter in the eastern Pacific Ocean. North American Fauna 68. U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

Kenyon, K.W. 1975. The Sea Otter in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, NY.

Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals from underwater explosions. Pages 391-407 *in* R.A. Kastelein, J.A. Thomas, and P.E. Nachtigall, eds. Sensory Systems of Aquatic Mammals. De Spil Publishers, Woerden, Netherlands.

Ketten, D.R. 1998. Marine mammal auditory systems: a summary of audiometric and anatomical data and its implications for underwater acoustic impacts. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-256. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Ketten, D.R. 2000. Cetacean ears. Pages 43-108 *in* W.W.L. Au, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Hearing by Whales and Dolphins. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Ketten, D.R. 2004. Marine mammal auditory systems: a summary of audiometric and anatomical data and implications for underwater acoustic impacts. Polarforschung 72:79-92. ;

Ketten D.R. and J.J. Finneran. 2004. Injury [Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)] Criteria. Presentation to Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals, Marine Mammal Commission. Arlington, Virginia, 28-30 April.

Ketten, D.R., J. Lien, and S. Todd. 1993. Blast injury in humpback whale ears: evidence and implications. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 94:1849-1850. (Abstract)

Ketten, D.R., J. O'Malley, P.W.B. Moore, S. Ridgway, and C. Merigo. 2001. Aging, injury, disease, and noise in marine mammal ears. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 110:2721. (Abstract)

Knowlton, A.R. and M.W. Brown. 2007. Running the gauntlet: right whales and ship strikes. Pages 409-435 *in* S.D. Kraus and R.M. Rolland, eds. The Urban Whale: North Atlantic Right Whales at the Crossroads. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Knowlton, A.R., C.W. Clark, and S.D. Kraus. 1991. Sounds recorded in the presence of Sei whales, *Balaenoptera borealis*. Page 40 *in* Abstracts of the 9th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 5-9 December 1991, Chicago, IL.

Knowlton, A.R., J. Sigurjonsson, J.N. Ciano, and S.D. Kraus. 1992. Long-distance movements of North Atlantic Right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*). Marine Mammal Science 8:397-405.

Kolinski, S.P., D.M. Parker, L.I. Ilo, and J.K. Ruak. 2001. An assessment of the sea turtles and their marine and terrestrial habitats at Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Micronesica 34:55-72.

Komak, S., J.G. Boal, L. Dickel, and B.U. Budelmann. 2005. Behavioural responses of juvenile cuttlefish (*Sepia officinalis*) to local water movements. Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology 38:117-125.

Kongsberg Maritime. 2005a. Hydroacoustics, Echo Sounders Multibeam: EM 120 Multibeam echo sounder. http://www.km.kongsberg.com/KS/WEB/NOKBG0397.nsf/AllWeb/6B7656717DD9FE01C1256D4A0031824C?OpenDocument. Accessed 20 November.

Kongsberg Maritime. 2005b. Sub bottom profiler - SBP 120. http://www.km.kongsberg.com/KS/WEB/NOKBG0240.nsf/AllWeb/EF54BDEF668D0CABC1256CAE00303701?OpenDocument. Accessed 20 November.

Kopitsky, K., R.L. Pitman, and P.H. Dutton. 2002. Reproductive ecology of olive ridleys in the open ocean in the eastern tropical Pacific. Pages 90-91 *in* A. Mosier, A. Foley, and B. Brost, compilers. Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-477. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Koski, W.R., J.W. Lawson, D.H. Thomson, and W.J. Richardson. 1998. Marine Mammal Technical Report. Point Mugu Sea Range Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, and Ogden Environmental and Energy Services, Santa Barbara, CA, for Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA. December.

Koski, W.R., M.P. Heide-Jørgensen and K. Laidre. 2006. Winter abundance of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, in Hudson Strait, March 1981. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 8:139-144.

Koski, W.R., D.W. Funk, D.S. Ireland, C. Lyons, K. Christie, A.M. Macrander, and S.B. Blackwell. 2009. An update on feeding by bowhead whales near an offshore seismic survey in the central Beaufort Sea. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/61/BRG3.

Kostyvchenko, L.P. 1973. Effects of elastic waves generated in marine seismic prospecting on fish eggs in the Black Sea. Hydrobiological Journal 9:45-48.

Kraus, S.D. and R.M. Rolland. 2007. Right whales in the urban ocean. Pages 1-38 *in* S. D. Kraus and R. M. Rolland, eds. The Urban Whale: North Atlantic Right Whales at the Crossroads. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kraus, S.D., P.K. Hamilton, R.D. Kenney, A.R. Knowlton, and C.K. Slay. 2001. Reproductive parameters of the North Atlantic right whale. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management Special Issue 2:231-236.

Kreithen, M.L. and D.B. Quine. 1979. Infrasound detection by the homing pigeon: A behavioral audiogram. Journal of Comparative Physiology 129:1-4.

Kremser, U., P. Klemm, and W.D. Kötz. 2005. Estimating the risk of temporary acoustic threshold shift, caused by hydroacoustic devices, in whales in the Southern Ocean. Antarctic Science 17:3-10.

Kryter, K.D. 1985. The Effects of Noise on Man. 2nd edition. Academic Press, Orlando, FL.

La Bella, G., S. Cannata, C. Froglia, A. Modica, S. Ratti, and G. Rivas. 1996. First assessment of effects of air-gun seismic shooting on marine resources in the Central Adriatic Sea. Pages 227-238 *in* Society of Petroleum Engineers, International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment, New Orleans, Louisiana, 9-12 June.

Lacroix, D.L., R.B. Lanctot, J.A. Reed, and T.L. McDonald. 2003. Effect of underwater seismic surveys on molting male long-tailed ducks in the Beaufort Sea, Alaska. Canadian Journal of Zoology 81:1862-1875.

Ladich, F. and A.N. Popper. 2004. Parallel evolution in fish hearing organs. Pages 95-127 *in* G.A. Manley, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Evolution of the Vertebrate Auditory System. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Laist, D.W., A.R. Knowlton, J.G. Mead, A.S. Collet, and M. Podesta. 2001. Collisions between ships and whales. Marine Mammal Science 17:35-75.

Lance, M.M., S. A. Richardson, and H.L. Allen. 2004. Washington state recovery plan for the sea otter. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Wildlife Program, Olympia, WA. December.

Larsen, F. 1995. Abundance of minke and fin whales off West Greenland, 1993. Report of the International Whaling Commission 45:365-370.

Latha, G., S. Senthilvadivu, R. Venkatesan, and V. Rajendran. 2005. Sound of shallow and deep water lobsters: Measurements, analysis, and characterization (L). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117: 2720-2723.

Laurinolli, M.H. and N.A. Cochrane. 2005. Hydroacoustic analysis of marine mammal vocalization data from ocean bottom seismometer mounted hydrophones in the Gully. Pages 89-95 *in* K. Lee, H. Bain and G.V. Hurley, eds. Acoustic Monitoring and Marine Mammal Surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf Before and During Active Seismic Surveys. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 151.

Lazell, J.D. 1980. New England waters: critical habitat for marine turtles. Copeia 1980:290-295.

L-DEO. 2005. R/V *Langseth* Seismic Source Arrays. Personal communication via email from J. Diebold, Chief Scientist for Marine Operations, to A. Shor, Program Director, Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF. 23 November.

L-DEO. 2006. Marine Operations: R/V *Ewing* Replacement Plan. http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/res/fac/oma/replacement/index.html.

L-DEO. 2010. Marine Operations: R/V *Marcus G. Langseth*. http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/res/fac/oma/langseth/index.html. Accessed 1 September.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003a. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* in the Hess Deep Area of the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean. LGL Report TA2822-4. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 18 March.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003b. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* off the West Coast of Norway in the Norwegian Sea. LGL Report TA2822-6. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 29 April.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003c. Environmental Assessment of Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Surveys in the Mid-Atlantic Ocean. LGL Report TA2822-9. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 28 July.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003d. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* near Bermuda. LGL Report TA2822-10. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 5 August.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003e. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean. LGL Report TA2822-13. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 11 September.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003f. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* off the Northern Yucatán Peninsula, Gulf of Mexico, March-April 2004. LGL Report TA2822-15. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 1 October.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003g. Environmental Assessment of Marine Seismic Testing Conducted by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* in the Northern Gulf of Mexico, May – June 2003. LGL Report TA2822-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 7 March.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003h. Request by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory for an Incidental Harassment Authorization to allow the incidental take of marine mammals during a marine seismic survey off the northern Yucatán Peninsula, Gulf of Mexico, March–April 2004. LGL Report TA2822-14. Prepared by LGL Ltd, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

L-DEO and NSF. 2004a. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by R/V *Maurice Ewing* on the Blanco Fracture Zone in the Northeastern Pacific Ocean, July 2004. LGL Report TA2822-22. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 25 February.

L-DEO and NSF. 2004b. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* in the Eastern Pacific Ocean off Central America, Late Autumn 2004. LGL Report TA2822-18. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. June.

L-DEO and NSF. 2004c. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* in the Gulf of Alaska, Late Summer/Early Autumn 2004. LGL Report TA2822-24. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 6 April.

L-DEO and NSF. 2004d. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Kilo Moana* around the Aleutian Islands, June–July 2005. LGL Report 4089-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 20 December.

L-DEO and NSF. 2005. Revisions to the Environmental Assessment and IHA Application for a 2005 Summer Aleutian Islands Seismic Survey. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 17 February.

L-DEO and NSF. 2006a. Draft Environmental Assessment of the Batholiths Marine Seismic Survey, Inland Waterways and Near-Offshore, Central Coast of British Columbia. LGL Report TA2822-32. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, Sidney, BC. 28 March.

L-DEO and NSF. 2006b. Draft Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the Bermuda Rise area, October–November 2006. LGL Report TA4250-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. February.

L-DEO and NSF. 2007a. Environmental Assessment of two Marine Geophysical Surveys by R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, 2008. LGL Report TA4397-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 21 August.

L-DEO and NSF. 2007b. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* off Central America, January-March 2008. LGL Report TA4342-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 16 April.

L-DEO and NSF. 2008a. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in Southeast Asia, March-July 2009. LGL Report TA4553-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 24 October.

L-DEO and NSF. 2008b. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in Southwest Pacific Ocean, January-February 2009. LGL Report TA4686-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 15 August.

L-DEO and NSF. 2008c. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the Gulf of Alaska, September 2008. LGL Report TA4412-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 8 April.

L-DEO and NSF. 2009. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the Northeast Pacific Ocean, August-September 2009. LGL Report TA4597-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 11 February.

Leatherwood, S., L.J. Harrington-Coulombe, and C.L. Hubbs. 1978. Relict survival of the sea otter in central California and evidence of its recent redispersal south of Point Conception. Bulletin of Southern California Academy of Sciences 77:109-115.

Leatherwood, S., B.S. Stewart, and P.A. Folkens. 1987. Cetaceans of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary. Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary, Santa Barbara, CA and National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA.

Le Boeuf, B.J., D.P. Costa, A.C. Huntley, G.L. Kooyman, and R.W. Davis. 1986. Pattern and depth of dives in northern elephant seals, *Mirounga angustirostris*. Journal of Zoology 208:1-7.

Le Boeuf, B.J., Y. Naito, A.C. Huntley, and T. Asaga. 1989. Prolonged, continuous, deep diving by northern elephant seals. Canadian Journal of Zoology 67:2514-2519.

Le Corre, M., A. Ollivier, S. Ribes, and P. Jouventin. 2002. Light-induced mortality of petrels: a four year study from Re´union Island (Indian Ocean). Biological Conservation 105:93–102.

LeDuc, R., W.L. Perryman, J.W. Gilpatrick, Jr., C. Stinchcomb, J.V. Carretta, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2001. A note on recent surveys for right whales in the southeastern Bering Sea. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management Special Issue 2:287-289.

Lee, Wu-Jung1,; Yu, Hsin-Yi; Chou, Lien-Siang. 2005. Vocalization Repertoire of the Three Strayed Rough-Toothed Dolphins (*Steno bredanensis*) in the Danshui River, Taipei, Taiwan. Page 165 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Lefebvre, L.W., T.J. O'Shea, G.B. Rathburn, and R.C. Best. 1989. Distribution, status, and biogeography of the West Indian manatee. *In* C.A. Woods and F.E. Sergile, eds. Biogeography of the West Indies: Past, Present, and Future. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Lenhardt, M. 2002. Sea turtle auditory behavior. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 112(5, Pt. 2):2314 (Abstract).

Lenhardt, M.L. 1994. Seismic and very low frequency sound induced behaviors in captive loggerhead marine turtles (*Caretta caretta*). Pages 238-241 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson, and P.J. Eliazar, compilers. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-351. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Lenhardt, M.L., S. Bellmund, R.A. Byles, S.W. Harkins, and J.A. Musick. 1983. Marine turtle reception of bone-conducted sound. Journal of Auditory Research 23:119-125.

Lesage, V., C. Barrette, M.C.S. Kingsley and B. Sjare. 1999. The effect of vessel noise on the vocal behavior of belugas in the St. Lawrence River estuary, Canada. Marine Mammal Science 15:65-84.

LGL. 2003. Marine Mammal Monitoring During Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Acoustic Calibration Study in the Northern Gulf of Mexico, 2003. LGL Report TA2822-12. September. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

LGL. 2005. Marine Mammal and Bird Observations during a Survey in Support of the BATHOLITHS Research Project in the Southeastern Queen Charlotte Basin, British Columbia. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, Sidney, BC, for Department of Geosciences, Princeton University, NJ. 14 November.

Limpus, C.J. 1995a. Conservation of marine turtles in the Indo-Pacific region. Final report to the Australian Nature Conservancy Agency, Canberra, Australia.

Limpus, C.J. 1995b. Global overview of the status of marine turtles: a 1995 viewpoint. Pages 605-609 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, ed. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Revised edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Limpus, C.J. and N. MacLachlin. 1979. Observations on the leatherback turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea* (L.), in Australia. Australian Wildlife Research 6:105-116.

Limpus, C.J. and N. MacLachlin. 1994. The conservation status of the Leatherback Turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*, in Australia. Pages 63-67 *in* Proceedings of the Australian Marine Turtle Conservation Workshop, Gold Coast, 14-17 November 1990.

Limpus, C.J., A. Fleay, and M. Guinea. 1984. Sea turtles of the Capricornia section, Great Barrier Reef. Pages 61-78 *in* W. T. Ward and P. Saenger, eds. The Capricornia Section of the Great Barrier Reef: Past, Present and Future. Royal Society of Queensland and Australian Coral Reef Society.

Little, B., E.M. Seibert, J. Townsend, J.H. Sprinkle, Jr., and J. Knoerl. 2000. National Register Bulletin 36: Guidelines for Evaluating and Registering Archeological Properties. http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/arch/index.htm.

Ljungblad, D. and K. Stafford. 2005. Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) acoustic results from the 2003-2004 International Whaling Commission-Southern Ocean Whale and Ecosystem Research Circumpolar Cruise, Area V. Page 170 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Ljungblad, D.K., S.E. Moore, and D.R. Van Schoik. 1984. Aerial surveys of endangered whales in the Beaufort, eastern Chukchi, and northern Bering Seas, 1983: with a five year review, 1979-1983. NOSC Technical Report 955. Prepared by Naval Ocean Systems Center, San Diego, CA for MMS, Anchorage, AK.

Ljungblad, D.K., B. Würsig, S.L. Swartz, and J.M. Keene. 1988. Observations on the behavioral responses of bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) to active geophysical vessels in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Arctic 41:183-194.

Ljungblad, D.K., K.M. Stafford, H. Shimada, and K. Matsuoka. 1997. Sounds attributed to blue whales recorded off the southwest coast of Australia in December 1995. Report of the International Whaling Commission 47:435-439.

Lohmann, K.J. and C.M.F. Lohmann. 1998. Migratory guidance mechanisms in marine turtles. Journal of Avian Biology 29:585-596.

Lohmann, K.J., B.E. Witherington, C.M.F. Lohmann, and M. Salmon. 1997. Orientation, navigation, and natal beach homing in sea turtles. Pages 107-135 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Lohmann, K.J., S.D. Cain, S.A. Dodge, and C.M.F. Lohmann. 2001. Regional magnetic fields as navigational markers for sea turtles. Science 294(5541):364-366.

Løkkeborg, S. 1991. Effects of geophysical survey on catching success in longline fishing. Paper presented at the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Annual Science Conference. ICES CM B 40:1-9.

Longhurst, A. 2006. Ecological Geography of the Sea. 2nd Edition. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

López-Castro, M.C., W.J. Nichols, and M. Orantes. 2000. Olive ridley nesting in Baja California Sur, Mexico: Preliminary observations. Pages 273-274 *in* H. Kalb and T. Wibbels, compilers. Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-443. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Love, M.S and A. York. 2005. A comparison of the fish assemblages associated with an oil/gas pipeline and adjacent seafloor in the Santa Barbara Channel, Southern California Bight. Bulletin of Marine Science 77:101-117.

Love, M.S., D.M. Schroeder, and W.H. Lenarz. 2005. Distribution of boccaccio (*Sebastes paucispinis*) and cow cod (Sebastes levis) around oil platforms and natural outcrops off California with implications for larval production. Bulletin of Marine Science 77:397-408.

Lovell, J.M., M.M. Findley, R.M. Moate, and H.Y. Yan. 2005a. The hearing abilities of the prawn *Palaemon serratus*. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A 140:89-100.

Lovell, J.M., M.M. Findlay, R.M. Moate, J.R. Nedwell, and M.A. Pegg. 2005b. The inner ear morphology and hearing abilities of the paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*) and the lake sturgeon (*Acipenser fulvescens*). Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part A 142:286- 296.

Lucke, K., U. Siebert, P.A. Lepper, and M.-A. Blanchet. 2009. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after exposure to seismic airgun stimuli. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 125:4060-4070.

Luczkovich, J.J., M.W. Sprague, S.E. Johnson, and R.C. Pullinger. 1999. Delimiting spawning areas of weakfish *Cynoscion regalis* (Family Sciaenidae) in Pamlico Sound, North Carolina using passive acoustic surveys. Bioacoustics 1999:143-160.

Lutcavage, M.E. 1996. Planning your next meal: Leatherback travel routes and ocean fronts. Pages 174-178 *in* J.A. Keinath, D.E. Barnard, J.A. Musick, and B.A. Bell, compilers. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-387. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Lutcavage, M.E. and P.L. Lutz. 1997. Diving physiology. Pages 277-296 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Lutcavage, M. and J.A. Musick. 1985. Aspects of the biology of sea turtles in Virginia. Copeia 1985:449-456.

Lutcavage, M.E., P. Plotkin, B. Witherington. and P.L. Lutz. 1997. Human impacts on sea turtle survival. Pages 387-409 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Lutz. P.L. and J.A. Musick, eds. 1997. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Lux, J., R.Reina, and L. Stokes. 2003. Nesting activity of leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in relation to tidal and lunar cycles at Playa Grande, Costa Rica. Pages 215-216 *in* J.A. Seminoff, compiler. Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-503. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

MacAskie, I.B. and C.R. Forrester. 1962. Pacific leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys*) off the coast of British Columbia. Copeia 3:646.

MacGillivray, A.O. and D. Hannay. 2007. Chapter 3: Summary of noise assessment. Pages 3-1 – 3-21 *in* Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc. in the Chukchi Sea, July-October 2006. LGL Report P903-2. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates Inc., Anchorage, AK, and JASCO Research Ltd., Victoria, BC, for ConocoPhillips Alaska Inc., Anchorage, AK, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Macleod, K., M.P. Simmonds, and E. Murray. 2006. Abundance of fin (*Balaenoptera physalus*) and sei whales (*B. borealis*) amid oil exploration and development off northwest Scotland. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 8:247-254.

MacLean, S.A. and B. Haley. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Støregga slide area of the Norwegian Sea, August-September 2003. LGL Report TA2822-20. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates, Inc., Anchorage, AK, for L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY.

MacLean, S.A. and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine Mammal Monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Seismic Program in the Gulf of Alaska, August – September 2004. LGL Report TA2822-28. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Madsen, P.T., B. Mohl, B.K. Nielsen, and M. Wahlberg. 2002. Male sperm whale behavior during exposures to distant seismic survey pulses. Aquatic Mammals 28:231-240.

Madsen, P.T., M. Johnson, P.J.O. Miller, N. Aguilar de Soto, J. Lynch, and P.L. Tyack. 2006. Quantitative measures of air gun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. Journal of the Acoustic Society of America 120:2366–2379.

Malakoff, D. 2002. Seismology - Suit ties whale deaths to research cruise. Science 298(5594):722-723.

Malme, C.I. and P.R. Miles. 1985. Behavioral responses of marine mammals (gray whales) to seismic discharges. Pages 253-280 *in* G.D. Greene, F.R. Engelhard, and R.J. Paterson, eds. Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment, January 1985, Halifax, NS. Technical Report 5. Canadian Oil & Gas Lands Admininstration, Environmental Protection Branch, Ottawa, ONT.

Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. 1984. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Report 5586. Prepared by Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Alaska OCS Region, Anchorage, AK.

Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, P. Tyack, C.W. Clark, and J.E. Bird. 1985. Investigation of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on feeding humpback whale behavior. BBN Report 5851; OCS Study MMS 85-0019. Prepared by BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK.

Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1986. Behavioral responses of gray whales to industrial noise: feeding observations and predictive modeling. Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment Program, Final Report. BBN Rep. 6265. OCS Study MMS 88-0048. Prepared by BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for NMFS and MMS, Anchorage, AK.

Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, B., J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1988. Observations of feeding gray whale responses to controlled industrial noise exposure. Pages 55-73 *in* W.M. Sackinger, M.O. Jeffries, J.L. Imm, and S.D. Treacy, eds. Port and Ocean Engineering under Arctic Conditions, Vol. II. Symposium on Noise and Marine Mammals. University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK.

Manly, B.F.J., V.D. Moulton, R.E. Elliott, G.W. Miller, and W.J. Richardson. 2007. Analysis of covariance of fall migrations of bowhead whales in relation to human activities and environmental factors, Alaskan Beaufort Sea: Phase I, 1996-1998. LGL Report TA2799-2; OCS Study MMS 2005-033. Report from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and WEST Inc., Cheyenne, WY, for Minerals Management Service, Herndon, VA, and Anchorage, AK.

Mann, D.A., Z. Lu, and A.N. Popper. 1997. A clupeid fish can detect ultrasound. Nature 389:341.

Mann, D.A., Z. Lu, M.C. Hastings, and A.N. Popper. 1998. Detection of ultrasonic tones and simulated dolphin echolocation clicks by a teleost fish, the American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 104:562-568.

Mann, D.A., D.M. Higgs, W.N. Tavolga, M.J. Souza, and A.N. Popper. 2001. Ultrasound detection by clupeiforme fishes. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 109:3048-3054.

Mann, D.A., A.N. Popper, and B. Wilson. 2005. Pacific herring hearing does not include ultrasound. Biological Letters 1:158-161.

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

Marcatto, M.A., M.B. Alonso, and C.P. Bertozzi. 2005. Marine mammal sightings during fishery operations in southeastern and southern Brazil. Page 179 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Márquez, M.R. 1990. Sea Turtles of the World: An Annotated and Illustrated Catalogue of Sea Turtle Species Known to Date. FAO Fisheries Synopsis No. 125, Vol 11. Rome, Italy.

Mate, B. and J. Urbán. 2005. The spring northward migration and summer feeding of mother gray whales in the eastern North Pacific. Page 182 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, San Diego, CA, 12-16 December 2005.

Mate, B.R., K.M. Stafford, and D.K. Ljungblad. 1994. A change in sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) distribution correlated to seismic surveys in the Gulf of Mexico. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 96:3268-3269.

Maybaum, H.L. 1990. Effects of a 3.3 kHz sonar system on humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in Hawaiian waters. Eos 71(2):92.

Maybaum, H.L. 1993. Responses of humpback whales to sonar sounds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 94:1848-1849.

May-Collado, L., T. Gerrodette, J. Calambokidis, K. Rasmussen, and I. Sereg. 2005. Patterns of cetacean sighting distribution in the Pacific Exclusive Economic Zone of Costa Rica based on data collected from 1979-2001. Revista de Biologia Tropical 53:249-263.

McCauley, R.D. and D.H. Cato. 2003. Acoustics and marine mammals: introduction, importance, threats and potential as a research tool. Pages 332-353 *in* N. Gales, M. Hindell, and R. Kirkwood, eds. Marine Mammals: Fisheries, Tourism and Management issues. CSIRO Publications, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

McCauley, R.D. and J.R. Hughes. 2006. Marine seismic mitigation measures – perspectives in 2006. Paper SC/58/E44 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St Kitts and Nevis.

McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. APPEA Journal 38:692-707.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: Analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Report from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, for Australian Petroleum Production Association, Sydney, NSW.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch and K. McCabe. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. APPEA Journal 40:692-706.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, and A.N. Popper. 2003. High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 113:638-642.

McDonald, M.A. and S.E. Moore. 2002. Calls recorded from North Pacific right whales (*Eubalaena japonica*) in the eastern Bering Sea. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 4:261-266.

McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.C. Webb. 1995. Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the Northeast Pacific. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 98:712-721.

McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.M. Wiggins. 2006. Increases in deep ocean ambient noise in the Northeast Pacific west of San Nicholas Island, California. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120:711-718.

McGavern, L. 1989. Plastics: Sealing the Fate of Marine Life. MIT Sea Grant College Program for Coastweeks.

McLellan, W.M., A.S. Friedlaender, J.G. Mead, C.W. Potter, and D.A. Pabst. 2003. Analysing 25 years of bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) strandings along the Atlantic coast of the USA: do historic records support the coastal migratory stock hypothesis? Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 4:297-304.

MCS Advisory Board, ed. 2006. Imaging Earth History Beneath the Ocean Floor: Three Decades of Major Scientific Accomplishment. Prepared by Geosciences Professional Services, Inc., Bethesda, MD. Available at http://www.geo-prose.com/projects/imaging_earth.html.

McShane, L.J., J.A. Estes, M.L. Riedman, and M.M. Staedler. 1995. Repertoire, structure, and individual variation of vocalizations in the sea otter. Journal of Mammalogy 76:414-427.

Mecklenberg, C.W., T.A. Mecklenberg, and L.K. Thorsteinson. 2002. Fishes of Alaska. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD.

Medwin, H. 2005. Sounds in the Sea: From Ocean Acoustics to Acoustical Oceanography. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

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

Mellinger, D.K., K.M. Stafford, and C.G. Fox. 2004. Seasonal occurrence of sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) sounds in the Gulf of Alaska, 1999–2001. Marine Mammal Science 20:48–62.

Melvin, E.F., J.K. Parrish, and L.L. Conquest. 1999. Novel tools to reduce seabird bycatch in coastal gillnet fisheries. Conservation Biology 13:1386-1397.

Méndez, M., M. Arbelo, E. Sierra, A. Godinho, M.J. Caballero, J. Jaber, P. Herráez, and A. Fernández. 2005. Lung fat embolism in cetaceans stranded in Canary Islands. Page 189 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Mesnick, S.L. and K. Ralls. 2002. Mating systems. Pages 726-733 *in* W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and H.G.M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Meyer M. and A.N. Popper. 2002. Hearing in "primitive" fish: brainstem responses to pure tone stimuli in the lake sturgeon, *Acipenser fulvescens*. Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology 25:11-12 (Abstract).

Meylan, A. 1995. Sea turtle migration: Evidence from tag returns. Pages 91-100 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, ed. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Revised Edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Mignucci-Giannoni A.A. and D.K. Odell. 2001. Tropical and subtropical records of hooded seals (*Cystophora cristata*) dispel the myth of extant Caribbean monk seals (*Monachus tropicalis*). Bulletin of Marine Science 68:47-58.

Mikhalev, Y. 1997. Humpback whales *Megaptera novaeangliae* in the Arabian Sea. Marine Ecology Progress Series 149:13-21.

Miksis-Olds, J.L. and J.H. Miller. 2006. Transmission loss in manatee habitats. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120:2320-2327.

Miksis-Olds, J.L., P.L. Donaghay, J.H. Miller, P.L. Tyack, and J. Nystuen. 2007. Noise level correlates with manatee use of foraging habitats. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 121:3011-3020.

Miller, J.D. 1997. Reproduction in sea turtles. Pages 51-81 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Miller, J.D., K.A. Dobbs, C.J. Limpus, N. Mattocks, and A.M. Landry, Jr. 1998. Long-distance migrations by the hawksbill turtle, *Eretmochelys imbricata*, from north-eastern Australia. Wildlife Research 25:89-95.

Miller, G.W., R.E. Elliott, W.R. Koski, V.D. Moulton, and W.J. Richardson. 1999. Whales. Pages 5-1 to 5-109 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Report TA2230-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Miller, P.J.O., N. Biassoni, A. Samuels, and P.L. Tyack. 2000. Whale songs lengthen in response to sonar. Nature 405(6789):903.

Miller, G.W., V.D. Moulton, R.A. Davis, M. Holst, P. Millman, A. MacGillivray, and D. Hannay. 2005. Monitoring seismic effects on marine mammals—southeastern Beaufort Sea, 2001-2002. Pages 511-542 *in* S.L. Armsworthy, P.J. Cranford, and K. Lee, eds. Offshore Oil and Gas Environmental Effects Monitoring/Approaches and Technologies. Battelle Press, Columbus, OH.

Minke Whale Project. 2004a. International Whaling Commission Report – Dwarf Minke Whales. http://www.minkewhale.org/iwc_report.htm. Accessed 12 July 2006.

Minke Whale Project. 2004b. Dwarf Minke Whale *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*: Migration. http://www.minkewhale.org/whale_migration.htm. Accessed 19 December 2007.

Minton, G., T. Collins, K. Findlay, R. Baldwin, H.C. Rosenbaum, F. Kennedy and V. Cockcroft. 2002. Preliminary investigations of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) distribution and habitat use off the coast of Oman. Paper SC/54/H3 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 20-24 May 2002, Shimonoseki, Japan.

Misund. O. A., J. T. Øvreal, and M. T. Hafsteinsson. 1996. Reactions of herring schools to the sound field of a survey vessel. Aquatic Living Resources 9:5-11.

Mitson, R.B. and H.P. Knudsen. 2003. Causes and effects of underwater noise on fish abundance estimation. Aquatic Living Resources 16:255-263.

Mizroch, S.A. 1991. Distribution of minke whales in the North Pacific based on sightings and catch data. Paper 43/Mi36 presented at the IWC Annual Meeting, Reykjavik, Iceland, 27-31 May.

MMC. 2003. Marine Mammal Species of Special Concern. http://www.mmc.gov/species. Last updated 19 December 2003, accessed March 2006 and June 2006.

MMC. 2004. Annual Report to Congress 2003. Bethesda, MD. 30 April.

MMS. 1993. Social Indicators Study of Alaskan Coastal Villages: IV, Postspill Key Informant Summaries, Schedule C Communities, Part 2 (Kenai, Tyonek, Seldovia, Kodiak City, Kariuk, Old Harbor, Chignik). Technical Report No. 155. Alaska OCS Region, Anchorage, AK. May.

MMS. 2000. Shipwrecks off Alaska's Coast. http://www.mms.gov/alaska/ref/ships/index.htm. Last updated 6 June, accessed 7 June.

MMS. 2002. Liberty Development and Production Plan. Final Environmental Impact Statement. OCS EIS/EA, MMS 2002-019, 4 volumes. Alaska OCS Region, Anchorage, AK. May.

MMS. 2003. MMS and California, Summer 2003. http://www.mms.gov/ooc/newweb/congressionalaffairs/statepapers2003/california2003.pdf. Accessed 21 June 2006.

MMS. 2004. Geological and Geophysical Exploration for Mineral Resources on the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment. OCS EIS/EA MMS 2004-054. Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. July.

MMS. 2006a. Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment: Arctic Ocean Outer Continental Shelf Seismic Surveys - 2006. OCS EIS/EA MMS 2006-038. Alaska OCS Region, Anchorage, AK. June.

MMS. 2006b. Personal communication via telephone, Robin Cacy, Public Affairs Officer, Alaska OCS Region, Regional Directors Office, Anchorage, AK. 21 June.

MMS. 2007. Notice to Lessees and Operators (NTL) of Federal Oil, Gas, and Sulphur Leases in the Outer Continental Shelf, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region: Implementation of Seismic Survey Mitigation Measures and Protected Species Observer Program. NTL No. 2007-G02. 7 February.

Mobley, J.R., Jr. 2005. Assessing responses of humpback whales to North Pacific Acoustic Laboratory (NPAL) transmissions: results of 2001-2003 aerial surveys north of Kauai. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117:1666-1673.

Moein, S.E., J.A. Musick, J.A. Keinath, D.E. Barnard, M. Lenhardt, and R. George. 1994. Evaluation of seismic sources for repelling sea turtles from hopper dredges. Report from Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Gloucester Point, VA, for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, MS.

Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. 2006. Special status species: northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*). http://www.mbnms-simon.org/projects/specialSpecies/elephant_seal.php. Last updated January 2006, accessed February 2007.

Montevecchi, W.A., F.K. Wiese, G. Davoren, A.W. Diamond, F. Huettmann, and J. Linke. 1999. Seabird attraction to offshore platforms and seabird monitoring from offshore support vessels and other ships: literature review and monitoring designs. Report prepared for Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Calgary, AB.

Moore, C.J., S.L. Moore, M.K. Leecaster, and S.B. Weisberg. 2001. A comparison of plastic and plankton in the North Pacific Central Gyre. Marine Pollution Bulletin 42:1297-1300.

Moore, M.J., S.D. Berrow, B.A. Jensen, P. Carr, R. Sears, V.J. Rowntree, R. Payne, and P.K. Hamilton. 1999. Relative abundance of large whales around South Georgia (1979-1998). Marine Mammal Science 15:287-302.

Moore, P.W.B. and R.J. Schusterman. 1987. Audiometric assessment of northern fur seals *Callorhinus ursinus*. Marine Mammal Science 3:31–53.

Moore, S. 2001. Aleutian Passes cruise: killer whale component introduction. AFSC Quarterly Report.

Moore, S.E. and R.P. Angliss. 2006. Overview of planned seismic surveys offshore northern Alaska, July-October 2006. Paper SC/58/E6 presented to IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St Kitts and Nevis.

Moore, S.E. and J.T. Clarke. 2002. Potential impact of offshore human activities on gray whales (*Eschrichtius robustus*). Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 4:19-25.

Moore, S.E., K.M. Stafford, M.E. Dahlheim, C.G. Fox, H.W. Braham, J.J. Polovina, and D.E. Bain. 1998. Seasonal variation in reception of fin whale calls at five geographic areas in the North Pacific. Marine Mammal Science 14:617-627.

Moore, S. E., J.M. Waite, L.L. Mazzuca, and R.C. Hobbs. 2000. Mysticete whale abundance and observations of prey associations on the central Bering Sea shelf. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 2:227-234.

Moore, S.E., J.M. Waite, N.A. Friday, and T. Honkalehto. 2002a. Cetacean distribution and relative abundance on the central-eastern and the southeastern Bering Sea shelf with reference to oceanographic domains. Progress in Oceanography 55:249-261.

Moore, S.E., W.A. Watkins, M.A. Daher, J.R. Davies, and M.E. Dahlheim. 2002b. Blue whale habitat associations in the Northwest Pacific: analysis of remotely-sensed data using a Geographic Information System. Oceonagraphy 15:20-25.

Moore, S.E., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, and J.A. Hildebrand. 2006. Listening for large whales in offshore waters of Alaska. BioScience 56:49-55.

Moreno, I.B., A.N. Zerbini, D. Danielwicz, M.C. de Oliveira Santos, P.C. Simoes-Lopez, J. Laison-Brito, Jr., and A.F. Azevedo. 2005. Page 198 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Mori, K., S. Ichiki, H. Tsutsui, and M. Uchikomi. 2005. Distribution and residencey of Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops aduncus*) in the waters of the Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands, Japan. Page 198 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Morreale, S., E. Standora, F. Paladino, and J. Spotila. 1994. Leatherback migrations along deepwater bathymetric contours. Page 109 *in* B.A. Schroeder and B.E. Witherington, compilers. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-341. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Mosher, D.C., J.W. Shimeld, and D.R. Hutchinson. 2009. 2009 Canada Basin Seismic Reflection and Refraction Survey, Western Arctic Ocean: CCGS Louis S. St.. Laurent Expedition Report. Geological Survey of Canada Open File 6343.

Moulton, V.D. and J.W. Lawson. 2002. Seals, 2001. Pages 3-1 – 3-48 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine Mammal and Acoustical Monitoring of WesternGeco's Open Water Seismic Program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 2001. LGL Report TA2564-4. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ONT and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for WesternGeco, Houston, TX, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Moulton, V.D. and G.W. Miller. 2005 (published 2007). Marine mammal monitoring of a seismic survey on the Scotian Slope, 2003. Pages 29-40 *in* K. Lee, H. Bain and G.V. Hurley, eds. Acoustic Monitoring and Marine Mammal Surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during Active Seismic Surveys. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 151.

Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, and R.A. Buchanan. 2005. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Resources' 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2004. LGL Report SA817. Prepared by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NF, for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, AB, ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, NF, and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, AB.

Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, R.E. Harris, and R.A. Buchanan. 2006a. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Limited's 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2005. LGL Report SA843. Prepared by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NF, for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, AB, ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, NF, and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, AB.

Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, and R.A. Buchanan. 2006b. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of ConocoPhillips' 3-D seismic program in the Laurentian Sub-basin, 2005. LGL Report SA849. Prepared by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NF, for ConocoPhillips Canada Resources Corp., Calgary, AB.

Moyle, P.B. 2001. Inland fish of California, 2nd edition. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Mrosovksy, N. 1972. Spectrographs of the sounds of leatherback turtles. Herpetologica 28:256-258.

Mullin, K.D. and G.L. Fulling. 2003. Abundance of cetaceans in the southern U.S. North Atlantic Ocean during summer 1998. Fisheries Bulletin 101:603-613.

Musick, J.A. and C.J. Limpus. 1997. Habitat utilization and migration in juvenile sea turtles. Pages 137-163 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Nachtigall, P.E., J.L. Pawloski, and W.W.L. Au. 2003. Temporary threshold shifts and recovery following noise exposure in the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 113:3425-3429.

Nachtigall, P.E., A.Y. Supin, J. Pawloski, and W.W.L. Au. 2004. Temporary threshold shifts after noise exposure in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) measured using evoked auditory potentials. Marine Mammal Science 20:673-687.

NAMMCO. 2005. Status of marine mammals in the North Atlantic: Minke whale. http://www.nammco.no/webcronize/images/Nammco/634.pdf. Accessed 6 June 2006.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration. 2006. North Atlantic Productivity. http://disc.gsfc.nasa.gov/oceancolor/scifocus/space/ocdst_north_atlantic_productivity.shtml. Last updated 14 February.

Nations, C.S., S.B. Blackwell, K.H. Kim, A.M. Thode, C.R. Greene, Jr., A.M. Macrander, and T.L. McDonald. 2009. Effects of seismic exploration in the Beaufort Sea on bowhead whale call distributions. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126(4, Pt. 2):2230 (Abstract).

NAVFAC Pacific. 2007. Marine mammal and sea turtle survey and density estimates for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Prepared by SRS-Parsons Joint Venture, Newport, CA, Geo-Marine, Inc., Plano, TX, and Bio-Waves, Inc., Encinitas, CA, for NAVFAC Pacific and Commander Pacific Fleet, Honolulu, HI. August.

Nedwell, J.R., A.W.H. Turnpenny, J. Lovell, S.J. Parvin, R. Workman, J.A.L. Spinks and D. Howell. 2007. A validation of the dB_{ht} as a measure of the behavioural and auditory effects of underwater noise. Subacoustech Report 534R1231. Prepared by Subacoustech, Bishop's Waltham, Hants., UK, for Chevron Ltd.

Neff, J.M. 1985. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. Pages 416-454 *in* G.M. Rand and S.R. Petrodelli, eds. Fundamentals of Aquatic Toxicology. Hemisphere Publishing, Washington, DC.

Nelson, J.S. 2006. The Fishes of the World. John Wiley and Sons, New York, NY.

Nelson, J.S., E.J. Crossman, H. Espinosa-Perez, L.T. Findley, C.R. Gilbert, R.N. Lea, and J.D. Williams. 2004. Common and Scientific Names of Fishes from the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Sixth Edition. American Fisheries Society Special Publication 29. Bethesda, MD.

New England Fishery Management Council. 1998. Essential Fish Habitat Amendment. http://www.nefmc.org/habitat/index.html. 7 October.

New Jersey Scuba Diver. 2006. Marine Biology: Commercial fishing vessels, Dive Sites, and Artifacts and Shipwrecks. http://www.njscuba.net/. Accessed 20 June 2006.

New Jersey SHPO. 2006. Personal communication via telephone, Deborah Fimbel, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Natural & Historic Resources, Trenton, NJ. June.

New York Seafood Council. 2004. Major New York Commercial Fishing Port Areas and Commercial Landings. http://www.nyseafood.com/doc.asp?document_id=3599. Accessed July 2006.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. 2006. Marine Fishery Landings and Statistics. http://www.dec.state.ny.us/website/dfwmr/marine/bmr/marstats.html. Accessed July.

New Zealand Department of Conservation. 2006. Guidelines for Minimising Acoustic Disturbance to Marine Mammals from Seismic Survey Operations. Marine Conservation Unit, Wellington, NZ. February 2006

Nichol, L., E. Gregr, R. Flinn, J. Ford, R. Gurney, L. Michaluk, and A. Peacock. 2002. British Columbia commercial whaling catch data 1908 to 1967: A detailed description on the B.C. historic whaling database. Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2371.

Nichols, W.J., P.H. Dutton, J.A. Seminoff, E. Bixby, F.A. Abreu, and A. Resendiz. 2000a. Poi or papas: Do Hawaiian and Mexican green turtles feed together in Baja California waters? Pages 14-15 *in* H. Kalb and T. Wibbels, compilers. Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-443. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Nichols, W.J., A. Resendiz, J.A. Seminoff, and B. Resendiz. 2000b. Transpacific migration of a loggerhead turtle monitored by satellite telemetry. Bulletin of Marine Science 67:937-947.

Nieukirk, S.L., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, R.P. Dziak, and C.G. Fox. 2004. Low-frequency whale and seismic airgun sounds recorded in the mid-Atlantic Ocean. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 115: 1832-1843.

Nishimoto, M.M. and L. Washburn. 2002. Patterns of coastal eddy circulation and abundance of pelagic juvenile fish in the Santa Barbara Channel, California, USA. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 241: 183-199.

Nishiwaki, M., T. Kasuya, N. Miyazaki, N. Toboyama, and T. Kataoka. 1979. Present distribution of the dugong in the world. Scientific Report of the Whale Research Institute 31:133-141.

NJDEP. 2006a. New Jersey Division of Fish & Wildlife, Marine Fisheries Administration, Commercial Regulations – 2006 (Revised February 2006). http://www.nj.gov/dep/fgw/pdf/2006/comregs06.pdf. Accessed 20 June 2006.

NJDEP. 2006b. Division of Fish and Wildlife, Bureau of Marine Fisheries. http://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/marfhome.htm. Accessed 20 June.

NMFS. 1992. Recovery plan for the Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*). Prepared by the Steller Sea Lion Recovery Team. Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 1993. Designated Critical Habitat; Steller Sea Lion; Final Rule. Federal Register 58:45269-45285.

NMFS. 1994a. Designated critical habitat; northern right whale. Federal Register 59:28793-28808.

NMFS. 1994b. Designated critical habitat; Steller sea lion; final rule; technical amendment. Federal Register 59:30715-30716.

NMFS. 1995. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; offshore seismic activities in Southern California. Federal Register 60:53753-53760.

NMFS. 1998a. Recovery plan for the blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*). Prepared by R.R. Reeves, P.J. Clapham, R.L. Brownell, Jr., and G.K. Silber for NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 1998b. Draft recovery plan for the fin whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*) and sei whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*). Prepared by R.R. Reeves, G.K. Silber, and P.M. Payne for NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 1998c. Recovery Plan for the Shortnose Sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*). Prepared by the Shortnose Sturgeon Recovery Team for NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. December.

NMFS. 2000. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; marine seismic-reflection data collection in southern California. Federal Register 65:16374-16379.

NMFS. 2001a. Stock structure of coastal bottlenose dolphins along the Atlantic coast of the US. Prepared for the Bottlenose Dolphin Take Reduction Team. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

NMFS. 2001b. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; oil and gas exploration drilling activities in the Beaufort Sea/Notice of issuance of an incidental harassment authorization. Federal Register 66:9291-9298.

NMFS. 2002. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion: Authorization of Pelagic Fisheries under the Fishery Management Plan for Pelagic Fisheries of the Western Pacific Region. Southwest Region, Pacific Islands Area Office, Honolulu, HI.

NMFS. 2003a. Taking of threatened or endangered species incidental to commercial fishing operations; Final rule and technical correction. Federal Register 68:69962-69967.

NMFS. 2003b. Biological Opinion on Marine Mammal Conservation Division's Incidental Harassment Authorization to Lamont-Doherty's Earth Observatory for Takes Incidental to Marine Seismic Testing in the Northern Gulf of Mexico [F/FPR/2003/00342]. Silver Spring, MD. 23 May.

NMFS. 2004a. Northern fur seal study funded. Alaska Region News Release. NMFS 04-AKR, July 12, 2004. http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/newsreleases/nfs071204.htm.

NMFS. 2004b. Biological Opinion for Issuance of an MMPA Authorization to Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Survey in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and Adjacent Atlantic Ocean [F/FPR/2003/01492]. Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 2004c. NOAA scientists sight blue whales in Alaska: Critically endangered blue whales rarely seen in Alaska waters. NOAA-04-R160:1-2. NMFS Alaska Region News Release, Juneau, AK. 27 July.

NMFS. 2005a. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Essential Fish Habitat Identification and Conservation in Alaska, Volume 1. Alaska Region, Juneau, AK. April.

NMFS. 2005b. Biological Opinion for Low-Energy Seismic Survey by Scripps Institute of Oceanography in the Southwest Pacific Ocean. Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 2005c. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. Federal Register 70:1871-1875.

NMFS. 2005d. Final Recovery Plan for the Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*). Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 2005e. Green Sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*) Status Review Update. Biological Review Team, Santa Cruz Laboratory, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, Santa Cruz, CA. February.

NMFS. 2005f. Biological Opinion for Marine Seismic Research on the Chicxulub Crater off the Northern Yucatan Peninsula in the Gulf of Mexico [F/FPR/2003/01540]. Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 2005g. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. Federal Register 70:1871-1875.

NMFS. 2006a. Endangered and Threatened Species; Revision of Critical Habitat for the Northern Right Whale in the Pacific Ocean. Federal Register 71:38277-38297.

NMFS. 2006b. Steller Sea Lion Critical Habitat and No-Entry Zones. http://www.fakr.noaa.gov/protectedresources/stellers/habitat.htm. Accessed 12 June.

NMFS. 2006c. Olive Ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys oliveacea*). http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/turtles/olive.html. Accessed on 13 June.

NMFS. 2006d. Proposed Recovery Plan for Southern Resident Killer Whales (*Orcinus orca*). Northwest Regional Office, Seattle, WA. November.

NMFS. 2007. Office of Protected Resources, Fisheries Interaction/Protected Species Bycatch, http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/by_catch/bycatch_rm.htm. Accessed 10 Decmber.

NMFS. 2008a. Biological Opinion for Issuance of an MMPA Authorization to Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's Marine Seismic Survey off Central America. Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 2008b. Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for North Pacific Right Whale. Federal Register 73:19000-19014.

NMFS. 2010. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Threatened Status for Southern Distinct Population Segment of Eulachon. Federal Register 75:13012-13024.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998a. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*). NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998b. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*). NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998c. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998d. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*). NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998e. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the olive ridley turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*). NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998f. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the East Pacific green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS and USFWS. 2007a. Green Sea Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) 5-year Review: Summary and Evaluation. NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, MD and USFWS, Southeast Region, Ecological Services Field Office, Jacksonville, FL. August.

NMFS and USFWS. 2007b. Hawksbill Sea Turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) 5-year Review: Summary and Evaluation. NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, MD and USFWS, Southeast Region, Ecological Services Field Office, Jacksonville, FL. August.

NOAA. 1999. Environmental Review Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. Administrative Series 216-6. 20 May.

NOAA. 2001. Guidance on Programmatic Environmental Impact Statements. Memorandum prepared by C.R. O'Connor, Acting General Counsel, Washington, DC, for W.T. Hogarth, Assistant Administrator for Fisheries. 11 December.

NOAA. 2003. Guidance on Adopting National Environmental Policy Act Documents Prepared by Other Federal Agencies. Memorandum from S. Kennedy, Acting NOAA NEPA Coordinator, Silver Spring, MD. 17 December.

NOAA. 2005. Sound in the deep sea. www.oceanexplorer.noaa.gov/explorations/03fire/background/acoustics/acoustics.html. Last updated 11 July 2005, accessed 28 April 2006.

NOAA. 2006. Office of Coast Survey: Automated Wreck and Obstruction Information System (AWOIS). http://chartmaker.ncd.noaa.gov/hsd/hsd-3.html. Last updated 14 April, accessed 19 June.

NOAA Fisheries. 2005. Final Assessment of NOAA Fisheries' Critical Habitat Analytical Review Teams for 12 Evolutionarily Significant Units of West Coast Salmon and Steelhead. Protected Resources Division. Portland, OR.

NOAA Fisheries. 2006a. Office of Science and Technology: Annual Commercial Landing Statistics. http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/commercial/landings/annual_landings.html. Last updated 15 November 2005, accessed 20 June 2006.

NOAA Fisheries. 2006b. Office of Science and Technology: Recreational Fisheries. http://www.st.nmfs.gov/st1/recreational/index.html. Accessed 20 June 2006.

NOAA Fisheries. 2010. Office of Protected Resources: Species Information. www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/. Accessed November.

NOAA and U.S. Navy. 2001. Joint interim report: Bahamas marine mammal stranding event of 15-16 March 2000. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations and Environment, Washington, DC.

North Pacific Fishery Management Council. Fishery management plan for the salmon fisheries in the EEZ off the coast of Alaska. North Pacific Fishery Management Council and National Marine Fishery Service.

North Pacific Right Whale Recovery Team. 2004. National Recovery Strategy for the North Pacific Right Whale (*Eubalaena japonica*) in Pacific Canadian waters. Department of Fisheries & Oceans Canada, Vancouver, BC.

North Slope Borough Department of Planning and Community Services. 2004. Revision to the North Slope Borough Coastal Management Plan: Distribution of Subsistence Use. http://www.co.north-slope.ak.us/acmp/CMP%20Plan/NSBTerrestrialSubsistence.pdf. Last updated 24 May 2005, accessed 8 June 2006.

Nøttestad, L., T. Falkenhaug, J. Horne, C. Anderson, E. Olsen, U. Pietkowski, H. Skov, G. Vikingsson, and G. Waring. 2005. Marine mammal hot spots along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge from Iceland to the Azores investigated by integrated acoustics, biological sampling and visual observations. Page 208 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Nowacek, D.P., L.H. Thorne, D.W. Johnston, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. Mammal Review 37:81-115.

Nowak, R.M. 1999. Walker's Mammals of the World. Sixth Edition. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

NRC. 1990. Decline of the Sea Turtles: Causes and Preventions. National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

NRC. 1995. Clean Ships, Clean Ports, Clean Oceans. National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

NRC. 2003a. Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals. National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

NRC. 2003b. Decline of the Steller sea lion in Alaska waters: Untangling food webs and fishing nets. National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

NRC. 2005. Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise: Determining When Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects. Prepared by D.W. Wartzok, J. Altmann, W. Au, K. Ralls, A. Starfield, and P.L. Tyack. National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

NSF. 2005. Notice of Intent To Prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for the National Science Foundation To Address Potential Impacts on the Marine Environment Related to the Use of Seismic Sources in Support of NSF-Funded Research by U.S. Academic Scientists. Federal Register 70: 55630-55631.

NSF. 2006a. Investing in America's Future: Strategic Plan FY 2006-2011. NSF 06-48. Arlington, VA. September. Available at:

NSF. 2006b. Past and Current Year Program Supported by NSF Division of Ocean Sciences and Arctic Section of Office of Polar Programs. Personal communication via email from A. Shor, Program Director, Division of Ocean Sciences, Arlington, VA to R. Spaulding, TEC Inc., Bainbridge Island, WA. 11 May.

NSF. 2008a. United States National Science Foundation: FY2007 Performance Highlights. NSF 08-03Arlington, VA. Available at: http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2008/nsf0803/highlights_complete.pdf.

NSF. 2008b. Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Integrated Ocean Drilling Program-U.S. Implementing Organization (IODP-USIO). Prepared for Consortium for Ocean Leadership, Inc., Washington, DC, in Collaboration with Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, and Texas A&M University/Texas A&M University Research Foundation. June.

Offutt, G.C. 1970. Acoustic stimulus perception by the American lobster, *Homarus americanus* (Decapoda). Experientia 26: 1276-1278.

OGP. 2008. Fundamentals of Underwater Sound. Report No. 406. London, UK. May.

O'Hara, J. and J.R. Wilcox. 1990. Avoidance responses of loggerhead turtles, *Caretta caretta*, to low frequency sound. Copeia 1990:564-567.

O'Hara, K., N. Atkins, and S. Iudicello. 1986. Marine Wildlife Entanglement in North America. Prepared by Center for Environmental Education, Washington, DC.

Olavarría, C., M. Poole, N. Hauser, C. Garrigue, S. Caballero, M. Brasseur, K. Martien, K. Russell, M. Oremus, R. Dodemont, L. Flórez-González, J. Capella, H. Rosenbaum, D. Moro, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J. Bannister, and C.S. Baker. 2003. Population differentiation of humpback whales from far Polynesia (Group F breeding grounds) based on mitochondrial DNA sequences. Paper SH/55/SH11 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 26 May–6 June, Berlin, Germany.

Olesiuk, P.F. 1999. An assessment of the status of harbour seals (*Phoca vitulina*) in British Columbia. Technical Report 99/33. Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Pacific Biological Station, Nanaimo, BC.

Oliver, J.A. 1946. An aggregation of Pacific sea turtles. Copeia 2:103.

Olsen, E., L. Nøttestad, L. Kleivane, P. Budgell, R. Prieto, M. Silva, and N. Øien. 2005. Intelligent migration of a sei whale from the Azores to the Labrador Sea in April. Page 208 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Omura, H. 1955. Whales in the northern part of the North Pacific. Norsk Hvalfangst-Tidende 44:323-345.

Packard, A., H.E. Karlsen, and O. Sand. 1990. Low frequency hearing in cephalopods. Jorunal of Comparative Physiology A 166: 501-505.

Page, B., J. McKenzie, R. McIntosh, A. Baylis, A. Morrissey, N. Calvert, T. Haase, M. Berris, D. Dowie, P.D. Shaughnessy, and S.D. Goldsworthy. 2004. Entanglement of Australian sea lions and New Zealand fur seals in lost fishing gear and other marine debris before and after Government and industry attempts to reduce the problem. Marine Pollution Bulletin 49:33-42.

Palka, D.L. 2006. Summer abundance estimates of cetaceans in US North Atlantic Navy Operating Areas. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 06-03. NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA.

Parente, C.L., J.D. Lontra, and M.E. de Araujo. 2006. Occurrence of sea turtles during seismic surveys in Northeastern Brazil. Biota Neotropica 6:Jan/Apr.

Park, Y.S., T. Maukai, and Y. Sakurai. 1995. Auditory characteristics of walleye pollock *Theragra chalcogramma* (Pallus). Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 61:159-163.

Parker, D.M., P. Dutton, S. Eckert, D.R. Kobayashi, J.J. Polovina, D. Dutton, and G.H. Balazs. 2004. Transpacific migration along oceanic fronts by loggerhead turtles released from Sea World San Diego. Pages 280-281 *in* M.S. Coyne and R.D. Clark, compilers. Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-528. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Parker, P.L. and T.F. King. 1998. Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties. http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/nrb38/.

Parks, S.E., C.W. Clark, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: the potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 122:3725-3731.

Parry, G.D. and A. Gason. 2006. The effect of seismic surveys on catch rates of rock lobsters in western Victoria, Australia. Fisheries Research 79:272-284.

Parsons, T.R., M. Takahashi, and B. Hargrave. 1977. Biological Oceanographic Processes. 2nd edition. Pergamon Press, Oxford, UK.

Parvin, S.J. 1998. The effects of low frequency underwater sound on divers. Pages 227-232 *in* Proceedings of Undersea Defence Technology (UDT) Europe 98, 23-25 June 1998, Wembley Conference Centre London, UK.

Payne, P.M., J.R. Nicolas, L. O'Brien, and K.D. Powers. 1986. The distribution of the humpback whale, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, on Georges Bank and in the Gulf of Maine in relation to densities of the sand eel, *Ammodytes americanus*. Fishery Bulletin 84:271-277.

Payne, P.M., D.W. Heinemann, and L.A. Selzer. 1990. A distributional assessment of cetaceans in shelf/shelf-edge and adjacent slope waters of the northeastern United States based on aerial and shipboard surveys, 1978-1988. NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA.

Payne, J.F., C.A. Andrews, L.L. Fancey, A.L. Cook, and J.R. Christian. 2007. Pilot Study on the Effects of Seismic Air Gun Noise on Lobster (*Homarus americanus*). Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2712.

Payne, J.F., C. Andrews, L. Fancey, D. White, and J. Christian. 2008. Potential Effects of Seismic Energy on Fish and Shellfish: An Update since 2003. Fisheries and Oceans Canada Science, Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2008/060.

Payne, J.F., J. Coady, and D. White. 2009. Potential effects of seismic airgun discharges on monkfish eggs (*Lophius americanus*) and larvae. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 170. St. John's, NL.

Pearson, W.H., J.R. Skalski, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on behavior of captive rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 49:1343-1356.

Pearson, W., J. Skalski, S. Sulkin, and C. Malme. 1994. Effects of seismic energy releases on the survival and development of zoeal larvae of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). Marine Environmental Research 38:93-113.

Pendoley, K. 1997. Sea turtles and management of marine seismic programs in Western Australia. Petroleum Exploration Society of Australia Journal 25:8-16.

Perry, S.L., D.P. DeMaster, and G.K. Silber. 1999. The great whales: history and status of six species listed as endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973. Marine Fisheries Review (Special Issue) 61:1-74.

Peterson, A.P., editor. 2006. Zoological Nomenclature Resource (Zoonomen): Birds. http://www.zoonomen.net. Last updated 26 April.

PFMC. 1998. The coastal pelagic species fishery management plan. Amendment 8. Portland, OR.

PFMC. 2006. Pacific coast groundfish fishery management plan for the California, Oregon, and Washington groundfish fishery as amended through Amendment 19 including Amendment 16-4. Portland, OR.

PFMC. 2007. Fishery management plan for US west coast fisheries for highly migratory species. As amended by Amendment 1. Portland, OR.

Pickard, G.L. and W.J. Emery. 1990. Descriptive physical oceanography. 5th edition. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, UK.

Pickett, G.D., D.R. Eaton, R.M.H. Seaby, and G.P. Arnold. 1994. Results of bass tagging in Poole Bay during 1992. Laboratory Leaflet Number 74. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Directorate of Fisheries Research, Lowestoft, UK.

Pierson, M.O., J.P. Wagner, V. Langford, P. Birnie, and M.L. Tasker. 1998. Protection from, and mitigation of, the potential effects of seismic exploration on marine mammals. Chapter 7 in M.L. Tasker and C. Weir, eds. Proceedings of the Seismic and Marine Mammals Workshop, London, 23-25 June 1998.

Pike, G.C. 1962. Migration and feeding of the gray whale (*Eschrichtius gibbosus*). Journal of the Fisheries Research Board Canada 19:815-38.

Pitcher, K.W. 1989. Studies of southeastern Alaska sea otter populations: distribution, abundance, structure, range expansion and potential conflicts with shellfisheries. Alaska Department of Fish and Game, Anchorage, AK.

Pitman, R.L. 1990. Pelagic distribution and biology of sea turtles in the eastern tropical Pacific. Pages 143-148 in T.H. Richardson, J.I. Richardson, and M. Donnelly, compilers. Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-278. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Center, Miami, FL.

Pitman, R.L. 2002. Mesoplodont whales *Mesoplodon* spp. Pages 738-742 *in* W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Pitman, R.L. and M.S. Lynn. 2001. Biological observations of an unidentified mesoplodont whale in the eastern tropical Pacific and probable identity: *Mesoplodon peruvianus*. Marine Mammal Science 17: 648-657.

Pitman, R.L., A. Aguayo L., and J. Urbán R. 1987. Observations of an unidentified beaked whale (*Mesoplodon* sp.) in the eastern tropical Pacific. Marine Mammal Science 3:345-352.

Pitman, R.L., D.M. Palacios, P.L.R. Brennan, B.J. Brennan, K.C. Balcomb, III, and T. Miyashita. 1999. Sightings and possible identity of a bottlenose whale in the tropical Indo-Pacific: *Indopacetus pacificus*? Marine Mammal Science 15:531-549.

Plachta, D.T.T. and A.N. Popper. 2003. Evasive responses of American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*) to ultrasonic stimuli. Acoustic Research Letters Online 4:25-30.

Plotkin, P.T., R.A. Byles, and D.W. Owens. 1994a. Post-breeding movements of male olive ridley sea turtles *Lepidochelys olivacea* from a nearshore breeding area. Page 119 *in* K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson, and P.J. Eliazar, compilers. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-351. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Plotkin, P.T., R.A. Byles, and D.W. Owens. 1994b. Migratory and reproductive behavior of *Lepidochelys olivacea* in the eastern Pacific Ocean. Page 138 *in* B.A. Schroeder and B.E. Witherington, compilers. Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-341. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Polacheck, T. 1987. Relative abundance, distribution and inter-specific relationship of cetacean schools in the eastern tropical Pacific. Marine Mammal Science 3:54-77.

Polovina J.J., E. Howell, D.M. Parker, and G.H. Balazs. 2003. Dive-depth distribution of loggerhead *(Caretta caretta)* and olive ridley *(Lepidochelys olivacea)* sea turtles in the central North Pacific: might deep longline sets catch fewer turtles? Fishery Bulletin 101:189–193.

Polovina, J.J., D.R. Kobayashi, D.M. Parker, M.P. Seki, and G.H. Balazs. 2000. Turtles on the edge: movements of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) along oceanic fronts, spanning longline fishing grounds in the central north Pacific, 1997-1998. Fisheries Oceanography 9:71-82.

Popper, A.N. 2003. Effects of anthropogenic sounds on fish. Fisheries 28:24-31.

Popper, A.N. 2005. A Review of Hearing by Sturgeon and Lamprey. Report for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District, Portland, OR. 12 August.

Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 1993. Sound detection and processing by fish: critical review and major research questions. Brain, Behavior, and Evolution 41:14-38.

Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 1999. The auditory periphery in fishes. Pages 43-100 *in* R.R. Fay and A.N. Popper, eds. Comparative Hearing: Fish and Amphibians. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 2010. Rethinking sound detection by fishes. Hearing Research (in press). doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2009.12.023.

Popper, A.N., M. Salmon, and K.W. Horch. 2001. Acoustic detection and communication by decapod crustaceans. Journal of Comparative Physiology A 187:83-89.

Popper, A.N., R.R. Fay,C. Platt, and O. Sand. 2003. Sound detection mechanisms and capabilities of teleost fishes. Pages 3-38 *in* S.P. Collin and N.J. Marshall, eds. Sensory Processing in Aquatic Environments. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Popper, A.N., M.E. Smith, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, A.O. MacGillivray, M.E. Austin, and D.A. Mann. 2005. Effects of exposure to seismic airgun use on hearing of three fish species. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117:3958-3971.

Popper, A.N., T.J. Carlson, A.D. Hawkins, B.L. Southall, and R.L. Gentry. 2006. *Interim criteria* for injury of fish exposed to pile driving operations: A white paper. Prepared for the Fisheries Hydroacoustic Working Group established by the California Department of Transportation, Oregon Department of Transportation, and Federal Highways Administration. 13 May.

Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. 2006. Seaport. http://www.panynj.gov/DoingBusinessWith/seaport/html/index.html. Accessed July.

Port of Hueneme. 2006. Port of Hueneme, Oxnard Harbor District. http://www.portofhueneme.org/. Accessed 21 June.

Port of Los Angeles. 2006. Port of Los Angeles. http://www.portoflosangeles.org/. Accessed 21 June.

Potter, J.R. 2004. A possible mechanism for acoustic triggering of decompression sickness symptoms in deep-diving marine mammals. Paper presented to the 2004 IEEE International Symposium on Underwater Technology, Taipei, Taiwan, 19-23 April.

Potter, J.R., M. Thillet, C. Douglas, M.A. Chitre, Z. Doborzynski and P.J. Seekings. 2007. Visual and passive acoustic marine mammal observations and high-frequency seismic source characteristics recorded during a seismic survey. IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineers 32:469-483.

Preen, A.R., H. Marsh, I.R. Lawler, R.I.T. Prince, and R. Shepherd. 1997. Distribution and abundance of dugongs, turtles, dolphins, and other megafauna in Shark Bay, Ningaloo Reef and Exmouth Gulf, Western Australia. Wildlife Research 24:185-208.

Price, A. 2007. The effects of high frequency, high intensity underwater sound on the oxygen uptakes of *Mytilus edulis* (L.). Bachelor of Science Thesis (Honours), Applied Biology, Heriot-Watt University, Scotland.

Prince, R.I. 1993. Western Australian marine turtle conservation project: an outline of scope and an invitation to participate. Marine Turtle Newsletter 60:14.

Prince, R.I. 1994a. The Flatback turtle *Natator depressus* in Western Australia: new information from the Western Australian Marine Turtle Project. Pages 146-153 *in* Proceedings of the Australian Marine Turtle Conservation Workshop, Gold Coast, 14-17 November 1990.

Prince, R.I. 1994b. Status of the Western Australian marine turtle populations: the Western Australian Marine Turtle Project 1986-1990. Pages 1-14 *in* Proceedings of the Australian Marine Turtle Conservation Workshop, Gold Coast, 14-17 November 1990.

Pritchard, P.C.H. 1973. International migrations of South American sea turtles (Cheloniidae and Cermochelidae). Animal Behavior 21:18-27.

Projecto TAMAR. 2006. Species in Brazil. http://ospiti.peacelink.it/zumbi/org/tamar/eng/species.html#ver. Accessed 13 June.

Provancha, J.A. and Provancha, M.J. 1988. Long-term trends in abundance and distribution of manatees in the northern Banana River, Brevard County, FL. Marine Mammal Science 4:323-338.

Pye, H.J., and W.H. Watson, III. 2004. Sound detection and production in the American lobster, *Homarus americanus*: Sensitivity range and behavioural implications. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 115 (Part 2):2486.

Racca, R.G. and J.A. Scrimger. 1986. Underwater Acoustic Source Characteristics of Air and Water Guns. Prepared by JASCO Research Ltd., Victoria, BC, for Defence Research Establishment Pacific (DREP). Contract No. 06SB 97708-5-7055.

Radford, C.A., A.G. Jeffs, and J.C. Montgomery. 2007. Orientated swimming behavior of crab postlarvae in response to reef sound. Poster at First International Conference on the Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life, Nyborg, Denmark, August 2007.

Ralls, K., B.B. Hatfield, and D.B. Siniff. 1995. Foraging patterns of California sea otters as indicated by telemetry. Canadian Journal of Zoology 73:523-531.

Ralls, K., T.C. Eagle, and D.B. Siniff. 1996. Movement and spatial use patterns of California sea otters. Canadian Journal of Zoology 74:1841-1849.

Ramcharitar, J., D.M. Higgs, and A.N. Popper. 2001. Sciaenid inner ears: a study in diversity. Brain Behavior and Evolution 58:152-162.

Ramcharitar, J. and A.N. Popper. 2004. Masked auditory thresholds in sciaenid fishes: a comparitive study. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 116:1687-1691.

Rawizza, H.E. 1995. Hearing and associative learning in cuttlefish, *Sepia officinalis*. Hopkins Marine Station Student Paper. Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Reeves, R.R. 1992. Whale responses to anthropogenic sounds: A literature review. Science and Research Series 47. New Zeland Department of Conservations, Wellington, NZ.

Reeves, R.R. and H. Whitehead. 1997. Status of the sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus*, in Canada. Canadian Field-Naturalist 111:293-307.

Reeves, R.R., S. Leatherwood, S.A. Karl, and E.R. Yohe. 1985. Whaling results at Akutan (1912-39) and Port Hobron (1927-37), Alaska. Report of the International Whaling Commission 35:441-457.

Reeves, R.R., B.S. Stewart, and S. Leatherwood. 1992. The Sierra Club Handbook of Seals and Sirenians. Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, CA.

Reeves, R.R., E. Mitchell and H. Whitehead. 1993. Status of the northern bottlenose whale, *Hyperoodon ampullatus*. Canadian Field-Naturalist 107:490-508.

Reeves, R.R., B.S. Stewart, P.J. Clapham, and J.A. Powell. 2002. Guide to Marine Mammals of the World. Chanticleer Press, New York, NY.

Reeves, R.R., T.D. Smith, and E.A. Josephson. 2007. Near-annihilation of a species: right whaling in the North Atlantic. Pages 39-74 *in* S.D. Kraus and R.M. Rolland, eds. The Urban Whale: North Atlantic Right Whales at the Crossroads. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Reiser, C.M., B. Haley, J. Beland, D.M. Savarese, D.S. Ireland, and D.W. Funk. 2009. Evidence of short-range movements by phocid species in reaction to marine seismic surveys in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort seas. Page 211 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Renaud, M.L. and J.A. Carpenter. 1994. Movements and submergence patterns of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Gulf of Mexico determined through satellite telemetry. Bulletin of Marine Science 55:1-15.

Reyes, J.C. 1991. The conservation of small cetaceans: a review. Prepared for the Secretariat of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals. UNEP/CMS Secretariat, Bonn, Germany.

Reynolds, J.E. and D.K. Odell. 1991. Manatees and Dugongs. Facts on File Inc., New York, NY.

Rice, D.W. 1986. Beaked whales. Pages 102-109 *in* D. Haley, ed. Marine Mammals of the Eastern North Pacific and Arctic Waters. Pacific Search Press, Seattle, WA.

Rice, D.W. 1989. Sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* Linnaeus, 1758. Pages 177-233 *in* S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, eds. Handbook of Marine Mammals, Vol. 4: River Dolphins and the Larger Toothed Whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Rice, D.W. 1998. Marine Mammals of the World: Systematics and Distribution. Special Publication 4, Society for Marine Mammalogy.

Rice, D.W. and C.H. Fiscus. 1968. Right whales in the south-eastern North Pacific. Norsk Hvalfangsttid 57:105-107.

Rice University and NSF. 2009. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Endeavor* in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, August 2009. LGL Report TA4760-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 12 May.

Richard, P., L. Loseto, G. Stern, J. Orr, and S. Ferguson. 2005 Using resource selection function analysis to determine ice and shelf habitat use in Beaufort beluga whales. Page 236 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Richards, R. 2002. Southern right whales: a reassessment of their former distribution and migration routes in New Zealand waters, including on the Kermadee grounds. Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand 32:355-377.

Richardson, W.J. and B. Würsig. 1997. Influences of man-made noise and other human actions on cetacean behaviour. Marine and Freshwater Behavioral Physiology 29:183-209.

Richardson, W.J., M.A. Fraker, B. Würsig, and R.S. Wells. 1985. Behaviour of bowhead whales *Balaena mysticetus* summering in the Beaufort Sea: reactions to industrial activities. Biological Conservation 32:195-230.

Richardson, W.J., B. Würsig, and C.R. Greene. 1986. Reactions of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, to seismic exploration in the Canadian Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 79:1117-1128.

Richardson, W.J., R.A. Davis, C.R. Evans, D.K. Ljungblad, and P. Norton. 1987. Summer distribution of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, relative to oil industry activities in the Canadian Beaufort Sea, 1980-84. Arctic 40:93-104.

Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995a. Marine Mammals and Noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene Jr., J.S. Hanna, W.R. Koski, G.W. Miller, N.J. Patenaude, M.A. Smultea, R. Blaylock, R. Elliott, and B. Wursig. 1995b. Acoustic effects of oil production activities on bowhead and white whales visible during spring migration near Pt. Barrow, Alaska-1991 and 1994 phases. OCS Study MMS 95-0051. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for MMS, Herndon, VA.

Richardson, W.J., G.W. Miller, and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Displacement of migrating bowhead whales by sounds from seismic surveys in shallow waters of the Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 106:2281. (Abstract)

Richardson, W.J., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and M. Cummings. 2009. Responses of cetaceans to large-source seismic surveys by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. Page 213 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Ridgway, S. H. and R. Harrison. 1989. Handbook of Marine Mammals, Vol. 4: River Dolphins and the Larger Toothed Whales. Academic Press, London, UK.

Ridgway, S.H., E.G. Wever, J.G. McCormick, J. Palin, and J.H. Anderson. 1969. Hearing in the giant sea turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, U.S. 64:884-890.

Riedman, M.L. 1983. Studies of the effects of experimentally produced noise associated with oil and gas exploration and development on sea otters in California. Prepared by the Center for Coastal Marine Studies, University of California-Santa Cruz, CA, for U.S. Minerals Management Service, Anchorage, AK.

Riedman, M.L. 1984. Effects of sounds associated with petroleum industry activities on the behavior of sea otters in California. Appendix D. Pages D1-D12 *in* C.I. Malme, P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migratory gray whale behavior. Phase II. Final report to the Minerals Management Service.

Riedman, M.L. and J.A. Estes. 1990. The sea otter *Enhydra lutris*: behavior, ecology, and natural history. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 90(14).

Riedman M.L, J.A. Estes, M.M. Staedler, A.A. Giles, and D.R. Carlson. 1994. Breeding patterns and reproductive success of California sea otters. Journal of Wildlife Management 58:391-399.

Ripple, J. and D. Perrine. 1999. Manatees and Dugongs of the World. Voyageur Press, Stillwater, MN.

Roden, C.L. and K.D. Mullin. 2000. Sightings of cetaceans in the northern Caribbean Sea and adjacent waters, winter 1995. Caribbean Journal of Science 36:280-288.

Rogers, P. and M. Cox. 1988. Underwater sound as a biological stimulus. Pages 131-149 *in* A. Atema, R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga, eds. The Sensory Biology of Aquatic Animals. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Romano, T.A., M.J. Keogh, C.Kelly, P. Feng, L. Berk, C.E. Schlundt, D.A. Carder and J.J. Finneran. 2004. Anthropogenic sound and marine mammal health: measures of the nervous and immune systems before and after intense sound exposure. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 61:1124-1134.

Romero, A., A.I. Agudo, S.M. Green, and G. Notarbartolo di Sciara. 2001. Cetaceans of Venezuela: their distribution and conservation status. NOAA Technical Report NMFS 151. NMFS, Seattle, WA.

Roppel, A.Y. 1984. Management of northern fur seals on the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, 1786-1981. NOAA Technical Report NMFS-4.

Ross, J.B. 2006. Review of the Conservation Status of Australia's Smaller Whales and Dolphins. Prepared for the Department of Environment and Heritage, Australia.

Roth, E.H. and V. Schmidt. 2010. Noise levels generated by research icebreakers and marine seismic sources in the deep-water, Arctic Ocean. Scripps Technical Report MPL TM-527.

Rotterman, L.M. and T. Simon-Jackson. 1988. Sea otter (*Enhydra lutris*). In J.W. Lentfer, ed. Selected Marine Mammals of Alaska: Species Accounts with Research and Management Recommendations. Marine Mammal Commission, Washington, DC.

Rowlett, R.A., G.A. Green, C.E. Bowlby, and M.A. Smultea. 1994. The first photographic documentation of a northern right whale off Washington State. Northwest Naturalist 75:102- 104.

Rowntree, V.J., R.S. Payne, and D.M. Schell. 2001. Changing patterns of habitat use by southern right whales (*Eubalaena australis*) on their nursery ground at Península Valdés, Argentina, and in their long-range movements. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management Special Issue 2:133–143.

Saetre, R. and E. Ona. 1996. Seismiske undersøkelser og skader på fiskeegg og -larver en vurdering av mulige effekter pa bestandsniv0. [Seismic investigations and damages on fish eggs and larvae; an evaluation of possible effects on stock level] Fisken og Havet 1996:1-17, 1-8. (in Norwegian with English summary).

Sailor's Choice. 2006. Welcome to Santa Barbara Harbor. http://www.sailorschoice.com/SantaBarbara/index.htm. Accessed 21 June.

Sakamoto, W., I. Uchida, Y. Naito, K. Kureha, M. Tujimura, and K. Sato. 1990. Deep diving behavior of the loggerhead turtle near the frontal zone. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 56:1435-1443.

Saltzman, J. and K.F. Wishner. 1997. Zooplankton ecology in the eastern tropical Pacific oxygen minimum zones above a seamount: 1. General trends. Deep Sea Research I 44:907-930.

Samuel, Y., S.J. Morreale, C.W. Clark, C.H. Greene, and M.E. Richmond. 2005. Underwater, low-frequency noise in a coastal sea turtle habitat. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117:1465-1472.

Samuel, Y., S.J. Morreale, C.W. Clark, M.E. Richmond, and C.H. Greene. 2006. Underwater noise and anthropogenic disturbance in critical sea turtle habitats. Page 93 *in* N.J. Pilcher, ed. Proceedings of the 23rd Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-536.

Sand, O. 1981. The lateral line and sound reception. Pages 459-478 *in* W.N. Tavolga, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Hearing and Sound Communication in Fishes. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Sand, O. and H.E. Karlsen. 1986. Detection of infrasound by the Atlantic cod. Journal of Experimental Biology 125:197-204.

Sand, O. and H.E. Karlsen. 2000. Detection of infrasound and linear acceleration in fish. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, London B 355:1295-1298.

Sanders, M. 1989. Marine debris: fatal attraction. Makai 11:2-3.

Santulli, A., C. Messina, L. Ceffa, A. Curatolo, G. Rivas, G. Fabi, and V. Damelio. 1999. Biochemical responses of European sea bass (*Dicentrachus labrax*) to the stress induced by offshore experimental seismic prospecting. Marine Pollution Bulletin 38:1105-1114.

Sanvito, S. and F Galimberti. 2000a. Bioacoustics of southern elephant seals I: Acoustic structure of male aggressive vocalizations. International Journal of Animal Sound and its Recording 10:259-285.

Sanvito, S. and F Galimberti. 2000b. Bioacoustics of southern elephant seals II: Individual and geographic variation in male aggressive vocalizations. International Journal of Animal Sound and its Recording 10:287-307.

Sergeant, D.E. 1991. Harp Seals, Man and Ice. Canadian Special Publications of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 114.

Sarti-M., L., S.A. Eckert, N. Garcia-T., and A.R. Barragan. 1996. Decline of the world's largest nesting assemblage of leatherback turtles. Marine Turtle Newsletter 74:2-5.

Sathasivam, K. 2004. Marine Mammals of India. Hyderabad, Universities Press, New Delhi, India.

Sauerland, M. and G. Dehnhardt. 1998. Underwater audiogram of a tucuxi (*Sotalia fluviatilis guianensis*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 103:1199-1204.

Saulitis, E., C. Matkin, L. Barrett-Lennard, K. Heise, and G. Ellis. 2000. Foraging strategies of sympatric killer whale (*Orcinus orca*) populations in Prince William Sound, Alaska. Marine Mammal Science 16:94-109.

SAUP. 2010. Sea Around Us Project. www.seaaroundus.org.

Scarff, J. E. 1991. Historic distribution and abundance of the right whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*) in the North Pacific, Bering Sea, Sea of Okhotsk and Sea of Japan from the Maury Whale Charts. Report of the International Whaling Commission 41:467-489.

Shellert, A.M. and A.N. Popper. 1992. Functional aspects of the evolution of the auditory system of actinoperygian fish. Pages 295-323 *in* B.D. Webster, R.R. Fay, and A.N. Popper, eds. Evolutionary Biology of Hearing. Springer-Verlag, New York.

Schilling, M.R., I. Seipt, M.T. Weinrich, S.E. Frohock, A.E. Kuhlberg, and P.J. Clapham. 1992. Behavior of individually-identified sei whales *Balaenoptera borealis* during an episodic influx into the southern Gulf of Maine in 1986. Fishery Bulletin 90:749-755.

Schlundt, C.E., J.J. Finneran, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Temporary shift in masking hearing thresholds of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*, after exposure to intense tones. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 107:3496-3508.

Scholik, A.R. and H.Y. Yan. 2002. Effects of boat engine noise on the auditory sensitivity of the fathead minnow, *Pimepheles promelas*. Environmental Biology of Fishes 63:203-209.

Schroeder, B. 1987. 1986 Annual report Annual report of the Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network, Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, January – December 1986. Miami Laboratory Coastal Resources Division Contribution Number CRD-87/88-12. National Marine Fisheries Service, Coastal Resources Division, Miami, FL.

Schroeder, B.A. and A.A. Warner. 1988. 1987 Annual report of the Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network, Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, January – December 1987. Miami Laboratory Coastal Resources Division Contribution Number CRD-87/88-28. National Marine Fisheries Service, Coastal Resources Division, Miami, FL.

Schuijf, A. 1981. Models of acoustic localization. Pages 267-310 *in* W.N. Tavolga, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, R.R., eds. Hearing and Sound Communication in Fishes. Springer-Verlag New York, NY.

Schulman, A. 1984. Humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) sighting off Los Angeles Harbor, Southern California. Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences 83:157-162.

Scott, N. and J. A. Horrocks. 1993. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for St. Vincent and the Grenadines. CEP Technical Report No. 27. UNEP Caribbean Environment Program, Kingston, Jamaica.

Schroeder, D.M., and M.S. Love. 2002. Recreational fishing and marine fish populations in California. California Cooperative Oceanic Fisheries Investigations Reports 43:182–189.

Schusterman, R., D. Kastak, B. Southall, and C. Kastak. 2000. Underwater temporary threshold shifts in pinnipeds: tradeoffs between noise intensity and duration. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 108:2515-2516.

Schwarz, A.L. and G.L. Greer. 1984. Responses of Pacific herring, *Clupea harengus pallasi*, to some underwater sounds. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 41:1183-1192.

Seal Conservation Society. 2006. Pinniped species information pages. http://www.pinnipeds.org/species/species.htm. Accessed 20 July.

Sea Otter Recovery Team. 2004. National Recovery Strategy for the Sea Otter (Enhydra lutris) in Canada. Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

Seminoff, J.A., A Resendiz, B. Resendiz, and W.J. Nichols. 2004. Occurrence of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Gulf of California, Mexico: Evidence of life-history variation in the Pacific Ocean. Herpetological Review 35:25-27.

Serrano, A. and J.M. Terhune. 2001. Within-call repetition may be an anti-masking strategy in underwater calls of harp seals (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 79:1410-1413.

Serrano, A. and J.M. Terhune. 2002. Antimasking aspects of harp seal (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*) underwater vocalizations. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 112:3083-3090.

Shimada, H. and T. Miyashita. 2001. Report of the sightings surveys for winter distribution of large cetaceans in the low latitudinal waters of the western North Pacific, 1999-2001. Paper SC/53/RMP10 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, July 2001, London.

Sigurjonsson, J. 1995. On the life history and autecology of North Atlantic rorquals. *In* A.S. Blix, L. Walloe, and O. Ultang, eds. Developments in Marine Biology, 4. Whales, Seals, Fish, and Man. International Symposium on the Biology of Marine Mammals in the Northeast Atlantic, Tromso, Norway.

Sigurjonsson, J. and G.A. Vikingsson. 1997. Seasonal abundance of and estimated food consumption by cetaceans in Icelandic and adjacent waters. Journal of Northwest Atlantic Fishery Science 22:271-287.

Simard, Y., F. Samaran, and N. Roy. 2005. Measurement of whale and seismic sounds in the Scotian Gully and adjacent canyons in July 2003. Page 97-115 *in* K. Lee, H. Bain and C.V. Hurley, eds. Acoustic Monitoring and Marine Mammal Surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf Before and During Active Seismic Surveys. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 151.

Simmonds, M.P., S.J. Dolman, and L. Weilgart, eds. 2006. Oceans of Noise 2004: A WDCS Science Report. Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, Chippenham, UK.

Simon, M., M. Wahlberg, and L.E. Miller. 2007. Echolocation clicks from killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) feeding on herring (*Clupea harengus*) (L). Journal of the Acoustical Society ofAmerica 121:749-752.

Sinclair, E.H., S.E. Moore, N.A. Friday, T.K. Zeppelin, and J.M. Waite. 2005. Do patterns of Steller sea lion (*Eumetopias jubatus*) diet, population trend and cetacean occurrence reflect oceanographic domains from the Alaska Peninsula to the central Aleutian Islands? Fisheries Oceanography 14:223-242.

Siniff, D. B. and K. Ralls. 1991. Reproduction, survival and tag loss in California sea otters. Marine Mammal Science 7:211-229.

SIO. 2004. Marine Mammal Monitoring during a Seismic Survey in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean by the Research Vessel ROGER REVELLE, September 2003 and January 2004. Prepared by Ship Operations & Marine Technial Support, La Jolla, CA. May.

SIO. 2005a. Ships. http://shipsked.ucsd.edu/ships. Accessed 15 September.

SIO. 2005b. Request by Scripps Institution of Oceanography for an Incidental Harassment Authorization to Allow the Incidental Take of Marine Mammals during a Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean, March - April 2006. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 30 September.

SIO. 2005c. Marine Mammal Monitoring during a Low-Energy Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography Vessel R/V *Melville* in the Southwest Pacific Ocean, February – March 2005. Prepared by Ship Operations & Marine Technial Support, La Jolla, CA.

SIO. 2006. Marine Mammal Monitoring during a Low-Energy Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography Vessel R/V Roger Revelle in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean, March-April 2006. Prepared by Ship Operations & Marine Technical Support, La Jolla, CA.

SIO. 2007. Marine Mammal Monitoring during a Low-Energy Seismic and OBS Survey in the NE Pacific Ocean by Scripps Institution of Oceanography, on board the OSU Research Vessel WECOMA, September 5-11 2007. Prepared by Shipboard Technical Support, La Jolla, CA.

SIO. 2009. Marine Mammal Monitoring during a Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey in the Santa Barbara Channel by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography Research Vessel Melville, November 2008. Prepared by Shipboard Technical Support, La Jolla, CA.

SIO and NSF. 2003. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography Vessel R/V *Roger Revelle* in the Southern Gulf of California, May 2004. LGL Report TA2923-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 2 December.

SIO and NSF. 2004. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography Vessel R/V *Melville* in the Southwest Pacific Ocean, February-March 2005. LGL Report TA4060-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 30 September.

SIO and NSF. 2005. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography on the Louisville Ridge in the Southwest Pacific Ocean, January-February 2006. LGL Report TA4133-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. June.

SIO and NSF. 2006a. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in the South Pacific Ocean, December 2006 – January 2007. LGL Report TA4301-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 20 July.

SIO and NSF. 2006b. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in the Northeast Indian Ocean, May-July 2007. LGL Report TA4410-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 21 December.

SIO and NSF. 2007. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-energy Marine Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in the Northeast Pacific Ocean, September 2007. LGL Report TA4470-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 20 April.

SIO and NSF. 2008. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Melville* in the Santa Barbara Channel, November 2008. LGL Report TA4643-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 24 June.

SIO and NSF. 2009. Environmental Assessment of a Planned Low-Energy Marine Seismic Survey by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in the Northeast Pacific Ocean, July 2009. LGL Report TA4779-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 31 March.

Skalski, J.R., W.H. Pearson, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on catch-per-unit-effort in a hook-and-line fishery for rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 49:1357-1365.

Skov, H., T. Gunnlaugsson, J. Horne, L. Nøttestad, E. Olsen, H. Søiland, G. Vikingsson, and G. Waring. 2005. Small-scale variability of cetaceans associated with oceanographic and topographic features along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge. Page 263 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Slocum, C.J., R. Schoelkopf, S. Tulevech, M. Stevens, S. Evert, and M. Moyer. 1999. Seal populations wintering in New Jersey (USA) have increased in abundance and diversity. Pages 174-175 *in* Abstracts of the 13th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 28 November-3 December 1999, Wailea, Maui, HI.

Slotte, A., K. Hansen, J. Dalen, and E. Ona. 2004. Acoustic mapping of pelagic fish distribution and abundance in relation to a seismic shooting area off the Norwegian west coast. Fisheries Research 67:143-150.

Smith, M.E., A.S. Kane, and A.N. Popper. 2004a. Acoustical stress and hearing sensitivity in fishes: does the linear threshold shift hypothesis hold water. Journal of Experimental Biology 207:3591-3602.

Smith, M.E., A.S. Kane, and A.N. Popper. 2004b. Noise-induced stress and hearing loss in the goldfish (*Carassius auratus*). Journal of Experimental Biology 207:427-435.

Smith. M.E., A.B. Coffin, D.L. Miller, and A.N. Popper. 2006. Anatomical and functional recovery in the goldfish (*Carassius auratus*) ear following noise exposure. Journal of Experimental Biology 209:4193-4202.

Smith, T.D., J. Allen, P.J. Clapham, P.S. Hammond, S. Katona, F. Larsen, J. Lien, D. Mattila, P. Palsbøll, J. Sigjónsson, P.T. Stevick, and N. Øien. 1999. An ocean-basin-wide mark-recapture study of the North Atlantic humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). Marine Mammal Science 15:1-32.

Smith, T.G., D.J. St. Aubin, and J.R. Geraci, eds. 1990. Advances in research on the beluga whale, *Delphinapterus leucas*. Canadian Bulletin of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 224.

Smultea, M.A. 1994. Segregation by humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) cows with a calf in coastal habitat near the island of Hawaii. Canadian Journal of Zoology 72:805-811.

Smultea, M.A. and M. Holst. 2003. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Hess Deep area of the Eastern Equatorial Tropical Pacific, July 2003. LGL Report TA2822-16. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Smultea, M.A. and M. Holst. 2008. Marine Mammal Monitoring during a University of Texas Institute for Geophysics Seismic Survey in the Northeast Pacific Ocean, July 2008. LGL Report TA4584-2. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for University of Texas, Institute for Geophysics, Austin, TX; L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Smultea, M.A., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and S. Stoltz. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean, April-June 2004. LGL Report TA2822-26. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Smultea, M.A., W.R. Koski, and T.J. Norris. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic study of the Blanco Fracture Zone in the Northeastern Pacific Ocean, October-November 2004. LGL Report TA2822-29. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Sobolevsky, Y.I. and O.A. Mathisen. 1996. Distribution, abundance, and trophic relationships of Bering Sea cetaceans. Pages 265-275 *in* O.A. Mathisen and K.O. Coyle, eds. Ecology of the Bering Sea: A Review of Russian Literature. Alaska Sea Grant Report 96-01. University of Alaska-Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK.

Sodal, A. 1999. Measured underwater acoustic wave propagation from a seismic source. Proceedings of the Airgun Environmental Workshop, 6 July, London, UK.

Song, J., D.A. Mann, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, and A.N. Popper. 2008. The inner ears of Northern Canadian freshwater fishes following exposure to seismic air gun sounds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 124:1360-1366.

Southall, B.L., R.J. Schusterman, and D. Kastak. 2000. Masking in three pinnipeds: underwater, low-frequency critical ratios. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 108:1322-1326.

Southall, B.L., A.E. Bowles, W.T. Ellison, J.J. Finneran, R.L. Gentry, C.R. Greene, Jr., D. Kastak, D.R. Ketten, J.H. Miller, P.E. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, J.A. Thomas, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. Aquatic Mammals 33:411-521.

South Pacific Whale Research Consortium. 2004. Report of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium, 2-6 April 2004, Byron Bay, NSW, Australia. Paper SC/55/SH7 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 19-22 July, Sorrento, Italy.

Southwood, A.L., R.D. Reina, V.S. Jones, and D.R. Jones. 2003. Seasonal diving patterns and body temperatures of juvenile green turtles at Heron Island, Australia. Canadian Journal of Zoology 81:1014-1024.

Spotila, J.R., M.P. O'Connnor, and F.V. Paladino. 1997. Thermal Biology. Pages 297-314 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Spraker, T.R., L.F. Lowry, and K.J. Frost. 1994. Gross necropsy and histopathological lesions found in harbor seals. Pages 281-311 *in* T.R. Loughlin, ed. Marine Mammals and the Exxon Valdez. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Springer, A.M., J.A. Estes, G.B. van Vliet, T.M. Williams, D.F. Doak, E.M. Danner, K.A. Forney, and B. Pfister. 2003. Sequential megafaunal collapse in the North Pacific Ocean: an ongoing legacy of industrial whaling? Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 100:12223-12228.

Stafford, K.M. 2003. Two types of blue whale calls recorded in the Gulf of Alaska. Marine Mammal Science 19:682-693.

Stafford, K.M., S.E. Moore, and C.G. Fox. 2005. Diel variation in blue whale calls recorded in the eastern tropical Pacific. Animal Behaviour 69: 951–958.

Stanley, K. M., E.K. Stabeneau, and A. M. Landry. 1988. Debris ingestion by sea turtles along the Texas coast. Pages 119-121 *in* B.A. Schroeder, compiler. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-214. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Starbird, C., A. Baldridge, and J.T. Harvey. 1993. Seasonal occurrence of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in the Monterey Bay Region, with notes on other sea turtles, 1986–1991. California Fish and Game 79:54-62.

State of Queensland, Environmental Protection Agency. 1999. Conservation and Management of the Dugong in Queensland 1999-2004. Conservation Plan Series.

St. Aubin, D.J., R.H. Stinson and J.R. Geraci. 1984. Aspects of the structure and composition of baleen, and some effects of exposure to petroleum hydrocarbons. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 62:193-198.

Stedman, S-M. and J. Hanson. 2006. Habitat Connections: Wetlands, Fisheries and Economics, Part Five – Mid-Atlantic. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/habitat/habitatconservation/publications/habitatconections/num5.htm. Accessed June 2006.

Stemp, R. 1985. Observations of the effects of seismic exploration on seabirds. Pages 217-233 *in* G.D. Green, F.R. Engelhardt, and R.J. Patterson, eds. Proceedings of a workshop on effects of explosives use in the marine environment, January 1985, Halifax, NS. Technical Report Number 5. Canadian Oil and Gas Lands Administration, Environmental Protection Branch, Ottawa.

Sternberg, J. 1981. The worldwide distribution of sea turtle nesting beaches. Sea Turtle Rescue Fund, Center for Environmental Education, Washington, DC.

Stewart, B.S. and H.R. Huber. 1993. *Mirounga angustirostris*. Mammalian Species 449:1-10.

Stinson, M.L. 1984. Biology of sea turtles in San Diego Bay, California, and in the northeastern Pacific Ocean. Thesis, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

Stone, C.J. 2003. The effects of seismic activity on marine mammals in UK waters 1998-2000. JNCC Report 323. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Stone, C.J. and M.L. Tasker. 2006. The effects of seismic airguns on cetaceans in UK waters. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 8:255-263.

Stone, G.S., S.K. Katona, and E.B. Tucker. 1987. History, migration and present status of humpback whales *Megaptera novaeangliae* at Bermuda. Biological Conservation 42:133-145.

Sutcliffe, W.H. and P.F. Brodie. 1977. Whale distribution in Nova Scotia Waters. Fisheries and Marine Service Technical Report 722. Fisheries and Marine Service, Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Dartmouth, NS, Canada.

Sverdrup, A., E. Kjellsby, P.G. Krüger, R. Fløysand, F.R. Knudsen, P.S. Enger, G. Serck-Hanssen, and K.B. Helle. 1994. Effects of experimental seismic shock on vasoactivity of arteries, integrity of the vascular endothelium and on primary stress hormones of the Atlantic salmon. Journal of Fish Biology 45:973-995.

Swartz, S.L., A. Martinez, T. Cole, P.J. Clapham, M.A. McDonald, J.A. Hildebrand, E.M. Oleson, C. Burks, and J. Barlow. 2001. Visual and acoustic survey of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the eastern and southern Caribbean Sea: preliminary findings. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-456. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, FL.

Swartz, S.L., T. Cole, M.A. McDonald, J.A. Hildebrand, E.M. Oleson, A. Martinez, P.J. Clapham, J. Barlow, and M.L. Jones. 2003. Acoustic and visual survey of humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) distribution in the eastern and southeastern Caribbean Sea. Caribbean Journal of Science 39:195-208.

Sybesma, J. 1992. WIDECAST Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for the Netherlands Antilles. CEP Technical Report No. 11. UNEP Caribbean Environment Program, Kingston, Jamaica.

Tavolga, W. N. and J. Wodinsky. 1963. Auditory capacities in fishes: Pure tone thresholds in nine species of marine teleosts. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 126:177-240.

Tavolga, W. N. and J. Wodinsky. 1965. Auditory capacity in fishes: threshold variability in the blue-striped grunt, *Haemulon sciurus*. Animal Behaviour 13:301-311.

Teachout, E. 2006. Evaluating and minimizing the effects of impact pile driving on the marbled murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*), a threatened seabird (Abstract). Page 32 *in* C.L. Irwin, P. Garrett, and K.P. McDermott, eds. Proceedings of the 2005 International Conference on Ecology and Transportation, August 25 -September 2, 2005, San Diego, CA. Center for Transportation and the Environment, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.

Teas, W.G. and A. Martinez. 1989. 1988 Annual report of the Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network, Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States, January – December 1988. Miami Laboratory Coastal Resources Division Contribution Number CRD-87/89-19. NMFS, Coastal Resources Division, Miami, FL.

Terhune, J.M. 1994. Geographical variation of harp seal underwater vocalizations. Canadian Journal of Zoology 72:892-897.

Terhune, J.M. 1999. Pitch separation as a possible jamming-avoidance mechanism in underwater calls of bearded seals, *Erignathus barbatus*. Canadian Journal of Zoology 77:1025-1034.

Thompson, D., M. Sjöberg, E.B. Bryant, P. Lovell, and A. Bjørge. 1998. Behavioural and physiological responses of harbour (*Phoca vitulina*) and grey (*Halichoerus grypus*) seals to seismic surveys. Page 134 *in* Abstracts of the World Marine Mammal Conference, 20-24 January, Monte Carlo, Monaco.

Thompson, P.M. 1993. Harbour seal movement patterns. Symposium of the Zoological Society of London 66:225-240.

Thompson, T. J., H.E. Winn, and P.J. Perkins. 1979. Mysticete sounds. Pages 403-431 *in* H. E Winn and B. L. Olla Perseus, eds. Behavior of Marine Animals. Plenum Publishing, Cambridge, MA.

Thomsen, B. 2002. An experiment on how seismic shooting affects caged fish. Thesis, Faroese Fisheries Laboratory, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland. 16 August.

Thomson, D.H., J.W. Lawson, and A. Muecke. 2001. Proceedings of a workshop to develop methodologies for conducting research on the effects of seismic exploration on the Canadian east coast fishery, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 7-8 September 2000. ESRF Report No. 139. Environmental Studies Research Funds, Calgary, AB.

Tillman, M.F. 1977. Estimates of population size for the North Pacific sei whale. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 1:98-106.

Timm, R.M., R.M. Salazar, and A.T. Peterson. 1997. Historical distribution of the extinct tropical seal, *Monachus tropicalis* (Carnivora: Phocidae). Conservation Biology 11:549-551.

Tolstoganova, L.K. 2002. Acoustical behaviour in king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*). Pages 247-254 *in* A.J. Paul, E.G. Dawe, R. Elner, G.S. Jamieson, G.H. Kruse, R.S. Otto, B. Sainte-Marie, T.C. Shirley, and D. Woodby, eds. Crabs in Cold Water Regions: Biology, Management, and Economics. University of Alaska Sea Grant, AK-SG-02-01. Fairbanks, AK.

Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, L. Doermann, S. Nooner, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, T.J. Crone, and R.C. Holmes. 2009. Broadband calibration of the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* four-string seismic sources. Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems 10(8):1-15.

Tougaard, J., J. Carstensen, H. Skov, and J. Teilmann. 2005. Behavioural reactions of harbour porpoises to underwater noise from pile drivings. Page 282 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, San Diego, CA, 12-16 December 2005.

Tremel, D.P., J.A. Thomas, K.T. Ramirez, G.S. Dye, W.A. Bachman, A.N. Orban and K.K. Grimm. 1998. Underwater hearing sensitivity of a Pacific white-sided dolphin, *Lagenorhynchus obliquidens*. Aquatic Mammals 24:63-69.

Trites, A.W., V.B. Deecke, E.J. Gregr, J.K.B. Ford, and P.F. Olesiuk. 2007. Killer whales, whaling, and sequential megafaunal collapse in the North Pacific: a comparative analysis of the dynamics of marine mammals in Alaska and British Columbia following commercial whaling. Marine Mammal Science 23:751-765.

Turnpenny, A.W.H. and J.R. Nedwell. 1994. Consultancy Report: The Effects on Marine Fish, Diving Mammals and Birds of Underwater Sound Generated by Seismic Surveys. FCR 089/94. Prepared by Fawley aquatic research laboratories, Ltd. for the UK Offshore Operators Association (UKOOA).

Tyack, P.L. 2009. Human-generated sound and marine mammals. Physics Today 62(11, Nov.):39-44.

Tyack, P., M. Johnson, and P. Miller. 2003. Tracking responses of sperm whales to experimental exposures of airguns. Pages 115-120 *in* A.E. Jochens and D.C. Biggs, eds. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/Annual Report: Year 1. OCS Study MMS 2003-069. Prepared by Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, for MMS, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.

Tyack, P.L., M.P. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, P.J. Miller, and J. Lynch. 2006. Biological significance of acoustic impacts on marine mammals: examples using an acoustic recording tag to define acoustic exposure of sperm whales, *Physeter catodon*, exposed to airgun sounds in controlled exposure experiments. Eos Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Supplement, Abstract OS42A-02. 23-26 May, Baltimore, MD.

Tynan, C. 1999. Redistribution of cetaceans in the southeast Bering Sea relative to anamolous oceanographic conditions during the 1997 El Niño. *In* H.J. Freeland, W.T. Peterson, and A. Tyler, eds. Proceedings of the 1998 Science Board Symposium on the Impacts of the 1997-1998 El Niño Event on the North Pacific Ocean and its Marginal Seas. PICES Scientific Report No. 10. North Pacific Marine Science Organization (PICES), Sidney, BC, Canada.

Tynan, C.T., D.P. DeMaster, and W.T. Peterson. 2001. Endangered right whales on the southeastern Bering Sea shelf. Science 294:1894.

UAF and NSF. 2005. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the Coast Guard Cutter *Healy* across the Arctic Ocean, August – September 2005. LGL Report 4122-1. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates, Inc., Anchorage, AK, and LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 24 March.

UNEP. 2006. World Conservation Monitoring Center: Marine Mammals. http://sea.unep-wcmc.org/isdb/marine_mammals/Taxonomy/. Accessed 23 June.

University of Delaware. 2004. How many ships travel the Delaware River and Bay, and what cargo do they carry? http://www.ocean.udel.edu/oilspill/shipping.html. Accessed July 2006.

University of Hawaii. 2005. Ships: R/V Kilo Moana. http://www.soest.hawaii.edu/UMC/KiloMoana.htm. Accessed 15 November.

University of Washington. 2003. R/V Thomas G. Thompson (AGOR 23). http://martech.ocean.washington.edu/tgt.html. Last updated 16 February 2003, accessed 15 November 2005.

UNOLS. 2010. UNOLS Research Vessels. http://www.unols.org/index.html. Last updated 19 January; accessed 25 January.

Urick, R.J. 1983. Principles of Underwater Sound: Chapter 7 – The Noise Background of the Sea: Ambient Noise Level. 3rd Edition. Peninsula Publishing, Los Altos, CA.

Urick, R.J. 1984. Ambient Noise in the Sea. Undersea Warfare Technology Office, Naval Sea Systems Command, Department of the Navy, Washington, DC.

USACE. 2006a. Waterborne Commerce of the United States: Calendar Year 2004, Part 1 – Waterways and Harbors, Atlantic Coast. http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/ndc/wcsc/pdf/wcusatl04.pdf.

USACE. 2006b. Waterborne Commerce of the United States: Calendar Year 2004, Part 4 – Waterways and Harbors, Pacific Coast, Hawaii, and Alaska. http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/ndc/wcsc/pdf/wcuspac04.pdf.

USCG. 2001. USCGC Healy Cruise Planning Guide. http://www.uscg.mil/pacarea/healy/. Last updated 2 April 2001, accessed 15 November 2005.

USFWS. 2000. Notice of designation of the northern sea otter in the Aleutian Islands as a candidate species. Federal Register 65:67343-67345.

USFWS. 2001. Florida manatee recovery plan. Third revision. Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA.

USFWS. 2003a. Final revised recovery plan for the southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*). Portland, OR.

USFWS. 2003b. Species Accounts: West Indian Manatee (*Trichechus manatus*), from Endangered and Threatened Species of the Southeastern United States (The Red Book). Region 4, Atlanta, GA. August. Available at: http://www.fws.gov/endangered/i/a/saa0c.html.

USFWS. 2004. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; listing the southwest Alaska distinct population segment of the northern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris kenyoni*) as threatened. Federal Register 69:6600-6621.

USFWS. 2005a. Loggerhead Sea Turtle (*Caretta caretta*). http://www.fws.gov/northflorida/SeaTurtles/Turtle%20Factsheets/loggerhead-sea-turtle.htm. Last updated 29 December 2005, accessed June 2006.

USFWS. 2005b. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status and Special Rule for the Southwest Alaska Distinct Population Segment of the Northern Sea Otter (*Enhydra lutris kenyoni*); Final Rule and Proposed Rule. Federal Register 70:46366-46386.

USFWS. 2010. Species Information: Threatened and Endangered Animals and Plants. http://www.fws.gov/endangered/wildlife.html. Accessed 10 June.

USGS. 2005. Mapping Benthic Habitat around Oil Platforms in the Santa Barbara Channel, California. http://soundwaves.usgs.gov/2004/11/fieldwork3.html. Last updated 7 October 2005, accessed 21 June 2006.

USGS. 2010a. Personal communication re: previous USGS seismic survey cruises, via email from D. Hutchinson, Research Geophysicist, USGS, Woods Hole Science Center, Woods Hole, MA to R. Spaulding, PM, TEC, Bainbridge Island, WA. 13 April.

USGS. 2010b. Sea Otter Studies at WERC: Spring 2010 Mainland California Sea Otter Survey Results. http://www.werc.usgs.gov/ProjectSubWebPage.aspx?SubWebPageID=16&ProjectID=91&List=SubWebPages&Web=Project_91&Title=Sea Otter Studies at WERC. Accessed September 1.

U.S. National Ocean Bottom Seismograph Instrument Pool. 2006. Instrumentation: Short Period. http://www.obsip.org/index.html. Accessed 25 May.

U.S. Navy. 2000. San Diego Bay Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. Prepared by Tierra Data Systems, Escondido, CA, for Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego, CA.

U.S. Navy. 2001. Final Overseas Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Statement for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) Sonar. Volume 1 of 2. January.

U.S. Navy. 2002. Final Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, Point Mugu Sea Range. Prepared by Naval Air Systems Command, Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA. March.

U.S. Navy. 2005. Marine Resources Assessment for the Northeast Operating Areas: Atlantic City, Narragansett Bay, and Boston. Final Report. February.

U.S. Navy. 2007. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) Sonar. Chief of Naval Operations, Washington, DC. April.

UTA and NSF. 2006. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the USCG *Healy* of the Western Canada Basin, Chukchi Borderland and Mendeleev Ridge, Arctic Ocean, July–August 2006. LGL Report TA4285-3. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates, Inc., Anchorage, AK, and LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT. November.

Van Bergeijk, W.A. 1967. The evolution of vertebrate hearing. Pages 1-49 *in* W.D. Neff, ed. Contributions to Sensory Physiology. Academic Press, New York, NY.

Van Blaricom, G.R., A.N. Zerbini, D.P. DeMaster, A. Andriolo, M.P. Heidi-Jorgensen, and B.M. Blaud. 2005. Precautionary regression-based determination of protective boundaries for migratory corrdiors of large whales. Page 290 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, San Diego, CA, 12-16 December 2005.

Van Waerebeek, K., A.N. Baker, F. Félix, J. Gedamke, M. Iñiguez, G. P. Sanino, E. Secchi, D. Sutaria, A. van Helden, and Y. Wang. 2006. Vessel collisions with small cetaceans worldwide and with large whales in the Southern Hemisphere; building a standardized database. IWC Scientific Document SC/58/BC6.

Vasconcelos, R.O., M.C.P. Amorim, and F. Ladich. 2007. Effects of ship noise on the detectability of communication signals in the Lusitanian toadfish. Journal of Experimental Biology 210:2104-2112.

Vaughan, D.S., C.M. Manooch III, and J.C. Potts. 2001. Assessment of the wreckfish fishery on the Blake Plateau. Am. Fish. Soc. Symp. 25: 105-120.

Víkingsson, G.A, D. Olafsdóttir, and H. Gunnlaugsson. 2004. Iceland. Progress report on cetacean research, April 2003 to April 2004 with statistical data for the calendar year 2003. Paper SC/56/Prog.Rep.Iceland presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 19-22 July, Sorrento, Italy.

Wada, S., M. Oishi, and T.K. Yamada. 2003. A newly discovered species of living baleen whale. Nature 426:278-281.

Wade, P.R. and T. Gerrodette. 1993. Estimates of cetacean abundance and distribution in the eastern tropical Pacific. Report of the International Whaling Commission 43:477-493.

Wade, P.R., J.W. Durban, J.M. Waite, A.N. Zerbini, and M.E. Dahlheim. 2003. Surveying killer whale abundance and distribution in the Gulf of Alaska and Aleutian Islands. AFSC Quarterly Report October-November-December.

Wade, P., M.P. Heide-Jorgensen, J. Barlow, J. Carretta, C. Stinchcomb, R. LeDuc, K. Shelden, L. Munger, A. Sauter, and J. Durban. 2005. Satellite tagging and acoustic detection leads to discovery of unprecedented concentration of rare North Pacific right whales. Page 295 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Wade, P.R., V.N. Burkanov, M.E. Dahlheim, N.A. Friday, L.W. Fritz, T.R. Loughlin, S.A. Mizroch, M.M. Muto, D.W. Rice, L.G. Barrett-Lennard, N.A. Black, A.M. Burdin, J. Calambokidis, S. Cerchio, J.K.B. Ford, J.K. Jacobsen, C.O. Matkin, D.R. Matkin, A.V. Mehta, R.J. Small, J.M. Straley, S.M. McCluskey, G.R. VanBlaricom and P.J. Clapham. 2007. Killer whales and marine mammal trends in the North Pacific -- a re-examination of evidence for sequential megafauna collapse and the prey-switching hypothesis. Marine Mammal Scienc3e 23:766-802.

Wahlberg, M. 2002. The acoustic behaviour of diving sperm whales observed with a hydrophone array. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 281:53-62.

Waite, J.W., K. Wynne, and D.K. Mellinger. 2003. Documented sighting of a North Pacific right whale in the Gulf of Alaska and post-sighting acoustic monitoring. Northwestern Naturalist 84:38-43.

Wakefield, E.D. 2001. The distribution and vocal behaviour of common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis* L.) in the Celtic sea and adjacent waters, with particular reference to the effects of seismic surveying. Thesis, University of Wales, Bangor.

Wallace, N. 1985. Debris entanglement in the marine environment: A review. Pages 259-277 *in* R.S. Shomura and H.O. Yoshida, eds. Proceedings of the Workshop on the Fate and Impact of Marine Debris. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFC-54. NMFS, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Wardle, C.S., T.J. Carter, G.G. Urquhart, A.D.F. Johnstone, A.M. Ziolkowski, G. Hampson, and D. Mackie. 2001. Effects of seismic airguns on marine fish. Continental Shelf Research 21:1005-1027.

Waring, G.T., T. Hamazaki, D. Sheehan, G. Wood, and S. Baker, S. 2001. Characterization of beaked whale (Ziphiidae) and sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) summer habitat in shelf-edge and deeper waters off the northeast U.S. Marine Mammal Science 17:703-717.

Waring, G.T., Quintal, J.M. and Fairfield, C.P., eds. 2002. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments – 2002. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-169.

Waring,G.T., R.M. Pace, J.M. Quintal, C.P. Fairfield, and K. Maze-Foley. 2004. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments – 2003. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-182. NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA.

Waring, G.T., L. Nøttestad, E. Olsen, and H. Skov. 2005a. Distribution and density estimates of cetaceans along the Mid-Atlantic Ridge during summer 2004. Page 301 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Waring, G.T., E. Josephson, C.P. Fairfield, and K. Maze-Foley. 2005b. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments – 2005. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-194. NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA.

Waring, G.T., E. Josephson, C.P. Fairfield, and K. Maze-Foley. 2006. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments – 2005. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-194. NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA.

Waring, G.T., E. Josephson, C.P. Fairfield, and K. Maze-Foley. 2009. US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments 2008. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-210. February.

Wartzok, D. and R.R. Ketten. 1999. Marine mammal sensory systems. Pages 117-175 *in* J.E. Reynolds III and S. Rommel, eds. Biology of Marine Mammals. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Wartzok, D., A.N. Popper, J. Gordon, and J. Merrill. 2004. Factors affecting the responses of marine mammals to acoustic disturbance. Marine Technology Society Journal 37(4):6-15.

Watkins, W.A. 1977. Acoustic behavior of sperm whales. Oceanus 20:50-58.

Watkins, W.A. 1986. Whale reactions to human activities in Cape Cod waters. Marine Mammal Science 2:251-262.

Watkins, W.A. and W.E. Schevill. 1975. Sperm whales (*Physeter catadon*) react to pingers. Deep-Sea Research 22:123-129.

Watkins, W A. and W.E. Schevill. 1979. Distinctive characteristics of underwater calls of the harp seal, *Phoca groenlandica*, during the breeding season. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 66:983-988.

Watkins, W.A., K.E. Moore, and P. Tyack. 1985. Sperm whale acoustic behaviors in the southeast Caribbean. Cetology 49:1-15.

Watkins, W.A., M.A. Daher, N.A. DiMarzio, A. Samuels, D. Wartzok, K.M. Fristrup, D.P. Gannon, P.W. Howey, R.R. Maeiefski, and T.R. Spradlin. 1999. Sperm whale surface activity from tracking by radio and satellite tags. Marine Mammal Science 15:1158-1180.

Watkins, W.A., M.A. Daher, G.M. Reppucci, J.E. George, D.L. Martin, N.A. DiMarzio, and D.P. Gannon. 2000a. Seasonality and distribution of whale calls in the North Pacific. Oceanography 13:62-67.

Watkins, W.A., J.E. George, M.A. Daher, K. Mullin, D.L. Martin, S.H. Haga, and N.A. DiMarzio. 2000b. Whale call data from the North Pacific, November 1995 through July 1999: Occurrence of calling whales and source locations from SOSUS and other acoustic systems. Technical Report WHOI-00-02. Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, MA.

Watkins, W.A., M.A. Daher, N.A. DiMarzio, A. Samuels, D. Wartzok, K.M. Fristrup, P.W. Howey, and R.R. Maeiefski. 2002. Sperm whale dives tracked by radio tag telemetry. Marine Mammal Science 18:55-68.

Watson, J.C. 1993. The effects of sea otter foraging on shallow rocky communities off northwestern Vancouver Island, British Columbia. Dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA.

Watson, J.C. 2000. The effects of sea otters (*Enhydra lutris*) on abalone (*Haliotis* spp.) populations. Pages 123-132 *in* A. Campbell, ed. Workshop on rebuilding abalone stocks in British Columbia. Canadian Special Publications in Fisheries and Aquatic Science 130.

Webb, J.F., R.R. Fay, and A.N. Popper, eds. 2008. Fish Bioacoustics. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research Volume 32. Springer Science+Business Media, New York, NY.

Weber, M. 1995. Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii*. Pages 109-122 *in* P.T. Plotkin, ed. Status Reviews of Sea Turtles Listed Under the Endangered Species Act of 1973: Loggerhead Turtle, *Caretta caretta*; East Pacific Green Turtle, *Chelonia mydas*; Leatherback Turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*; Hawksbill Turtle, *Eretmochelys imbricata*; Kemp's Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii*; Olive Ridley Turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea*. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD, and USFWS, Washington, DC.

Wehle, D.H.S. and F.C. Colemar. 1983. Plastics at sea. Natural History 92:20-26.

Weilgart, L., editor. 2010. Report of the Workshop on Alternative Technologies to Seismic Airgun Surveys for Oil and Gas Exploration and Their Potential for Reducing Impacts on Marine Mammals. Held by Okeanos – Foundation for the Sea. 31 August-1 September 2009, Monterey, CA.

Weinrich, M.T., M. Martin, R. Griffiths, J. Bove, and M. Schilling. 1997. A shift in distribution of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in response to prey in the southern Gulf of Maine. Fishery Bulletin 95:826-836.

Weir, C.R. 2007. Observations of marine turtles in relation to seismic airgun sound off Angola. Marine Turtle Newsletter 116:17-20.

Weir, C.R. 2008. Overt responses of humpback whales (Megaptera novaeangliae), sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), and Atlantic spotted dolphins (*Stenella frontalis*) to seismic exploration off Angola. Aquatic Mammals 34:71-83.

Weir, C.R., S.J. Dolman, and M.P. Simmonds. 2006. Marine mammal mitigation during seismic surveys and recommendations for worldwide standard mitigation guidance. Paper SC/58/E12 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts and Nevis.

Welch, L., ed. 1988. Marine Log. Florida Sea Grant College Program. October:3.

Weller, D.W., Y.V. Ivashchenko, G.A. Tsidulko, A.M. Burdin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2002. Influence of seismic surveys on western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia in 2001. Working Paper SC/54/BRG14, International Whaling Commission Western Gray Whale Working Group Meeting, Ulsan, South Korea, 22-25 October 2002.

Weller, D.W., G.A. Tsidulko, Y.V. Ivashchenko, A.M. Burdin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2006. A re-evaluation of the influence of 2001 seismic surveys on western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia. Paper SC/58/E5 presented to IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts and Nevis.

Wendell, F.E., R.A. Hardy, and J.A. Ames. 1985. Assessment of the accidental take of sea otters, *Enhydra lutris*, in gill and trammel nets. Unpublished report. Marine Resource Branch, California Department of Fish and Game.

Wenzel, F., D.K. Mattila, and P.J. Clapham. 1988. *Balaenoptera musculus* in the Gulf of Maine. Marine Mammal Science 4:172-175.

Weston, D.E. and P.A. Ching. 1989. Wind effects in shallow-water acoustic transmission. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 86:1530-1545.

Wezensky, E.M., G.H. Mitchell, C.D. MacLeod, R.J. Barton, R.C. Tyce, P.M. Scheifele, and W.N. Lange. 2005. Oceanographic effects on mid-frequency sound propagation in beaked whale environments. Page 302 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Whitehead, H.P. 1982. Populations of humpback whales in the western North Atlantic. Report of the International Whaling Commission 32:345-353.

Whitehead, H. 2002. Estimates of the current global population size and historical trajectory for sperm whales. Marine Ecology Progress Series 242:295-304.

Whitehead, H. 2003. Sperm Whales: Social Evolution in the Ocean. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Whiting, S.D. 1997. Observations of a nesting olive ridley turtle. Herpetofauna 27:39-42.

Whiting, S.D., M. Guinea, and G.D. Pike. 2000. Sea turtles nesting in the Australian Territory of Ashmore and Cartier Islands, Eastern Indian Ocean. Pages 86-93 *in* Proceedings of the 2nd ASEAN Symposium and Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

WHOI. 2005. Marine Operations, Research Vessels: R/V Knorr. http://www.whoi.edu/marops/research_vessels/knorr/. Accessed 15 November.

Wiese, F.K., W.A. Montevecchi, and G.K. Davoren, F. Huettmann, A.W. Diamond, and J. Linke. 2001. Seabirds at risk around offshore oil platforms in the north-west Atlantic. Marine Pollution Bulletin 42:1285–90.

Wieting, D. 2004. Background on development and intended use of criteria. Page 20 *in* S. Orenstein, L. Langstaff, L. Manning, and R. Maund, eds. Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals, Final Meeting Summary. Second Meeting, April 28-30, 2004, Arlington, VA. Sponsored by the Marine Mammal Commission. 10 August.

Williams, R. and L. Thomas. 2007. Distribution and abundance of marine mammals in the coastal waters of British Columbia, Canada. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 9:15-28.

Wilson, B., K. Rivera, S. Fitzgerald, and C. Rose. 2004. Discussion paper on seabird interactions with trawl vessel gear. Protected Resources Report No. 2. North Pacific Fishery Management Council, Anchorage, AK.

Wilson, D.E., M.A. Bogan, R.L. Brownell, Jr., A.M. Burdin, and M.K. Maminov. 1991. Geographic variation in sea otters, *Enhydra lutris*. Journal of Mammalogy 72:22-36.

Wilson, J., L. Rotterman, and D. Epperson. 2006. Minerals Management Service overview of seismic survey mitigation and monitoring on the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf. Paper SC/58/E8 presented to IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts and Nevis.

Winn, H.E. and N.E. Reichley. 1985. Humpback whale *Megaptera novaeangliae* (Borowski, 1781). Pages 241-273 *in* S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison. eds. Handbook of Marine Mammals, Vol. 3. The Sirenians and Baleen Whales. Academic Press, London, UK.

Winsor, M.H. and B.R. Mate. 2006. Seismic survey activity and the proximity of satellite tagged sperm whales. IWC Working Paper SC/58/E16.

Witzell, W.N. 1998. Long-term tag returns from juvenile Kemp's ridleys. Marine Turtle Newsletter 79:20.

Witzell, W.N. 1999. Distribution and relative abundance of sea turtles caught incidentally by the U.S. pelagic longline fleet in the western North Atlantic Ocean, 1992-1995. Fisheries Bulletin 97:200-211.

Wright, A.J., N. Aguilar Soto, A.L. Baldwin, M. Bateson, C.M. Beale, C. Clark, T. Deak, E.F. Edwards, A. Fernández, A. Godinho, L.T. Hatch, A. Kakuschke, D. Lusseau, D. Martineau, L.M. Romero, L.S. Weilgart, B.A. Wintle, G. Notarbartolo-di-Sciara, and V. Martin. 2007a. Do marine mammals experience stress related to anthropogenic noise? International Journal of Comparative Psychology 20:274-316.

Wright, A.J., N. Aguilar Soto, A.L. Baldwin, M. Bateson, C.M. Beale, C. Clark, T. Deak, E.F. Edwards, A. Fernández, A. Godinho, L.T. Hatch, A. Kakuschke, D. Lusseau, D. Martineau, L.M. Romero, L.S. Weilgart, B.A. Wintle, G. Notarbartolo-di-Sciara and V. Martin. 2007b. Anthropogenic noise as a stressor in animals: A multidisciplinary perspective. International Journal of Comparative Psychology 20: 250-273.

Wright, S.D., B.B. Ackerman, R.K. Bonde, C.A. Beck, and D.J. Banowetz. 1995. Analysis of watercraft-related mortality of manatees in Florida, 1979-1991. Pages 259-268 *in* T.J. O'Shea, B.B. Ackerman, and H.F. Percival, eds. Population Biology of the Florida Manatee (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*). Information and Technology Report 1. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Biological Service, Washington, DC.

Würsig, B. 1990. Cetaceans and oil: ecologic perspectives. Pages 129-165 *in* J.R. Geraci and D.J. St. Aubin, eds. Sea Mammals and Oil: Confronting the Risks. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Würsig, B., S.K. Lynn, T.A. Jefferson, and K.D. Mullin. 1998. Behaviour of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. Aquatic Mammals 24:41-50.

Wyneken, J. 1997. Sea Turtle Locomotion: Mechanics, Behavior, and Energetics. Pages 165-198 *in* P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick, eds. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.

Wysocki, L.E., J.P. Dittami, and F. Ladich. 2006. Ship noise and cortisol secretion in European freshwater fishes. Biological Conservation 128:501-508.

Yamaguchi, M., H. Suganuma, F. Sato, and Y. Matsuzawa. 2005. The increasing trend in sighting numbers of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) off the west coastal waters of Chichi-jima, Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands, Japan. Page 314 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, R.M. Nielson, V.L. Vladimirov and P.W. Wainwright. 2007a. Distribution and abundance of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134:45-73.

Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, R.M. Nielson and P.W. Wainwright. 2007b. Feeding of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134:93-106.

Yochem, S.K., and S. Leatherwood. 1985. Blue whale. Pages 193-240 in S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison, eds. Handbook of Marine Mammals, Volume 3: The Sirenians and Baleen Whales. Academic Press, NY.

Yoder, J.A. 2002. Declaration James A. Yoder in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 28 October. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division.

Zavalaga, C.B. and J. Jahncke. 1997. Maximum dive depths of the Peruvian diving petrel. Condor 99:1002-1004.

Zerbini, A.N., P.R. Wade, and J.M. Waite. 2003. Abundance and distribution of fin, humpback and minke whales from the Kenai Fjords to the Central Aleutian Islands, Alaska: Summer 2001-2002. Paper SC/55/O9 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 16-19 June, Berlin, Germany.

Zerbini, A.N., P.R. Wade, and J.M. Waite. 2004a. Summer abundance and distribution of cetaceans in coastal waters of the western Gulf of Alaska and the eastern and central Aleutian Islands. Page 179 *in* Abstract Book, ASLO/TOS 2004 Ocean Research Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii, 15-20 Feb. 2004.

Zerbini, A.N., A. Andriolo, J.M. Da Rocha, P.C. Simões-Lopes, S. Siciliano, J.P. Pizzorno, J.M. Waite, D.P. Demaster, and G.R. VanBlaricom. 2004b. Winter distribution and abundance of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) off northeastern Brazil. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 6:101-107.

Zerbini, A.N., A. Andriolo, M.P. Heide-Jørsen, J.L. Pizzorno, Y.G. Maia, G.R. VanBlaricom, D.P. DeMaster, P.C. Simões-Lopes, S. Moreira, and C. Bethlem. 2006. Satellite-monitored movements of humpback whales *Megaptera novaeangliae* in the Southwest Atlantic Ocean. Marine Ecology Progress Series 313:295-304.

Zhang, G.S., T. Hiraishi, K. Motomatsu, K. Yamamoto and K. Nashimoto. 1998. Auditory threshold of marbled sole *Pleuronectes yokohamae*. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 64:211-215. (English abstract)

Zimmer, W.M.X., P.L. Tyack, P.T. Madsen, M.P. Johnson, and V. Teloni. 2005. On the multi-pulse structure of sperm whale usual clicks. Page 315 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Ziolkowski, A. 1970. A method for calculating the output pressure waveform from an air gun. Geophys. J. R. astr. Soc. 21:137–161.

Zoidis, A.M., M.A. Smultea, D. Fertl, A.J. Day, D. DenDanto, A.S. Ertl, J. Hayes, and A.D. Whitt. 2005. Can you hear me now? Social sounds and underwater behavior of Hawaiian humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) calves. Page 315 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

Zoidis, A.M., M.A. Smultea, A.S. Frankel, J.L. Hopkins, A. Day, S. Ertl, A. Whitt, and D. Fertl. 2008. Sounds attributed to humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) calves recorded in Hawaii. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 123:1737-1746.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

CHAPTER 6
LIST OF PREPARERS

TEC Inc. (TEC)

Richard Heiderstadt, PROJECT DIRECTOR
Masters in City and Regional Planning

Jim Hunt, PROJECT MANAGER
MS, Civil Engineering

Rick Spaulding, PROJECT MANAGER
MS, Wildlife and Fisheries Science

Erika Fuery, SOCIOECONOMICS
MS, Environmental Science

Jaclyn Johnson, SOCIOECONOMICS
BS, Ecology

Kathleen Riek-Miller, CULTURAL RESOURCES AND SOCIOECONOMICS (TASK MANAGER)
BS, Biology

Kathy Rose, PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT SPECIALIST
MS, Forest Resource Management

Deirdre Stites, GRAPHIC DESIGN
AA, Geology

Lori Thursby, CULTURAL RESOURCES
MAH, Architectural History

Bob Wardwell, QUALITY ASSURANCE
MS, Environmental Science and MBA, Transportation/Logistics

Jen Weitkamp, MARINE FISH AND INVERTEBRATES
BS, Fisheries Biology

LGL Ltd. environmental research associates (LGL)

W. John Richardson, MARINE MAMMALS AND BIOACOUSTICS
PhD, Animal Behavior

Mari A. Smultea, MARINE MAMMALS AND BIOACOUSTICS
MS, Wildlife & Fisheries Sciences

William Koski, MARINE MAMMALS AND BIOACOUSTICS
MS, Wildlife Biology

Robert Bocking, MARINE FISH AND INVERTEBRATES
MRM, Natural Resources Management

John Christian, INVERTEBRATES AND MARINE FISH
MS, Marine Biology

William Cross, SEA TURTLES AND MARINE MAMMALS
MS, Marine Sciences

Mike Demarchi, SEABIRDS
MS, Wildlife Ecology

Michelle Gilders, SEA TURTLES AND MARINE MAMMALS
MA, Pure and Applied Biology

Meike Holst, MARINE MAMMALS
MS, Marine Biology

Sonya Meier, MARINE MAMMALS
MS, Biogeography

Heather Patterson, MARINE MAMMALS
MS, Biology and Geography

Carl Schilt, MARINE FISH AND BIOACOUSTICS
MS, Marine Science

JASCO Research Ltd. (JASCO)

Scott Carr, ACOUSTIC MODELING (TASK MANAGER)
ME, Acoustics

Isabelle Gaboury, ACOUSTIC MODELING
MS, Earth and Ocean Sciences

Marjo Laurinolli, ACOUSTIC MODELING
MS, Physical & Biological Oceanography

Alex MacGillivray, ACOUSTIC MODELING
MS, Earth and Ocean Sciences

Stephen Turner, ACOUSTIC MODELING
BE, Electrical Engineering

Mikhail Zykov, ACOUSTIC MODELING
PhD, Earth and Ocean Sciences

Marine Acoustics, Inc. (MAI)

Adam Frankel, ACOUSTIC MODELING (TASK MANAGER)
PhD, Biological Oceanography

Bill Ellison, ACOUSTIC MODELING
PhD, Acoustics

Kathleen Vigness-Raposa, ACOUSTIC MODELING
PhD, Natural Resources Science

Environmental BioAcoustics

Arthur Popper, MARINE INVERTEBRATES, FISH, AND SEA TURTLES
PhD, Biology

CHAPTER 7
DISTRIBUTION LIST

FEDERAL AGENCIES

USEPA

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Activities
EIS Filing Section
Mail Code 2252-A, Room 7241
Ariel Rios Building (South Oval Lobby)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

U.S. EPA – Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

U.S. Department of State

John Field
U.S. Department of State
7203 Central Ave.
Takoma Park, MD 20912

BOEMRE

Jill Lewandowski, Protected Species Biologist
Environmental Assessment Branch
BOEMRE
381 Elden Street
Herndon, VA 20170

Casey Rowe
Gulf of Mexico OCS Region
BOEMRE
1201 Elmwood Park Boulevard (MS 5412)
New Orleans, LA 70123–2394

James Price
Marine Mammals Env. Studies Coordinator
BOEMRE
381 Elden Street, MS 4041
Herndon, VA 20170-4817

Deborah Epperson
BOEMRE
1201 Elmwood Park Boulevard (MS 5432)
New Orleans, LA 70123–2394

Wayne Crayton
BOEMRE
3801 Centerpoint Drive, Suite 500
Anchorage, AK 99503

USGS

Esther Eng
Chief, Environmental Management Branch
U.S. Geological Survey
MS-207
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston VA 20192

James Devine
Senior Advisor for Science Applications
U.S. Geological Survey Headquarters
MS-106
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston, VA 20192

John Haines
Coordinator for Coastal & Marine Geology
U.S. Geological Survey Headquarters
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Mail Stop 915B
Reston, VA 20192-0002

Navy

John Quinn
Deputy Director
Environmental Readiness Division
(OPNAV N45)
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Suite 2000
Arlington, VA 22202

James E. Eckman
Marine Mammals & Biological Oceanography Program
Office of Naval Research – Code 322
One Liberty Center, Rm 1073
875 N. Randolph St.
Arlington, VA 22203-1995

Michael J. Weise
Marine Mammals & Biological Oceanography Program
Office of Naval Research - Code 32
One Liberty Center, Rm 1068
875 N. Randolph St.
Arlington, VA 22203-1995

USFWS

John Fay
Division of Endangered Species
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
420 ARLSQ
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203

NOAA-NMFS

Steve Leathery, National NEPA Coordinator
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Highway, Room 14555
Silver Spring, MD 20910

James Lecky, Director
Office of Protected Resources
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Angela Somma, Chief Endangered Species Division
Office of Protected Resources
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Hwy
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Karen Abrams
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Highway
SSMC3, 14th Floor F/HC
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Brad Smith
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
222 W. 7th St.
Box 43
Anchorage, AK 99513

Jolie Harrison
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Jay Barlow
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
8604 La Jolla Shores Dr.
La Jolla, CA 92038

MMC

Tim Ragen
Marine Mammal Commission
4340 East-West Highway, Suite 700
Bethesda, MD 20814

STATE AGENCIES

Clyde W. Namu'o, Administrator
State of Hawai'i
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapi'olani Blvd., Suite 500
Honolulu, HI 96813

Mark Delaplaine
Federal Consistency Supervisor
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont St., Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

Jessica Bertenshan
9500 Gilman Dr.
UC-San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

John Collins
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
MS-34
360 Woods Hole Rd.
Woods Hole, MA 02543

Pat Cooper
School of Ocean and Earth Sciences and Technology
University of Hawaii
1680 East-West Road, POST 802
Honolulu HI 96822

Meagan Cummings
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
P.O. Box 1000
61 Route 9W
Palisades, NY 10964-1000

John Eastlund
IODP
1000 Discovery Dr.
College Station, TX 77845

Benny Gallaway
LGL
1410 Cavitt St.
Bryan, TX 77801

Roger Gentry
Joint Industry Program
1750 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 500
West Lobby
Washington, DC 20006

David Goldberg
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
P.O. Box 1000
61 Route 9W
Palisades, NY 10964-1000

Jessica Gribbon
EarthTech
675 N. Washington St.
Alexandria, VA 22307

Sean Higgins
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
P.O. Box 1000
61 Route 9W
Palisades, NY 10964-1000

R.D. Hofman
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Cara Horowitz
Natural Resources Defense Council
1314 Second St.
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Art Jung
Metcalf and Eddy
2751 Prospect Ave., Suite 200
Fairfax, VA 22031

George Krasnick
TEC Inc.
1003 Bishop St., Suite 1550
Pauahi Tower
Honolulu, HI 96813

Bill Lang
Mandeville, LA 70448

James Lima
Anchorage, AK 99501

Michael Link
LGL Alaska
1101 E 76th Ave., Suite B
Anchorage, AK 99513

Jeff McGuire
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
MS-24
360 Woods Hole Rd.
Woods Hole, MA 02543

APPENDIX **A:**

AGENCY AND PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE/COORDINATION

Notice of Intent (NOI) and Public Scoping

respond: It is estimated that 255 persons submit 1,106 completed DEA Forms 250, at 1 hour per form, for an annual burden of 1,106 hours. It is estimated that 25 companies submit information pertaining to new drug applications or abbreviated new drug applications, at 2 hours per response, for an annual burden of 50 hours.

(6) *An estimate of the total public burden (in hours) associated with the collection:* It is estimated that the total annual burden associated with this information collection is 1,156 hours.

If additional information is required contact: Brenda E. Dyer, Department Clearance Officer, United States Department of Justice, Justice Management Division, Policy and Planning Staff, Patrick Henry Building, Suite 1600, 601 D Street NW., Washington, DC 20530, or by e-mail at *brenda.e.dyer@usdoj.gov.*

Dated: September 16, 2005.

Brenda E. Dyer,

Department Clearance Officer, Department of Justice.

[FR Doc. 05–18903 Filed 9–21–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4410–09–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Notice of Intent To Prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for the National Science Foundation To Address Potential Impacts on the Marine Environment Related to the Use of Seismic Sources in Support of NSF-Funded Research by U.S. Academic Scientists.

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR parts 1500–1508), the National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OES) to evaluate the potential environmental impacts associated with the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), a part of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, is being invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OES.

Publication of this notice begins the official scoping process that will help identify alternatives and determine the scope of environmental issues to be addressed in the Programmatic EIS/OEIS. This notice requests public participation in the scoping process and provides information on how to participate.

ADDRESSES AND DATES: Public-scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations:

1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1–5 p.m., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD;

2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5–9 p.m., J. Erick Jonhhon Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA;

3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5–9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX;

4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5–9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, 555 West Fifth Avenue, Anchorage, AK;

5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5–9 p.m., 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, CA; and

6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5–9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be mailed to NSF by October 28, 2005 (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Written statements and questions regarding the scoping process should be mailed to Dr. Alexander Shor, Program Director, Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services, Division of Ocean Sciences, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230; voice (703) 292–8583 or e-mail at *OCE-EIS@nsf.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: In the last 2 years, NSF has prepared 16 environmental assessments (EAs) on the impact of seismic noise on endangered species and marine mammals during planned marine research projects concerning the geology and geophysics of the seafloor. The EAs were prepared for various worldwide, academic research cruises that required the use of various marine seismic sources. These EAs were intended to address regulations and public concern over anthropogenic noise in the marine environment and its possible, negative impacts on marine life. They were prepared to address U.S. laws and regulations, including NEPA; the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (MMPA); the endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA); and Executive Order (EO) 12114 (1979), *Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions.* In some cases they have also been used as background information to address foreign regulations, especially where research has been carried out entirely or partially within territorial waters or Exclusive Economic Zone waters surrounding a foreign nation.

In each case, the NSF EA and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been used as the basis for consultation with NMFS Office of Protected Resources (OPR) under Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, and in each case for which an action is finalized, NMFS OPR has issued a Biological Opinion and a related Incidental Take Statement authorizing the proposed project to be undertaken, and indicating any mitigation measures needed to reduce impacts on endangered species. In parallel with this effort, a separate application has been submitted for each cruise to apply for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) under the MMPA from NMFS OPR, and an IHA has also been issued by NMFS for each of the projects. Increasingly over the past 2 years, public comments have expressed concern that by evaluating individual projects in isolation, the cumulative impacts of NSF-funded seismic activities on the marine environment are not being adequately addressed. NSF and NMFS OPR personnel have examined this concern and have concluded that a Programmatic EIS/OEIS could provide both the holistic view of cumulative impacts, as well as provide the principal technical and environmental foundation to form the basis of evaluating environmental impacts of most NSF-funded seismic efforts.

The Programmatic EIS/OEIS will take a view of the planned program as a whole and thereby assemble and analyze the broadest range of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with the entire program rather than assessing individual cruises separately. This approach will also address possible concerns that NSF is analyzing their research program in segments, rather than holistically where the true cumulative impacts of the entire program can be identified. Further, the parent Programmatic EIS/OEIS will provide a broad analytical backdrop within which NSF, using tiered documents, will be able to analyze cruise-specific issues relevant for analysis and decision. Additionally, it will streamline the preparation of subsequent environmental documents for the individual cruises and also

enable NSF to identify any prudent conservation practices and mitigation measures that may be applied across the entire program. The site-specific information is required by NMFS (and sometimes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) for purposes of preparing Biological Opinions and Incidental Take Statements required by ESA.

The main focus of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS will be on the seismic operations to be conducted from NSF's primary seismic ship, soon to be the R/V Marcus G. Langseth. The Programmatic EIS/OEIS will address the variety of airgun configurations to be operated from the Langseth, as well as the multi-beam bathymetric sonar, sub-bottom profiler, and other acoustic sources to be deployed as standard equipment. In addition, the Programmatic EIS/OEIS will deal with the generally small airgun sources occasionally operated from other vessels under NSF sponsorship.

Major environmental issues that will be addressed in the Programmatic EIS/OEIS include marine biological resources including Essential Fish Habitat (EFH), acoustic impacts to marine mammals, fish, sea turtles, invertebrates, and threatened and endangered species; cultural resources; human health and safety; socioeconomics and land use (*i.e.,* commercial, private, and recreational uses of the marine environment); and water quality.

NSF is initiating this scoping process for the purpose of determining the extent of issues to be addressed and identifying the significant issues related to this action. NSF will hold public scoping meetings as identified in the **DATES AND ADDRESSES** section of this notice. These meetings will also be advertised in area newspapers. NSF and NMFS representatives will be available at these meetings to receive comments from the public regarding issues of concern to the public. Federal, state, and local agencies and interested individuals are encouraged to take this opportunity to identify environmental concerns that should be addressed during the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS. Agencies and the public are also invited and encouraged to provide written comments on scoping issues in addition to, or in lieu of, oral comments at the public meeting. To be most helpful, scoping comments should clearly describe issues or topics that the commenter believes the Programmatic EIS/OEIS should address.

We invite you to learn about the NSF seismic research program at an informational open house, and to assist NSF in defining the alternatives and the scope of environmental issues related to the seismic research program. All our public meeting locations are wheelchair-accessible. If you plan to attend a scoping meeting/open house, and need special assistance such as sign language interpretation or other reasonable accommodation, please notify NSF (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**) at least 3 business days in advance. Include your contact information as well as information about your specific needs.

We request public comments or other relevant information on environmental issues related to the NSF seismic research program. The public meetings are not the only opportunity you have to comment. In addition to or in place of attending a meeting, you can submit comments to Dr. Alexander Shor by October 28, 2005 (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**). We will consider all comments received during the comment period. We request that you include in your comments:

- Your name and address (especially if you would like to receive a copy of the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS upon completion);
- An explanation for each comment; and
- Include any background materials to support your comments as you feel necessary.

You may mail, e-mail, or hand deliver your comments to NSF (see **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**). All comment submissions must be unbound, no larger than 8½ by 11 inches, and suitable for copying and electronic scanning. Please note that regardless of the method used for submitting comments or material, all submissions will be publicly available and, therefore, any personal information you provide in your comments will be open for public review. In addition, if you wish to receive a copy of the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS, please indicate this in your comment. No decision will be made to implement any alternative until the NEPA process is completed.

Dated: September 19, 2005.

Alexander Shor,

Program Director, Division of Ocean Sciences, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 05–18962 Filed 9–21–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Sunshine Act Meeting

AGENCY HOLDING MEETING: National Science Foundation, National Science Board and its Subdivisions

DATE AND TIME: September 28–29, 2005.

September 28, 2005, 8:15 a.m.–5 p.m.
Sessions:
8:15 a.m.–9 a.m., Open;
9 a.m.–9:30 a.m., Closed;
9:30 a.m.—10:30 a.m., Open;
10:30 a.m.–11 a.m., Open;
11 a.m.–11:45 a.m., Open;
11:45 a.m.–12:05 p.m., Open;
12:05 p.m.–12:15 p.m., Closed;
12:45 p.m.–12:55 p.m., Closed;
12:55 p.m.–3 p.m., Open;
3 p.m.–5 p.m., Open.
September 29, 2005, 8 a.m.–3:30 p.m.,
Sessions:
8:30 a.m.–10 a.m., Open;
10 a.m.–10:30 a.m., Closed;
10:30 a.m.–11 a.m., Open;
11 a.m.–11:15 a.m., Closed;
1 p.m.–1:15 p.m., Executive Closed;
1:15 p.m.–1:30 p.m., Closed;
1:30 p.m.–3:30 p.m., Open.

PLACE: National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd, Room 1235, Arlington, VA 22230.

PUBLIC MEETING ATTENDANCE: All visitors must report to the NSF's visitor's desk at the 9th and N. Stuart Streets entrance to receive a visitor's badge.

CONTACT INFORMATION: Please refer to the National Science Board Web site (*www.nsf.gov/nsb*) for updated schedule. NSB Office: (703) 292–7000.

STATUS: Part of this meeting will be closed to the public. Part of this meeting will be open to the public.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

Wednesday, September 28, 2005

Open

Committee on Programs and Plans Subcommittee on Polar Issues (8:15 a.m.–9 a.m.), Room 1235
- Chair's Remarks and Approval of Minutes
- OPP Director's Report
- Update on Icebreaker Issues
- Antarctic Geological Drilling Project
- Collaboration of Researchers with Native Communities: King Island, Alaska

Education and Human Resources Subcommittee on S&E Indicators (9:30 a.m.–10:30 a.m.), Room 1235
- Approval of Minutes
- Chairman's Remarks
- Brief Progress Report on Science and Engineering Indicators 2006
- Discussion of Draft Companion Piece
- Contractor Presentation on Indicators

Committee on Programs and Plans Task Force on Transformative Research (10:30 a.m.–11 a.m.), Room 1235
- Approval of Minutes
- Brief Overview of Workshop I: August 12, 2005

Workers press for slot machine bill, but measure seen as long shot

By Raphael Lewis
GLOBE STAFF

Hundreds of employees from the state's four racetracks packed a State House hearing yesterday to urge the passage of a bill that would allow slot machine gambling at these struggling facilities, but top lawmakers on both sides of the issue said steep opposition in the House of Representatives and the governor's office make the chances for such a bill to become law extremely slim.

Doreen Carolan of Revere, a Wonderland Greyhound Park valet, and her niece Katie DeBenedetto showed up to the hearing dressed in one-armed bandit costumes to show support, but Carolan said the issue was hardly a laughing matter. "My family has dedicated its life to the track, and it's diminishing rapidly," Carolan said. "We're only hanging on."

In the next two weeks the state Senate is expected to debate a bill on allowing slot machine gambling at the racetracks, said Michael W. Morrissey, a Quincy Democrat who chaired yesterday's hearing. Backers say the slot measure would not only pump $550 million in new revenues into the state in its first full year, but would save the tracks from financial ruin.

But opponents question promises of vast new revenues, and internal polling suggests that neither the House nor the Senate has established enough support to overcome a veto. Those familiar with the polling yesterday said 23, and perhaps 24, of the 39 senators would vote in favor of the bill, but it would take 27 votes to overcome a veto by Governor Mitt Romney in the Senate.

Top aides to Senate President Robert E. Travaglini, whose district includes Suffolk Downs and Wonderland, are engaging reluctant lawmakers in a bid to win broader support for the measure, political and industry sources familiar with the planning said.

The House has 60 to 98 supporters of expanded gaming, according to several lawmakers who

BARRY CHIN/THE BOSTON GLOBE STAFF

Katie DeBenedetto and her aunt Doreen Carolan were dressed as slot machines at the State House hearing yesterday. Hundreds of workers urged lawmakers to pass the slot machine bill.

back the concept, but that's not enough to overcome a promised veto by Romney.

Hoping to impress upon lawmakers that all four tracks are facing massive job cuts or bankruptcy, the tracks' labor unions and owners rounded up an armada of workers to show up yesterday. The crowd, many wearing red T-shirts that depicted a slot machine and the slogan, "Why Not Mass.?", cheered wildly as sympathetic lawmakers, horse trainers, and others made their case before the Joint Committee on Consumer Protection and Professional Licensure.

"How can you turn your backs on us and allow thousands of good jobs to vanish," testified Louis Clarione, president of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 123, which represents 200 Suffolk Downs workers."

Such arguments are apparently falling to persuade Representative Daniel E. Bosley of North Adams, the House chairman of the Joint Committee on Economic Development and Emerging Technologies, which deals with all gambling legislation. Asked whether he intends to allow any bills that seek to expand gaming to emerge on the House floor for a vote, he said "No." "What's the economic benefit?" he said. "It's really not there if you run the numbers."

Bosley made his comments after testifying at a separate hearing held yesterday by lawmakers opposed to expanded gaming.

Proposal urges more tax relief for seniors

Auditor envisions state-run system

By Stephanie Ebbert
GLOBE STAFF

State Auditor Joseph DeNucci yesterday called for doing away with a hodgepodge of municipal senior tax-relief programs and replacing them with a uniform, state-run system that would save homeowners 65 and older an average of $1,446 a year on their property taxes.

In a report by his Division of Local Mandates, DeNucci said the programs have not kept pace with the original legislative intent to offset half of the state's median tax bill, which computed to $1,446 last year. Instead, the average local tax exemption is now worth only about $500, and property values continue to soar.

Tax relief is also not consistent among localities, ranging from $175 to $1,000. A senior eligible for exemptions in one community can get shut out after moving to another, according to the report.

DeNucci recommended that the patchwork of local programs be scrapped in favor of a state-run tax exemption that would expand an existing program under the state Department of Revenue that currently allows seniors 65 and older to claim a state income tax credit of up to $820 for the taxes they pay on their homes. Seniors are eligible for this "circuit breaker" program if they earn less than $44,000 annually (or $66,000 as a couple) and their properties, after abatement, are valued at less than $441,000.

Expanding the program — and allowing the full $1,446 exemption — would cost the state about $16 million a year, the report estimates. DeNucci called for a "hold-harmless" clause that would protect any homeowners who might otherwise wind up paying more under his proposal.

Tim Connolly, a spokesman for the Department of Revenue, said his agency would examine the report and weigh the proposal to expand the circuit breaker program, which more than 36,000 people took advantage of last year.

As housing values skyrocketed in recent years, advocacy groups have championed efforts to help seniors find the resources to pay off their growing tax bills. DeNucci's report gives testimony to the issue's longevity: He issued a similar report in 1998 and, even then, found that the value of the local tax exemptions was slipping and fewer seniors were able to qualify.

"This is long overdue," said Laura Henze Russell, director of the Elder Economic Security Standard Project at the Gerontology Institute of the University of Massachusetts, Boston. "Everyone talks about how high heating costs are rising, but property taxes have been rising at incredible amounts over the past five years."

'This is long overdue. . . . property taxes have been rising at incredible amounts.'
LAURA HENZE RUSSELL
Gerontology Institute, UMass-Boston

The Legislature is considering numerous bills that would let cities and towns increase their local exemptions or loosen income and asset restrictions for seniors. The Department of Revenue is estimating the cost of various provisions, and a bill is expected to emerge from the Joint Committee on Revenue in the coming weeks.

Over time, cities and towns have offered more and more local exemptions for which they do not receive state reimbursement. That creates inequities for both individuals and communities, DeNucci found. Most Massachusetts communities receive less from the state than they spend on exemptions. And a senior who does not qualify for tax relief in one town could move to a neighboring community and save 60 percent on taxes, the report found.

Local government representatives say a broader state-run system would alleviate some difficult budgetary decisions local governments now must make. "Right now, communities are offering property tax exemptions for senior citizens and trying to do their best to offer property tax relief. But under state law, they're forced to fund that by cutting other services," said Geoff Beckwith, executive director of the Massachusetts Municipal Association.

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is being invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

NSF is holding a public scoping meeting in Woods Hole, MA, Thursday, October 6, 5-9 PM. This meeting will be an open house format at the E. Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, 314 Quissett Avenue. If you are unable to attend this open house meeting, you may submit written comments to:

Dr. Alexander Shor
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230
or via email at OCE-EIS@nsf.gov

Although we will accept comments throughout the preparation of the EIS/OEIS, we recommend that your scoping comments be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005, to ensure equitable consideration in the Draft EIS/OEIS.

2 adults, toddler hurt in Route 3 crash

Racing is probed as possible cause

By John Ellement
GLOBE STAFF

Three people, including a 2-year-old girl and her mother, survived a wild crash yesterday when the car they were riding in slammed into a guardrail and rolled over several times before coming to rest on Route 3 in Braintree. Authorities said they are investigating whether the crash stemmed from drag racing.

State Police identified the driver of the 2000 Chevrolet Impala as Rachael Thibodeau, 18, of Weymouth and her passenger as Katherine Joslyn, 20, also of Weymouth. Citing privacy laws, State Police would not say which of the women is the child's mother, but another state official familiar with the facts of the crash said Joslyn is the mother. The official spoke on the condition of anonymity because the second agency was not directly involved in the case.

Both women and the child were taken to Boston Medical Center following the 3:30 a.m. crash. Late yesterday afternoon, a hospital spokesman said Joslyn's condition had been upgraded to fair, while Thibodeau remained in serious condition.

The child was not listed as a patient at the hospital, a spokesman said. State Police said she was only slightly injured.

State Police Sergeant Scott Range said that at the time of the crash, the toddler was properly secured in a child safety seat and that troopers are trying to determine whether both Joslyn and Thibodeau were also wearing safety restraints.

Range said Joslyn was not thrown from the Impala, but Thibodeau was partially thrown from the car after it crashed on Route 3 north, south of Exit 17 in Braintree.

Range said troopers are trying to determine whether drag racing was a contributing factor in the crash.

"Whether or not racing and whether or not a second vehicle was involved in the crash is still being investigated," Range said.

The trooper said that after Thibodeau lost control of the car, it smashed into the center guardrail, rolled over several times, and then came to rest in the right-hand and breakdown lanes, forcing the shutdown of those two lanes for about an hour.

Thibodeau has a clean driving history, according to the Registry of Motor Vehicles.

Relatives of the women did not return telephone calls yesterday seeking comment.

Buy 2 Get 1 Free Vinyl Windows
Bring in Your Measurements for On-the-Spot Pricing
Vinyl Siding 33% OFF
Call Today For Your Free In-Home Estimate
10% OFF Patio Rooms
FACTORY DIRECT SINCE 1953
Champion WINDOWS • SIDING • PATIO ROOMS
Wilmington • 1-877-846-3699
Avon • 1-877-946-3699
www.championwindow.com
Offer(s) applies to our regular list price. All prices, prior regular transactions, terms or agreements do not apply. Expires 10-11-05. ADLOC: BORF092705

Boston Reads Metro
Metro is the largest and fastest growing international newspaper in the world with 57 editions published in 17 countries and 17 languages across North and South America, Europe and Asia.
Young, Urban, Affluent, Active
70% of our readers worldwide are age 19 to 44
Visit www.metropolitan.com to read Metro editions from all over the world.
For more information contact us at the following:
admin@metro-boston.com
phone 617.570.0100
metro

The Boston Globe
Publication Date: 09/29/2005
Ad Number: 9RCL02200
Insertion Number: 9RCL02200
Size: 2X4
Color Type: B&W
Client Name: Tec Inc
Advertiser: Tec Inc
Section/Page/Zone: METRO/005/NZ
Description: Tec Inc
This E-Sheet is provided as conclusive evidence that the ad appeared in the Boston Globe on the date and page indicated. You may not create derivative works, or in any way exploit or repurpose any content.

Affidavit of Publication

TEC, INC.

3879 PEBBLE BROOKE CIRCLE

ORANGE PARK, FL 32065

ATTN: KATHY ROSE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA} ss.
County of San Diego}

The Undersigned, declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California: That....She is a resident of the County of San Diego. THAT....She is and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years, and that .....She is not a party to, nor interested in the above entitled matter; that ....She is..... Chief Clerk for the publisher of .....

The San Diego Union-Tribune

a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and which newspaper is published for the dissemination of local news and intelligence of a general character, and which newspaper at all the times herein mentioned had and still has a bona fide subscription list of paying subscribers, and which newspaper has been established, printed and published at regular intervals in the said City of San Diego, County of San Diego, for a period exceeding one year next preceding the date of publication of the notice hereinafter referred to, and which newspaper is not devoted to nor published for the interests, entertainment or instruction of a particular class, profession, trade, calling, race, or denomination, or any number of same; that the notice of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following date, to-wit:

OCTOBER 8, 2005

Chief Clerk for the Publisher

Affidavit of Publication of

Legal Classified Advertisement

Ad # 99900

Ordered by: KATHY ROSE

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is being invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

NSF is holding a public scoping meeting in La Jolla, CA, Monday, October 17, 5-9 PM. This meeting will be an open house format at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way. If you are unable to attend this open house meeting, you may submit written comments to:

Dr. Alexander Shor
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230
or via email at OCE-EIS@nsf.gov

Although we will accept comments throughout the preparation of the EIS/OEIS, we recommend that your scoping comments be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005, to ensure equitable consideration in the Draft EIS.

The San Diego Union-Tribune.

ıtributing to the delinquency of a
inor after he allegedly touched the
rl inappropriately while she was at
s home about 2:30 a.m. Sunday.
he girl told her parents about the
leged incident when she got home,
ıd they called police.
Raskin is being held without
ond.

ompiled from reports by staff
riters.

Day/Pick-3:	5-9-5
Pick-4:	4-8-6-0
Night/Pick-3:	3-3-7
Pick-4:	7-2-8-3
Match 5:	1-2-23-26-35 *39
Lotto:	1-4-7-8-11-18

All winning lottery numbers are official only when validated at a lottery ticket location or a lottery claims office.

Lotto South:	5-6-10-14-20-48

MULTI-STATE GAMES

Mega Millions:	14-17-26-27-28 **5
Powerball:	7-22-27-48-50 ***17
Power Play:	2
Hot Lotto:	2-22-23-24-29 †16

*Bonus Ball **Mega Ball ***Powerball †Hot Ball
Because of late Tuesday drawings, the Mega Millions and Virginia's Cash-5 numbers did not appear in all Wednesday editions. For late lottery results, check www.washingtonpost.com/lottery.



ES
R
STAN MONTH
ARPET
y and Excellence
022"
TOWN CENTER 703-444-9906
GLEBE 703-524-7275

VOOD
E!
RING
excess stock
an Up!
Specials:
y last)
ork Flooring
ts per sq. ft.
g w/30 Year Warranty
incredible $2.89 per s
tions Prefinished Guns
– $1.99 per sq. ft.
ts off per sq. ft.
OFFER!
rting at 50 cents per sq
is stuff – so you sav
OM • BELLAWOOD.
OFFER ENDS 10/5/05

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is being invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

NSF is holding a public scoping meeting in Silver Spring, MD, Wednesday, October 5, 1-5 PM. This meeting will be an open house format at the Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, 1301 East-West Highway. If you are unable to attend this open house meeting, you may submit written comments to:

Dr. Alexander Shor
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230
or via email at OCE-EIS@nsf.gov

Although we will accept comments throughout the preparation of the EIS/OEIS, we recommend that your scoping comments be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005, to ensure equitable consideration in the Draft EIS/OEIS.

End of Year Blowouts
Save $575 to $875
NordicTrack
NordicTrack Viewpoint TV
Life-time Motor Warranty
reg. $2599.99
sale $1799.99
1724.99
Save
875
with $75 OFF
BEST DEAL!
DMILLS STARTING AT $799
NordicTrack®
FACTORY DIRECT STORES
*When you purchase of $499 or more. Subject to credit approval. No accrued finance charges due during the 0% period. Monthly payments may be possible. Finance charge will accrue during the deferred period. If original purchase amount is paid in full by the deferred date on your statement, then finance charges will not be imposed. Finance charge will accrue from the date of delivery. Finance charges will accrue at 21.9% APR. Regular credit terms apply after 0% period. Offer expires 10/2/2005. See store for details. Not valid on any prior purchase. Prices do not include delivery.
Come see our new location on the top floor of
TYSON'S GALLERIA near Saks 5th Avenue 703-448-0015
WESTFIELD SHOPPINGTOWN MONTGOMERY 301-365-4471
CALL 1-800-TO-BE-FIT FOR OUR STORE NEAREST YOU!

Washington Post
September 29, 2005

Grand Forks, N.D., she lived in the Angus, Minn., area until she was 4 and graduated from Warroad High School in 2002. That summer she invited recruiter to their h signed up, Steve LaD

Felicia LaDuke w driver with the divis Transportation Comp Combat Support Ba March, she returned ployment in suppor tion Iraqi Freedom, dad said lasted sev While in Iraq she dr voys between Tikri dad, sometimes wo door gunner.

The family isn't Felicia's body will b but her father said will be in Warr Church, where Fel was baptized.

Advertiser staff writer Mike Gordon and Grand Forks (N.D.) Herald reporter Stephen J. Lee contributed to this report.

Honolulu Advertiser

October 12, 2005

Matchmaking is our Business!

WHICH DO YOU PREFER...

Reiko Morita PRESIDENT

333 www.matchmakinghawaii.com



MOBILITY SPECIALISTS
Call For Free In-Home Consultation
735-2557 *Since 1973*
featuring Pride Mobility Products
www.DandMSales.com
SERVING ALL ISLANDS TOLL FREE: 888-722-2200

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is being invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

NSF is holding a public scoping meeting in Honolulu, HI, Wednesday, October 19, 5-9 PM. This meeting will be an open house format at the Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive. If you are unable to attend this open house meeting, you may submit written comments to:

Dr. Alexander Shor
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230
or via email at OCE-EIS@nsf.gov

Although we will accept comments throughout the preparation of the EIS/OEIS, we recommend that your scoping comments be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005, to ensure equitable consideration in the Draft EIS.

ond Gallery
WEDDING ENGAGEMENT CENTER
IAMOND SALE



Diamond Rings
GIA, EGL Diamonds
i Blvd. Suite 638 Phone 944-8360
nondgalleryhawaii.com Validated Parking

TA-266
oahu maui hilo/kona kauai lanai molokai
593-4481 270-8888 930-8888 240-8888 568-8888 660-8888
s Discount Airfare Specialist! FOR GROUP TRAVEL CALL 792-2818
NATIONAL CITIES
$580 AMSTERDAM $670
430 ATHENS 815
978 BERLIN 680
439 BRUSSELS 670
499 FRANKFURT 680
BOOK YOUR PACKAGE ONLINE AT WWW.KINGSTRAVEL.COM!
VACATION PACKAGES starting from . . .
Disneyland Park $399
Bangkok $599
5 nts, air, Mandarin Hotel, Daily breakfast buffet.
Sydney $839

earing

se

property tax
ate raised
h was used
enance and

proposing a
t rate would
23,446 more

to consider
aring will be
M. at City of
901 Bagby,
ond hearing
A.M. at City
901 Ba

earings
courage
ou wis
rd at
to spe
Secreta
el, City
on, Texas,

HIP Fracture? You may have Rights
713-830-7687
THE DIETRICH LAW FIRM
HOUSTON, TEXAS

Visit Our Showroom and See For Yourself
SKYLIGHT SOLUTIONS
6650 W. Sam Houston Pkwy. N.
Houston, TX
713-466-1551
www.solatubehouston.com

Carolyn Thompson's
ANTIQUE CENTER OF TEXAS
TEXAS' LARGEST
713-688-4211 • 1001 West Loop North @ Old Katy Rd

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is being invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

NSF is holding a public scoping meeting in College Station, TX on Wednesday, October 12, 5-9 PM. This meeting will be an open house format at Texas A&M University, 1000 Discovery Drive, Room C126. If you are unable to attend this open house meeting, you may submit written comments to:

Dr. Alexander Shor
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230
or via email at OCE-EIS@nsf.gov

Although we will accept comments throughout the preparation of the EIS/OEIS, we recommend that your scoping comments be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005, to ensure equitable consideration in the Draft EIS.

5th Annual
Accolades 2005
Fall luncheon event benefitting CHILDREN AT RISK

Honoring Mark & Shannon Wallace
being of all children through
lity health care.
Doctors Ralph & Judith Feigin
hairs: Tom & Laura Bellows
en 2005 Award:
Janek
Whitmire
ton's Children:
M.D.
Court Services
es & More
30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
2 West Loop South
ease call (713) 869-7740.

HOUSTON CHRONICLE
Supporting our Community
children at Risk
www.childrenatrisk.org

Houston Chronicle

October 5, 2005



ALVARO BARRIENTOS / The Associ

Spanish soldiers patrol the border between Morocco and Spai
enclave of Melilla on Thursday. Both countries are finalizing a
return Africans who illegally entered Spain from Morocco.

nine miles from Melilla.

Morocco's communications minister, Nabil Benabdellah, said illegal immigration "is a delicate question that needs wise and rigorous treatment."

Morocco is a "victim" in the matter, he said, referring to the use of Moroccan soil by African immigrants hoping to make their way to Spain. He underscored the need for an approach that involves Morocco's neighbors as well as the European Union but did not specify a solution his North African nation would find acceptable.

On Sept. 29, five people

the past week and hundr
men scaling razor wire
to reach the small outp
Europe.

Spain announced pl
expel the Africans as it
gles to cope with an ov
ing holding facility housin
immigrants in Melilla a
seemingly nonstop drive
migrants bound to reach

Spain says it is acting u
never enforced 1992 agre
with Morocco that lets i
back immigrants arrivin
that country even if they
Moroccan.

Under current Spanis
nment lets Afric
stay if they ar
that do not hav
patriation agree
Spain to send
e. Most of the
come from de

Anchorage Daily News

October 7, 2005

Is It Wood
or is it
Laminate
Can You Tell The Difference
J & D Interiors
8300 Briarwood • 349-9685 • 800-770-9685 • jdinteriors.com

y as ABC!
NOW!
ABC RV SALES • 561-19
5550 Old Seward Hwy

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces its intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is being invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

NSF is holding a public scoping meeting in Anchorage, Friday, October 14, 5-9 p.m. This meeting will be an open house format at the Egan Civic and Convention Center; Space 1, 13-14; 555 West Fifth Avenue. If you are unable to attend this open house meeting, you may submit written comments to:

Dr. Alexander Shor
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230
or via e-mail at OCE-EIS@nsf.gov

Although we will accept comments throughout the preparation of the EIS/OEIS, we recommend that your scoping comments be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005, to ensure equitable consideration in the Draft EIS.



September 29, 2005

USFWS Headquarters
1849 C St. NW
Washington, DC 20242

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Marvin Moriarty
Field Supervisor (Regional Director)
USFWS
300 Westgate Center Dr
Hadley, MA 1035

Dear Mr. Moriarty,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Sue Hamilton
Field Supervisor (Regional Director)
USFWS
1875 Century Blvd
Atlanta, GA 30345

Dear Ms. Hamilton,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

William Seawell
Field Supervisor (Regional Director)
USFWS
10711 Burnet Road, Ste. 200
Austin, TX 78758

Dear Mr. Seawell,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Steve Thompson
Field Supervisor (Regional Director)
USFWS
2800 Cottage Way Suite W2606
Sacramento, CA 95825

Dear Mr. Thompson,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Dave Allen
Field Supervisor (Regional Director)
USFWS
911 NE 11th St
Portland, OR 97232

Dear Mr. Allen,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Tauline Davis
Field Supervisor (Regional Director)
USFWS
1011 East Tudor Rd
Anchorage, AK 99503

Dear Ms. Davis,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Ted Swem
Wildlife Biologist
USFWS
101 12th Avenue, Box 19
Fairbanks, AK 99701

Dear Mr. Swem,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Craig Perham
Wildlife Biologist
USFWS
1011 East Tudor Rd
Anchorage, AK 99503

Dear Mr. Perham,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Maggie Ahmaogak
Executive Director
AEWC
P.O. Box 570
Barrow, AK 99723

Dear Ms. Ahmaogak,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Craig George
Wildlife Biologist
DWM
Department of Wildlife Management, North Slope Borough, PO Box 69
Barrow, AK 99723

Dear Mr. George,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Charles Brower
Director
Department of Wildlife Management
North Slope Borough, PO Box 69
Barrow, AK 99723

Dear Mr. Brower,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

NOAA/NMFS Headquarters
14th St. & Consitution Ave Rm 6217
Washington, DC 20230

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Patricia A. Kurkul
Regional Administrator
NOAA/NMFS
One Blackburn Drive
Gloucester, MA 1930

Dear Ms. Kurkul,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Dr. Roy E. Crabtree
Regional Administrator
NOAA/NMFS
236 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg , FL 33701

Dear Dr. Crabtree,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Rodney McInnis
Regional Administrator
NOAA/NMFS
501 W. Ocean Blvd
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mr. McInnis,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Bob Lohn
Regional Administrator
NOAA/NMFS
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Dear Mr. Lohn,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

James Balsiger
Regional Administrator
NOAA/NMFS
PO Box 21668
Juneau, AK 99802

Dear Mr. Balsiger,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Joseph Montgomery
Director NEPA Compliance, Off. of Federal Activities
USEPA
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (6403J)
Washington , DC 20460

Dear Mr. Montgomery,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Robert W. Varney
Regional Administrator
USEPA
1 Congress St
Boston, MA

Dear Mr. Varney,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Alan J. Steinburg
Regional Administrator
USEPA
290 Broadway, 26th Floor
New York, NY 10007

Dear Mr. Steinburg,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Donald S. Welsh
Regional Administrator
USEPA
1650 Arch St
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dear Mr. Welsh,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

J.I. Palmer, Jr
Regional Administrator
USEPA
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303

Dear Mr. Palmer,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Thomas V. Skinner
Regional Administrator
USEPA
77 West Jackson Blvd
Chicago, IL 60604

Dear Mr. Skinner,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Richard Greene
Regional Administrator
USEPA
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas , TX 75202

Dear Mr. Greene,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

James B. Gulliford
Regional Administrator
USEPA
901 N. 5th Street
Kansas City, KS 66101

Dear Mr. Gulliford,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Robbie Roberts
Regional Administrator
USEPA
999-18th St. Suite 300
Denver, CO 80202

Dear Mr. Roberts,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Wayne Nastri
Regional Administrator
USEPA
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Dear Mr. Nastri,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Ron Kreizenbeck
Regional Administrator
USEPA
1200 Sixth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101

Dear Mr. Kreizenbeck,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Tony MacDonald
Executive Director
Coastal States Organization
444 N. Capitol, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dear Mr. MacDonald,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Minerals Management Service
Environmental Branch
1849 C Street NW
Washington, DC 20240

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

G. Ed Richardson
Minerals Management Service
139 Deerlake Drive
Asheville, NC 28803

Dear Mr. Richardson,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

James Bennett
Minerals Management Service/Environmental Branch
381 Elden Street, MS 4023
Herndon, VA 20170

Dear Mr. Bennett,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Minerals Management Service
Environmental Branch
770 Paseo Camarillo
Camarillo, CA 93010

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

David Moore
Minerals Management Service
381 Elden Street
Herndon, VA 21071

Dear Mr. Moore,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Alaska Intertribal Council
431 West 7th Ave Suite 201
Anchorage, AK 99501

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

National Congress of American Indians
1300 Connecticut Ave Suite 200
Washignton, DC 20036

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapi`olani Blvd. Suite 500
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

Northwest Indian Fisheries Council
6730 Martin Way E.
Olympia, WA 98516

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

September 29, 2005

National Tribal Environmental Council
2501 Rio Grande Blvd. NW, Suite A
Albuquerque, NM 87104

Dear Sir or Madam,

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has announced its intention to prepare a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists. The National Marine Fisheries Service will be invited to be a cooperating agency in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

To begin the process, NSF is holding a series of public scoping meetings. Public scoping meetings will be held at the following dates, times, and locations: 1. Wednesday, October 5, 2005, 1-5 P.M., Silver Spring Metro Center Building 4, Science Center, 1301 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD; 2. Thursday, October 6, 2005, 5-9 p.m., J. Erik Jonsson Center of the National Academy of Sciences, Carriage House, 314 Quissett Avenue, Woods Hole, MA; 3. Wednesday, October 12, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Room C126, 1000 Discovery Drive, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX; 4. Friday, October 14, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Egan Civic and Convention Center, Space 1, 13-14, 555 West Fifth Ave. Anchorage, AK; 5. Monday, October 17, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 100 Vaughn Hall, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA; and 6. Wednesday, October 19, 2005, 5-9 p.m., Ala Moana Hotel, 410 Atkinson Drive, Honolulu, HI.

Written comments will be accepted at these meetings as well as during the scoping period, and can be sent to NSF by October 28, 2005. Information on addressing comments and details on NSF's proposal is available in the September 22, 2005 Federal Register.

for Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Phone: (703) 292-7711 (Direct Line)
Phone: (703) 292-8583 (Program Assistant)
Fax: (703) 292-9085; Email: ashor@nsf.gov

PHONE (808) 594-1888

FAX (808) 594-1865

STATE OF HAWAI'I
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
711 KAPI'OLANI BOULEVARD, SUITE 500
HONOLULU, HAWAI'I 96813

HRD05/2064

October 25, 2005

Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences, NSF
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230

RE: Request for public scoping on the preparations of a Programmatic EIS/Overseas EIS about potential impacts on the marine environment by the use of seismic sources in support of National Science Foundation-funded scientific research

Dear Alexander Shor,

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) is in receipt of your September 29, 2005, request for comments on the above-referenced proposal. While our staff was unable to attend the public scoping meeting at the Ala Moana Hotel on October 19, 2005, we look forward to the opportunity to review and comment upon the forthcoming Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. If you have further questions or concerns, please contact Heidi Guth at (808) 594-1962 or e-mail her at heidig@oha.org.

Sincerely,

Clyde W. Nāmu'o
Administrator

United States Department of the Interior

U. S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Reston, VA 20192

In Reply Refer To:
Mail Stop 423
ER 05/833

October 28, 2005

Dr. Alexander Shor, Program Director
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230

RE: Review of Notice of Intent to Prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for the National Science Foundation to Address Potential Impacts on the Marine Environment Related to the Use of Seismic Sources in Support of NSF-Funded Research by U.S. Academic Scientists

Dr. Alexander:

The U.S. Geological Survey has reviewed the programmatic/overseas environmental impact statements and has no comments.

Sincerely,

/Signed/
Lloyd H. Woosley, Jr., P.E.
Chief, Environmental Affairs Program

Cc: EAP Chron, MS 423
USGS:WRD:LWOOSLEY:bjjohnso:x6832:10/28/05

NRDC
THE EARTH'S BEST DEFENSE

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

By U.S. Mail and Email

October 28, 2005

Dr. Alexander Shor
Program Director
Oceanographic Instrumentation and Technical Services
Division of Ocean Sciences
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd., Suit 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Email: OCE-EIS@nsf.gov

Re: *Scoping comments for Programmatic EIS/OEIS for National Science Foundation Funding of Research Using Seismic Sources*

Dear Dr. Shor:

On behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council ("NRDC") and our more than 650,000 members nationwide, I submit these scoping comments on the National Science Foundation's ("NSF") notice of intent to prepare a programmatic environmental impact statement and overseas environmental impact statement ("P/OEIS") for its funding of research by U.S. scientists using seismic sources. *See* "Notice of intent to prepare a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for the National Science Foundation to address potential impacts on the marine environment related to the use of seismic sources in support of NSF-funded research by U.S. academic scientists," 70 Fed. Reg. 55630 (Sept. 22, 2005) ("Scoping Notice").

We appreciate NSF's commitment to prepare an EIS for these activities, as the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4331 *et seq.*, requires. Moreover, NRDC welcomes the decision to review NSF's funding of seismic research programmatically. As you are aware, maritime acoustic activities such as the seismic surveys at issue here have the potential to kill, injure, and harass marine mammals and other marine life over wide geographic areas. It is imperative, in approaching such activities, that NSF incorporate the rigorous, objective analysis demanded by NEPA into the earliest possible stages of its planning. To this end, we offer the following comments and recommendations.

A. General Requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act

Enacted by Congress in 1969, NEPA establishes a national policy to "encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment" and "promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man." 42 U.S.C. § 4321. In order to achieve its broad goals, NEPA mandates that "to the fullest extent possible" the "policies, regulations, and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with [NEPA]." 42 U.S.C. § 4332. As the Supreme Court explained,

> NEPA's instruction that all federal agencies comply with the impact statement requirement – and with all the requirements of § 102 – "to the fullest extent possible" [cit. omit.] is neither accidental nor hyperbolic. Rather the phrase is a deliberate command that the duty NEPA imposes upon the agencies to consider environmental factors not be shunted aside in the bureaucratic shuffle.

Flint Ridge Development Co. v. Scenic Rivers Ass'n, 426 U.S. 776, 787 (1976).

Central to NEPA is its requirement that, before any federal action that "*may* significantly degrade some human environmental factor" can be undertaken, agencies must prepare an environmental impact statement. *Steamboaters v. F.E.R.C.*, 759 F.2d 1382, 1392 (9th Cir. 1985) (emphasis in original). The fundamental purpose of an EIS is to force the decision-maker to take a "hard look" at a particular action – at the agency's need for it, at the environmental consequences it will have, and at more environmentally benign alternatives that may substitute for it – before the decision to proceed is made. 40 C.F.R. §§ 1500.1(b), 1502.1; *Baltimore Gas & Electric v. NRDC*, 462 U.S. 87, 97 (1983). The law is clear that the EIS must be a pre-decisional, objective, rigorous, and neutral document, not a work of advocacy to justify a decision that has already, in essence, been made.

A few of the elements most pertinent to the instant process may briefly be described as follows:

First, in order to satisfy NEPA, an EIS must include a "full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1. It is not enough, for the purposes of this discussion, to consider the proposed action in isolation, divorced from other public and private activities that impinge upon the same resource; rather, it is incumbent on NSF to assess cumulative impacts as well, including the "impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future significant actions." *Id.* § 1508.7.

Second, the preparer of an EIS must make every attempt to obtain and disclose data necessary to its analysis. The simple assertion that "no information exists" will not suffice; unless the costs of obtaining the information are exorbitant, NEPA requires that it be obtained. *See id.* § 1502.22(a). If the costs are deemed excessive, then the EIS must explain the relevance of incomplete information, summarize existing credible scientific evidence on the issue, and evaluate impacts using theoretical approaches or research

case-by-case basis, but which may become practicable through application across the entire program. An example of such mitigation measures is source-based modification, especially as many or most of the research projects being funded will be conducted from one boat, the *R/V Marcus G. Langseth*. Doing so would fulfill NEPA's mandate to "inform decisionmakers and the public of the reasonable alternatives which would avoid or minimize adverse impacts." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1.

B. Specific Points Requiring Particular Emphasis

In light of the requirements discussed above, a number of points require further mention:

(1) *Impacts of Ocean Noise on Marine Biota* – As marine science and the courts have increasingly recognized, intense underwater sound can have a range of deleterious effects on marine mammals and other ocean life. *See, e.g., National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Babbitt*, 241 F.3d 722 (9th Cir. 2001); *NRDC v. Evans*, 279 F.Supp.2d 1129 (N.D. Cal. 2003); International Whaling Commission, Report of the Scientific Committee to the International Whaling Commission, at § 12.2.5 and Annex K (2004) (hereinafter "*Report*") (concluding that there is "now compelling evidence implicating anthropogenic sound as a potential threat to marine mammals" at both the "regional and ocean scale levels," and expressing, in particular, "serious concerns over seismic survey impacts on cetaceans".)[2]

The P/OEIS must take this important issue into account in a meaningful and comprehensive way, accounting not only for the possibility of direct physical injury to marine life from undersea noise, but also for behavioral effects and for delayed indirect effects that, in some cases, may be lethal or severe. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8 (requiring analysis of both direct and indirect impacts). In particular, the risk that animals exposed to intense noise will later succumb to ship-strikes or entanglements has been documented in the literature and should be addressed.[3]

---

[2] For a review of research on behavioral and auditory impacts of undersea noise, see, *e.g.*, W. John Richardson *et al., Marine Mammals and Noise* (1995); Jonathan Gordon & Anna Moscrop, *Underwater Noise Pollution and Its Significance for Whales and Dolphins, in The Conservation of Whales and Dolphins* (M.P. Simmons & J.D. Hutchinson eds., 1996); National Research Council, *Ocean Noise and Marine Mammals* (2003). For two recent papers on strandings of whales associated specifically with seismic exploration, *see* M.H. Engel, M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F. O Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos, *Are Seismic Surveys Responsible for Cetacean Strandings? An Unusual Mortality of Adult Humpback Whales in Abrolhos Bank, Northeastern Coast of Brazil*, IWC Doc. SC/56/E28 (2004); J. Hildebrand, *Impacts of Anthropogenic Sound on Cetaceans*, IWC Doc. SC/56/E13 (2004) (includes discussion of a stranding of Cuvier's beaked whales in the Gulf of California in September 2002).

[3] S. Todd *et al., Behavioral Effects of Exposure to Underwater Explosions in Humpback Whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)*, 74 Can. J. Zoology 1661 (1996); *see also* M. André *et al., Are Low-Frequency Sounds a Marine Hearing Hazard?: A Case Study in the Canary Islands*, 19 Proc. Inst. Acoustics 82 (1997).

(2) *Conflicts with Preservation Values* – The areas affected by seismic surveying to be conducted under this P/OEIS may include marine protected areas and preserves. Where this is the case, it can reasonably be anticipated that NSF's activities may have direct or indirect effects on their resources and values. NSF must consider these effects. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8. Potential conflicts with any other federal, state, or local policies governing use of the area must also be discussed.

(3) *Alternatives Analysis*– The analysis of alternatives must be objective, unbiased and searching. In addition to the "no action" alternative (which, in this case, would mean denying NSF funding for seismic surveys), the EIS should consider alternative levels of restrictions on funded research, as well as alternative mitigation and monitoring measures. For example, the alternatives considered must take into account the possibility of restricting surveys geographically or temporally—restricting them from certain areas, or from certain areas at particular times of the year, or allowing them to proceed only in certain weather states and visual conditions—in order to lessen impacts on natural resources. They should also consider capping the total number of takes of protected species permissible under the funded projects. No alternative can be disregarded merely because it does not offer a complete solution to the problem. *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Morton*, 458 F.2d 827, 836 (D.C. Cir. 1972).

(4) *Monitoring and Additional Mitigation* – A thorough and well-planned monitoring program is essential, not only to keep such vulnerable species as marine mammals and sea turtles away from planned activities, but also to assess activities' indirect impacts and behavioral effects and to make appropriate changes in management if unforeseen impacts are observed. To begin with, any reliable program must provide independent observation and monitoring of acoustic activities, a well-funded response and reporting system for marine mammal strandings, and a means of investigating unusual mortality events, such as fish kills. Details of the monitoring program, including funding and identification of independent individuals, organizations, or agencies conducting the program, should be considered in the P/OEIS.

Furthermore, per 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(f), NSF must consider ways to mitigate activities' impacts, in addition to modifying the source to reduce output to the lowest practicable levels and avoiding areas with high marine mammal and endangered species abundance. The importance of considering a wide variety of mitigation measures at the programmatic level is discussed *supra* at 3-4. Measures should include, for example and without limitation, safety zones,[4] other

[4] Larger safety zones than those currently imposed by U.S. Minerals Management Service on industry seismic survey operations are supported by recent literature on the propagation of airgun noise. *See, e.g.,* S.L. Nieukirk, K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, R.P. Dziak, and C.G. Fox, *Low-Frequency Whale and Seismic Airgun Sounds Recorded in the Mid-Atlantic Ocean*, 115 J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 1832 (2004)

operational restrictions, modifications to acoustic and other technologies, site remediation, reductions in activities, and the establishment of an independent, publicly inclusive committee to review relevant environmental management practices.[5]

(5) *Cumulative and Synergistic Impacts* – As mentioned above, in order to satisfy NEPA, an EIS must include a "full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1. This discussion must take account of the "impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future significant actions." *Id.* § 1508.7.

A thorough cumulative impacts analysis is especially important to understanding the harm that may be caused by undersea noise generated by seismic surveys. In reporting that there is "now compelling evidence implicating anthropogenic sound as a potential threat to marine mammals" at both the "regional and ocean scale levels," the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission has stressed the significance of cumulative effects from acoustic activities. International Whaling Commission, Report of the Scientific Committee to the International Whaling Commission, at Annex K § 6.4 (2004). The Committee found that evidence of increased sound from several different sources, including military sonar, ships and seismic activities, was "cause for serious concern." *Id.* at § 12.2.5.1. The Committee also noted "the potential for cumulative or synergistic effects of sounds . . . with non-acoustic anthropogenic stressors." *Id.*

These concerns highlight the importance of considering both the cumulative effects of various sources of noise on the natural resources of the area and the synergistic effects of such acoustic impacts together with other environmental stressors, such as chemical and biological pollution, habitat degradation, fishing bycatch, and ship strikes.

Here, the P/OEIS must consider at least the cumulative impacts of (1) all the research projects proposed to be funded by NSF, taken together; (2) all military activities in the region of these projects; (3) recreational watercraft activities in the region; and (4) industrial and commercial activities such as fishing and shipping that may impact the same populations of animals. These impacts must

---

(documenting significant propagation over N. Atlantic); International Whaling Commission, *Report* at Annex K (reporting data from C. Clark on nearly continuous sound produced by seismic surveys); M. Tolstoy, J.B. Diebold, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, E. Chapp, R.C. Holmes, and M. Rawson, *Broadband calibration of R/V* Ewing *seismic sources*, 31 Geophysical Res. Letters L14310 (2004) (measuring or estimating isopleths in various shallow and deep water scenarios).

[5] In choosing mitigation and monitoring measures to analyze, NSF should consider measures proposed for use in other jurisdictions. *See, e.g.*, URS Australia, Draft Review of DEH Guidelines on the Application of the EPBC Act to Interactions between Offshore Seismic Operations and Larger Cetaceans, Task Two: Review of Management Practices at App. B (May 12, 2004) (summary of proposed mitigations for various jurisdictions).

be considered in light of current and reasonably foreseeable future environmental stressors. Only by analyzing these impacts together – by considering, for example, how they may cumulatively compromise biologically important activities by elevating stress, masking relevant sounds, and altering behavior – can NSF reach a full understanding of the environmental consequences of its proposed funding.

Similarly, NSF's analysis cannot be limited only to the activities' direct effects, *i.e.*, effects that occur at the same time and place as the proposed activities themselves. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 1508.8(a). It must also take into account their indirect effects, which, though reasonably foreseeable, may occur later in time or at a farther remove. *See id.* § 1508.8(b). This requirement is particularly critical in the present case given the potential of underwater noise to cause indirect harms not clearly observable in the short or immediate term. For example, any analysis of the effects of acoustic activities must discuss indirect effects such as shifts in abundance or distribution of prey species and secondary effects of hearing loss.

(6) *Range of Species and Impacts* – The P/OEIS must carefully investigate, describe, and analyze potential impacts to the affected environment and to all species that may be impacted, including, but not limited to, marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, invertebrates, and sea birds. Marine mammals should not be the sole focus of the analysis. Indeed, although marine mammals have been the subject of much research on the effects of underwater noise, other species are also put at risk by such noise—especially by noise generated by seismic survey airguns—including commercial fish stocks, snow crabs, and giant squid.[6] Impacts on these and other species must be considered.

---

[6] For representative studies showing harm to other species from anthropogenic noise, *see* Popper, A., "Effects of anthropogenic sounds on fishes," *Fisheries* 28 (Oct. 2003): pp. 24-31; McCauley, R., J. Fewtrell, and A.N. Popper, "High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 113 (2003): pp. 638-42; McCauley, R. *et al.*, Marine seismic surveys: analysis and propagation of air-gun signals; and effects of air-gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid (Perth: Curtin University Centre for Marine Science and Technology, 2000); Engås, A., S. Løkkeborg, E. Ona, and A.V. Soldal, "Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (Gadus morhua) and haddock (Melanogrammus aeglefinus)," *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic. Sciences* 53 (1996): pp. 2238-2249; Guerra, A., A.F. Gonzalez and F. Rocha, "A review of records of giant squid in the north-eastern Atlantic and severe injuries in Architeuthis dux stranded after acoustic exploration," Abstract, presented to the Annual Science Conference of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (2004); D. MacKenzie, *Seismic Surveys May Kill Giant Squid*, New Scientist News Service, Sept. 22, 2004, *available at* www.newscientist.com/news/news.jsp?id=ns99996437; M.L. Lenhardt, *Seismic and Very Low Frequency Sound-Induced Behaviors in Captive Loggerhead Marine Turtles* (Caretta caretta), in *Proceedings, Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation* (1994) (NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-351); Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Natuales, Direccion General de Vida Silvestre, Delegacion Federal en Campeche, Relaciòn de tortugas varadas en la costa de Campeche del 20 de Diciembre de 2003 al 12 de Febrero de 2004 (2004); Fisheries and Oceans Canada, "Potential Impacts of Seismic Energy on Snow Crab" (Sept. 2004) (Draft Habitat Status Report).

(7) *Impacts on Endangered Species* – While analyzing potential impacts of the proposed expansion on all species that may be affected, the P/OEIS must pay particular heed to vulnerable species, including especially those listed species, such as whales and sea turtles, that have been shown to be particularly vulnerable to disturbance from intense undersea noise.

(8) *Impacts on Human Divers* – High-intensity seismic survey noise may have adverse impacts on human divers. The effects of this proposed rulemaking on human divers must be incorporated into the P/OEIS.

(9) *Public Disclosure* – Disclosure of the specific activities contemplated by NSF is essential if the P/OEIS process is to be a meaningful one. *See, e.g., LaFlamme v. F.E.R.C.*, 852 F.2d 389, 398 (9th Cir. 1988) (noting that NEPA's goal is to facilitate "widespread discussion and consideration of the environmental risks and remedies associated with [a proposed action]"). NSF must describe the full extent of noise-producing activities to be funded, as well as source levels, frequency ranges, and other technical parameters relevant to determining their potential impacts. Without this information, the P/OEIS process will be inadequate, with the public guessing at the nature of the activities to take place.

(10) *Tiering concerns* -- Programmatic review is important for allowing comprehensive consideration of related impacts from different aspects of a program, and we applaud NSF's decision to perform a comprehensive analysis of the impacts of its seismic survey research funding. At the same time, however, we urge NSF to avoid the most common pitfalls of programmatic review, such as the deferral of important analysis to the site-specific stage, which in turn gets short shrift in reliance on the programmatic EIS.[7] Here, NSF should be careful to tackle important questions—such as those concerning source-based mitigation—up front and not defer them until funding commitments have already been made to specific research projects. NSF should also take care to provide notice of proposed decisions, and the right to comment on those proposed decisions, through each stage of review.

(11) *Compliance with Other Federal and State Laws* – A number of federal laws are implicated by the research funding at issue here. Among those that should be disclosed and addressed in the P/OEIS are the following:

First, NSF should address fully its proposal to fulfill the requirements of the Marine Mammal Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1361 *et seq.* As you know, any actions adopted through the present process must conform with the incidental take provisions, including the "small numbers" and "negligible impact" standards, of the MMPA. *See, e.g., NRDC v. Evans*, 279 F.Supp.2d 1129, 1141 (N.D. Cal.

[7] NEPA Task Force, Report to the Council on Environmental Quality: Modernizing NEPA Implementation (Sept. 2003), p. 39 (NEPA Task Force report).

2003). In addition, NSF should address the methods and means of effecting the "least practicable adverse impact" on species and stock and their habitat. *Id.*

Second, the federal Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et seq.*, requires NSF to enter into formal consultation with NMFS and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and receive a legally valid Incidental Take Permit prior to its "take" of any endangered or threatened marine mammals or other threatened or endangered species, including fish, sea turtles, or birds, or its "adverse modification" of any designated critical habitat. *See, e.g.*, 16 U.S.C. 1536(a)(2); *Romero-Barcelo v. Brown*, 643 F. 2d 835 (1st Cir. 1981), *rev'd on other grounds*, *Weinberger v. Romero-Barcelo*, 456 U.S. 304, 313 (1982). Under NMFS' regulations, formal consultation *must* be requested by NSF (or by NMFS) where agency action "may affect listed species or critical habitat." 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(a), (c). In addition to an Incidental Take Permit, each of these consultations must result in a Biological Opinion that validly concludes no jeopardy and no adverse modification of critical habitat before the federal action may proceed. Moreover, NSF is prohibited from irretrievably committing resources to the proposed action until these consultations are complete. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(d). NSF should address fully its compliance with these requirements in its funding of seismic survey activities.

Third, the federal consistency provisions of the Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1456(c)(1)(A), govern the resources off the coast and may also apply.

As you know, we are committed to minimizing the impact of high-energy seismic surveys on the marine environment, including on marine mammals. We remain confident that NSF's scientific mission can be met in ways consistent with the conservation of our natural resources. Thank you for your consideration of our comments on this important matter.

Very truly yours,



Cara Horowitz
Project Attorney

Encl.

APPENDIX B:

ACOUSTIC MODELING REPORT

APPENDIX B:
ACOUSTIC MODELING REPORT

Prepared by:

Scott A. Carr, Isabelle Gaboury, Marjo Laurinolli, Alex O. MacGillivray,
Stephen P. Turner, and Mikhail Zykov
JASCO Research Ltd.
Halifax, Nova Scotia

Adam S. Frankel, William T. Ellison, and Kathleen Vigness-Raposa
Marine Acoustics, Inc.
Arlington, Virginia

and

W. John Richardson, Mari A. Smultea, and William R. Koski
LGL Ltd., environmental research associates
King City, Ontario

Submitted to:

TEC Inc.
Annapolis, Maryland

February 2011

Acronyms and Abbreviations

2-D	two-dimensional
3-D	three-dimensional
AASM	Airgun Array Source Model
AIM	Acoustic Integration Model
BC	British Columbia
bsf	below the sea floor
DAA	Detailed Analysis Area
dB	decibel(s)
dB re 1 μPa-1 m	decibels referenced 1 microPascal at 1 meter
dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$	decibels referenced 1 microPascal squared second
DSDP	Deep Sea Drilling Project
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ft	foot/feet
g/cm^3	grams per cubic centimeter
GDEM	Generalized Digital Environmental Model
GI	generator injector
HF	high-frequency
hr	hour(s)
Hz	hertz
in^3	cubic inches
J	Joule(s)
kHz	kilohertz
km	kilometer(s)
L-DEO	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
LF	low-frequency
m	meter(s)
MAI	Marine Acoustics, Inc.
MF	mid-frequency
min	minute(s)
MMO	marine mammal observer
MONM	Marine Operations Noise Model
ms	millisecond(s)
m/s	meters per second
N	North/Northern
nmi	nautical mile(s)
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NSF	National Science Foundation
NW	Northwestern
ODP	Ocean Drilling Program
OEIS	Overseas Environmental Impact Statement
QAA	Qualitative Analysis Area
RAM	Range Dependent Acoustic Model
RL	received level
rms	root mean square
R/V	Research Vessel
S	South/Southern
s	second(s)
SEL	sound exposure level
SL	source level
SPL	sound pressure level
spp.	species
SW	Southwestern
TL	transmission loss
U.S.	United States
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
W	West/Western

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION AND APPROACH 1
2 MAJOR FACTORS AFFECTING UNDERWATER SOUND PROPAGATION 4
2.1 Spreading 4
2.2 Absorption 4
2.3 Refraction 4
2.4 Scattering 6
2.5 Bathymetry 6
2.6 Bottom Loss 7
2.7 Shear Waves 8
3 CLASSIFICATION OF OCEAN REGIONS 9
3.1 Ocean Basin 9
3.2 Continental Shelf 9
4 SEISMIC SURVEY OVERVIEW 10
4.1 Airgun Operating Principles 10
4.2 Airgun Array SLs 11
5 MODELING METHODOLOGY: RECEIVED SOUND LEVELS 13
5.1 Airgun Array Source Model (AASM) 13
5.1.1 Research Vessel *Marcus G. Langseth* (*Langseth*) Airgun Arrays 14
5.2 Sound Propagation Model: MONM 17
5.2.1 Estimating 90% rms SPL from SEL 17
5.2.2 M-Weighting for Marine Mammal Hearing Abilities 18
6 MONM PARAMETERS 20
6.1 Survey Source Locations – DAAs 20
6.2 Sound Speed Profiles 20
6.3 Model Receiver Depths 21
6.4 Bathymetry and Acoustic Environment of DAAs 22
6.4.1 S California 22
6.4.2 Caribbean 22
6.4.3 Galapagos Ridge 23
6.4.4 W Gulf of Alaska 23
6.4.5 NW Atlantic 24
6.5 Acoustic Environment of QAAs 25
6.5.1 Mid-Atlantic Ridge 26
6.5.2 North Atlantic/Iceland (N Atlantic/Iceland) 27
6.5.3 Mariana Islands (Marianas) 27
6.5.4 Sub-Antarctic 27
6.5.5 Western India (W India) 27
6.5.6 Western Australia (W Australia) 27
6.5.7 Southwest Atlantic Ocean (SW Atlantic) 28
6.5.8 British Columbia Coast (BC Coast) 28
7 ACOUSTIC INTEGRATION MODEL (AIM) 29
7.1 Rationale 29
7.2 Introduction to AIM 30
7.3 Programmatic EIS/OEIS-Specific Modeling Methods 30
7.4 Data Convolution to Create Animat Exposure Histories 31

7.5 Simulation of Monitoring and Mitigation 32
7.6 Numbers of Mammals Exposed 37
7.7 Marine Mammal Density Values 38
7.7.1 S California 38
7.7.2 Caribbean 38
7.7.3 Galapagos Ridge 38
7.7.4 W Gulf of Alaska 38
7.7.5 NW Atlantic 38
8 RESULTS 39
8.1 Sound Propagation Modeling – MONM 39
8.1.1 S California 40
8.1.2 Caribbean 40
8.1.3 Galapagos Ridge 41
8.1.4 W Gulf of Alaska 41
8.1.5 NW Atlantic 42
8.2 SELs and 90% RMS SPLs 42
8.3 Comparison with Free-field Models 43
8.3.1 TL Estimates 43
8.3.2 Near-field vs. Far-field Estimates 44
8.4 Marine Mammal Exposure Modeling – AIM 44
8.4.1 S California 46
8.4.3 Caribbean 49
8.4.4 Galapagos Ridge 52
8.4.5 W Gulf of Alaska 55
8.4.6 NW Atlantic 58
10 LITERATURE CITED 61
ANNEX 1: FAR-FIELD SL COMPUTATION 67
ANNEX 2: AIRGUN ARRAY $^1/_3$-OCTAVE BAND SLS 69
ANNEX 3: SOURCE LOCATIONS AND STUDY AREAS 75
ANNEX 4: MARINE MAMMAL SPECIES AND ASSOCIATED DENSITIES AND ANIMAT DEPTH RESTRICTIONS INCLUDED IN AIM MODELING 81
ANNEX 5: NOISE MAPS 85
ANNEX 6: PREDICTED RANGES TO VARIOUS RLS 99

List of Tables

Table B-1. Descriptions of R/V *Langseth* Standard Airgun Array Configurations 15
Table B-2. Marine Mammal Functional Hearing Groups and Associated Auditory Bandwidths 19
Table B-3. Source Coordinates and Array Axis Orientation 20
Table B-4. Injury and Behavior Exposure Criteria for Cetaceans and Pinnipeds 29
Table B-5. Summary of Modeled Marine Mammal Level A Exposure Criteria Radii for DAAs 32
Table B-6. Assumed *P*(detect) Values for Different Species 33
Table B-7. Nominal Example of Exposure Calculation 37
Table B-8. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the S California Sites 40
Table B-9. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the Caribbean Sites 40
Table B-10. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the Galapagos Ridge Sites 41
Table B-11. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the W Gulf of Alaska Sites 41
Table B-12. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the NW Atlantic Sites 42
Table B-13. Real World Exposure Predictions for S California Site under Alternatives A and B 48
Table B-14. Real World Exposure Predictions for the Caribbean Site under Alternatives A and B 51
Table B-15. Real World Exposure Predictions for the Galapagos Ridge Site under Alternatives A and B 54
Table B-16. Real World Exposure Predictions for the W Gulf of Alaska Site under Alternatives A and B 57
Table B-17. Real World Exposure Predictions for the NW Atlantic Site under Alternatives A and B 60

List of Figures

B-1. Generic Sound Speed Profiles with Some Common Terms Depicted 5
B-2. Sensitivity of Propagation to Sound Speed 6
B-3. Examples of Estimates of Bottom Loss Curves 7
B-4. Overpressure Signature for a Single Airgun, Showing the Primary Peak and the Bubble Pulse 11
B-5. Diagram of R/V *Langseth* Standard 1,650 in^3 Subarray Design for 2-D and 3-D Reflection or Refraction Surveys 15
B-6. Computed Broadside and Endfire Overpressure Signatures, with Associated Frequency Spectra, for R/V *Langseth* Airgun Arrays based on AASM 16
B-7. Plots of Sound Speed Profiles vs. Depth from the GDEM Database for Each Modeling Site 21

B-8. Exemplary QAAs 25

B-9. Plots of Sound Speed Profiles vs. Depth from the GDEM Database for Proposed Exemplary QAAs and Seasons 26

B-10. Illustration of Pressure-based Exposure or "Take" Methodology (not to scale) 30

B-11. Example of Decreasing and Increasing Range between a Source Vessel and a Single Whale Animat over Time, in Relation to the Mitigation Distance (red line) 34

B-12. Time History of Predicted RL of the Whale Animat in Figure B-11 35

B-13. Ping-o-gram of First 2,500 Animats over 270 Minutes 36

B-14. Ping-o-gram of First 2,500 Animats over 270 Minutes but with Successful Mitigation Implemented from Minute 130 to Minute 160 36

B-15. Stylized Diagram Showing Approximate Regions of Applicability of the MONM and Free-field Models 43

B-16. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Common Dolphin in the S California Site 46

B-17. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for California Sea Lion in the S California Site 47

B-18. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Bottlenose Dolphin in the Caribbean Site 49

B-19. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Pantropical Spotted Dolphin in the Caribbean Site 50

B-20. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Bryde's Whale in the Galapagos Ridge Site 52

B-21. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Pantropical Spotted Dolphin in the Galapagos Ridge Site 53

B-22. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Fin Whale in the W Gulf of Alaska Site 55

B-23. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Steller's Sea Lion in the W Gulf of Alaska Site 56

B-24. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Bottlenose Dolphin in the NW Atlantic Site 58

B-25. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Sperm Whale in the NW Atlantic Site 59

List of Figures – Annex 1

A1-1. Plan View Diagram of the Far-field Summation Geometry for an Airgun Array 67

List of Figures – Annex 2

A2-1. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D Reflection, 2 x 1, 650 in^3, 6 m tow depth) 69

A2-2. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D Reflection, 4 x 1, 650 in^3, 6 m tow depth) 70

A2-3. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D Refraction, 4 x 1, 650 in^3, 12 m tow depth) 71

A2-4. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D High Resolution, 2 x GI, 2.5 m tow depth) 72

A2-5. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$) (R/V *Langseth* 3-D High Resolution, 2 x GI, 2.5 m tow depth) 73

List of Figures – Annex 3

A3-1. Locations of S California Modeling Sites 75

A3-2. Locations of Caribbean Modeling Sites 76

A3-3. Locations of Galapagos Ridge Modeling Sites 77

A3-4. Locations of W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites 78

A3-5. Locations of NW Atlantic Modeling Sites 79

List of Tables – Annex 4

A4-1. Species and Densities Modeled at the Caribbean Site 81

A4-2. Species and Densities Modeled at the NW Atlantic Site 82

A4-3. Species and Densities Modeled at the Galapagos Ridge Site 82

A4-4. Species and Densities Modeled at the S California Site 83

A4-5. Species and Densities Modeled at the W Gulf of Alaska Site 84

List of Figures – Annex 5

A5-1. Predicted SELs for S California Modeling Sites 86

A5-2. Predicted SELs for S California Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-1) 87

A5-3. Predicted SELs for Caribbean Modeling Sites 88

A5-4. Predicted SELs for Caribbean modeling sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-3) 89

A5-5. Predicted SELs for Galapagos Ridge Modeling Sites 90

A5-6. Predicted SELs for Galapagos Ridge Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-5) 91

A5-7. Predicted SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites 1 and 3 92

A5-8. Predicted SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Site 2 93

A5-9. Predicted SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-7 and Figure A5-8 94

A5-10. Predicted SELs for NW Atlantic Modeling Sites 95

A5-11. Predicted SELs for NW Atlantic Modeling Sites (zoomed in from Figure A5-10) 96

A5-13. Predicted SELs for Caribbean Site #2 (deep water), for Transects in the Aft Endfire (middle panel) and Port Broadside (right panel) Directions 97

A5-14. Predicted SELs for Caribbean Site #3 (slope), for Transects in the Forward Endfire (2nd panel), Aft Endfire (3rd panel), and Starboard Broadside (4th panel) Directions 98

List of Tables – Annex 6

A6-1. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the S California Sites 99

A6-2. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the Caribbean Sites 100

A6-3. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the Galapagos Ridge Sites..... 100

A6-4. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the W Gulf of Alaska Sites..... 101

A6-5. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the NW Atlantic Sites 101

1 Introduction and Approach

This report provides technical information in support of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas EIS (EIS/OEIS) prepared by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) concerning their marine seismic research operations. In particular, this report describes the procedures used to estimate the airgun sound fields that would occur around the seismic vessel during five exemplary seismic surveys and the numbers of marine mammals that might be exposed to specified levels of underwater sound during those surveys.

The five exemplary cruises analyzed here are within five Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) that are analyzed in the EIS/OEIS for potential impacts on the human and natural environment with implementation of marine seismic surveys funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS. The five DAAs consist of the Western Gulf of Alaska (W Gulf of Alaska), Southern California (S California), Galapagos Ridge, Caribbean Sea (Caribbean), and northwest Atlantic Ocean (NW Atlantic) (see Annex 3 to this report). These areas include a wide variety of water depths, sound propagation conditions, and types of marine mammals. Also, the five exemplary seismic surveys involve a wide variety of airgun sources, ranging from a small two generator injector (GI)-gun configuration to a large 36-airgun configuration. The EIS/OEIS also considers, in a qualitative way, eight additional exemplary cruises to other geographic regions or qualitative analysis areas (QAAs). However, those are not considered in this technical analysis of the anticipated sound fields and numbers of marine mammals exposed to specified sound levels.

To estimate the sound fields expected to exist during the surveys in the five DAAs, two quantitative acoustic models were applied in sequence. First, for each configuration of airguns planned for use in one or more of the DAAs, an Airgun Array Source Model (AASM) was used to predict the amount of sound that would be projected in each direction. This model takes account of the specific sizes and positions of the individual airguns relative to one another, along with the depths of the airguns below the water surface. The model predicts the sound output, in each direction, by ⅓-octave frequency band (see Section 5.1 for details).

The second acoustic model that was used is the Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM), described in Section 5.2. This model predicts the received levels (RLs) of airgun sound as a function of bearing, distance, and depth in the water column. This model was run for two to four representative locations within each of the five DAAs. The MONM takes account of the frequency-specific source levels predicted by the AASM for the particular airgun configuration to be used in each DAA. It also takes account of the best available site-specific information about environmental factors that would affect the propagation and attenuation of that sound as it travels outward from the airgun array. These include bathymetry, sub-bottom conditions, and the sound velocity profile of the water column (see Section 6). MONM predicted the received sound field around the various representative locations for each ⅓-octave band. The predicted values were, for each location in the sound field, the received energy level for an individual pulse, in decibels reference 1 microPascal squared second (dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$). This energy value is commonly referred to as the sound exposure level (SEL).

Since the mid-1990s, the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has specified that marine mammals should not be exposed to pulsed sounds with RLs exceeding 180 or 190 dB re 1 μPa (rms). Here rms, or root mean square, refers to a particular method of measuring the average sound pressure over the approximate duration of an individual sound pulse. Since 2000, the "do not exceed" levels have been specified as 180 dB re 1 μPa (rms) for cetaceans and 190 dB (rms) for pinnipeds (NMFS 2000). NMFS also considers that both cetaceans and pinnipeds exposed to levels ≥160 dB re 1 μPa (rms) may be disturbed.

The 180- and 190-dB (rms) "do-not-exceed" criteria were determined before there was any specific information about the RLs of underwater sound that would cause temporary or permanent hearing

damage in marine mammals. Subsequently, data on RLs that cause the onset of temporary threshold shift (TTS) have been measured for certain toothed whales and pinnipeds (Kastak et al. 1999; Finneran et al. 2002, 2005). There are no specific data concerning the levels of underwater sound necessary to cause permanent hearing damage (permanent threshold shift or PTS) in any species of marine mammal. However, data from terrestrial mammals provide a basis for estimating the difference between the (unmeasured) PTS thresholds and the measured TTS thresholds. A group of specialists in marine mammal acoustics, the "Noise Criteria Group", has recently recommended new criteria, based on current scientific knowledge, to replace the somewhat arbitrary 180 and 190 dB (rms) "do-not-exceed" criteria. The primary measure of sound used in the new criteria is the received sound energy, not just in the single strongest pulse, but accumulated over time. On that basis, the received sound levels above which some auditory damage (PTS) might occur were determined by the Noise Criteria Group to be 198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot$ sec for any cetacean, and 186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot$ sec for pinnipeds.

A further recommendation from the Noise Criteria Group is that allowance should be given to the differential frequency responsiveness of various marine mammal groups and use what are known as M-weighted curves (Southall et al. 2007). This is important when considering airgun sounds: the energy in airgun sounds is predominantly at low frequencies (below 500 hertz [Hz]), with diminishing amounts of energy at progressively higher frequencies (Greene and Richardson 1988; Goold and Fish 1998). Baleen whales (mysticetes) are most sensitive to low-frequency sounds, and not very sensitive to high-frequency sounds. On the other hand, odontocetes or toothed whales (including dolphins and porpoises) are quite insensitive to low frequencies but very sensitive to high frequencies (Richardson et al. 1995). As compared with other odontocetes, porpoises, river dolphins, and the Southern-Hemisphere genus *Cephalorhynchus* are even less sensitive to low frequencies than are other odontocetes. Pinnipeds are intermediate between baleen and toothed whales. However, the recommendations from the Noise Criteria Group have not yet been adopted by NMFS. Therefore, the analysis considered both M-weighted and unweighted (flat) RLs, and produced take estimates for both.

The Noise Criteria Group has proposed that, in calculating the effective SELs, frequency weighting functions should be applied (Southall et al. 2007). These so-called "M-weighting" curves de-emphasize the high-frequency energy when dealing with baleen whales, and de-emphasize the low-frequency energy when dealing with odontocetes. For pinnipeds, there is some de-emphasis of both the low-and high-frequency energy, but the low frequencies are weighted more heavily than for odontocetes, and the high frequencies are weighted more heavily than for mysticetes. The shapes of the M-weighting curves are similar to those of C-weighting curves that are widely used when considering effects of strong pulsed sounds on human hearing. However, the M-weighting curves are shifted downward in frequency for baleen whales and upward in frequency for toothed whales. In this analysis, the M-weighting curves were applied when estimating effective received energy levels. This was done by applying the M-weights to MONM's estimates of the received energy levels in each ⅓-octave frequency band before accumulating across bands to derive the overall received energy level.

To estimate the number of marine mammals of each species or species-group that would receive various amounts of sound energy, we applied the Acoustic Integration Model (AIM) developed by Marine Acoustics Inc. (MAI) (Frankel et al. 2002). For each species or group in each DAA, AIM simulated the three-dimensional (3-D) motion of the mammal population, taking account of existing knowledge of diving and swimming behavior. At short intervals of time, AIM predicted the bearing and distance of each simulated animal from the (moving) seismic source, along with the depth of the animal. The expected RL of airgun sound at that bearing, distance and depth was determined from JASCO's MONM results for the most representative acoustic modeling site. For each simulated animal, the time-history of received energy levels was predicted for the full duration of the simulated seismic cruise. From these individual time-histories, the total received sound energy was determined for the 24-hour (hr) period centered on the time when the received sound was strongest. By considering all the simulated animals, AIM could then

estimate how many marine mammals would, over the course of the seismic survey, receive any specified amount of sound energy in at least one 24-hr period.

A further feature built into the AIM process was to take account of mitigation strategies. Implementation of either Alternative A or Alternative B involved shutting down the airguns if a cetacean or pinniped is detected within the 180- or 190-dB (rms) radius, respectively (a mitigation strategy that has been used by NSF in the past.). The airguns were assumed to remain off for a specified period after each shutdown, during which time none of the simulated mammals would be receiving airgun sound.

The 180- and 190-dB (rms) radii used in simulating the mitigation process were derived from the MONM modeling with the additional assumption that, for airgun pulses, rms RLs measured in dB re 1 μPa average about 10 dB higher than SEL (energy) values in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Greene 1997; McCauley et al. 1998; Blackwell et al. 2006; MacGillivray and Hannay 2007). Also, the 180- and 190-dB (rms) radii used as assumed mitigation distances included M-weighting, so were smaller for pinnipeds and especially for odontocetes than for baleen whales. These factors caused the 180- and 190-dB (rms) radii to vary widely depending on airgun configuration, water depth, and type of animal.

This report and its Annexes describe the acoustic modeling and AIM simulation processes in some detail, and present the results for the five DAAs. The results are used in the EIS/OEIS to help assess the potential impacts on marine mammals of NSF-funded or USGS marine seismic research.

2 Major Factors Affecting Underwater Sound Propagation

Knowledge of the properties of the surrounding environment is necessary for the study of underwater acoustics. Some of the factors that affect sound propagation in the ocean, such as spreading and directivity, are well understood and predictable. However, scattering of sound from the surface and bottom boundaries and from other objects is difficult to quantify (due to its dependence on fine-scale features of the local environment), and unfortunately scattering is extremely important in characterizing and understanding the sound field. These factors need to be taken into account when using a numerical model to predict sound propagation losses and RLs in water.

2.1 Spreading

Spreading refers to the geometric distribution of sound energy as it leaves a source. For sound propagating from an omnidirectional source in the absence of boundaries, the received sound level decreases with the square of the distance from the source as the transmitted energy is distributed over the expanding spherical wave front. The transmission loss (TL) in decibels (dB) from spherical spreading in this scenario is $20 \log_{10} R$ (where R = range). This formula can be applied at short range from an omnidirectional source. However, as R increases, boundary interactions begin to focus the sound (e.g., by reflection from the surface and sea floor) and the factor 20 changes to 10 or even 5. The situation is also more complex for a directional source (e.g., an airgun), for which spreading may occur primarily in a few preferred directions.

2.2 Absorption

As sound waves propagate, they interact at a molecular level with the constituents of sea water through a range of mechanisms, resulting in absorption of sound energy (Francois and Garrison 1982a, b; Medwin 2005). This occurs even in completely particulate-free waters, and is in addition to scattering that may occur from objects such as zooplankton or suspended sediments (see Section 2.4). The absorption of sound energy by water contributes to the TL linearly with range and is given by an attenuation coefficient in units of decibels per kilometer (dB/km). This absorption coefficient is computed from empirical equations and increases with the square of frequency. For example, for typical open-ocean values (temperature of 10°C, pH of 8.0, and a salinity of 35 practical salinity units [psu]), the equations presented by Francois and Garrison (1982a, b) yield the following values for attenuation near the sea surface: 0.001 dB/km at 100 Hz, 0.06 dB/km at 1 kilohertz (kHz), 0.96 dB/km at 10 kHz, and 33.6 dB/km at 100 kHz. Thus, low frequencies are favored for long-range propagation.

2.3 Refraction

Refraction refers to a change of direction in a propagating wave due to spatial variations in sound speed within the medium. As a wave travels across a sound speed interface or gradient, portions of the wave front travel at different speeds, resulting in bending of the ray path (Medwin 2005). By affecting travel paths within the medium, refraction controls the angle of arrival of the sound at a receiver as well as the angle of incidence upon boundaries (e.g., the sea floor).

The fundamental requirement for refraction calculations is knowledge of the sound speed profile. Figure B-1 shows a generic profile of sound speed as a function of depth, as might occur in temperate waters. Because of the strong influence of temperature, sound speed varies the most near the surface both seasonally and daily. If the wind has mixed the water to a constant temperature near the surface, then the increase in speed with depth (pressure) will result in upward refraction of propagating sound waves. Sound will tend to be channeled in the near-surface layer, referred to as a surface duct, as it is repeatedly reflected downward from the air-sea interface and refracted upward by the positive sound speed gradient (Medwin 2005). In the thermocline, temperature and sound speed decline, but below this, the temperature is constant and sound speed begins to increase again with depth. The sound speed

minimum results in refraction toward the depth at which the minimum occurs. This allows sound to travel without reflection from the bottom, significantly reducing TL (see Section 2.6). The deep sound channel is an important stable channel for long-range propagation, allowing low-frequency sound to travel thousands of kilometers (Medwin 2005). In cold polar waters, the minimum sound speed is usually at the surface and below that, the sound speed increases with depth, favoring refraction toward the surface.



Figure B-1. Generic Sound Speed Profiles with Some Common Terms Depicted

In shallow continental shelf regions, the water depth is not sufficient to form a deep sound channel and sound speed (and hence sound propagation) is strongly affected by seasonal and daily temperature changes. Short-term variations in the sound speed profile associated with the local weather (e.g., cloud clover and wind speed), are superimposed on seasonal changes in the water column (e.g., water temperature, seasonally varying wind speed and storm frequency). As an example of short-term variations, the following set of data demonstrates the impact that changes in sound speed profiles make in shallow water. The left hand portion of Figure B-2 displays some measured sound speed profiles taken over a shallow water shelf area at a spacing of 2.4 km over a period of 6 days. The profiles are displaced by 10 meters per second (m/s) to portray the range sampling separation. These data display the variability that can occur temporally and spatially near the sea surface. In the right hand portion of Figure B-2, the TL through the region (computed from the sound speed profiles using a parabolic equation for a frequency of 400 Hz) is shown for each of the 6 days. The differences between these single-frequency transmission loss curves are as high as 20 dB. Broadband transmission loss (i.e., summed over multiple frequencies) would be much less sensitive to environmental variations. Averaged historical sound speed profiles are often used to estimate typical sound propagation conditions for different locations and times of year.



Figure B-2. Sensitivity of Propagation to Sound Speed

Left: Measured shallow water profiles taken over a 6-day period on a spatial sampling grid 2.4 km apart. Sound speed (in m/s) is shown on the x-axis and depth (in m) on the y-axis. On each day's graph, the profiles are offset by 10 m/s to represent the sample spacing.

Right: 400 Hz TL as a function of range computed for each day of the 6-day experiment (McCammon 2000).

2.4 Scattering

Scattering is a general term that covers several types of interactions arising from the interaction of a propagating wave front with inhomogeneities in the medium (e.g., suspended particulates, bubbles, buried objects, air-sea or sea-sediment interfaces). Sound energy arriving at an object may bend around it (diffraction) and/or be scattered back toward the source (backscattering) or in some other direction. For sound incident upon an interface such as the sea floor, some of the energy is reflected, while some of the energy is transmitted across the interface (with refraction); see also Section 2.6 below. For complex objects (e.g., a rough sea floor), the nature of these interactions can be quite complicated, as individual portions of a wave front are scattered differently (Medwin 2005). However, if the acoustic wavelength is much greater than the scale of the seabed non-uniformities (as is most often the case for low-frequency sounds) then the effect of scattering on propagation loss is negligible.

2.5 Bathymetry

Water depth is very influential on sound propagation, particularly at frequencies less than a few kilohertz. In shallow water (less than ~100m depth) propagation loss is dominated by reflection and scattering of sound from the seabed. In deep water (greater than ~1 km depth) sound propagation is dominated by refraction in the water column. At intermediate depths, propagation loss is influenced by a combination of these two factors.

As discussed above, sound arriving at an interface such as the sea floor is both reflected from the interface and transmitted into the lower medium with refraction. The proportion of the sound energy that is reflected or refracted depends both on the sound speed in each medium and on the angle of incidence upon the interface, with greater reflection for shallower angles of incidence (Medwin 2005). Thus, water

depth has a very large influence on underwater sound propagation, especially at low to mid frequencies (less than a few kilohertz) where scattering losses are low.

2.6 Bottom Loss

Considering a sound pulse that has traveled from a source to a receiver (where both are above the bottom) by reflecting from the bottom, bottom loss refers to the decrease in signal strength that occurs from the bottom reflection. Computation of this value in real life is difficult, due to the complexity of sound propagation at the water-sediment interface. Sound energy arriving at the sea floor may be reflected, scattered in many different directions by surface roughness, or transmitted into the sea floor. Transmitted sound is refracted and undergoes attenuation within the sediments. Furthermore, the same processes of reflection and refraction may occur at the interfaces between different sediment layers, possibly returning some of the sound energy to the water column.

Because sound penetrates sediments readily, especially at low frequencies (Clay and Medwin 1977; Hamilton 1980), knowledge of the bottom loss is a critical factor in modeling sound transmission. This requires information on the composition and internal structure of the sediments. However, unlike sound speed or bathymetry, there are no easy ways to measure or compute this quantity. Specialized sampling is generally employed to characterize the bottom at different grazing angles and frequencies to try to discover its composition and layering. A great deal of effort has been made recently to characterize sediments by their physical properties of density, speed, and attenuation (both compressional and shear) and to provide theoretical calculations that will convert these physical quantities (called geoacoustic parameters) into acoustic bottom loss. However the efforts have been only partially successful and this is still an ongoing area of research.

In Figure B-3, theoretical estimates for bottom loss from mud (left) and sand (right) are shown. Note the vertical scale change between the figures. The mud bottom can be over twice as lossy as the sand due to greater transmission of sound into the sediments, reflecting differences in the speed of sound within the two sediment types (Hamilton 1980). Furthermore, there are differences between hard packed sand, sand and shell, and loose sand, as well as many other sediment types not shown in these figures. Bottom loss is a complex and only partly understood phenomenon.



Figure B-3. Examples of Estimates of Bottom Loss Curves
Note: The left curves are for mud bottoms while the right curves are for sand.

2.7 Shear Waves

The above discussion of sound propagation in sea water has dealt only with compressional waves, (i.e., waves where particles vibrate along the direction of travel of the wave). In addition to compressional waves, solids are able to support shear waves, where the particles vibrate in a direction that is perpendicular to the direction of travel (these cannot travel through liquids or gases). Both types of waves may be reflected and refracted as discussed above. In addition, sound waves may be converted from one type to another at a boundary between water and sediment or between different types of sediments (Robinson and Çoruh 1988). Many semi-consolidated and consolidated bottom sediments support both compressional and shear waves; the sound speed and attenuation associated with each wave type is determined by the physical properties of the sediments (Hamilton 1980). Although only pressure waves can propagate through water, the ability of shear waves to reflect from sub-bottom layers and be converted (in part) back to pressure waves makes it necessary to model shear wave propagation in the sub-bottom.

3 Classification of Ocean Regions

3.1 Ocean Basin

In deep water (greater than 2,000 m), the deep sound channel allows refracted sounds to travel long distances without losses from reflection at the bottom due to the upward-refracting sound speed profile below the deep sound channel. The depth of this channel is around 1,000 m at mid-latitudes and close to the surface at high latitudes.

The surface mixed layer of isothermal water extends to ~25 m in the summer and ~75 m in the winter at mid-latitudes. If there is a sound speed minimum in the mixed layer at the sea-surface then the result is a surface duct. Sound from a shallow source, such as an airgun array, will become trapped in the surface duct by continual refraction and reflection from the sea-surface. If the sea-surface is rough, sound will be scattered out of the surface duct; scattering loss at the surface will increase with sea state. A shadow zone is created below the duct where the intensity of the sound is much less than inside the duct. Low frequency sounds, whose wavelength is greater than ~4 times the size of the duct, will not be trapped inside a surface duct. The existence of a strong surface duct is unusual, however, because of the uniform properties of seawater in the mixed layer.

3.2 Continental Shelf

In shallow water (less than 200 m), sound speed profiles tend to be downward refracting or nearly constant with depth, resulting in repeated bottom interaction. Long-range sound propagation, at distances of more than a few kilometers, is complicated and difficult to predict due to spatially and temporally varying water and bottom properties. Low frequencies (less than 1 kHz) are the most affected by bottom loss and high frequencies (above 10 kHz) by scattering loss. There is less bottom interaction in the winter than in the summer since the surface waters are less warm and thus sound speed is lower. The optimum frequency for propagation in shallow water is highly dependent on depth, partially dependent on sound speed profile, and weakly dependent on bottom type. In 100-m water, frequencies of 200-800 Hz would likely travel the farthest.

4 Seismic Survey Overview

Marine seismic airgun surveys are capable of producing high-resolution 3-D images of stratification within the Earth's crust, down to several kilometers depth, and have thus become an essential tool for geophysicists studying the Earth's structure. Seismic airgun surveys may be divided into two types, two-dimensional (2-D) and 3-D, according to the type of data that they acquire. 2-D surveys provide a 2-D cross-sectional image of the Earth's structure and are operationally characterized by large spacing between survey lines, on the order of kilometers or tens of kilometers. 3-D surveys, on the other hand, employ very dense line spacing, of the order of a few hundred meters, to provide a 3-D volumetric image of the Earth's structure.

A typical airgun survey, either 2-D or 3-D, is operated from a single survey ship that tows both the seismic source and receiver apparatus. The seismic source is an airgun array consisting of many individual airguns that are fired simultaneously in order to project a high-amplitude seismo-acoustic pulse into the ocean bottom. The receiver equipment often consists of one or more streamers, often several kilometers in length, that contain hundreds of sensitive hydrophones for detecting echoes of the seismic pulse reflected from sub-bottom features. In other cases, the receiving equipment consists of seismometers placed on the ocean bottom. For some seismic surveys, both streamers and ocean-bottom seismometers are used.

The majority of the underwater sound generated by a seismic survey is due to the airgun array; in comparison, the survey vessel itself contributes very little to the overall sound field. Airgun arrays produce sound energy over a wide range of frequencies, from under 10 Hz to over 5 kHz (Richardson et al. 1995: Figure 6-20). Most of the energy, however, is concentrated at low frequencies below 200 Hz. For deep surveys, the array consists of many airguns that are configured in such a way as to project the maximum amount of seismic energy vertically into the seafloor. A significant portion of the sound energy from the array, nonetheless, is emitted at off-vertical angles and propagates into the surrounding environment. The frequency spectrum of the sound propagating near-horizontally can differ markedly from that of the sound directed downward. There can also be substantial differences in the amount and frequency spectrum of sound projected in different horizontal directions. During 3-D surveys, it is common for the ship to tow two identical airgun arrays displaced laterally from one another; these are discharged alternately. For shallow surveys designed to characterize the sub-bottom layers within 10s or 100s of meters below the seafloor, the energy source can be a smaller array of airguns, or just a single airgun. These smaller sources emit less sound, but can have less downward directivity.

4.1 Airgun Operating Principles

An airgun is a pneumatic sound source that creates predominantly low-frequency acoustic impulses by generating bubbles of compressed air in water. The rapid release of highly compressed air (typically at pressures of ~2,000 pounds per square inch) from the airgun chamber creates an oscillating air bubble in the water. The expansion and oscillation of this air bubble generates a strongly-peaked, high-amplitude acoustic impulse that is useful for seismic profiling. The main features of the pressure signal generated by an airgun, as shown in Figure B-4, are the strong initial peak and the subsequent bubble pulses. The amplitude of the initial peak depends primarily on the firing pressure and chamber volume of the airgun, whereas the period and amplitude of the bubble pulse depends on the volume and firing depth of the airgun.



Figure B-4. Overpressure Signature for a Single Airgun, Showing the Primary Peak and the Bubble Pulse

Zero-to-peak source levels (SLs) for individual airguns are typically between 220 and 235 decibels referenced 1 microPascal at 1 m (dB re 1 µPa-1 m) (~1–6 bar · m)[1], with larger airguns generating higher peak pressures than smaller ones. The peak pressure of an airgun, however, only increases with the cubic root of the chamber volume. Furthermore, the amplitude of the bubble pulse also increases with the volume of the airgun — and for the geophysicist the bubble pulse is an undesirable feature of the airgun signal since it smears out sub-bottom reflections. In order to increase the pulse amplitude (to "see" deeper into the Earth), geophysicists generally combine multiple airguns together into arrays. Airgun arrays provide several advantages over single airguns for deep geophysical surveying:

- The peak pressure of an airgun array in the vertical direction increases nearly linearly with the number of airguns (Parkes and Hatton 1986:25).
- The geometric lay-out of airgun arrays can be optimized to project maximum peak levels toward the seabed (i.e., directly downward). While a single airgun produces nearly omnidirectional sound (arising from the release and oscillations of a single air bubble), interactions between the bubbles produced by the multiple airguns in an array can generate a highly directional signal.
- By utilizing airguns of several different volumes, airgun arrays can be "tuned" to increase the amplitude of the primary peak and simultaneously decrease the relative amplitude of the bubble pulses.

4.2 Airgun Array SLs

In discussing source levels associated with an airgun array, it is important to distinguish between the near-field and far-field regions. In the near field, the signatures from the array elements do not add coherently, and the RL at any given point in the vicinity of the array will vary depending on location relative to the array elements. The maximum extent of the near field is given by the expression:

$$R_{nf} < \frac{L^2}{4\lambda}$$

[1] Source level in dB re 1 µPa-1 m = 20 log (pressure in bar · m) + 220

where λ is the sound wavelength and L is the longest dimension of the array (Lurton 2002). Beyond this range, it can be assumed that an array radiates like a directional point source, where the source level and directionality are determined by the array geometry. It is this far-field source level that is used for propagation modeling.

The far-field pressure generated by a seismic airgun array is substantially greater than that of an individual airgun. However, because of the interactions between the individual sources within the array, the far-field pressure is also strongly angle dependent relative to the array axis. An array of 30 guns, for example, may have a zero-to-peak SL of 255 dB re 1 μPa-1 m (~56 bar · m) in the vertical direction. This source level is the level that one might theoretically expect to occur 1 m below a point source emitting the same total amount of energy as is emitted from all the airguns in the distributed array. Because the array is designed to maximize the signal in the downward direction, toward the sea floor, this apparently high value for the SL can lead to erroneous conclusions about the impact on marine mammals and fish for the following reasons:

- Peak SLs for seismic survey sources are usually quoted relative to the vertical direction; however, due to the directional dependence of the radiated sound field, SLs off to the sides of the array are generally lower.
- Far-field SLs do not apply in the near field of the array where the individual airguns do not add coherently. As discussed above, sound levels in the near field are lower than would be expected from far-field estimates; there is no location in the water where the RL is as high as the theoretical source level.

The acoustic SL of a seismic airgun array varies considerably in both the horizontal and vertical directions due to the complex interaction between the signals from the component airguns. One must account for this variability in order to correctly predict the sound field generated by an airgun array. If the source signatures of the individual airguns are known (taking into account both the characteristics of each airgun and interactions with neighboring elements), then it is possible to accurately compute the SL of an array in any direction by summing the contributions of the array elements with the appropriate time delays, according to their relative positions. This is the basis for the airgun array source model discussed in the next chapter.

5 Modeling Methodology: Received Sound Levels

Two complementary models are used in this work to forecast the underwater acoustic fields resulting from the operation of the seismic array in a particular area. The Airgun Array Source Model (AASM) described in Section 5.1 predicts the directional SL of a seismic airgun array. An acoustic propagation model is then used to estimate the acoustic field at any range from the source. Sound propagation modeling uses acoustic parameters appropriate for the specific geographic region of interest, including the expected water column sound speed profile, the bathymetry, and the bottom geoacoustic properties, to produce site specific estimates of the radiated noise field as a function of range and depth. The Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM), described in section 5.2, is used to predict the directional TL footprint from source locations corresponding to trial sites for experimental measurements. The RL at any 3-D location away from the source is calculated by combining the SL and TL, both of which are direction dependent, using the following relation:

$$RL = SL - TL$$

Acoustic TL and RLs are a function of depth, range, bearing, and environmental properties. The RLs estimated by MONM, like the SLs from which they are computed, are equivalent to the SEL over the duration of a single source pulse. SEL is expressed in units of dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$.

The safety and disturbance criteria currently applied to marine seismic surveys by the NMFS are based on the rms sound pressure level (SPL) metric as adapted for impulsive sound sources. Therefore, a method is required to convert the modeled SEL levels to rms SPL. The conversion estimate used in this study is discussed in Section 5.2.1.

5.1 Airgun Array Source Model (AASM)

The current study makes use of a full-waveform AASM, developed by JASCO Research Ltd. (JASCO), to compute the SL and directionality of airgun arrays. The airgun model is based on the physics of the oscillation and radiation of airgun bubbles, as described by Ziolkowski (1970). The model solves, in parallel, a set of coupled differential equations that govern the airgun bubble oscillations.

In addition to the basic bubble physics, the source model also accounts for non-linear pressure interactions between airguns, port throttling, bubble damping, and GI-gun behavior, as described by Dragoset (1984), Laws et al. (1990), and Landro (1992). The source model includes four empirical parameters that are parameterized so that the model output matches observed airgun behavior. The model parameters were fitted to a large library of real airgun data using a "simulated annealing" global optimization algorithm. These airgun data were obtained from a previous study (Racca and Scrimger 1986) that measured the signatures of Bolt 600/B guns ranging in volume from 5 in^3 to 185 in^3.

The AASM requires several inputs, including the array layout, volumes, towing depths, and firing pressure. The output of the source model is a set of "notional" signatures for the array elements. The notional signatures are the pressure waveforms of the individual airguns, compensated for the interaction with other airguns in the array, at a standard reference distance of 1 m. After the source model is executed, the resulting notional signatures are summed together with the appropriate phase delays to obtain the far-field source signature of the array. The far-field array signature, in turn, is filtered into $^1/_3$-octave pass bands to compute the SL of the array as a function of frequency band, f_c, and propagation azimuth, θ:

$$SL = SL(f_c, \theta)$$

The interaction between the signals from individual airguns creates a directionality pattern in the overall acoustic emission from the array. This directionality is particularly prominent at frequencies in the mid-

range of several tens to several hundred Hz: at lower frequencies the array appears omni-directional, while at higher frequencies the pattern of lobes becomes too finely spaced to resolve.

The sound propagation model, discussed in Section 5.2, calculates TL from an equivalent point-like acoustic source to receiver locations at various distances, depths, and bearings. However, as discussed in Section 4.2, an airgun array consists of many sources and so the point-source assumption is not valid in the near field, where the array elements do not add coherently. For example, the 4-string (36-airgun) array described in the next sub-section is approximately 29 m in length along its diagonal, and so the maximum near-field range is 140 m at 1 kHz (R_{nf} is less for lower frequencies; see the equation in Section 4.2). This range decreases for the smaller arrays, down to approximately 43 m for a single string (9 guns) and approximately 28 m for the pair of GI guns used for 2-D reflection surveys. Beyond these ranges the arrays can be treated as directional point sources for the purpose of propagation modeling.

5.1.1 Research Vessel *Marcus G. Langseth* (*Langseth*) Airgun Arrays

The R/V *Langseth* will employ seven standard airgun array configurations for different geophysical survey applications. The standard *Langseth* array configurations include both conventional (Bolt) airguns as well as GI-guns in their designs. Large arrays of conventional airguns, consisting of 20–40 elements, are used primarily for deep 2-D and 3-D reflection and refraction surveys. Small arrays of two or four GI-guns are used for shallow, high-resolution profiling.

The *Langseth's* 2-D and 3-D array configurations are all based on a single, standard 1,650 in^3 subarray design (Figure B-5) which is composed of 10 Bolt airguns (9 active and 1 spare). All of the *Langseth's* 2-D and 3-D arrays are made up of two or more of these 1,650 in^3 subarrays; the source wavelet of the array is adjusted to the particular application by varying the tow-depth and spacing of the subarrays. The *Langseth's* high-resolution arrays are made up of identical 45/105 in^3 GI-guns (i.e., with 45 in^3 generator volume and 105 in^3 injector volume).

Table B-1 lists all seven of the *Langseth's* planned standard array airgun configurations, each with its total volume, number of guns, array layout, and nominal tow depth. Note that the firing volume for many of the arrays is less than the total volume of guns in the water. This is because some guns are used as spares (in case of a dropout) and also because the 3-D arrays are fired in "flip-flop" fashion, where only half the array volume is fired for each shot. For example, each of the two 4-string 3-D reflection arrays listed in Table B-1 consists of two 2-string sub-arrays fired in alternation, and is equivalent to the 2-string 2-D reflection array in terms of the sound field generated.

Each of the arrays listed in Table B-1 was modeled using the JASCO AASM to compute notional source signatures and also $^1/_3$-octave band SLs as a function of azimuth angle. For each of the *Langseth* airgun arrays, computed broadside (perpendicular to the tow direction) and endfire (along the tow direction) overpressure signatures and corresponding power spectrum levels are shown in Figure B-6. Note that most of the energy output by the array is concentrated at low frequencies. Horizontal $^1/_3$-octave band directionality plots for the *Langseth* arrays are provided in Annex 2. Three of these arrays were input as sources to the sound propagation model described in the next section, based on the sources associated with each DAA (see Chapter 2): the 2-string, 2-D reflection array (18 guns) (Galapagos Ridge and W Gulf of Alaska); the 2 GI gun, 2-D high-resolution array (S California, NW Atlantic); and the 4-string, 2-D refraction array (36 guns) (Caribbean).



Figure B-5. Diagram of R/V *Langseth* Standard 1,650 in^3 Subarray Design for 2-D and 3-D Reflection or Refraction Surveys

Note: Volumes of individual airguns are shown in in^3. Note that one of the 180-in^3 guns is an inactive spare (in case of an airgun dropout) and so the nominal firing volume of the subarray is actually 1,470 in^3.

Table B-1. Descriptions of R/V *Langseth* Standard Airgun Array Configurations.

Array description	*No. guns*	*Total vol. (in^3)*	*Shot vol. (in^3)*	*Array configuration*	*Tow depth (m)*
2-string array for 2-D reflection	18(20)	3,300	2,940	2 x 1,650 in^3 subarray	6
4-string array for 2-D reflection	36(40)	6,600	5,880	4 x 1,650 in^3 subarray	6
4-string array for 2-D refraction	36(40)	6,600	5,880	4 x 1,650 in^3 subarray	12
2-string GI array for 2-D high resolution	2	300	300	2 x 45/105 in^3 GI-gun	2.5
2-string GI-array for 3-D high resolution	4	600	300	4 x 45/105 in^3 GI-gun	2.5
4-string array for 3-D reflection	36(40)	6,600	2,940	4 x 1,650 in^3 subarray	6
4-string array for wide 3-D reflection	36(40)	6,600	2,940	4 x 1,650 in^3 subarray	6

Note: Parentheses in second column indicate total number of active guns plus spares. 3-D arrays are fired as dual "flip-flop" arrays, where only half the total active array volume is fired for a single shot.



Figure B-6. Computed Broadside and Endfire Overpressure Signatures, with Associated Frequency Spectra, for R/V *Langseth* Airgun Arrays based on AASM

Note: The array volume given in the plot annotations is the shot volume, not the total array volume.

5.2 Sound Propagation Model: MONM

The modeled directional ⅓-octave SLs for the airgun array were used as input for the acoustic propagation software MONM, which computes the sound field radiated from the source. MONM, a proprietary application developed by JASCO, is an advanced modeling package whose algorithmic engine is a modified version of the widely-used the Range Dependent Acoustic Model (RAM) (Collins et al. 1996).

RAM is based on the parabolic equation method using the split-step Padé algorithm to efficiently solve range dependent acoustic problems. RAM assumes that outgoing reflected and refracted sound energy dominates scattered sound energy and computes the solution for the outgoing (one-way) wave equation. At low frequencies, the contribution of scattered energy is very small compared with the outgoing sound field. An uncoupled azimuthal approximation is used to provide 2-D TL values in range and depth. RAM has been enhanced by JASCO to approximately model shear wave conversion at the sea floor using the equivalent fluid complex density approach of Zhang and Tindle (1995).

Because the modeling takes place over radial planes in range and depth, volume coverage is achieved by creating a fan of radials that is sufficiently dense to provide the desired tangential resolution. This $n \times 2\text{-}D$ approach is modified in MONM to achieve greater computational efficiency by not over-sampling the region close to the source.

The desired coverage is obtained through a process of tessellation, whereby the initial fan of radials has a fairly wide angular spacing (5 degrees was used in this study), but the arc length between adjacent radials is not allowed to increase beyond a preset limit (1.5 km for this study) before a new radial modeling segment is started, bisecting the existing ones. The new radial need not extend back to the source because its starting acoustic field at the bisection radius is "seeded" from the corresponding range step of its neighboring traverse. The tessellation algorithm also allows the truncation of radials along the edges of a bounding quadrangle of arbitrary shape, further contributing to computational efficiency by enabling the modeling region to be more closely tailored to an area of relevance.

MONM has the capability of modeling sound propagation from multiple directional sources at different locations and merging their acoustic fields into an overall RL at any given location and depth. This feature was not required in the present single-source study. The received sound levels at any location within the region of interest are computed from the ⅓-octave band SLs by subtracting the numerically modeled TL at each ⅓-octave band center frequency, and summing incoherently across all frequencies to obtain a broadband value. The RLs, like the SLs from which they are computed, are equivalent to SEL over the duration of a single pulse or equivalently the rms level over a fixed 1-s time window.

The acoustic environment in MONM is defined by a vertical sound speed profile in the water column as well as by fundamental physical properties of the sediment, such as density, P-wave velocity, P-wave attenuation, S-wave velocity, and S-wave attenuation. The physical properties are defined as vertical profiles (i.e., can vary with depth). The profiles that describe the physical properties of the sediment are referred to as geoacoustic model parameters.

5.2.1 Estimating 90% rms SPL from SEL

Existing U.S. safety radius requirements for impulsive sound sources are based on the rms sound pressure level metric. An objective definition of pulse duration is needed when measuring the rms level for a pulse. Following suggestions by Malme et al. (1986), Greene et al. (1997), and McCauley et al. (1998), pulse duration is conventionally taken to be the interval during which 90% of the pulse energy is received. Although one can measure the 90% rms SPL *in situ*, this metric is difficult to model in general since the adaptive integration period, implicit in the definition of the 90% rms level, is highly sensitive to the specific multipath arrival pattern from an acoustic source. Multipath reflections result in temporal spreading of the received seismic pulse, changing the pulse duration, rms estimates, and safety radii. To

accurately predict the 90% rms level it is necessary to model full-waveform acoustic propagation, which for low frequencies in highly range dependent environments is currently computationally prohibitive at any significant range from the source.

Despite these issues associated with the pulse duration, accurate estimates of airgun array safety ranges must take into account the acoustic energy that is returned to the water column by bottom and surface reflections. This is especially important in the case of shallow water, where multiple reflections are likely. The MONM algorithm does not attempt to predict the pulse duration or rms pressure directly; rather it models the propagation of acoustic energy in ⅓-octave bands in a realistic, range-dependent acoustic environment. As a result, the effects of the environment on energy propagation can be taken into account without the computational overhead involved in modeling the pulse length. When the ⅓-octave band levels are summed, the result is a broadband level that is equivalent to the sound exposure for a single airgun array pulse over a nominal time window of 1 s. For *in situ* measurements the SEL, pulse duration, and 90% rms SPL can all be measured, and SPL is related to SEL via a simple relation that depends only on the rms integration period *T*:

$$SPL_{rms90} = SEL - 10\log(T) - 0.458$$

Here the last term accounts for the fact that only 90% of the acoustic pulse energy is delivered over the standard integration period. In the absence of *in situ* measurements, however, the integration period is difficult to predict with any reasonable degree of accuracy, for the reasons outlined above. The best that can be done is to use a heuristic value of *T*, based on field measurements in similar environments, to estimate an rms level from the modeled SEL. Safety radii estimated in this way are approximate since the true time spreading of the pulse has not actually been modeled. For this study, the integration period *T* has been assumed equal to a pulse width of ~0.1 s resulting in the following approximate relationship between rms SPL and SEL:

$$SPL_{rms90} = SEL + 10$$

In various studies where the SPL_{rms90}, SEL, and duration have been determined for individual airgun pulses, the average offset between SPL and SEL has been found to be 5 to 15 dB, with considerable variation dependent on water depth and geo-acoustic environment (Greene et al. 1997; Austin et al. 2003; Blackwell et al. 2007; MacGillivray and Hannay 2007).

5.2.2 M-Weighting for Marine Mammal Hearing Abilities

In order to take into account the differential hearing capabilities of various groups of marine mammals, the M-weighting frequency weighting approach described by Southall et al. (2007) is commonly applied. The M-weighting filtering process is similar to the C-weighting method that is used for assessing impacts of loud impulsive sounds on humans. It accounts for sound frequencies extending above and below the most sensitive hearing range of marine mammals within each of five functional groups: low frequency (LF-), mid-frequency (MF-), and high-frequency (HF-) cetaceans; pinnipeds in water; and pinnipeds in air (Table B-2). The filter weights Mw_i, for frequency band i with center frequency f_i. are defined by:

$$Mw_i = -20\log_{10}\left(\frac{f_i^2 f_{hi}^2}{\left(f_i^2 + f_{lo}^2\right)\left(f_i^2 + f_{hi}^2\right)}\right)$$

Here f_{lo} and f_{hi} are as listed in Table B-2.

Table B-2. Marine Mammal Functional Hearing Groups and Associated Auditory Bandwidths

Functional hearing group	*Members*	*Estimated auditory bandwidth**	
		f_{lo}	f_{hi}
LF-cetaceans	Mysticetes	7 Hz	22 kHz
MF-cetaceans	Lower-frequency odontocetes	150 Hz	160 kHz
HF-cetaceans	Higher-frequency odontocetes	200 Hz	180 kHz
Pinnipeds	Pinnipeds	75 Hz	75 kHz

Note: *Only the in-water bandwidth is shown for pinnipeds.
Source: Southall et al. 2007.

6 MONM Parameters

6.1 Survey Source Locations – DAAs

The geographic location of each source point used for the modeling runs, the orientation of the airgun array tow axis (aligned with the survey track), and the array tow depth are listed in Table B-3. . Modeled source locations and proposed survey tracks are also shown on the maps in Annex 3:.

Table B-3. Source Coordinates and Array Axis Orientation

DAA	*Site No.*	*Water Depth (m)*	*Latitude (°N)*	*Longitude (°W)*	*Array Heading (° rel UTM N)*	*Array Depth (m)*
S California	1	100-1,000	34.250	119.667	90	2.5
	2	100-1,000	34.288	120.037	130	2.5
Caribbean	1	<100	12.000	70.750	35	12
	2	>1,000	11.330	67.720	190	12
	3	100-1,000	11.110	64.670	165	12
	4	>1,000	13.330	64.330	123	12
Galapagos Ridge	1	>1,000	-4.000	103.417	0	6
	1	>1,000	-4.000	103.417	90	6
W Gulf of Alaska	1	<100	55.300	157.750	69	6
	2	100-1,000	54.850	157.500	69	6
	3	>1,000	53.750	157.750	69	6
NW Atlantic	1	<100	39.383	72.683	139.2	2.5
	2	100-1,000	39.250	72.317	139.2	2.5
	3	>1,000	39.117	72.183	139.2	2.5
	4	100-1,000	39.517	72.367	139.2	2.5

The NSF EIS/OEIS Team selected five exemplary DAAs for which modeling would be conducted: NW Atlantic; Caribbean, Galapagos Ridge, W Gulf of Alaska, and S California. Each of these sites meets two main criteria: (1) provides multiple habitats for a wide variety of marine mammal species, and (2) represents an area that may potentially be used for NSF-funded marine seismic research using a seismic airgun array. After reviewing current marine mammal research, biologists with LGL, Ltd. and MAI, determined which marine mammal species are most likely to occur at the modeling sites during the exemplary season. Lists of these animals, and their assumed densities, are contained in Annex 4.

6.2 Sound Speed Profiles

Sound speed profiles in the ocean for each modeling location were derived from the US Naval Oceanographic Office's Generalized Digital Environmental Model (GDEM) database (Teague et al. 1990). The latest release of the GDEM (version 3.0) provides average monthly profiles of temperature and salinity for the world's oceans on a latitude/longitude grid with 0.25 degree resolution. Profiles in GDEM are provided at 78 fixed depth points up to a maximum depth of 6,800 m. The current version of the GDEM is based on historical observations of global temperature and salinity from the 1986 version of the US Navy's Master Oceanographic Observational Data Set (MOODS), supplemented by additional holdings at the Naval Oceanographic Office (NAVOCEANO) (Teague et al. 1990). These data sources encompass 66 years of observations, such that year-to-year variations are averaged out in the GDEM profiles..

For each acoustic model scenario, a single temperature/salinity profile was extracted from the GDEM database for the appropriate season and source location and converted to speed of sound in seawater using the equations of Coppens (1981):

$$c(z,T,S) = 1449.05 + 45.7T - 5.21t^2 - 0.23t^3 + (1.333 - 0.126t + 0.009t^2)(S-35) + \Delta$$
$$\Delta = 16.3Z + 0.18Z^2$$
$$Z = z/1000(1 - 0.0026\cos 2\phi)$$
$$t = T/10$$

where z is depth in m, T is temperature in degrees Celsius, S is salinity in psu and φ is latitude. For continental shelf sites, where the water depth at the source was less than the maximum modeling depth, sound speed profiles were extrapolated to the maximum modeling depth by splicing data points from neighboring grid cells.

Figure B-7 shows all of the sound speed profiles, extracted from GDEM, which were used for modeling each of the five survey locations. The important characteristics of the sound speed profiles at each of these five sites are discussed in the following sub-sections.



Figure B-7. Plots of Sound Speed Profiles vs. Depth from the GDEM Database for Each Modeling Site

6.3 Model Receiver Depths

From the chosen source positions, the model can generate a grid of acoustic levels over any desired area as well as at any depth in the water column. For the sites in this study, sound levels were calculated at each of the depths in the list generated from the following equation:

$$z = 2i^{1.5}, \quad \text{where } i=1,2,3,\ldots,132$$

In this equation, z is the receiver depth in meters and i is an integer index corresponding to the 132 receiver depths. The result is a vector of depths ranging from 2 m below the surface to a maximum of just over 3,000 m, with greater resolution near the surface (and hence near the source depth). For the purposes

of generating maps and tables of noise level contours, this modeled acoustic field was typically maximized over all relevant depths (up to the maximum modeled depth or local bottom depth, whichever is less). Maximizing RL over depth ensured that the modeled radii represented the largest possible (and therefore most precautionary) distance to any given SPL threshold at each site.

6.4 Bathymetry and Acoustic Environment of DAAs

6.4.1 S California

6.4.1.1 Bathymetry and Geoacoustic Properties

The proposed track lines cover the Santa Barbara Basin. The depths inside the survey area vary from 100 m to 500 m (Figure A3-1 in Annex 3). Based on the bathymetry, two modeling sites were proposed. The first one is in the center of the Santa Barbara Basin in the vicinity of Ocean Drilling Program (ODP) Site 893 (water depth 580 m). The second is in the Santa Barbara Channel with water depth about 180 m.

In November 1992, a drilling survey was conducted in the Santa Barbara Basin that provided some information on the sediment properties to a depth of 190 m below the sea floor (bsf) (Shore-based Scientific Party 1994). The sediment column is composed of silty clay and clayey silt. The density of the sediments immediately below the seafloor is quite low, which is explained by a high sedimentation rate. The density profile starts from 1.26 grams per cubic centimeter (g/cm^3). The porosity is very high at the top of the sediment column, about 80%, and decreases to 60% at 50 m bsf. The high porosity results in very low shear wave speed and a low attenuation factor for the compressional wave. The compressional velocity of the surficial sediments is about 1,510 m/s according to Reid (2005). The velocity stays the same for at least the first 200 m, according to the sonic velocity well-log at ODP Site 893. The compressional velocity and attenuation factors were chosen according to the known physical properties (P-wave velocity, density, porosity, grain size) using Hamilton (1980).

Modeling location #2 was chosen in shallower waters, approximately 30 km to the east of modeling location #1, and also in the Santa Barbara Channel. According to core studies (Valent and Lee 1971), the sediment content is coarser here, with a greater sand component. The average grain size distribution, sand-silt-clay, is 40-40-20%. The reported density for the surficial sediments is about 1.5 g/cm^3, which increases to about 1.75 g/cm^3 at 1 m bsf. The porosity decreases from about 70% at the surface to 50% at the 1 m depth (Valent and Lee 1971). The compressional velocity for the surficial sediments at the location is about 1,500 m/s according to Reid (2005).

6.4.1.2 Sound Speed Profiles

The spring sound speed profile off S California has a single sound channel at 700 m depth (Figure B-7). In deeper water, beyond the continental shelf-break, acoustic energy from an airgun array may be trapped in this sound channel (see Sections 2.3 and 3.1), since the sound speed at the water surface is less than at the seabed.

6.4.2 Caribbean

6.4.2.1 Bathymetry and Geoacoustic Properties

The proposed tracks cover a vast variety of environments in terms of bathymetry as well as geoacoustic properties of the sea floor, due to the presence of different geological provinces within the survey area. Four sites are proposed for modeling (see Figure A3-2 in Annex 3).

Modeling site #1 is located in the Gulf of Venezuela, where depths are in the range of 100–200 m. The sedimentation here is affected by material coming from Lake Maracaibo and El Tablazo Bay. The surficial sediments are expected to be similar to the ones in El Tablazo bay, where the sandy component is at a level of 50% of the total sediment volume (Morales and Godoy 1996). The geoacoustic profile was

constructed using the above information and average values listed by Hamilton (1980) for shallow shelf environments.

Modeling site #2 is situated in the middle of the deep basin located between the continent and the Antilles Islands chain. The sediments at this site are expected to have somewhat similar properties to those in the Cariaco Basin, where ODP wells 147 and 1002 were drilled. The well logs report a silty clay sediment type with a porosity of about 80% immediately below the sediment surface, and a density of about 1.3 g/cm^3. The porosity rapidly decreases in the first few tens of meters, which results in greater density and higher sonic velocity. The surficial sediment sonic velocity was estimated to be 1,500 m/s according to Einwich (1981).

Modeling site #3 is located in the abyssal part of the Caribbean Sea, West of the Aves Ridge. The sediments at this location are expected to be similar to the typical abyssal plain environment. Also, some similarity to site #2 is believed to be present. In addition, information from Deep Sea Drilling Project (DSDP) wells 148, 150, and 153 put more constraints on the geoacoustic parameters at the site. The sonic velocity of the surficial sediments is expected to be 1,520 m/s (Einwich 1981).

6.4.2.2 Sound Speed Profiles

The spring sound speed profile in the Caribbean has a pronounced sound channel at 800 m depth, and the sound speed gradient in the thermocline is strongly down-refracting (Figure B-7). Thus, acoustic energy from an airgun array will tend to be focused within the sound channel at deep ocean-basin locations, as discussed in Sections 2.3 and 3.

6.4.3 Galapagos Ridge

6.4.3.1 Bathymetry and Geoacoustic Properties

The proposed site for the seismic survey is located in deep water approx. 1,400 km west of the Galapagos Islands (see Figure A3-3 in Annex 3). It covers the midoceanic ridge between the Pacific and Nazca plates. Due to close proximity to the spreading center, the age of the oceanic crust at the location is very low; thus the thickness of the sediments accumulated on the basalt bedrock is very small as well. According to the global map of total sediment thickness (Divins 2006), the bedrock surface is at about 20 m bsf. For the purpose of modeling, the thickness of the sediment cover was set to 20 m. The geoacoustic properties for the sediments and the bedrock were estimated based on data available from ODP legs 203 and 206, which were drilled on the Pacific and Cocos plates (Shipboard Scientific Party 2003a, b).

6.4.3.2 Sound Speed Profiles

The winter sound speed profile at the Galapagos Ridge site has a sound channel at 1 km depth (Figure B-7); however the sound speed in the mixed layer, where the airguns operate, is too high to effectively ensonify this sound channel. Thus ducted sound propagation is not expected to be significant at this site.

6.4.4 W Gulf of Alaska

6.4.4.1 Bathymetry and Geoacoustic Properties

The proposed tracks in this region are located between Kodiak Island and the Shumagin Islands. The tracks are positioned perpendicular to the shore and cover the shelf, continental slope, Aleutian Terrace, and Aleutian Trench (see Figure A3-4 in Annex 3). The water depths vary from less than a 100 m to more than 6,000 m. Three modeling locations are being proposed in the area and are designated according to water depth: on the shelf, on the slope, and in deep waters.

Only a few reports on surficial sediment properties are available for this area, yielding a general description of the sediment type at the location. The sediment type for the shelf province is clayey silt

with less than 2% sand and a silt component of about 60%. Based on this information, the geoacoustic properties of the sediment section for the site were approximated based on the average parameters and empirical equations described by Hamilton (1980). The total sediment thickness at the site is about 500 m (Divins 2006).

The sediment properties for the continental slope site are believed to be the same as for the shelf site. The bedrock surface is located deeper at this site, at 600 m bsf. The deep water site is believed to have more clayey content. The sediment thickness is about 500 m.

6.4.4.2 Sound Speed Profiles

The summer sound speed profile in the W Gulf of Alaska has a strong sound channel at 70 m depth (Figure B-7). This shallow sound channel is expected to trap much of the acoustic energy from an airgun array at the surface, resulting in ducted propagation and lower TL at this site (see Sections 2.3 and 3).

6.4.5 NW Atlantic

6.4.5.1 Bathymetry and Geoacoustic Properties

The survey proposed off-shore of New Jersey over the Hudson canyon covers an area with water depths from less than 100 m to greater than 1,500 m (see Figure A3-5 in Annex 3). The majority of the survey area lies over the shelf, with water depths being less than 200 m. The southeastern part of the survey extends over the continental slope to the abyssal plain. Four sites for modeling are proposed based on bathymetric features (shelf, slope, deep water, and Hudson canyon). Two ODP drilling experiments took place in the vicinity of the modeling sites, with ODP legs 150 (site 904) and 174 (sites 1072 and 1073) providing some information on the sediment properties.

Modeling Site #1 for the shelf province is placed near ODP well 1072. A very detailed well log is available for this well that contains information on the P-wave velocity as well as density (Shipboard Scientific Party 1998). The P-wave velocity profile starts with relatively high values of 1,700–1,750 m/s near the sediment surface and varies with depth between 1,650 and 2,000 m/s. The density profile is almost flat with an average value of 2.1 g/cm^3. Also, there are *in situ* measurements of compressional wave velocity and compressional attenuation for the subsurface sediments at several locations around the drill site (Goff et al. 2004). The P-wave velocity measurements from these two sources are in good agreement with each other. The shear wave velocity profile and attenuation factors for P- and S-wave energy (0.2 and 1.0 respectively) were taken from the AMCOR-10 site (Carey et al. 1995), which is placed at approximately the same distance from the shelf edge, but 50 km to the southwest. Adjustments were made to the AMCOR-10 data for the absence of a porous layer at the very top of the sediment section at the modeling location.

Modeling Site #2 is located on the shelf slope. The location for it was chosen to be in the vicinity of ODP site 1073. The compressional wave velocity and the densities were taken from the ODP leg 174 report (Shipboard Scientific Party 1998). The shear wave velocity profile and attenuation coefficient profiles for P- and S-wave energy were constructed using information from the AMCOR-10 site, with consideration of the presence of a porous layer at the top and an overall lower average compressional wave velocity down the sediment section.

Less information is available for modeling Site #3, which is located in the deepest part of the area covered by the survey lines. The water depths there are about 1,500 m. In this deep environment the influence of the bottom properties on the sound propagation in the water column drops dramatically and geoacoustic parameters can be estimated with greater uncertainty without increasing the overall uncertainty of the modeling. The geoacoustic profiles were constructed using available information from modeling Site #2 and data obtained at ODP drill site 904 (Guerin 2000).

Similar to Site #3, Site #4 is located in the Hudson canyon and lacks direct measurements of geoacoustic parameters in its vicinity. However, sediment properties may be extrapolated by considering the nature of the canyon, which was formed due to erosion of the continental shelf. The geoacoustic property profiles for Site #4 are based on those for site #2 with portions of the profiles between 20 m and 170 m taken out to account for erosion). The profiles were also simplified by removing local anomalies from them.

6.4.5.2 Sound Speed Profiles

The summer sound speed profile at the NW Atlantic site exhibits two sound channels, one at 50 m depth and the other at 600 m depth (Figure B-7). However, the high sound speed in the mixed layer, caused by solar heating at the sea-surface, means that an airgun array is unlikely to ensonify either of these sound channels in deep water.

6.5 Acoustic Environment of QAAs

The following subsections discuss the acoustic environment at each of seven proposed exemplary QAAs (Figure B-8). The associated sound speed profiles, extracted from GDEM, are shown in Figure B-9 and are discussed below.



Figure B-8. Exemplary QAAs



Figure B-9. Plots of Sound Speed Profiles vs. Depth from the GDEM Database for Proposed Exemplary QAAs and Seasons

Note: The y-axis limits vary from site to site, depending on local water depths. The month indicated was chosen to be representative of the season modeled.

6.5.1 Mid-Atlantic Ridge

The Mid-Atlantic ridge is a deep water site with water depths greater than 3,000 m. The site is located in the vicinity of a spreading center where new oceanic crust is being formed. As such, the sediment column geoacoustic profile is believed to be similar to that at the Galapagos Ridge site, with a layer of clayey sediments overlying basalt bedrock (Herzig et al. 1998; Becker et al. 2001). However, as a result of the much slower spreading velocities at this site compared with the Galapagos Ridge site, the thickness of the sediments covering the basaltic bedrock is estimated to be closer to 100 m (Divins 2006).

The summer sound speed profile at this site features a pronounced sound channel at approximately 1,000 m depth and a downward-refracting stratified surface layer (Figure B-9). Similar to the profile at the Caribbean Site, these features are expected to result in channeling of the acoustic energy from an airgun array. Spring and fall sound speed profiles are almost identical to the one shown for mid-

summer; the only significant difference being that sound speeds are almost constant with depth in a 50-120 m mixed layer in the spring and fall.

6.5.2 North Atlantic/Iceland (N Atlantic/Iceland)

The Reykjanes ridge is the part of the Mid-Atlantic ridge structure in the northern part of the Atlantic Ocean. As a result, the same geoacoustic profiles are expected in the area as in the above region, with 50–100 m of sediment on top of the basaltic bedrock in the center of the ridge. The thickness of the sediment cover increases to several hundred meters at 300 km distance away from the ridge (Divins 2006). A portion of the survey covers the shelf part of Iceland. The sediments on the shelf are expected to have a greater sandy component. Typical sonic velocities of 1,500-1,550 m/s and densities of 1.5–1.6 g/cm^3 were detected in ODP well 409 logs for the subsurface sediments. The water depths measured on the shelf are about 30-500 m.

The summer sound speed profile in this region is downward-refracting near the surface, with a weak sound channel at approximately 100 m depth which may trap a portion of the acoustic energy from the airgun array (Figure B-9).

6.5.3 Mariana Islands (Marianas)

The Mariana Islands represent a typical example of an island arc located above a subduction zone. The proposed survey area is located in the back-arc basin. The bedrock surface is found at about 100 m below the sediment surface (Divins 2006). According to the ODP wells 456 and 455 the grain size distribution is 30%, 60%, and 10% between sand, silt, and clay components, respectively. The porosity of the surficial sediments is about 60%, the sonic velocity is about 1,500 m/s, and the density is about 1.6 g/cm^3. The physical properties do not change for the first 50 m bsf. Below this depth mark a layer with higher sonic velocity and density values can be found.

The sound speed profile near the Mariana Islands in spring reaches a minimum value near 1,000 m depth (Figure B-9). However, similar to the Galapagos Ridge site, the near-surface sound speed is sufficiently high that ducted sound propagation is not expected to be significant.

6.5.4 Sub-Antarctic

The survey area is located in the abyssal part of the ocean. The sediment coverage at the site is rather thin, only 100 m (Divins 2006). The geoacoustic properties profiles for the sediments at this location are expected to be similar to those at other deep-sea sites, such as the Mid-Atlantic ridge and N Atlantic/Iceland sites. A broad sound speed minimum occurs between approximately 200 and 1,200 m during austral summer at this site (Figure B-9), likely resulting in channeling of sound in this layer.

6.5.5 Western India (W India)

This site is also located in deep water, within the Indus Fan. Deep cores at DSDP site 222 and ODP site 720 revealed primarily detrital silty clays, with a higher porosity near the sediment surface (Prell et al. 1989). The total sediment thickness is approximately 2 km (Divins 2006).

The summer sound speed profile at this site exhibits a sound speed minimum at approximately 1,800 m depth (Figure B-9). However, sound speeds below this minimum are not high enough to result in significant channeling of sound in this layer.

6.5.6 Western Australia (W Australia)

The proposed location for the seismic survey is located offshore of the northwestern Australia, within the outer ramp portion of the Canning Basin (James et al. 2004). The overall sediment thickness is approximately 1,200 m, overlying Cretaceous sedimentary rocks (James et al. 2004; Divins 2006). Surficial sediments consist of a carbonate-rich mix of gravel, sand, and silt, with wind and wave action on the sediment surface favoring slightly coarser sediments (James et al. 2004).

The spring sound speed profile during the austral spring (and the austral fall) for the relatively shallow W Australia location decreases with depth from the surface to the sea floor (Figure B-9), favoring refraction of sound toward the bottom.

6.5.7 Southwest Atlantic Ocean (SW Atlantic)

The properties of the sediments at this location are influenced by the material brought by the Amazon River. Some information on physical sediment properties is available from the ODP drilling experiment (legs 154 and 155). The main portion of the sediments is represented by the clay component (about 60-80%) (Pirmez et al. 1997). According to the well logs the velocity at the surface is about 1500 m/s and gradually increases with depth, reaching 2,000 m/s at the 350 m bsf. For the same range of depths the density varies from 1.3 g/cm^3 to 1.8 g/cm^3. This location is similar to site #3 at the NW Atlantic site.

Similarly to the Marianas site in April, the sound speed profile at the SW Atlantic site exhibits a mid-water sound speed minimum, in this case near 700 m depth (Figure B-9), as well as a relatively high near-surface sound speed. As a result, ducted propagation is not expected to occur. Note that while the curve shown in Figure B-9 is based on January data, the profile remains similar year-round.

6.5.8 British Columbia Coast (BC Coast)

The B.C. Coast site is located in the southern portion of the Queen Charlotte Basin, in approximately 200 m of water. Surficial sediment type and thickness in this region are variable, ranging from thicker sands and muds to thinner sand, gravel, and glacial till (Barrie and Bornhold 1989; MacGillivray 2000). For the purposes of modeling, an average profile may be constructed consisting of approximately 20 m of silty sand (density of 1.77 g/cm^3, sound speed at the surface approximately 1,600 m/s) overlying lithified sediments (density of 2.20 g/cm^3, sound speed at the sediment/bedrock interface approximately 2,200 m/s) (MacGillivray 2000). Below the near-surface mixed layer, water column sound speed during autumn decreases with depth (Figure B-9). As a result, channeling of sound is not expected either near the surface or mid-water.

7 Acoustic Integration Model (AIM)

7.1 Rationale

The overall goal of this modeling effort was to predict the number of animals at each of the modeling locations within each DAA that would be exposed to sound levels in excess of regulatory thresholds. Visual observers are routinely used at sea to detect marine mammals within the mitigation range. The probability of visual detection (P_{detect}) by shipboard observers varies among species; cryptic species such as the harbor porpoise have a low P_{detect} value while large whales have a high P_{detect} value. When animals are detected within a mitigation zone, the airguns are turned off to limit the acoustic exposure of marine animals. Mitigation strategy under both alternatives is based upon a mitigation range corresponding to the 180-dB (rms) and 190-dB (rms) isopleths for cetaceans and pinnipeds, respectively. That range is predicted with an acoustic propagation model for each modeled DAA based upon the source configuration, local physical environment, and the species potentially present. This is the Preferred Alternative of the EIS/OEIS. The modeling reported here produced sound exposure histories for animals with mitigation measures implemented under Alternative A or Alternative B (Preferred Alternative). Thus, when an individual animal was detected within the mitigation distance, the resulting shutdown resulted in no exposures to any animals within or beyond the mitigation distance during the period of shutdown. A detailed explanation of this process is provided below.

Based on the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act, two different categories of "taking" are recognized: Level A takes, involving injury, and Level B takes, involving disturbance or "harassment". In predicting the occurrence of Level A takes, two different exposure or "take" criteria were employed, one based on the maximum rms sound pressure level received by the mammal, and the other based on the accumulated acoustic energy received by the animal. The former (pressure) criteria are the precautionary criteria that have been recognized by NMFS for several years. The latter (cumulative energy exposure) criteria are those recently proposed by the Noise Criteria Group (Southall et al. 2007). The Noise Criteria Group also recommends a "do not exceed" peak pressure criterion, but under field conditions the SEL criterion is the one that would be exceeded first and thus would be the operative criterion. In predicting the occurrence of Level B takes, only pressure criteria (as recognized by NMFS for the past several years) are available. The criteria employed in the analysis conducted for this report are shown in Table B-4. and the pressure criteria are illustrated in Figure B-10. In this analysis, we integrated the total energy received by each modeled animal during the 24-hr period surrounding the time when the maximum sound level was received, and compared this accumulated energy level with the energy-based metrics.

Table B-4. Injury and Behavior Exposure Criteria for Cetaceans and Pinnipeds

	Level A (Injury)		*Level B (Behavior)*
Group	*Pressure (dB re 1 µPa rms)*	*Energy (dB re 1 µPa^2 · sec)*	*Pressure (dB re 1 µPa rms)*
Cetaceans	180	198	160
Pinnipeds	190	186	160

Sources: NMFS 2000, 2005; Haley 2006; Southall et al. 2007.

As shown in Figure B-10 a sound source is surrounded by a zone of high sound level (orange) and (generally more distant) zone with lower sound level (yellow). The orange zone corresponds to Level A exposure and the yellow represents Level B. Three example theoretical marine mammal tracks are shown, depicting the relative motion of the mammal and the sound source as the source passes the mammal. The top track in Figure B-10 passes outside the yellow zone and does not represent a Level B exposure or "take". The second track passes through the yellow zone only, and represents a Level B take. The bottom-most track first enters the yellow zone and then continues into the orange zone. This animal would be reported as a Level A take.



Figure B-10. Illustration of Pressure-based Exposure or "Take" Methodology (not to scale)

7.2 Introduction to AIM

AIM is a Monte Carlo-based statistical model, strongly based on two earlier models: a whale movement and tracking model developed for the census of the bowhead whale (Ellison et al. 1987; Frankel et al. 2002), and an underwater acoustic back-scattering model for a moving sound source in an under-ice Arctic environment (Bishop et al. 1987). Because the exact positions of sound sources and animals (sound receivers for the purpose of this analysis) in any given simulation cannot be known, multiple runs of realistic predictions are used to provide statistical validity. The movement and/or behavioral patterns of sources and receivers can be modeled based on measured field data, and these patterns can be incorporated into the model. Each source and/or receiver is modeled via the "animat" concept, where each has parameters that control its speed and direction in three dimensions. In the case of the source, it is also imbued with the parameters describing its source operation over time (i.e. SL, signal duration, and pulse interval). Thus, it is possible to recreate the type of diving pattern that an animal shows in the real world. Furthermore, the movement of the animat can be programmed to respond to environmental factors, such as water depth and sound level (this latter feature was not used in this analysis). In this way, species that normally inhabit specific environments can be constrained in the model to stay within that habitat.

Once the behavior of the animats has been programmed, the model is run. The run consists of a user-specified number of steps forward in time. For each time step, each animat is moved according to the rules describing its behavior. For each time step of the model run, the received sound levels values at each receiver (i.e., a marine mammal) animat are calculated. For this analysis, AIM returns the movement patterns of the animats, and the received sound levels are calculated separately, using the acoustic propagation predictions provided by MONM.

At the end of each time step, each animat evaluates its environment including its 3-D location, the time and received sound level (if present). If an environmental variable has exceeded the user-specified boundary value (e.g., water too shallow), then the animat will alter its course to react to the environment. These responses to the environment are entitled 'aversions'. There are a number of potential aversion variables that can be used to build an animat's behavioral pattern.

7.3 Programmatic EIS/OEIS-Specific Modeling Methods

The creation of each modeling simulation began with the creation of a movement pattern for the seismic source vessel (e.g., R/V *Langseth*). EIS/OEIS personnel reviewed each vessel-source track to ensure that they were representative of actual ship movements that would be expected at that site, and covered a range of potential marine animal habitats within each modeling site.

The next step in the modeling procedure was to assign species- or group-specific behavioral values to each AIM model animat. Behavioral values that were used in modeling animal movement were dive depth, surfacing and dive durations, swimming speed, and course change. A minimum and maximum value for each of these parameters was specified. Data from the MAI behavioral database, which was updated with a review of current research, provided these values (Frankel and Vigness-Raposa 2006). These data were used to simulate movements and dive characteristics of individual animats for each species or species group relative to the simulated vessel source tracks at each of the five DAAs. These also included limits on the depth of water into which an animat was constrained. These constraints were to keep the marine mammals in the water throughout the simulation, and where appropriate, to keep animals from moving into deep water where they are not normally found. These depth restriction data are presented in Annex 4. The amount of data available for some individual species were sparse. In these cases, species were combined in a surrogate sense along phylogenetic or ecological dimensions into modeling groups (e.g., all *Stenella* species were modeled with a single *Stenella* animat).

After the animats were created, they were randomly distributed over each simulation area. The simulation area was delineated by four boundaries, composed of a combination of latitude and longitude lines, and in some cases by shoreline. These boundaries are shown in Annex 3 and extend at least 1 degree of latitude or longitude beyond the extent of the vessel track to insure an adequate number of animats in all directions. Each simulation had ~4,000 animats representing each species or species group. In most cases, this represents a higher density of animats in the simulation than occurs in the real environment. This "over-population" allowed the calculation of smoother distribution tails, and in the final analysis all results were normalized back to actual predicted population counts by species. (This was done based on the ratio of the real densities, from Annex 4, to the animat densities.) During the AIM modeling, animats were programmed to remain within the simulation area boundaries. This behavior was incorporated to prevent the animats from diffusing out of the simulation, the result of which, if allowed, would be a systematic decrease in animat density over time. Thus, the simulations modeled the animals as a closed population with a high residency factor. This approach is clearly conservative in terms of allowing for more prolonged exposures than would be expected from species with a lower residency factor.

The duration of each simulation was determined by the length of the vessel track, divided by the modeled vessel speed of 8 km per hr (~4 knots). The duration of each simulation ranged from 1,540 to 16,355 minutes (min) (Table B-5). The vessel speed was based on the typical speed at which NSF seismic research vessels operate while conducting seismic operations.

7.4 Data Convolution to Create Animat Exposure Histories

The AIM simulations created realistic animal movement tracks for each animat and were based on the best available animal behavioral data. It was assumed that, collectively, the ~4,000 animat tracks derived for each simulation were a reasonable representation of the movements of the animals in the population under consideration. Animat positions along each of these tracks were converted to polar coordinates (range and bearing) from the source (vessel) to the receivers (animals). These data, along with the depth of the receiver, were used to extract RL estimates from the acoustic propagation modeling results provided by JASCO (see Section 8). For each sampling time, we considered the RL predictions for the most appropriate of the acoustic modeling sites plotted in Annex 3. For each bearing, distance, and depth from the source when it was operating at that site, the RL values were expressed as SELs with units of dB re 1µPa^2-s. These SEL values were computed separately for flat-weighted (unweighted) and M-weighted RLs. The M-weighted values were calculated for LF-, MF-, and HF-cetaceans, and for pinnipeds in water, based on the M-weighting functions described by Southall et al. (2007). M-weighting is a filter function (most akin to human C-weighting) that is applied to the acoustic signal to account for the differential hearing capabilities of different species groups. The final result was a time history of acoustic exposures for each individual animat every 30 seconds.

7.5 Simulation of Monitoring and Mitigation

Simulated source and receiver data were processed to simulate the effect of marine mammal monitoring and mitigation. During an actual seismic survey, marine mammal observers (MMOs) monitor the mitigation zone for the presence of marine mammals and sea turtles. If they are detected within the mitigation zone, then the airguns would be turned off to mitigate the effect of the airgun impulses on the animals. Airguns would be shutdown for 30 min following the last sighting of a mysticete or sperm whale, or 15 min following the last sighting of another odontocete or pinniped. The mitigation distances are based upon the species group, airgun array size, and configuration as well as the local physical environment. Thus separate mitigation radii are used for flat-weighted (unweighted) RLs as well as for each of the four M-weighting species groups in order to reflect their differential hearing abilities. Furthermore, larger sources would have larger mitigation radii, and sources operating in shallow water would have a larger mitigation radius than the same source operating in deep water. Table B-5 summarizes, for each DAA, the mitigation radius assumed for each species group and water-depth category. Flat- or un-weighted mitigation radii are in Chapter 8, Tables B-8 thru B-12. The boundary between the shallow and deep zones was taken to be the 1,000 m depth contour.

Table B-5. Summary of Modeled Marine Mammal Level A Exposure Criteria Radii for DAAs

DAA Modeling Site	*Source*	*Duration (min)*	*Shallow/Deep Mitigation Radii (m)**			
			LF Cetaceans	*MF Cetaceans*	*HF Cetaceans*	*Pinnipeds*
Caribbean	Full refraction 36 guns, 6,600 in^3, 4 arrays, 12-m tow depth	16,355	1,338/ 741	533/ 234	447/ 182	262/ 102
NW Atlantic	High resolution 3-D, 1 pair of 45/105 in^3 GI guns, 2.5-m tow depth	9,990	64/ 36	28/ 14	28/ 14	14/ <10
S California	1 pair 45/105 in^3 GI guns for the high resolution surveys, 2.5-m tow depth	1,540	64/ NA	30/ NA	30/ NA	14/ NA
Galapagos	2 strings of 9 airguns (18 guns), 3,300 in^3 (times two, shot in flip-flop), 6-m tow depth	8,760	NA/ 345	NA/ 180	NA/ 140	NA/ 81
W Gulf of Alaska	2 strings of 9 airguns (18 guns), 3,300 in^3 (not flip-flop), 6-m tow depth	9,900	1,012/ 342	478/ 177	398/ 139	196/ 76

Notes: *NA = not applicable. Radii for cetaceans are estimated 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) radii, with M-weighting. Radii for pinnipeds are estimated 190 dB re 1 µPa (rms) radii, with M-weighting.

Mitigation radii were based on the acoustic modeling results. JASCO produced a summary table of Level A mitigation radii (predicted 180 and 190 dB (rms) distances) for each modeling location within each DAA. These radii were M-weighted for each of the four species groups: LF-, MF-, and HF-cetaceans and pinnipeds in water. These radii (Table B-5) were used to simulate Level A mitigation for Alternatives A and B. Flat- or un-weighted mitigation radii are listed in Chapter 8, Tables B-8 thru B-12.

The monitoring simulation program was then run on all of the data. The movement data were examined at each time step to determine if any of the animats were within the mitigation zone. If so, then a procedure was run to model whether or not the animat would have been detected by an MMO. In this procedure, a random number was generated and compared with the probability of detection for the species being modeled (*P*(detect)) (Table B-6). If the random number was less than the *P*(detect) value then the animal was considered to have been detected. Conversely, if the random number was greater than the *P*(detect) value, the animal was modeled as undetected. For example, if there was a 75% probability of

detection of a given species (*P*(detect) = 0.75), and the random number generator returned 0.5, then the animal would be considered to be detected. If an animat was detected, then the program would simulate the effect of the airgun source being shut down by setting the received sound levels of ALL animats in the run to 0 for the next 15 min (for pinnipeds and most odontocetes) or 30 min (for mysticetes and sperm whales).

Table B-6. Assumed *P*(detect) Values for Different Species

Species	*Group Size* 1-16	17-60	>60
Odontocetes			
Harbor porpoise	0.055	0.090	0.090
Dall's porpoise	0.055	0.090	0.090
Pacific white-sided dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
Risso's dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
Striped dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
Common dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
N right whale dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
Short-finned pilot whale	0.309	0.524	0.926
Spinner dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
Spotted dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
Rough-toothed dolphin	0.309	0.524	0.926
Killer whale	0.309	0.524	0.926
False killer whale	0.309	0.524	0.926
Cuvier's beaked whale	0.244	NA	NA
Baird's beaked whale	0.244	NA	NA
Blainville's beaked whale	0.244	NA	NA
Pygmy sperm whale	0.055	0.090	0.090
Dwarf sperm whale	0.055	0.090	0.090
Sperm whale	0.259	NA	NA
Mysticetes			
N right whale	0.259	0.259	NA
Humpback whale	0.259	0.259	NA
Gray whale	0.259	0.259	NA
Blue whale	0.259	0.259	NA
Fin whale	0.259	0.259	NA
Sei whale	0.259	0.259	NA
Bryde's whale	0.259	0.259	NA
Minke whale	0.244	0.244	NA
Pinnipeds			
N elephant seal	0.309	0.524	0.926
California sea lion	0.309	0.524	0.926
Harbor seal	0.309	0.524	0.926
N fur seal	0.309	0.524	0.926
Steller's sea lion	0.309	0.524	0.926

Notes: Values used for mitigation simulation in this study are highlighted in tan. This determination was based on typical group size data from Frankel and Vigness-Raposa (2006). NA = group sizes that are not expected to occur.

The procedure to calculate *P*(detect) was based on published sighting data from line-transect survey studies. Specifically, it was calculated from the *f*(0) values obtained from Koski et al. (1998), Barlow (1999), and Thomas et al. (2002). The details of the conversion from the *f*(0) parameters to *P*(detect) are as follows:

- 1/*f*(0) is the "effective strip width".

- The effective strip width was divided by the truncation distance used to calculate *f*(0).
- This value is *P*(detect) or the average probability that a whale would be seen within the truncation distance from the vessel.
- For cryptic species where only sea states 0 to 2 were used to calculate *f*(0), *P*(detect) was arbitrarily divided by 3 to account for the higher probability that animals would be missed during the survey whenever sea states were >2.
- Different *P*(detect) values were calculated for groups with 1-16, 17-60 and >60 individuals based on the different *f*(0) values for those group sizes.
- The mean group size for the species or guild determined the appropriate P(detect) that was used for that guild.

Figure B-11 illustrates this procedure by showing the approach of the vessel and a whale toward each other. The blue line is the separation distance between a whale and a vessel. The distance between the whale and the vessel decreased at first. There is then a closest point of approach of ~370 m at ~130 min, followed by an increasing distance between the whale and vessel with time. The red line indicates the mitigation distance, which was 741 m for this example. When the whale entered the mitigation zone (i.e. distance less than ≤741 m), it was assumed to be visually detected (i.e. the random number generated at that point was less than the *P*(detect) value), and the airguns were turned off (in the simulation).



Figure B-11. Example of Decreasing and Increasing Range between a Source Vessel and a Single Whale Animat over Time, in Relation to the Mitigation Distance (red line)

Figure B-12 shows the predicted RL for this example as a function of time. These data are plotted twice, both with and without mitigation. The red line illustrates the predicted exposure without mitigation (i.e., without turning the airguns off). The predicted maximum RL to which the animal would have been exposed in the absence of mitigation was 186 dB re 1 µPa (rms). However, the blue line shows that, since the animal was detected somewhat earlier, at a distance of 740 m at 130 min, the airguns were turned off during the period when the whale was closest, and the predicted maximum RL to which the animal would have been exposed was 165 dB re 1 µPa (rms).



Figure B-12. Time History of Predicted RL of the Whale Animat in Figure B-11

To illustrate further, Figure B-13 and Figure B-14 show the "ping-o-gram" of the first 2,500 (of the original ~4,000) animats over the same 270 min. Each horizontal line in the ping-o-gram illustrates the data for a single animat (e.g., the data shown in Figure B-12) and the sound level is represented by the color of the line. In Figure B-13, the unbroken horizontal lines indicate continuing exposure of the animats with no mitigation. The color of the lines indicates the RLs (e.g., red ≈ 160 dB while yellow ≈ 100 dB). For the many animats that are never close to the operating airguns during the 270-min period depicted, the RLs never are high enough to be depicted in a color other than dark blue.

In Figure B-14, the successful mitigation is seen at the vertical blue bar, representing the time when at least one animal was detected and the source was shut down. Therefore, the RLs for all of the animats in the simulation during the shutdown period were set to 0.



Figure B-13. Ping-o-gram of First 2,500 Animats over 270 Minutes
Note: Color scale represents dB re 1 µPa



Figure B-14. Ping-o-gram of First 2,500 Animats over 270 Minutes but with Successful Mitigation Implemented from Minute 130 to Minute 160
Note: Color scale represents dB re 1 µPa

The simulations were created assuming around-the-clock seismic exploration activity. However, the simulated mitigation was applied only during daylight hours when continuous and at least partially effective visual monitoring would be conducted during seismic operations. Daylight was considered to be 12 hr a day. Based on prior experience, it was assumed that any nighttime visual monitoring that might be conducted, with or without night vision devices, would have a low probability of detecting marine mammals. Also, the passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) system, as deployed on the R/V *Maurice Ewing* in the past and planned for use during some future NSF operations, does not (currently) have sufficient capabilities to function as an effective mitigation tool. Thus, for the purposes of AIM, no effective detection-dependent mitigation was assumed to occur during darkness.

7.6 Numbers of Mammals Exposed

Once the effect of mitigation had been considered, the modified exposure history of each animat was analyzed using both pressure and energy units. The JASCO-provided SEL RLs for each airgun shot were converted to rms values by adding 10 dB (i.e., rms = SEL + 10) (see Section 5.2.1).

The maximum rms RL for each animat was then determined, and these values were used to predict the number of modeled "takes" or "exposures" using the traditional NMFS-endorsed exposure criteria (i.e., rms pressure levels). Level A exposure estimates for cetaceans were those that exceeded 180 dB re 1 µPa (rms) while Level B exposures were those that exceeded 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms). The criteria used for pinnipeds and fissipeds (sea otter) were 190 and 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms) for Level A and B, respectively. Note that the exposure numbers at this step are based upon the modeled density of the animats; these numbers are scaled later to represent real-world animal densities.

In addition to these maximum pressure-based exposure estimates, an energy-based metric was calculated. The acoustic exposures that occurred during the 12 hr preceding and following the maximum sound exposure were integrated to produce the energy-based exposure metric for each animat. The exposure thresholds for this energy-based metric were 198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ SEL for all three groups of cetaceans and 186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ SEL for pinnipeds in water (LGL 2006). These were calculated for flat-weighted (unweighted) RLs as well as the M-weighted RLs.

It should be noted that the maximum value of both metrics was calculated for each animat. Therefore each animat in the model can be considered to be taken only once. It is possible that over the course of a simulation an animal might exceed the thresholds more than once. However, an informal examination of the distribution of exposures for individual animats rarely found a 'secondary' peak of exposures within the duration of the simulation that would suggest a second threshold exceedance.

The final step was to scale the number of modeled exposures by the ratio of modeling density to real animal density. Individual species density estimates were used for shallow water depths (< 1,000 m) and deep water (> 1,000 m). To illustrate, consider an example of one simulation that had 20 exposures above a threshold, 10 of which occurred in shallow water and 10 in adjacent deep water. In this example, the over-populated modeling density of 4,000 animats resulted in an overall average density of 0.1 animats/square km (km^2), whereas the shallow water density of real word animals is 0.025 animals/ km^2, and the adjacent deep water density is 0.01 animals/ km^2 (Table B-7). This diversity by regional animal density is accommodated in developing actual, real world exposure estimates. Thus, the number of predicted exposures in each area is different, reflecting the differences in animal abundance.

Table B-7. Nominal Example of Exposure Calculation

Area	*Modeled Exposures*	*Model Density*	*Real World Density*	*Real World Exposures*
Shallow Water	10	0.1	0.025	2.5
Deep Water	10	0.1	0.01	1.0

7.7 Marine Mammal Density Values

7.7.1 S California

The target date for the nominal S California cruise was identified as late spring to early summer. Therefore real world marine mammal density data for the May–July period were obtained from Table A-1 in Koski et al. (1998) for use in the exposure estimates in this report. Since there are several strata listed within this table, data for strata 2, 3, 4, and 6 (which include the Santa Barbara Channel and surrounding waters with similar water depths) were combined for the purposes of this analysis.

7.7.2 Caribbean

Marine mammal density values were taken from Tables 4.11 and 4.12 in Smultea et al. (2004). These tables present density calculations based on sighting data from non-seismic conditions in waters 100 to 1,000 m deep and >1,000 m deep collected in the same region during spring 2004. Unidentified animals have been assigned among species that are expected to occur there based on a literature review (i.e., including some species that were not sighted during the surveys of Smultea et al. [2004]). The basis for assigning unidentified species was Table 4.12 in Smultea et al. (2004). Note that these tables originally reported their values as animals/1,000 km^2. These values have been scaled to conform to AIM's use of densities in animals/km^2 by dividing the originally reported densities by 1,000.

7.7.3 Galapagos Ridge

Marine mammal density values were taken from Table 4 in Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (L-DEO) and NSF (2003). This table was produced from data in Ferguson and Barlow (2001) and the appendix to that report. The values from Block 142 in Ferguson and Barlow (2001) and adjacent blocks were used to compute the mean densities that appear in Table 4 of L-DEO and NSF (2003).

7.7.4 W Gulf of Alaska

Cetacean density values were taken directly from Table 8 in L-DEO and NSF (2004) supplemented with densities for killer whales from strata 9 and 10 in Zerbini et al. (2006). The density value for pinnipeds are based on the densities recorded by Brueggeman et al. (1987 , 1988) adjusted for changes in population size as described in L-DEO and NSF (2004).

7.7.5 NW Atlantic

The densities used for the NW Atlantic site were the average of the Shelf W and Shelf C strata in Palka (2006). These data were collected during ship surveys in 1998 and aerial surveys in 2004.

8 Results

8.1 Sound Propagation Modeling – MONM

The MONM propagation model was run in the full n × 2-D sense as described in Section 5.2 for third-octave frequency bands between 10 and 2,000 Hz. Because the airgun arrays are predominantly low-frequency sources (see Section 5.1.1), this frequency range is sufficient to capture essentially all of the energy output by the arrays. Geographically rendered maps of the received sound levels in dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ are shown in Annex 5 for each of the modeled source locations, along with range-depth plots for selected sites. The tables of Annex 6 and in the following sub-sections summarize the results of the acoustic modeling in terms of radii to threshold values of 170 dB and 180 dB SEL re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (approx. 180 dB and 190 dB re 1 μPa [rms]). Radii are shown both for unweighted (flat-weighted) RLs and for various M-weightings, as described in Sections 5.2.2 and 7.4. Note that the radial resolution of the model runs was 10 m for the ranges involved in calculation of these radii.

The acoustic level values in the model output represent the SEL metric, a suitable measure of the impact of an impulsive sound because it reflects the total acoustic energy delivered over the duration of the event at a receiver location. In order to determine the rms SPLs required in defining safety radii and exposure estimates, a pulse duration of 0.1 s was assumed, resulting in a conversion factor of +10 dB. Thus, rms levels (in dB re 1 μPa) were taken to be 10 dB higher than SEL values in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$.

For each sound level threshold, two different statistical estimates of the safety radii are provided in the tables in Annex 6 the 95% radius and the maximum endfire radius. Given a regularly gridded spatial distribution of modeled RLs, the 95% radius is defined as the radius of a circle that encompasses 95% of the grid points whose value is equal to or greater than the threshold value. This definition is meaningful in terms of potential impact to an animal because, regardless of the geometrical shape of the noise footprint for a given threshold level, it always provides a range beyond which no more than 5% of a uniformly distributed population would be exposed to sound at or above that level. The maximum endfire radius is the radius of a 60 degree angular sector, centered on the along-track axis of the array, that encompasses all grid points whose value is equal to or greater than the threshold value. The greater of the two metrics for each of the modeling cases is shown in the tables of sections 8.1.1 to 8.1.5. Modeled sound levels were sampled at several depths at each site, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or the seafloor depth. This was done on the assumption that, at sites deeper than 2,000 m, marine mammals would not dive deeply enough to be exposed to sounds at greater depths. The tables list radii based on maximum RLs over these ranges of depths. In all cases, however, the maximum radii actually occurred within the upper 500 m of the water column.

Comparison of measured and modeled sound level values in the past has indicated that a precautionary adjustment of 3 dB should be added to the MONM results in some shallow water situations, particularly where the bottom type is not well known (MacGillivray and Hannay 2007). This will minimize the likelihood of encountering situations where measured values will exceed predicted values. As such, model predictions for the shallow and slope sites are shown both with and without this adjustment in the tables of Annex 6:. In this and the following sections, the corrected model predictions are typically presented, unless otherwise indicated.

The number of predicted exposures in each area is different, reflecting the differences in animal abundance. Note that this separation was done for pressure-based exposure estimates because they are based upon a single sound exposure that can easily be located within these depth bins. The energy-based exposure metric is calculated over a 24-hr period, and it is possible that an animal could move back and forth between the shallow and deep water areas during the 24-hr period. Therefore, energy-based exposure estimates were not stratified by water depth, and the higher of the two animal density numbers were used to scale from modeled to real world exposure numbers.

8.1.1 S California

Table B-8. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the S California Sites

Site	*Water Depth (m)*	*M-weighting*	*Radius (m)**	
			180 dB rms	*190 dB rms*
1	100-1,000	Unweighted	45	20
		LF cetaceans	50	20
		MF cetaceans	30	10
		HF cetaceans	30	10
		Pinnipeds	40	10
2	100-1,000	Unweighted	64	14
		LF cetaceans	64	14
		MF cetaceans	28	<10
		HF cetaceans	22	<10
		Pinnipeds	42	14

Notes: *Radii shown are the more conservative (larger) of the values for each site in the tables of Annex 6, and represent a maximum over all modeled depths, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or seafloor depth, with a 3-dB precautionary factor added to the raw model output for sites with a water depth less than 1,000 m. Source is a pair of 45/105 in^3 GI guns, at a depth of 2.5 m.

8.1.2 Caribbean

Table B-9. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the Caribbean Sites

Site	*Water Depth (m)*	*M-weighting*	*Radius (m)**	
			180 dB rms	*190 dB rms*
1	<100	Unweighted	1,379	380
		LF cetaceans	1,338	366
		MF cetaceans	533	117
		HF cetaceans	447	81
		Pinnipeds	815	262
2	>1,000	Unweighted	806	252
		LF cetaceans	741	226
		MF cetaceans	232	71
		HF cetaceans	182	61
		Pinnipeds	326	102
3	100-1,000	Unweighted	524	272
		LF cetaceans	508	260
		MF cetaceans	342	104
		HF cetaceans	257	82
		Pinnipeds	446	149
4	>1,000	Unweighted	802	247
		LF cetaceans	738	229
		MF cetaceans	234	72
		HF cetaceans	180	58
		Pinnipeds	326	102

Notes: *Radii shown are the more conservative (larger) of the values for each site in the tables of Annex 6 and represent a maximum over all modeled depths, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or seafloor depth, with a 3 dB precautionary factor added to the raw model output for sites with a water depth less than 1,000 m. Source is a 36-gun array (6,600 in^3), at a depth of 12 m.

8.1.3 Galapagos Ridge

Table B-10. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the Galapagos Ridge Sites

Site	*Water depth (m)*	*M-weighting*	*Radius (m)**	
			180 dB rms	*190 dB rms*
1-0°	>1,000	Unweighted	360	110
		LF cetaceans	345	110
		MF cetaceans	180	60
		HF cetaceans	140	50
		Pinnipeds	260	81
1-90°	>1,000	Unweighted	357	110
		LF cetaceans	345	110
		MF cetaceans	180	60
		HF cetaceans	140	50
		Pinnipeds	260	81

Notes: *Radii shown are the more conservative (larger) of the values for each site in the tables of Annex 6, and represent a maximum over all modeled depths, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or seafloor depth, with a 3 dB precautionary factor added to the raw model output for sites with a water depth less than 1,000 m. Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3), at a depth of 6 m.

8.1.4 W Gulf of Alaska

Table B-11. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the W Gulf of Alaska Sites

Site	*Water Depth (m)*	*M-weighting*	*Radius (m)**	
			180 dB rms	*190 dB rms*
1	<100	Unweighted	1,012	206
		LF cetaceans	1,012	209
		MF cetaceans	478	139
		HF cetaceans	398	63
		Pinnipeds	885	196
2	100-1,000	Unweighted	595	155
		LF cetaceans	541	152
		MF cetaceans	262	76
		HF cetaceans	202	63
		Pinnipeds	390	114
3	>1,000	Unweighted	347	104
		LF cetaceans	342	103
		MF cetaceans	177	54
		HF cetaceans	139	45
		Pinnipeds	264	76

Notes: *Radii shown are the more conservative (larger) of the values for each site in the tables of Annex 6, and represent a maximum over all modeled depths, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or seafloor depth, with a 3 dB precautionary factor added to the raw model output for sites with a water depth less than 1,000 m. Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3), at a depth of 6 m.

8.1.5 NW Atlantic

Table B-12. Summary of Predicted Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii for the NW Atlantic Sites

Site	*Water Depth (m)*	*M-weighting*	*Radius (m)**	
			180 dB rms	*190 dB rms*
1	<100	Unweighted	64	14
		LF cetaceans	64	14
		MF cetaceans	28	<10
		HF cetaceans	28	<10
		Pinnipeds	42	14
2	100-1,000	Unweighted	57	14
		LF cetaceans	57	14
		MF cetaceans	28	<10
		HF cetaceans	28	<10
		Pinnipeds	42	14
3	>1,000	Unweighted	36	14
		LF cetaceans	36	14
		MF cetaceans	14	<10
		HF cetaceans	14	<10
		Pinnipeds	28	<10
4	100-1,000	Unweighted	57	14
		LF cetaceans	57	14
		MF cetaceans	28	<10
		HF cetaceans	22	<10
		Pinnipeds	42	14

Notes: *Radii shown are the more conservative (larger) of the values for each site in the Annex 6 tables. They represent a maximum over all modeled depths, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or seafloor depth, with a 3-dB precautionary factor added to the raw model output for sites with a water depth < 1,000 m. Source is a pair of 45/105 in^3 GI guns, 2.5 m depth.

8.2 SELs and 90% RMS SPLs

The acoustic levels predicted by the model output are expressed as SEL values. SEL is a suitable measure of the potential impact of an impulsive noise because it reflects the total acoustic energy delivered over the duration of the event at a receiver location. An impact threshold based on the SEL metric provides a consistent and readily applicable criterion useful with either measured or modeled noise levels. The Noise Criteria Group has concluded that, under most conditions, an energy-based metric such as SEL would be a better predictor of auditory injury than is pressure (Southall et al. 2007). For this reason, this analysis (see Section 8.4, below) concentrates on predicting the numbers of marine mammals that might be exposed to various received energy levels. The Noise Criteria Group also recommends a "do not exceed" peak pressure criterion, but under field conditions the SEL criterion is the one that would be exceeded first and thus would be the operative criterion (Southall et al. 2007).

However, regulatory practice in the U.S., insofar as impulsive underwater sounds are concerned, has to date been based on rms sound pressure level. Thus, there is also interest in predicting the rms RLs of airgun pulses. As discussed in Section 5.2.1, while existing safety radii regulations in the U.S. are based on the 90% rms SPL metric for impulsive noise sources, the sensitivity of rms levels to the specific multipath arrival patterns involved is such that model predictions of rms levels at any significant distance from the source are less accurate than are predicted SEL values. As such, the MONM algorithm does not attempt to directly model the rms level, but instead models the propagation of acoustic energy in $^1/_3$-octave bands in a realistic, range-dependent acoustic environment. The rms values may then be estimated from predicted SEL values based on heuristic estimates of the pulse length. However, the rms estimates are less reliable than the SEL estimates, as the relationship between the two can vary considerably with

range and propagation conditions. Site-specific field measurements would be necessary to resolve this uncertainty.

8.3 Comparison with Free-field Models

Seismic industry estimates of the sound fields around airgun arrays are typically based on "free-field" sound level calculations that assume uniform sound spreading in an infinite, homogenous ocean. These free-field estimates neglect specific environmental effects, such as water column refraction and bottom reflections, both of which are taken into account in MONM. In interpreting the results from this modeling study against sound level and safety range predictions provided by free-field models used in designing and optimizing airgun arrays, it must always be kept in mind that there are fundamental differences between these modeling approaches that strongly affect the conditions of their applicability. Specifically, as discussed in the subsections below, free-field models are valid only in the near field, in close proximity to the source, whereas the MONM is valid in the far field and only for shallow propagation angles (Figure B-15). These differences in how MONM and free-field estimates are obtained and the regions in which they are appropriate must be taken into account when comparing the sound level predictions provided by the current study to free-field estimates.



Figure B-15. Stylized Diagram Showing Approximate Regions of Applicability of the MONM and Free-field Models

8.3.1 TL Estimates

In deep water and for a source close to the sea surface (Figure B-15), acoustic TL may be described by the "Lloyd-mirror" effect — the interference of a sound source with its surface reflection or "ghost" — and simple free-field spherical spreading. An advantage of the free-field Lloyd-mirror model is its simplicity: acoustic TL is modeled by spherical spreading with a simple phase delay for the ghost. However, the Lloyd-mirror description is only valid at very short ranges from the source (less than a single water depth) where bottom reflections and water column refraction are unimportant.

In order to accurately predict received sound levels at longer ranges one must take into account reflection and absorption of sound by the sea-bottom and sound refraction in the water column. MONM satisfies this requirement by applying a variant of the numerical acoustic TL model RAM (based on the parabolic equation solution to the wave equation) to accurately account for these effects in a realistic environment. This increase in accuracy, however, comes at a significant computational cost and so two simplifications are necessary to make the hundreds of kilometers of TL computations feasible:

- MONM models sound transmission for an equivalent point-like acoustic source combined with an azimuthal directivity function, and
- MONM models transmission of acoustic energy in $^1/_3$-octave bands.

Approximating the airgun array as an omnidirectional source results in under-estimation of RLs directly underneath the array (for the reasons outlined in Section 4.2), where free-field models produce

more accurate results. However, beyond a very short range, the vertically projected component of the array's acoustic energy contributes negligibly to the RL at shallow propagation angles. Thus, MONM is able to predict TL as longer ranges, where the free-field model is not applicable. As discussed in Section 5.2, although the $^1/_3$-octave band approach cannot be used to replicate the acoustic signal in the time-domain, it is widely used in the acoustics community to characterize the energy of the sound field produced by broadband sources.

As long as environmental conditions are well defined, RAM provides physically accurate predictions of transmission loss for long-range propagation. This is borne out by numerical comparisons of RAM with benchmark acoustic propagation models (Collins et al. 1996; Hannay and Racca 2005).

8.3.2 Near-field vs. Far-field Estimates

An airgun array consists of multiple sources and therefore the first simplification above is not valid in the near field, close to the array. In the far field, on the other hand, an array radiates as a single acoustic source whose SL is dependent only on the propagation angle (both horizontal and vertical) from the array (see also Sections 4.2 and 5.1). The acoustic model RAM only computes acoustic transmission from a point-like, non-directional acoustic source; therefore, for each propagation bearing, MONM uses a different SL based on the horizontal directivity pattern of the airgun array to compute the RL. This approximation is valid for propagation at shallow vertical angles, but is not applicable in the region immediately above and below the array as shown in Figure B-15, as discussed above. Conversely, while the Lloyd-mirror approximation is only valid close to the array, in that region it does properly account for near-field interference effects between array elements.

Note that if we were to neglect the propagation modeling component of MONM, the source modeling component alone produces results that are consistent with free-field models.

8.4 Marine Mammal Exposure Modeling – AIM

Table B-4 shows the predicted mitigation radii under Alternative A and Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) for shallow and deep portions of each modeled DAA. For each of the five DAAs, two examples are provided of the modeled population exposure distributions. These graphs show the numbers of animats predicted to be exposed to various rms levels. These distributions are shown separately for the shallow and deep portions of each modeling area. Only the portions of these distributions above 155 dB re 1 µPa (rms) are shown, to provide greater detail in the portion of the distribution that includes the RLs that lead to Level A and Level B exposures. If the entire distribution was presented, the much larger number of lower RLs would obscure the relevant portion of the distribution (e.g., above 155 dB). It should be noted that the numbers of exposures in the figures are for the modeled population.

In addition, for the tables of predicted exposures in both SPL and SEL levels, JASCO provided transmission loss in units of M-weighted SEL that were normalized to a 1-second duration. These were converted to dB rms for the pressure exposure results. Under this methodology, the maximum value for each animat was selected to represent the exposure of that animat. This value was then compared against the appropriate thresholds to determine if each individual exposure would be considered a "pressure take".

The procedure to estimate the energy-based exposure began with determining the maximum pressure level, as above. Once the time of that maximum pressure exposure was determined, all exposures that occurred 12 hours prior to, and following, the maximum exposure were selected. These were converted from decibels to a linear pressure squared metric. All of the measures from the 24-hour period were then summed and converted back to a decibel metric.

The difference in the values in the pressure and energy take tables is largely due to the differences in the threshold values. To illustrate, the pressure threshold for mysticete cetaceans was 180 db re 1 µPa (rms), whereas the energy threshold was 198 dB re $1\mu Pa^2 \cdot$ sec. Therefore a single 181 dB re 1µPa

exposure would qualify as a pressure-based take. At the same RL, the animal would need to experience 63 exposures to accumulate sufficient energy to qualify as an energy-based take.

To estimate the actual numbers of marine mammals that would be exposed to sounds at specified levels, the AIM model results for each of the five DAAs were then scaled by the ratio of animat densities in the model to the real world animal densities. These real-world exposure estimates are provided in table form for Alternatives A and B.

8.4.1 S California



Figure B-16. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Common Dolphin in the S California Site

Notes: Only the predicted shallow-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B, since there was no deep water for this modeling location. See Table B-13 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.



Figure B-17. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for California Sea Lion in the S California Site

Notes: Only the predicted shallow-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B, since there was no deep water for this modeling location. See Table B-13 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.

Table B-13. Real World Exposure Predictions for S California Site under Alternatives A and B

Species	*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Shallow)*				*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Deep)*				*Real World Energy Exposures*
	M-weighted		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted and Unweighted*
	Level A	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*
Odontocetes									
Gervais' beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blainville's beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rough-toothed dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bottlenose dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Spinner dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clymene dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Striped dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Common dolphin	0.0	270.4	0.0	1,802.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
False killer whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Short-finned pilot whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Northern right whale dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.2	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harbor porpoise	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dall's porpoise	0.0	13.5	3.4	45.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pacific white-sided dolphin	3.2	12.9	3.2	71.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Killer whale	0.0	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Kogia spp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mysticetes									
Humpback whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minke whale	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bryde's whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sei whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fin whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gray whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blue whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pinnipeds									
Harbor seal	0.0	38.5	0.0	50.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
N. elephant seal	0.0	137.1	0.0	185.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
California sea lion	0.0	2,371.6	0.0	3,613.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Steller's sea lion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Guadalupe fur seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Northern fur seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

8.4.2 Caribbean



Figure B-18. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Bottlenose Dolphin in the Caribbean Site

Notes: The predicted shallow- and deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B. See Table B-14 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.



Figure B-19. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Pantropical Spotted Dolphin in the Caribbean Site

Notes: The predicted shallow- and deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B. See Table B-14 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.

Table B-14. Real World Exposure Predictions for the Caribbean Site under Alternatives A and B

Species	*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Shallow)*				*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Deep)*				*Real World Energy Exposures*	
	M-weighted		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*	*Unweighted*
	Level A	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	
Odontocetes										
Gervais' beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blainville's beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rough-toothed dolphin	0.4	8.1	1.7	14.0	0.3	3.0	0.4	12.9	0.0	0.0
Bottlenose dolphin	1.6	43.5	9.8	83.6	0.4	3.6	1.1	10.8	0.0	0.0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	0.7	7.2	1.7	10.5	0.2	2.5	0.4	2.3	0.0	0.1
Atlantic spotted dolphin	10.3	105.3	24.8	152.7	0.7	8.3	1.3	7.8	0.0	2.1
Spinner dolphin	0.1	0.8	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Clymene dolphin	0.1	0.8	0.2	1.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0
Striped dolphin	0.1	0.8	0.2	1.2	1.2	14.9	2.4	14.1	0.0	0.4
Long-beaked common dolphin	2.7	22.4	9.0	55.6	0.3	4.2	0.8	8.1	0.0	0.0
Fraser's dolphin	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0
Risso's dolphin	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Melon-headed whale	0.0	0.6	0.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pygmy killer whale	0.0	0.6	0.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
False killer whale	0.0	0.6	0.1	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Short-finned pilot whale	0.3	6.8	1.7	18.0	0.1	4.0	1.3	10.5	0.0	0.0
Killer whale	0.0	1.0	0.2	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sperm whale	0.0	0.4	0.2	2.9	0.0	2.0	0.3	14.2	0.0	0.0
Kogia spp.	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mysticetes										
Humpback whale	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.004	0.0
Minke whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bryde's whale	0.3	1.4	0.3	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.019	0.0
Sei whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fin whale	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.006	0.0
Blue whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

8.4.3 Galapagos Ridge





Figure B-20. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Bryde's Whale in the Galapagos Ridge Site

Notes: Only the predicted deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B, since there was no shallow water for this modeling location. See Table B-15 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.





Figure B-21. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Pantropical Spotted Dolphin in the Galapagos Ridge Site

Notes: Only the predicted deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B, since there was no shallow water for this modeling location. See Table B-15 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.

Table B-15. Real World Exposure Predictions for the Galapagos Ridge Site under Alternatives A and B

Species	*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Shallow)*				*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Deep)*				*Real World Energy Exposures*	
	M-weighted		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*	*Unweighted*
	Level A	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	
Odontocetes										
Sperm Whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	5.7	0.025	0.0
Pygmy sperm whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dwarf sperm whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.8	3.0	145.3	0.0	0.0
Cuvier's beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	36.2	0.0	0.0
Longman's beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pygmy beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blainville's beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mesoplodon spp.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	17.7	0.0	0.0
Rough-toothed dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	130.9	0.0	0.0
Bottlenose dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	10.1	1.0	69.5	0.0	0.0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.6	325.7	67.1	2,232.0	0.0	0.0
Spinner dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	174.0	32.9	1,095.4	0.0	0.0
Costa Rican spinner dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Clymene dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Striped dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	141.5	29.1	969.5	0.0	0.0
Short-beaked common dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	2.9	0.6	22.5	0.0	0.0
Fraser's dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	2.2	0.6	11.0	0.0	0.0
Risso's dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	0.7	56.3	0.0	0.0
Melon-headed whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.5	25.7	0.0	0.0
Pygmy killer whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.8	44.8	0.0	0.0
False killer whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.3	13.5	0.0	0.0
Short-finned pilot whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	1.9	100.8	0.0	0.0
Killer whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0
Mysticetes										
Humpback whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minke whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bryde's whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	16.8	0.6	21.1	0.0	0.0
Sei whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fin whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Blue whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0

8.4.4 W Gulf of Alaska



Figure B-22. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Fin Whale in the W Gulf of Alaska Site
Notes: The predicted shallow- and deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B. See Table B-16 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.



Figure B-23. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Steller's Sea Lion in the W Gulf of Alaska Site

Notes: The predicted shallow- and deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B. See Table B-16 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.

Table B-16. Real World Exposure Predictions for the W Gulf of Alaska Site under Alternatives A and B

Species	*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Shallow)*				*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Deep)*				*Real World Energy Exposures*	
	M-weighted		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*	*Unweighted*
	Level A	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	
Odontocetes										
Sperm whale	0.0	2.5	0.3	4.8	0.0	0.4	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
Cuvier's beaked whale	0.4	12.6	1.0	25.8	0.0	1.1	0.1	16.9	0.0	0.1
Baird's beaked whale	0.1	3.9	0.3	7.9	0.0	0.3	0.0	5.2	0.0	0.0
Stejneger's beaked whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Beluga whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pacific white-sided dolphin	0.1	7.3	1.1	14.0	0.1	4.0	0.3	12.3	0.0	0.0
Risso's dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Killer whale	0.2	8.9	1.2	18.6	0.0	3.0	0.8	7.1	0.0	0.0
Short-finned pilot whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harbor porpoise	0.5	61.7	15.1	137.4	0.0	17.9	4.3	27.0	0.0	0.0
Dall's porpoise	9.5	482.2	133.7	1,269.8	0.0	176.6	33.4	377.1	0.0	0.0
Mysticetes										
N Pacific right whale	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Gray whale	9.8	115.6	9.3	119.6	2.7	35.1	2.7	32.9	0.0	0.0
Humpback whale	13.6	154.8	14.3	163.7	5.5	31.4	4.8	23.9	0.0	0.0
Minke whale	2.2	36.9	1.9	38.3	0.8	9.5	0.8	7.9	0.0	0.0
Sei whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fin whale	13.7	122.9	12.7	131.4	0.5	39.6	1.1	34.3	0.0	0.0
Blue whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pinnipeds										
N fur seal	0.1	9.0	1.3	10.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.1	0.0
California sea lion	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Steller's sea lion	0.0	86.3	6.1	109.9	0.9	23.1	0.9	16.1	0.4	0.0
Pacific walrus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bearded seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harbor seal	1.4	142.3	13.5	203.2	1.4	32.6	4.2	29.0	1.4	0.0
Spotted seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ringed seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ribbon seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
N elephant seal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

8.4.5 NW Atlantic



Figure B-24. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Bottlenose Dolphin in the NW Atlantic Site

Notes: The predicted shallow- and deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B. See Table B-17 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.



Figure B-25. Distribution of Modeled Sound Exposures for Sperm Whale in the NW Atlantic Site
Notes: The predicted shallow- and deep-water sound exposure distributions are shown for Alternatives A and B. See Table B-17 for predicted numbers of real-world exposures.

Table B-17. Real World Exposure Predictions for the NW Atlantic Site under Alternatives A and B

Species	*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Shallow)*				*Real World Resident Pressure Exposures (Deep)*				*Real World Energy Exposures*
	M-weighted		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted*		*Unweighted*		*M-weighted and Unweighted*
	Level A	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*	*Level B*	*Level A*
Odontocetes									
Sperm whale	0.3	13.3	0.3	37.9	0.0	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.0
Kogia spp.	0.1	7.8	0.1	20.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0
Bottlenose whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unidentified beaked whale	0.0	3.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bottlenose dolphin	2.1	134.9	2.1	341.6	0.0	2.1	0.0	4.2	0.0
Spotted dolphin	0.0	50.6	0.9	117.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0
Spinner dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Striped dolphin	0.0	251.9	4.3	581.9	0.0	4.3	0.0	4.3	0.0
Common dolphin	8.0	378.3	8.0	1,118.7	0.0	24.1	0.0	32.2	0.0
Whitesided dolphin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Harbor porpoise	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pilot whale	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mysticetes									0.0
Right whale	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Humpback whale	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Minke whale	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sei whale	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Fin whale	0.0	1.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

9 Literature Cited

Austin, M.E., A.O. MacGillivray, D.E. Hannay, and S.A. Carr. 2003. Acoustic Monitoring of Marathon Canada Petroleum ULC 2003 Courland/Empire Seismic Program. Marathon Canada Petroleum ULC, by JASCO Research Ltd.

Barlow, J. 1999. Trackline detection probability for long-diving whales. Pages 209-221 *in* G.W. Garner, S.C. Amstrup, J.L. Laake, B.F.J. Manly, L.L. McDonald, and D.G. Robertson, eds. Marine Mammal Survey and Assessment Methods. A.A Balkema, Brookfield, VT.

Barrie, J.V. and B.D. Bornhold. 1989. Surficial geology of Hecate Strait, British Columbia continental shelf. Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences 26:1241-1254.

Becker, K., A. Bartetzko, and E.E. Davis. 2001. Leg 174B synopsis: revisiting Hole 395A for logging and long-term monitoring of off-axis hydrothermal processes in young oceanic crust. *In* K. Becker and M.J. Malone, eds. Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Scientific Results, Volume 174B. Available from http://www-odp.tamu.edu/publications/174B_SR/synopsis/synopsis.htm.

Bishop, G.C., W.T. Ellison, and L.E. Mellberg. 1987. A simulation model for high-frequency under-ice reverberation. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 82:275-285.

Blackwell, S.B., R.G. Norman, C.R. Greene Jr. and W.J. Richardson. 2007. Acoustic measurements. Pages 4-1 – 4-52 *in* Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by Shell Offshore Inc. in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, July-September 2006: 90-day report. LGL Report P891-1. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Shell Offshore Inc., Houston, TX, National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD, and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Anchorage, AK.

Brueggeman, J.J., G.A. Green, R.A. Grotefendt, and D.G. Chapman. 1987. Aerial surveys of endangered cetaceans and other marine mammals in the northwestern Gulf of Alaska and southeastern Bering Sea. Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment Program, Final Report, Principal Investigation 61(1989):1-124. OCS Study MMS 89-0026. Minerals Management Service, Anchorage, AK.

Brueggeman, J.J., G.A. Green, R.W. Tressler, and D.G. Chapman. 1988. Shipboard surveys of endangered cetaceans in the northwestern Gulf of Alaska. OCS Environmental Assessment Program Final Report, Principal Investigation 61(1989):125-188. OCS Study MMS 89-0026. Prepared by Envirosphere Company for Minerals Management Service, Alaska OCS Office and NOAA, Office of Oceanography and Marine Assessment, Alaska Office.

Buogo, S. and G.B. Cannelli. 2002. Implosion of an underwater spark-generated bubble and acoustic energy evaluation using the Rayleigh model. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 111:2594-2600.

Carey, W.M., J. Doutt, R.B. Evans, and L.M. Dillma. 1995. Shallow-water sound transmission measurements on the New Jersey continental shelf. IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering 20:321-336.

Clay, C.S. and H. Medwin. 1977. Acoustical Oceanography. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Collins, M.D., R.J. Cederberg, D.B. King, and S.A. Chin-Bing. 1996. Comparison of algorithms for solving parabolic wave equations. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 100:178-182.

Coppens, A.B. 1981. Simple equations for the speed of sound in Neptunian waters. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 69:862–863.

Divins, D.L. 2006. NGDC Total Sediment Thickness of the World's Oceans & Marginal Seas. http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/mgg/sedthick/sedthick.html. Accessed November.

Dragoset, W.H. 1984. A comprehensive method for evaluating the design of airguns and airgun arrays. 16th Annual Proceedings of Offshore Technology Conference 3:75-84.

Edgerton, H.E. and G.G. Hayward. 1964. The 'Boomer' sonar source for seismic profiling. Journal of Geophysical Research 69:3033-3042.

Einwich, A.E. 1981. Geology related to Acoustic transmission: Eastern Caribbean. Naval Ocean Research and Development Activity, NSTL Station, MS.

Ellison, W.T., R.M. Sonntag, and C.W. Clark. 1987. Comparison of measured bowhead whale, *Balaena mysticetus*, migration parameters with results from the tracking algorithm. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 37:309-311.

Ferguson, M.C. and J. Barlow. 2001. Spatial Distributions and Density of Cetaceans in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean Based on Summer/Fall Research Vessel Surveys in 1986-96. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2002. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 111:2929-2940.

Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt, and S.H. Ridgway. 2005. Temporary threshold shift in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to mid-frequency tones. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 118:2696-2705.

Francois, R.E. and G.R. Garrison. 1982a. Sound absorption based on ocean measurements. Part I: Pure water and magnesium sulfate contributions. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 72:896-907.

Francois, R.E. and G.R. Garrison. 1982b. Sound absorption based on ocean measurements. Part II: Boric acid contribution and equation for total absorption. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 72:1879-1890.

Frankel A.S. and K.V. Vigness-Raposa. 2006. Marine Animal Behavioral Analysis. Marine Acoustics, Inc., Annapolis, MD.

Frankel, A.S., W.T. Ellison, and J. Buchanan. 2002. Application of the Acoustic Integration Model (AIM) to predict and minimize environmental impacts. Pages 1438-1443 *in* Oceans '02, Vol. 3. Marine Technology Society & IEEE.

Goff, J.A., B.J. Kraft, L.A. Mayer, S.G. Schock, C.K. Sommerfield, H.C. Olson, S.P.S. Gulick, and S. Nordfjord. 2004. Seabed characterization on the New Jersey middle and outer shelf: correlatability and spatial variability of seafloor sediment properties. Marine Geology 209:147–172.

Goold, J.C. and P.J. Fish. 1998. Broadband spectra of seismic survey air-gun emissions, with reference to dolphin auditory thresholds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 103:2177-2184.

Greene, C.R., Jr. and W.J. Richardson. 1988. Characteristics of marine seismic survey sounds in the Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 83:2246-2254.

Greene, C.R., Jr., J.S. Hanna, and R.W. Blaylock. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. Pages 3-1 – 3-63 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Northstar Marine Mammal Monitoring Program, 1996: Marine Mammal and Acoustical Monitoring of a Seismic Program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. LGL Rep. 2121-2. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ON, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Exploration (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Guerin, G. 2000. Acoustic and Thermal Characterization of Oil Migration, Gas Hydrates Formation and Silica Diagenesis. Dissertation, Columbia University, NY.

Haley, B. 2006. Marine mammal monitoring during University of Texas at Austin's marine geophysical survey of the Western Canada Basin, Chukchi Borderland and Mendeleev Ridge, Arctic Ocean, July–August 2006. LGL Rep. TA4285-3. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates Inc., Anchorage, AK, and LGL Ltd., King City, ONT, for University of Texas at Austin Institute for Geophysics, Austin, TX; NMFS, Silver Spring, MD; and USFWS, Anchorage, AK. November.

Hamilton, E.L. 1980. Geoacoustic modeling of the sea floor. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 68:1313-1340.

Hannay, D.E. and R.G. Racca. 2005. Acoustic model validation. Technical report prepared by JASCO Research Ltd. for Sakhalin Energy Investment Company. 18 February. Available at http://www.sakhalinenergy.com/en/documents/doc_33_jasco.pdf.

Herzig, P.M., S.E. Humphris, D.J. Miller, and R.A. Zierenberg, Eds. 1998. Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Scientific Results, Volume 158. College Station, TX.

Holland, C.W. 2003. Seabed reflection measurement uncertainty. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 114:1861-1873.

Hutchins, R.W., D.L. McKeown, and L.H. Kind. 1976. A deep-tow high resolution seismic system for continental shelf mapping. Geoscience Canada 3:95-100.

James, N.P., Y. Bone, T.K. Kyser, G.R. Dix, and L.B. Collins. 2004. The importance of changing oceanography in controlling late Quaternary carbonate sedimentation on a high-energy, tropical, oceanic ramp: north-western Australia. Sedimentology 51:1179-1205.

Kastak, D., R.J. Schusterman, B.L. Southall, and C.J. Reichmuth. 1999. Underwater temporary threshold shift induced by octave-band noise in three species of pinniped. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 106:1142-1148.

Keenan, R.E., D.F. McCammon, E. Holmes, and M.S. Moustafa. 2001. Resolution and Accuracy of Environmental Parameters Required for Precise Acoustic Predictions. N774C Report.

Koski, W.R., J.W. Lawson, D.H. Thomson, and W.J. Richardson. 1998. Marine Mammal Technical Report. Point Mugu Sea Range Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement. Prepared by LGL Ltd., environmental research associates, King City, ONT, and Ogden Environmental and Energy Services, Santa Barbara, CA, for Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, Point Mugu, CA. December.

Landro, M. 1992. Modeling of GI gun signatures. Geophysical Prospecting 40:721-747.

Laws, M., L. Hatton, and M. Haartsen. 1990. Computer modeling of clustered airguns. First Break 8:331–338.

L-DEO and NSF. 2003. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Seismic Survey by the R/V *Maurice Ewing* in the Hess Deep Area of the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean. Prepared by LGL Ltd., environmental research associates, King City, ONT. LGL Report TA2822-4. 18 March.

L-DEO and NSF. 2004. Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Kilo Moana* around the Aleutian Islands, June–July 2005. LGL Report 4089-1. Prepared by LGL, Ltd., environmental research associates, King City, ONT. 20 December.

Lurton, X. 2002. An Introduction to Underwater Acoustics: Principles and Applications. Springer, Chichester, UK.

MacGillivray, A.O. 2000. An Acoustic Modeling Study of Seismic Airgun Noise in Queen Charlotte Basin. Thesis, University of Victoria, BC.

MacGillivray, A.O. and D. Hannay. 2007. Chapter 3: Summary of noise assessment. Pages 3-1 – 3-21 in Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc. in the Chukchi Sea, July-October 2006. LGL Report P903-2. Prepared by LGL Alaska Research Associates Inc., Anchorage, AK, and JASCO Research Ltd., Victoria, BC, for ConocoPhillips Alaska Inc., Anchorage, AK, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Malme, C.I., P.W. Smith, and P.R. Miles. 1986. Characterisation of geophysical acoustic survey sounds. Prepared by BBN Laboratories Inc., Cambridge, for Battelle Memorial Institute to the Minerals Management Service, Pacific Outer Continental Shelf Region, Los Angeles, CA.

McCammon, D.F. 2000. Capturing Uncertainty: Uncertainty in Propagation Loss Calculations. ONR Uncertainty Workshop.

McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. APPEA Journal 38:692-707.

Medwin, H. 2005. Sounds in the Sea: From Ocean Acoustics to Acoustical Oceanography. Cambridge University Press, NY.

Morales, F.E. and G. Godoy. 1996. Sediment distribution in El Tablazo bay, Maracaibo system, Venezuela. IEEE 3:1492–1496.

Mosher, D.C. and P.G. Simpkin. 1999. Status and trends of marine high-resolution seismic reflection profiling: data acquisition. Geoscience Canada 26:174-188.

NMFS. 2000. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; marine seismic-reflection data collection in southern California. Federal Register 65:16374-16379.

NMFS. 2005. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. Federal Register 70:1871-1875.

Palka, D.L. 2006. Summer abundance estimates of cetaceans in US North Atlantic Navy Operating Areas. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 06-03. NMFS, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA.

Parkes, G.E. and L. Hatton. 1986. The Marine Seismic Source. Springer, NY

Pirmez, C., R.D. Flood, J. Baptiste, H. Yin, and P.L. Manley. 1997. Clay content, porosity and velocity of Amazon Fan sediments determined from ODP Leg 155 core and wireline logs. Geophysical Research Letters 24:317–320.

Prell, W.L., N. Niitsuma, et al. 1989. Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Volume 117, Initial Reports. Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX. Available at: http://www-odp.tamu.edu/publications/117_IR/117ir.htm.

Racca, R.G. and J.A. Scrimger. 1986. Underwater Acoustic Source Characteristics of Air and Water Guns. Contractor report by JASCO Research Ltd., Victoria, BC, for DREP. Contract No. 06SB 97708-5-7055.

Reid, J.A. 2005. Point Coverage SCASMPL: Sediment sample data for the Channel Islands and Santa Barbara Channel Region. U.S. Geological Survey.

Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Roberts, R.W. 1976. Bottom sediment granulometric data for the Continental margins of the Bering, Chukchi East Siberian, Laptev, and Beaufort Seas. Special Report #70. University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Robinson, E.S. and C.S. Çoruh. 1988. Basic Exploration Geophysics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.

Shore-based Scientific Party. 1994. Site 893, Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Project, Initial Reports, Vol. 146 (Part 2). J.P. Kennett, J.G. Baldauf, et al., eds. Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Shipboard Scientific Party. 1998. Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Initial Reports, Vol. 174A. J.A. Austin, Jr., N. Christie-Blick, M.J. Malone, et al., eds. Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Shipboard Scientific Party. 2003a. Leg 203 Summary, Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Initial Reports, Vol. 203. J.A. Orcutt, A. Schultz, T.A. Davies, et al., eds. Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Shipboard Scientific Party. 2003b. Leg 206 Summary, Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Initial Reports, Vol. 206. D.S. Wilson, D.A.H. Teagle, G.D. Acton, et al., eds. Ocean Drilling Program, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.

Smultea, M.A., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and S. Stoltz. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean, April-June 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-26. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY.

Southall, B.L., A.E. Bowles, W.T. Ellison, J.J. Finneran, R.L. Gentry, C.R. Greene, Jr., D. Kastak, D.R. Ketten, J.H. Miller, P.E. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, J.A. Thomas, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. Aquatic Mammals 33:411-521.

Teague, W.J., M.J. Carron, and P.J. Hogan. 1990. A comparison between the generalized digital environmental model and Levitus climatologies. Journal of Geophysical Research 95(C5):7167-7183.

Thomas, T.A., W.R. Koski, and W.J. Richardson. 2002. Correction factors to calculate bowhead whale numbers from aerial surveys of the Beaufort Sea. Pages 12-1 – 12-38 *in* W.J. Richardson and D.H. Thomson, eds. OCS Study MMS 2002-012. U.S. Minerals Management Service, Anchorage, AK, and Herndon, VA.

Valent, P.J. and H.J. Lee. 1971. NCEL core data – Santa Barbara Channel area, Report #1. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Port Hueneme, CA.

Zerbini, A.N., A. Andriolo, M.P. Heide-Jørsen, J.L. Pizzorno, Y.G. Maia, G.R. VanBlaricom, D.P. DeMaster, P.C. Simões-Lopes, S. Moreira, and C. Bethlem. 2006. Satellite-monitored movements of humpback whales *Megaptera novaeangliae* in the Southwest Atlantic Ocean. Marine Ecology Progress Series 313:295-304.

Zhang, Z. and C. Tindle. 1995. Improved equivalent fluid approximations for a low shear speed ocean bottom. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 98:3391-3396.

Ziolkowski, A. 1970. A method for calculating the output pressure waveform from an air gun. Geophysical Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society 21:137–161.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

Annex 1: Far-field SL Computation

The $^1/_3$-octave band SLs for each modeling azimuth were computed from the horizontally propagating far-field signature of the array. The far-field signature, $s_{ff}(t)$ is the sum of the notional signatures of the individual guns, $s_i(t)$, time delayed according to their relative position and the propagation angle:

$$s_{ff}(t) = \sum_n s_i\left(t - \tau_i(\theta, \phi)\right)$$

where τ_i is its time-delay of the i^{th} gun in the angular direction (θ, ϕ). For horizontal sound propagation $\phi = 0$ and the time delay is only a function of the azimuthal angle, θ:

$$\tau_i = -\left(x_i \cos\theta + y_i \sin\theta\right)/c$$

where (x_i, y_i) is the position of gun i in the plane of the array and c is the speed of sound. A plan view diagram, illustrating the geometry of the far-field summation, is shown in Figure A1-1. It is often more convenient to perform this calculation in the frequency domain by utilizing the Fourier transform shift theorem, which states that a time delay of τ corresponds to a phase delay of $2\pi f\tau$, so that:

$$S_{ff}(f, \theta) = \sum_n S_i(f) \exp\left(\frac{j2\pi f}{c}(x_i \cos\theta + y_i \sin\theta)\right)$$

where f is frequency and S(f) denotes the Fourier transform of s(t). The far-field signature is then filtered into ⅓-octave pass-bands to generate frequency dependent SLs:

$$SL(f_c, \theta) = 2\pi \int_{f_{lo}}^{f_{hi}} \left|S_{ff}(f, \theta)\right|^2 df$$

where $SL(f_c, \theta)$ is the SL in a $^1/_3$-octave band with centre frequency f_c, in the azimuthal direction θ. Note that the limits of integration in this equation, f_{lo} and f_{hi}, are the lower and upper frequency bounds of the $^1/_3$-octave band. Source levels, computed in this way, are suitable for combining with TL output by a propagation model to compute received sound levels in the far field.



Figure A1-1. Plan View Diagram of the Far-field Summation Geometry for an Airgun Array

Airgun Model Optimization

A collection of high-quality airgun signature data, obtained from a DREP technical report by Racca and Scrimger [1986], was used to determine optimal values for four empirical model parameters, α, β, γ and κ. The airgun data were collected by DREP in Jarvis Inlet aboard the CFAV Endeavor as part of a study of the source characteristics of seismic airguns and water-guns. The dataset contains a collection of 38 back-propagated source signatures for five different Bolt 600/B airguns. The volumes of the airguns in the dataset are 5 in^3, 10 in^3, 40 in^3, 80 in^3 and 185 in^3 and the firing depths of the airguns range from 0.5 m to 10 m.

Best-fit values for the model parameters were obtained using a simulated annealing global optimization algorithm to fit the airgun model to the experimental source signature data.

Annex 2: Airgun Array $^{1}/_{3}$-Octave Band SLs



Figure A2-1. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB re µPa^2 · s) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D Reflection, 2 x 1, 650 in^3, 6 m tow depth); also 3-D Reflection, two sub-arrays fired in "flip-flop" fashion).



Figure A2-2. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB re µPa^2 · s) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D Reflection, 4 x 1, 650 in^3, 6 m tow depth)



Figure A2-3. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB re µPa^2 · s) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D Refraction, 4 x 1, 650 in^3, 12 m tow depth)



Figure A2-4. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB µPa^2 · s) (R/V *Langseth* 2-D High Resolution, 2 x GI, 2.5 m tow depth)



Figure A2-5. Directionality of the Airgun Array Source Levels (dB µPa^2 · s) (R/V *Langseth* 3-D High Resolution, 2 x GI, 2.5 m tow depth)

[This page intentionally left blank.]

Annex 3: Source Locations and Study Areas

The locations of modeling sites within each of the five study areas under consideration are shown in Figure A3-1 through Figure A3-5. In each case, the proposed ship's track and AIM modeling boundaries are also shown.



Figure A3-1. Locations of S California Modeling Sites



Figure A3-2. Locations of Caribbean Modeling Sites



Figure A3-3. Locations of Galapagos Ridge Modeling Sites



Figure A3-4. Locations of W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites



Figure A3-5. Locations of NW Atlantic Modeling Sites

[This page intentionally left blank.]

Annex 4: Marine Mammal Species and Associated Densities and Animat Depth Restrictions Included in AIM Modeling

This annex includes tables of species modeled for each of the exemplary DAAs. Species that were combined for modeling are highlighted in tan. Refer to Appendix C of the EIS/OEIS for scientific names. See Section 7.7 of this Appendix for sources of marine mammal density information that were considered for each DAA.

Table A4-1. Species and Densities Modeled at the Caribbean Site

Species		*Shallow Density (number/km^2)*	*Deep Density (number/km^2)*	*Depth Constraint* Min (m)	Max (m)
ODONTOCETES	Gervais' beaked whale	<0.0001	0.0000	-30	
	Blainville's beaked whale	<0.0001	0.0000	-30	
	Rough-toothed dolphin	0.0022	0.0010	-194	
	Bottlenose dolphin	0.0082	0.0014	-25	
	Pantropical spotted dolphin	0.0014	0.0007	-10	
	Atlantic spotted dolphin	0.0206	0.0022	-10	
	Spinner dolphin	0.0002	0.0001	-10	
	Clymene dolphin	0.0002	0.0001	-10	
	Striped dolphin	0.0002	0.0040	-10	
	Long-beaked common dolphin	0.0448	0.0050	-100	-1,000
	Fraser's dolphin	0.0001	<0.0001	-100	
	Risso's dolphin	0.0001	<0.0001	-100	
	Melon-headed whale	0.0002	0.0000	-200	
	Pygmy killer whale	0.0002	0.0000	-200	
	False killer whale	0.0002	0.0000	-200	
	Short-finned pilot whale	0.0028	0.0012	-200	
	Kogia spp.	<0.0001	0.0000	-117	
	Sperm Whale	0.0003	0.0011	-200	
	Killer whale	0.0002	0.0000	-10	
MYSTICETES	Humpback whale	<0.0001	0.0000	-25	
	Minke whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Bryde's whale	0.0002	0.0000	-50	
	Sei whale	0.0000	0.0000	-50	
	Fin whale	<0.0001	0.0000	-30	
	Blue whale	0.0000	0.0000	-50	

Table A4-2. Species and Densities Modeled at the NW Atlantic Site

Species		*Shallow Density (number/km²)*	*Deep Density (number/km²)*	*Depth Constraint*	
				Min (m)	*Max (m)*
ODONTOCETES	Sperm whale	0.0170	0.0171	-100	
	Kogia spp.	0.0068	0.0068	-100	
	Bottlenose whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Bottlenose dolphin	0.1054	0.1054	-30	
	Spotted dolphin	0.0436	0.0436	-10	
	Spinner dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Striped dolphin	0.2171	0.2171	-10	
	Common dolphin	0.4024	0.4024	-100	
	White-sided dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-50	
	Harbor porpoise	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Pilot whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
MYSTICETES	Right whale	<0.0001	<0.0001	-10	
	Humpback whale	0.0003	0.0003	-25	
	Minke whale	<0.0001	<0.0001	-30	
	Sei whale	<0.0001	<0.0001	-30	
	Fin whale	0.0013	0.0013	-30	

Table A4-3. Species and Densities Modeled at the Galapagos Ridge Site

Species		*Shallow Density (number/km²)*	*Deep Density (number/km²)*	*Depth Constraint*	
				Min (m)	*Max (m)*
ODONTOCETES	Pygmy sperm whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Dwarf sperm whale	0.0247	0.0247	-100	
	Sperm Whale	0.0006	0.0006	-200	
	Cuvier's beaked whale	0.0053	0.0053	-100	
	Longman's beaked whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Blainville's beaked whale	0.0026	0.0026	-100	
	Rough-toothed dolphin	0.0053	0.0053	-194	
	Bottlenose dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Pantropical spotted dolphin	0.0026	0.0026	-10	
	Spinner dolphin	0.0093	0.0093	-10	
	Clymene dolphin	0.0062	0.0062	-10	
	Striped dolphin	0.2395	0.2395	-10	
	Short-beaked common dolphin	0.0024	0.0024	-100	
	Fraser's dolphin	0.0016	0.0016	-100	
	Risso's dolphin	0.0061	0.0061	-100	
	Melon-headed whale	0.0017	0.0017	-100	
	Pygmy killer whale	0.0030	0.0030	-100	
	False killer whale	0.0009	0.0009	-100	
	Short-finned pilot whale	0.0067	0.0067	-100	
	Killer whale	0.0003	0.0003	-10	
MYSTICETES	Humpback whale	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
	Minke whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Bryde's whale	0.0016	0.0016	-30	
	Sei whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Fin whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Blue whale	0.0001	0.0001	-100	

Table A4-4. Species and Densities Modeled at the S California Site

Species		*Shallow Density (number/km²)*	*Deep Density (number/km²)*	*Depth Constraint*	
				Min (m)	*Max (m)*
ODONTOCETES	Gervais' beaked whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Blainville's beaked whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Rough-toothed dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-194	
	Bottlenose dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Pantropical spotted dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Spinner dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Clymene dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Striped dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Common dolphin	9.0130	9.0130	-100	
	False killer whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Short-finned pilot whale	<0.0001	<0.0001	-100	
	Northern right whale dolphin	0.0216	0.0216	-50	
	Kogia spp.	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Harbor porpoise	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Dall's porpoise	0.1691	0.1691	-100	
	Pacific white-sided dolphin	0.3226	0.3226	-50	
	Killer whale	0.0039	0.0039	-10	
MYSTICETES	Humpback whale	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
	Minke whale	0.0019	0.0019	-30	
	Bryde's whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Sei whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Fin whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Gray whale	0.0000	0.0000	-10	-200
	Blue whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
PINNIPEDS	Harbor seal	0.2960	0.2960	-10	
	N elephant seal	0.8064	0.8064	-10	
	California sea lion	11.2935	11.2935	-10	
	Steller's sea lion	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Guadalupe fur seal	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	N fur seal	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
FISSIPEDS	S sea otter	NA	NA	NA	NA

Table A4-5. Species and Densities Modeled at the W Gulf of Alaska Site

Species		*Shallow Density (number/km²)*	*Deep Density (number/km²)*	*Depth Constraint*	
				Min (m)	*Max (m)*
ODONTOCETES	Sperm Whale	0.0005	0.0005	-100	
	Cuvier's beaked whale	0.0035	0.0035	-100	
	Baird's beaked whale	0.0011	0.0011	-100	
	Stejneger's beaked whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Beluga whale	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
	Pacific white-sided dolphin	0.0014	0.0014	-50	
	Risso's dolphin	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
	Killer whale	0.0018	0.0018	-25	
	Short-finned pilot whale	0.0000	0.0000	-100	
	Harbor porpoise	0.0135	0.0135	-10	
	Dall's porpoise	0.1193	0.1193	-10	
MYSTICETES	N Pacific right whale	0.0000	0.0000	-10	
	Gray whale	0.0111	0.0111	-25	
	Humpback whale	0.0171	0.0171	-25	
	Minke whale	0.0039	0.0039	-30	
	Sei whale	0.0000	0.0000	-30	
	Fin whale	0.0132	0.0132	-30	
	Blue whale	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
PINNIPEDS	N fur seal (shelf/deep)	0.0011	0.0011	-25/-300	-300
	California sea lion	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
	Steller's sea lion	0.0109	0.0109	-25	
	Pacific walrus	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
	Harbor Seal	0.0177	0.0177	-25	
	N elephant seal	0.0000	0.0000	-25	
FISSIPEDS	S sea otter	NA	NA	NA	NA

Annex 5: Noise Maps

Sound field maps for each modeling region are shown in Figure A5-1 through Figure A5-11 below. At each point, maximum sound levels are calculated over all modeled depths, up to the lesser of 2,000 m or seafloor depth. Raw model output (i.e., without a 3-dB precautionary factor or frequency weighting) is shown in all cases. Note that the geographic scale of the maps may change from figure to figure. In particular, zoomed-in plots such as those in Figure A5-2 were created using one of two scales: the sound fields from the larger arrays (18- and 36-gun arrays) are shown at a scale of 1:200,000, while those from the smaller arrays (GI guns) are shown at a scale of 1:20,000. This is indicated by the scale bar in the bottom right portion of each figure.

In addition, range-depth plots of the modeled sound field are shown in Figure A5-12 through Figure A5-14 for shallow, slope, and deep-water sites in the Caribbean. The Caribbean region represents an extreme case in terms of the associated sound speed profile and is characterized by a mid-water sound speed minimum near 750 m depth (see Section 6.4.2.2). The cross-sections in these figures were created by running the sound propagation model at a higher resolution along selected radials, typically in directions where the top-down views in Figure A5-1 and Figure A5-3 indicate that the sound field is most intense.



Figure A5-1. Predicted SELs for S California Modeling Sites
Note: Source is a pair of 45/105 in^3 GI guns, at a depth of 2.5 m. See also Figure A5-2 below.



Figure A5-2. Predicted SELs for S California Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-1. Predicted SELs for S California Modeling Sites)
Note: Source is a pair of 45/105 in^3 GI guns, at a depth of 2.5 m.



Figure A5-3. Predicted SELs for Caribbean Modeling Sites
Note: Source is a 36-gun array (6,600 in^3), at a depth of 12 m. See also Figure A5-4 below.



Figure A5-4. Predicted SELs for Caribbean modeling sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-3)
Note: Source is a 36-gun array (6,600 in^3) at a depth of 12 m.



Figure A5-5. Predicted SELs for Galapagos Ridge Modeling Sites

Notes: Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3), at a depth of 6 m. Only the results obtained for an array heading of 0° (northward-pointing) are shown. See also Figure A5-6 below.



Figure A5-6. Predicted SELs for Galapagos Ridge Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-5)
Note: Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in3) at a depth of 6 m.



Figure A5-7. Predicted SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites 1 and 3

Notes: In order to avoid overlap, the sound field for site 2 is shown separately in Figure A5-8 below. Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3) at a depth of 6 m. See also Figure A5-9 for zoomed-in views.



Figure A5-8. Predicted SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Site 2

Notes: In order to avoid overlap, the sound fields for sites 1 and 3 are shown separately in Figure A5-7 above. Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3) at a depth of 6 m. See Figure A5-9 for zoomed-in views.



Figure A5-9. Predicted SELs for W Gulf of Alaska Modeling Sites (zoomed-in from Figure A5-7 and Figure A5-8

Note: Source is an 18-gun array (3,300 in^3) at a depth of 6 m.



Figure A5-10. Predicted SELs for NW Atlantic Modeling Sites
Notes: Source is a pair of 45/105 in^3 GI guns at a depth of 2.5 m. See also Figure A5-11 below.



Figure A5-11. Predicted SELs for NW Atlantic Modeling Sites (zoomed in from Figure A5-10)
Note: Source is a pair of 45/105 in^3 guns at a depth of 2.5 m.



Figure A5-12. Predicted SELs for Caribbean site #1 (shallow water), for Transects in the Aft Endfire (middle panel) and Starboard Broadside (right panel) Directions

Notes: Source is a 36-gun array (6,600 in^3) at a depth of 12 m. The sound speed profile (downloaded from the GDEM database) is shown in the left panel. The bottom is outlined and shown in dark blue.



Figure A5-13. Predicted SELs for Caribbean Site #2 (deep water), for Transects in the Aft Endfire (middle panel) and Port Broadside (right panel) Directions

Notes: Source is a 36-gun array (6,600 in^3), at a depth of 12 m. The sound speed profile (downloaded from the GDEM database) is shown in the left panel. The bottom is outlined and shown in dark blue.



Figure A5-14. Predicted SELs for Caribbean Site #3 (slope), for Transects in the Forward Endfire (2nd panel), Aft Endfire (3rd panel), and Starboard Broadside (4th panel) Directions

Notes: Source is a 36-gun array (6,600 in^3), at a depth of 12 m. The sound speed profile (downloaded from the GDEM database) is shown in the 1st panel. The bottom is outlined and shown in dark blue.

Annex 6: Predicted Ranges to Various RLs

Estimated safety radii are shown in the following tables for each of the DAAs. For each sound level threshold, two different statistical estimates of the safety radii are provided: the 95% radius and the maximum endfire radius (see also Section 8.1). Given a regularly gridded spatial distribution of modeled RLs, the 95% radius is defined as the radius of a circle that encompasses 95% of the grid points whose value is equal to or greater than the threshold value. The maximum endfire radius is the radius of a 60 degree angular sector, centered on the along-track axis of the array, that encompasses all grid points whose value is equal to or greater than the threshold value. The "95% Range" and "Endfire Range" columns in the following tables consider RLs at depths down to 2,000 m below the surface (deep sites) or, for other sites, to the deepest modeled depth. The radial resolution of the model runs is 10 m. Where appropriate (bottom depth less than 1,000 m), radii are shown for both the raw model output and for the "corrected" sound field (in parentheses).

Table A6-1. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the S California Sites

Southern California: Two 45/105in3 GI guns, source depth 2.5 m.													
				Unweighted		*LF Cetaceans*		*MF Cetaceans*		*HF Cetaceans*		*Pinnipeds*	
Site	*Water depth (m)*	*SEL (dB)*	*rms SPL (dB)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*
1	100-1,000	170	180	32 (45)	40 (60)	32 (50)	40 (60)	20 (30)	20 (30)	20 (30)	20 (30)	30 (40)	30 (50)
		180	190	10 (20)	10 (20)	10 (20)	10 (20)	<10 (10)	<10 (10)	<10 (10)	<10 (10)	10 (10)	10 (10)
2	100-1,000	170	180	32 (50)	36 (64)	32 (50)	36 (64)	14 (28)	14 (28)	14 (22)	14 (22)	28 (36)	28 (42)
		180	190	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (14)	<10 (14)

Notes: SELs are in dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, maximized over all modeled depths. Radii calculated from sound levels to which a 3-dB precautionary factor have been added are shown in parentheses for shelf and slope sites.

Table A6-2. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the Caribbean Sites

Caribbean: Full 2-D refraction array, 36 guns (6,600 in^3), source depth 12 m.													
				Unweighted		*LF Cetaceans*		*MF Cetaceans*		*HF Cetaceans*		*Pinnipeds*	
Site	*Water depth (m)*	*SEL (dB)*	*rms SPL (dB)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*
1	<100	170	180	779 (1,142)	949 (1,379)	739 (1,120)	891 (1,338)	425 (533)	208 (366)	344 (447)	122 (258)	505 (815)	416 (524)
		180	190	248 (348)	294 (380)	227 (340)	275 (366)	81 (117)	36 (50)	58 (81)	14 (36)	114 (262)	86 (150)
2	>1,000	170	180	696	806	632	741	232	133	182	112	326	245
		180	190	218	252	199	226	71	20	61	10	102	71
3	100-1,000	170	180	410 (524)	444 (517)	396 (508)	424 (495)	235 (342)	133 (206)	190 (257)	114 (165)	338 (446)	247 (332)
		180	190	191 (238)	221 (272)	181 (228)	209 (260)	73 (104)	41 (51)	51 (82)	10 (41)	112 (149)	73 (114)
4	>1,000	170	180	694	802	632	738	234	131	180	95	326	244
		180	190	214	247	197	229	72	36	58	23	102	72

Notes: SELs are in dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, maximized over all modeled depths. Radii calculated from sound levels to which a 3-dB precautionary factor have been added are shown in parentheses for shelf and slope sites.

Table A6-3. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the Galapagos Ridge Sites

Galapagos Ridge: 2-D reflection array, 18 guns (3,300 in^3), source depth 6 m.													
				Unweighted		*LF Cetaceans*		*MF Cetaceans*		*HF Cetaceans*		*Pinnipeds*	
Site	*Water depth (m)*	*SEL (dB)*	*rms SPL (dB)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*	*95th percentile (m)*	*Endfire max. (m)*
1-0°	>1,000	170	180	360	322	345	290	180	70	140	60	260	110
		180	190	110	100	110	91	60	20	50	10	81	30
1-90°	>1,000	170	180	357	323	345	290	180	70	140	60	260	110
		180	190	110	95	110	90	60	20	50	10	81	30

Notes: SELs are in dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, maximized over all modeled depths. Radii calculated from sound levels to which a 3-dB precautionary factor have been added are shown in parentheses for shelf and slope sites.

Table A6-4. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the W Gulf of Alaska Sites

West Gulf of Alaska: 2-D reflection array, 18 guns (3,300 in^3), source depth 6 m.

Site	Water depth (m)	SEL (dB)	rms SPL (dB)	Unweighted 95th percentile (m)	Unweighted Endfire max. (m)	LF Cetaceans 95th percentile (m)	LF Cetaceans Endfire max. (m)	MF Cetaceans 95th percentile (m)	MF Cetaceans Endfire max. (m)	HF Cetaceans 95th percentile (m)	HF Cetaceans Endfire max. (m)	Pinnipeds 95th percentile (m)	Pinnipeds Endfire max. (m)
1	<100	170	180	788 (1,012)	301 (418)	773 (1,012)	288 (383)	357 (478)	95 (202)	225 (398)	54 (149)	459 (885)	202 (256)
		180	190	165 (206)	98 (143)	166 (209)	89 (130)	63 (139)	14 (32)	45 (63)	10 (22)	139 (196)	32 (63)
2	100-1,000	170	180	383 (595)	320 (490)	364 (541)	288 (433)	180 (262)	67 (98)	143 (202)	54 (85)	266 (390)	117 (166)
		180	190	108 (155)	89 (126)	104 (152)	82 (117)	54 (76)	14 (32)	45 (63)	10 (22)	76 (114)	32 (45)
3	>1,000	170	180	347	288	342	269	177	67	139	54	264	117
		180	190	104	86	103	82	54	14	45	10	76	32

Notes: SELs are in dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, maximized over all modeled depths. Radii calculated from sound levels to which a 3-dB precautionary factor have been added are shown in parentheses for shelf and slope sites.

Table A6-5. Predicted Maximum Marine Mammal Exposure Criteria Radii at the NW Atlantic Sites

NW Atlantic: Two 45/105 in^3 GI guns, source depth 2.5 m

Site	Water depth (m)	SEL (dB)	rms SPL (dB)	Unweighted 95th percentile (m)	Unweighted Endfire max. (m)	LF Cetaceans 95th percentile (m)	LF Cetaceans Endfire max. (m)	MF Cetaceans 95th percentile (m)	MF Cetaceans Endfire max. (m)	HF Cetaceans 95th percentile (m)	HF Cetaceans Endfire max. (m)	Pinnipeds 95th percentile (m)	Pinnipeds Endfire max. (m)
1	<100	170	180	36 (50)	42 (64)	36 (57)	42 (64)	20 (28)	14 (28)	14 (22)	14 (28)	28 (36)	28 (42)
		180	190	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (14)	<10 (14)
2	100-1,000	170	180	36 (50)	42 (57)	32 (50)	36 (57)	14 (28)	14 (28)	14 (22)	14 (28)	28 (36)	28 (42)
		180	190	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (14)	<10 (14)
3	>1,000	170	180	32	36	32	36	14	14	14	14	28	28
		180	190	14	14	14	14	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10	<10
4	100-1,000	170	180	32 (50)	36 (57)	32 (50)	36 (57)	14 (28)	14 (28)	14 (22)	14 (22)	28 (36)	28 (42)
		180	190	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	14 (14)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (<10)	<10 (14)	<10 (14)

Notes: SELs are in dB re $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, maximized over all modeled depths. Radii calculated from sound levels to which a 3-dB precautionary factor have been added are shown in parentheses for shelf and slope sites.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

APPENDIX C:

COMMON AND SCIENTIFIC NAMES OF FAUNAL SPECIES DISCUSSED IN THE TEXT

Appendix C
Common and Scientific Names of Faunal Species Discussed in the Text

Common Name	*Scientific Name*
INVERTEBRATES	
American lobster	*Homarus americanus*
Australian spiny lobster	*Panulirus cygnus*
Balanoid barnacle	*Balanus amphirite*
Blue crab	*Callinectes sapidus*
Blue mussel	*Mytilus edulis*
Blue swimming crab	*Portunus pelagicus*
Brown shrimp	*Crangon crangon*
California market squid	*Loligo opalescens*
Caribbean spiny lobster	*Panulirus argus*
Chilean nylon shrimp	*Heterocarpus reedi*
Coonstripe shrimp	*Pandalus hypsinotus*
Cuttlefish	*Sepia officinalis*
Dana's swimming crab	*Callinectes danae*
Deep-sea lobster	*Panulirus waguersis*
Dungeness crab	*Cancer magister*
European lobster	*Homarus gammarus*
Golden king crab	*Lithodes aequispinus*
Grooved tanner crab	*Chionoecetes tanneri*
Jumbo flying squid	*Dosidicus gigas*
King crab	*Paralithodes camtschaticus*
Longfin squid	*Loligo pealei*
N giant Pacific octopus	*Octopus dofleini*
Northern shortfin squid	*Illex illecebrosus*
Northern shrimp	*Pandalus borealis*
Norway lobster	*Nephrops norvegicus*
Pink shrimp	*Farfantepenaeus duorarum*
Red deepsea crab	*Geryon quinquedins*
Red king crab	*Paralithodes camtschaticus*
Rock lobster	*Jasus edwardsii*
Scarlet king crab	*Lithodes couesi*
Snapping shrimp	*Synalpheus parneomeris*
Snow crab	*Chionoecetes opilio*
Softshell red crab	*Paralomis granulosa*
Southern calamari squid	*Sepioteuthis australis*
Spot shrimp	*Pandalus platyceros*
Tanner crab	*Chionoecetes bairdi*
Toad crab	*Hyas coarctatus alutaceus*
Triangle tanner crab	*Chionoecetes angulatus*
Wellington flying squid	*Nototodarus sloanii*
White abalone	*Haliotis sorenseni*
Zebra mussels	*Dreissena* spp.
FISH	
Albacore	*Thunnus alalunga*
Angular angel shark	*Squatina guggenheim*
Arctic char	*Salvelinus alpinus alpinus*
Arctic cisco	*Coregonus autumnalis*
Arctic cod	*Boreogadus saida*
Arctic grayling	*Thymallus arcticus articus*
Atlantic cod	*Gadus morhua*
Atlantic halibut	*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*
Atlantic herring	*Clupea harengus*
Atlantic mackerel	*Scomber scombrus*
Atlantic salmon	*Salmo salar*
Atlantic seabob	*Xiphopenaeus kroyeri*
Atlantic wolffish	*Anarhichas lupus*
Australian ruff	*Arripis georgianus*
Baltic sturgeon	*Acipenser sturio*
Banded eagle ray	*Aetomylaeus nichofii*
Barndoor skate	*Dipterus laevis*
Basking shark	*Cetorohinus maximus*

Common Name	*Scientific Name*
Bay anchovy	*Anchoa mitchilli*
Big-belly seahorse	*Hippocampus abdominalis*
Bigeye scad	*Selar crumenophthalmus*
Bigeye tuna	*Thunnus obesus*
Black sea bass	*Centropristis striata*
Blue grenadier	*Macruronus novaezelanier*
Blue runner	*Caranx crysos*
Blue whiting	*Micromesistius poutassou*
Bluefish	*Pomatomus saltatrix*
Bocaccio rockfish	*Sebastes paucispinus*
Bombay duck	*Harpadon nehereus*
Brazilian blind electric ray	*Benthobatis kreffti*
Brazilian crownose ray	*Rhinoptera brasiliensis*
Brazilian guitarfish	*Rhinobatos horkelii*
Brazilian sardinella	*Sardinella brasiliensis*
Broad whitefish	*Coregonus nasus*
Brown stingray	*Dasyatis fluviorum*
Brownstriped grunt	*Anisotremus moricandi*
Bull trout	*Salvelinus confluentus*
Burbot	*Lota lota*
California halibut	*Paralichthys californicus*
Capelin	*Mallotus villosus*
Chinook salmon	*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*
Chum salmon	*Oncorhynchus keta*
Coelacanth	*Latimeria chalumnae*
Coho salmon	*Oncorhynchus kisutch*
Common seahorse	*Hippocampus kuda*
Common shovelnose ray	*Rhinobatos typus*
Common skate	*Dipturus batis*
Crucian carp	*Carassius carassius*
Cubera snapper	*Lutjanus cyanopterus*
Deepwater spiny dogfish	*Centrophorus squamosus*
Dolly varden char	*Salvelinus malma*
Dumb shark	*Centrophorus harrissoni*
Dusky grouper	*Epinephelus marginatus*
Dwarf sawfish	*Pristis clavata*
Eastern angel shark	*Squatina sp. Nov. A*
European plaice	*Pleuronectes platessa*
Flat-faced seahorse	*Hippocampus trimaculatus*
Fluke	*Paralichthys lethostigma*
Fossil shark	*Hemipristis elongates*
Freshwater sawfish	*Pristis microdon*
Gag grouper	*Mycteroperca microlepis*
Giant grouper	*Epinephelus lanceoltus*
Giant sea bass	*Stereolepis gigas*
Goliath grouper	*Epinephelus itajara*
Goldstripe sardinella	*Sardinella gibbosa*
Great white shark	*Carcharodon carcharias*
Green sawfish	*Pristis zijsron*
Green sturgeon	*Acipenser medirostris*
Greenland halibut	*Reinhardtius hippoglossoides*
Gulf grouper	*Mycteroperca jordani*
Gulper shark	*Centrophorus granulosus*
Haddock	*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*
Hardwicke's pipefish	*Solegnathus hardwickii*
Hedgehog seahorse	*Hippocampus spinosissimus*
Hogfish	*Lachnolaimus maximus*
Humpback whitefish	*Coregonus clupeaformis*
Humphead wrasse	*Cheilinus undulates*
Inca scad	*Trachurus murphyi*
Indian mackerel	*Rastrelliger kanagurta*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Indian oil sardine	*Sardinella longiceps*
Kelp bass	*Paralabrax clathratus*
Knifetooth sawfish	*Anoxypristis cuspidate*
Lake chub	*Couesius plumbeus*
Lake sturgeon	*Acipenser fulvescens*
Lake trout	*Salvelinus namaycush*
Largetooth sawfish	*Pristis perotteti*
Least cisco	*Coregonus sardinella*
Leopard grouper	*Mycteroperca rosacea*
Leopard shark	*Stegostoma fasciatum*
Lesser sand eel	*Ammodytes marinus*
Lined seahorse	*Hippocampus erectus*
Lizard catshark	*Schroederichthys saurisqualus*
Mackerel	*Scomber scombrus*
Marbled grouper	*Dermatolepsis inermis*
Masked hamlet	*Hypoplectrus providencianus*
Menhaden	*Brevoortia tyrannus*
Monkfish	*Lophius americanus*
Monterrey spanish mackerel	*Scomberomorus concolor*
Mud skate	*Rhina ancylostoma*
Mutton snapper	*Lutjanus analis*
Nassau grouper	*Epinephelus striatus*
New caledonia catshark	*Aulohalaelurus kanaorum*
None	*Protemblemaria punctata*
None	*Anthias regalis*
None	*Anthias salmopunctatus*
None	*Chaetodon obliquus*
None	*Stegastes sanctipauli*
Northern pike	*Esox lucius*
Ocean perch	*Sebastes fasciatus*
Onefin skate	*Gurgesiella dorsalifera*
Pacific halibut	*Hippoglossus stenolepis*
Pacific seahorse	*Hippocampus ingens*
Pale dottyback	*Pseudochromis pesi*
Pink salmon	*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha*
Pink snapper	*Pagrus auratus*
Pollock	*Pollachius virens*
Pollock	*Pollachius pollachius*
Pondicherry shark	*Carcharinus hemiodon*
Porcupine ray	*Urogymnus asperrimus*
Rainbow parrotfish	*Scarus guacamaia*
Rainbow smelt	*Osmerus mordax dentex*
Red porgy	*Pagrus pagrus*
Redfish	*Sebastes fasciatus*
Rockfish	*Sebastes* spp.
Round sardinella	*Sardinella aurita*
Round whitefish	*Prosopium cylindraceum*
Sablefish	*Anoplopoma fimbria*
Sailfin grouper	*Mycteroperca olfax*
Saithe	*Pollachius virens*
Sand tiger shark	*Carcharias taurus*
Sawtail grouper	*Mycteroperca prionura*
Scaled sardine	*Harengula aguana*
School shark	*Galeorhinus galeus*
Sea bass	*Dicentrarchus labrax*
Sharptooth lemon shark	*Negaprion acutidens*
Shortnose sturgeon	*Acipenser brevirostrum*
Shortspine thornyhead	*Sebastolobus alascanus*
Shorttail nurse shark	*Pseudoginglymostoma brevicaudatum*
Silky shark	*Carcharhinus falciformis*
Silver hake	*Merluccius bilinearis*
Skipjack tuna	*Katsuwonus pelamis*
Smalltooth sawfish	*Pristis pectinata*
Smoothback angel shark	*Squatina occulta*

Common Name	Scientific Name
Smoothnose wedgefish	*Rynchobatus laevis*
Smoothtooth blacktip	*Carcharinus leiodon*
Snowy grouper	*Epinephelus niveatus*
Sockeye salmon	*Oncorhynchus nerka*
Southern bluefin tuna	*Thunnus maccoyii*
Southern sawtail catshark	*Galeus mincaronei*
Spanish sardine	*Sardinella aurita*
Speckled hind	*Epinephelus drummondhayi*
Spiny dogfish	*Squalus acanthias*
Spotback skate	*Atlanoraja castelnaui*
Squirefish	*Chrysophrys auratus*
Steelhead	*Oncorhynchus mykiss*
Striped bass	*Morone saxatilis*
Striped dogfish	*Mustelus fasciatus*
Swordfish	*Xiphias gladius*
Tawny nurse shark	*Nebrius ferrugineus*
Tayrona blenny	*Coralliozetus tayrona*
Threadfin breams	*Nemipterus sp.*
Tiger tail seahorse	*Hippocampus comes*
Tomco	*Microgadus proximus*
Torpedo scad	*Megalaspis cordyla*
Venezuelan grouper	*Mycteroperca cidi*
Warsaw grouper	*Epinephelus nigritus*
Weakfish	*Cynoscion regalis*
Whale shark	*Rhincodon typus*
White-edged rockcod	*Epinephelus albomarginatus*
White sea bass	*Atractoscion nobilis*
White-spot giant guitarfish	*Rhynchobatus djiddensis*
White-spotted guitarfish	*Rhynchobatus australiae*
Wreckfish	*Polyprion americanus*
Yellow-crowned butterflyfish	*Chaetodon flavocoronatus*
Yellowfin tuna	*Thunnus albacares*
Yellowtail flounder	*Limanda ferruginea*
REPTILES	
Estuarine crocodile	*Crocodilus porosus*
Flatback sea turtle	*Natator depressus*
Green sea turtle	*Chelonia mydas*
Hawksbill sea turtle	*Eretmochelys imbricata*
Kemp's ridley sea turtle	*Lepidochelys kempii*
Leatherback sea turtle	*Dermochelys coriacea*
Loggerhead sea turtle	*Caretta caretta*
Marine iguana	*Amblyrinchus chrystatus*
Olive ridley sea turtle	*Lepidochelys olivacea*
SEABIRDS	
Black-legged kittiwake	*Rissa tridactyla*
Brown pelican	*Pelecanus occidentalis*
Common murre	*Uria aalge*
Long-tailed duck	*Clangula hyemalis*
Marbled murrelet	*Brachyramphus marmoratus*
Northern fulmar	*Fulmarus glacialis*
Rhinoceros auklet	*Cerorhinca monocerata*
Roseate tern	*Sterna dougallii*
Short-tailed albatross	*Phoebastria albatrus*
Spectacled eider	*Somateria fischeri*
Steller's eider	*Polysticta stelleri*
Thick-billed murre	*Uria lomvia*
MAMMALS	
Alaskan sea otter	*Enhydra lutris lutris*
Amazonian manatee	*Trichecus inunguis*
Andrew's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon bowdoini*
Antarctic fur seal	*Arctocephalus gazella*
Antarctic minke whale	*Balaenoptera bonaerensis*
Antillean manatee	*Trichechus manatus manatus*
Arabian common dolphin	*Delphinus tropicalis*
Arnoux's beaked whale	*Berardius arnuxii*

Common Name	*Scientific Name*
Atlantic spotted dolphin	*Stenella frontalis*
Atlantic walrus	*Odobenus rosmarus rosmarus*
Atlantic white-sided dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus acutus*
Australian sea lion	*Neophoca cinerea*
Australian snubfin dolphin	*Orcaella heinsohni*
Baird's beaked whale	*Berardius bairdii*
Bearded seal	*Erignathus barbatus*
Beluga	*Delphinapterus leucas*
Blainville's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon densirostris*
Blue whale	*Balaenoptera musculus*
Bottlenose dolphin	*Tursiops truncatus*
Bowhead whale	*Balaena mysticetus*
Bryde's whale	*Balaenoptera brydei*
Burmeister's porpoise	*Phocoena spinipinnis*
California sea lion	*Zalophus californianus*
Caribbean monk seal	*Monachus tropicalis*
Clymene dolphin	*Stenella clymene*
Crabeater seal	*Lobodon carcinophaga*
Cuvier's beaked whale	*Ziphius cavirostris*
Dall's porpoise	*Phocoenoides dalli*
Dugong	*Dugong dugon*
Dusky dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*
Dwarf minke whale	*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*
Dwarf sperm whale	*Kogia sima*
Eden's whale	*Balaenoptera edeni*
False killer whale	*Pseudorca crassidens*
Fin whale	*Balaenoptera physalus*
Finless porpoise	*Neophocaena phocaenoides*
Florida manatee	*Trichechus manatus latirostris*
Fraser's dolphin	*Lagenodelphis hosei*
Gervais' beaked whale	*Mesoplodon europaeus*
Gingko-toothed beaked whale	*Mesoplodon gingkodens*
Gray seal	*Halichoerus grypus*
Gray's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon grayi*
Guadalupe fur seal	*Arctocephalus townsendi*
Harbor porpoise	*Phocoena phocoena*
Harbor seal	*Phoca vitulina*
Harp seal	*Pagophilus groenlandicus*
Hawaiian monk seal	*Monachus schauinslandi*
Hector's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon hectori*
Hooded seal	*Cystophora cristata*
Hourglass dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus cruciger*
Hubb's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon carlhubbsi*
Humpback whale	*Megaptera novaeangliae*
Indo-Pacific bottlenose dolphin	*Tursiops aduncus*
Indo-Pacific humpback dolphin	*Sousa chinensis*
Irrawaddy dolphin	*Orcaella brevirostris*
Killer whale	*Orcinus orca*
Leopard seal	*Hydrurga leptonyx*
Long-beaked common dolphin	*Delphinus capensis*
Long-finned pilot whale	*Globicephala melas*
Longman's beaked whale	*Indopacetus pacificus*
Melon-headed whale	*Peponocephala electra*
Minke whale	*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*

Common Name	*Scientific Name*
Northern Atlantic right whale	*Eubalaena glacialis*
Northern Pacific right whale	*Eubalaena japonica*
Narwhal	*Monodon monoceros*
Northern bottlenose whale	*Hyperoodon ampullatus*
Northern elephant seal	*Mirounga angustirostris*
Northern fur seal	*Callorhinus ursinus*
Northern right whale dolphin	*Lissodelphis borealis*
Northern sea otter	*Enhydra lutris kenyoni*
Pacific gray whale	*Eschrichtius robustus*
Pacific walrus	*Odobenus rosmarus divirgens*
Pacific white-sided dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus obliquidens*
Pantropical spotted dolphin	*Stenella attenuata*
Peale's dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus australis*
Perrin's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon perrini*
Polar bear	*Ursus maritimus*
Pygmy sperm whale	*Kogia breviceps*
Pygmy beaked whale	*Mesoplodon peruvianus*
Pygmy killer whale	*Feresa attenuata*
Pygmy right whale	*Caperea marginata*
Ribbon seal	*Histriophoca fasciata*
Ringed seal	*Pusa hispida*
Risso's dolphin	*Grampus griseus*
Rough-toothed dolphin	*Steno bredanensis*
Saimaa seal	*Phoca hispida saimensis*
Sei whale	*Balaenoptera borealis*
Shepherd's beaked whale	*Tasmacetus shepherdi*
Short-beaked common dolphin	*Delphinus delphis*
Short-finned pilot whale	*Globicephala macrorhynchus*
Southern bottlenose whale	*Hyperoodon planifrons*
Southern elephant seal	*Mirounga leonina*
Southern right whale	*Eubalaena australis*
Southern right whale dolphin	*Lissodelphis peronii*
Southern sea otter	*Enhydra lutris nereis*
Sowerby's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon bidens*
Spade-toothed whale	*Mesoplodon traversii*
Spectacled porpoise	*Phocoena dioptrica*
Sperm whale	*Physeter macrocephalus*
Spinner dolphin	*Stenella longirostris*
Spotted seal	*Phoca largha*
Stejneger's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon stejnegeri*
Steller's sea lion	*Eumetopias jubatus*
Strap-toothed whale	*Mesoplodon layardii*
Striped dolphin	*Stenella coeruleoalba*
Subantarctic fur seal	*Arctocephalus tropicalis*
Tropical bottlenose whale	*Hyperoodon* sp.
True's beaked whale	*Mesoplodon mirius*
Tucuxi dolphin	*Sotalia fluviatilis*
West Indian manatee	*Trichecus manatus*
West African manatee	*Trichechus senegalensis*
White-beaked dolphin	*Lagenorhynchus albirostris*

Sources: Lutz and Musick 1997; Rice 1998; Nelson et al. 2004; FishBase 2006; Peterson 2006.

[This page intentionally left blank.]

APPENDIX D:

REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON MARINE INVERTEBRATES AND FISH

APPENDIX D: REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON MARINE INVERTEBRATES[(1)] AND FISH[(2)]

This appendix provides a detailed summary of the limited data and literature available on the observed effects (or lack of effects) of exposure to airgun sound on marine invertebrates and fish. Specific conditions and results of the studies including SELs and sound thresholds of responses are discussed when available. However, it is sometimes difficult to interpret studies on the effects of underwater sound on marine animals because authors often do not provide enough information, including received sound levels, source sound levels, and specific characteristics of the sound. Specific characteristics of the sound include units and references, whether the sound is continuous or impulsive, and its frequency range. Underwater sound pressure levels are typically reported as a number of dB referenced to a reference level, usually 1 micro-Pascal (µPa). However, the sound pressure dB number can represent multiple types of measurements, including "zero to peak", "peak to peak", or averaged ("rms"). SELs may also be reported as dB. The SEL is the integration of all the acoustic energy contained within a single sound event. Unless precise measurement types are reported, it can be impossible to directly compare results from two or more independent studies.

Sound caused by underwater seismic survey equipment results in energy pulses with very high peak pressures (Richardson et al. 1995). This was especially true when chemical explosives were used for underwater surveys. Virtually all underwater seismic surveying conducted today uses airguns which typically have lower peak pressures and longer rise times than chemical explosives. However, sound levels from underwater airgun discharges might still be high enough to potentially injure or kill animals located close to the source. Also, there is a potential for disturbance of normal behavior upon exposure to airgun sound.

The following sections provide an overview of sound production and detection in marine invertebrates and fish, and information on the effects of exposure to sound on marine invertebrates and fish, with an emphasis on seismic survey sound. DFOC has published two internal documents that provide a literature review of the effects of seismic and other underwater sound on invertebrates (Moriyasu et al. 2004; Payne et al. 2008). The potential effect of seismic sounds on fish has been studied with a variety of taxa, including marine, freshwater, and anadromous species (reviewed by Fay and Popper 2000; Ladich and Popper 2004; Hastings and Popper 2005; Popper and Hastings 2009a, b). The available information as reviewed in those documents and here includes results of studies of varying degrees of scientific rigor as well as anecdotal information.

D.1 MARINE INVERTEBRATES

D.1.1 Acoustic Capabilities

Much of the available information on acoustic abilities of marine invertebrates pertains to crustaceans, specifically lobsters, crabs and shrimps. Other acoustic-related studies have been conducted on cephalopods. Many invertebrates are capable of producing sound, including barnacles, amphipods, shrimp, crabs, and lobsters (Au and Banks 1998; Tolstoganova 2002). Invertebrates typically produce sound by scraping or rubbing various parts of their bodies, although they also produce sound in other

(1)By John R. Christian, LGL Ltd., environmental research associates (rev. Dec. 2009).
(2)By John R. Christian and R.C. Bocking, LGL Ltd., environmental research associates (rev. Feb. 2010).

ways. Sounds made by marine invertebrates may be associated with territorial behavior, mating, courtship, and aggression. On the other hand, some of these sounds may be incidental and not have any biological relevance. Sounds known to be produced by marine invertebrates have frequencies ranging from 87 Hz to 200 kHz, depending on the species.

Both male and female American lobsters (*Homarus americanus*) produce a buzzing vibration with the carapace when grasped (Pye and Watson 2004; Henninger and Watson 2005). Larger lobsters vibrate more consistently than smaller lobsters, suggesting that sound production may be involved with mating behavior. Sound production by other species of lobsters has also been studied. Among deep-sea lobsters, sound level was more variable at night than during the day, with the highest levels occurring at the lowest frequencies.

While feeding, king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*) produce impulsive sounds that appear to stimulate movement by other crabs, including approach behavior (Tolstoganova 2002). King crab also appeared to produce 'discomfort' sounds when environmental conditions were manipulated. These discomfort sounds differ from the feeding sounds in terms of frequency range and pulse duration.

Snapping shrimp (*Synalpheus parneomeris*) are among the major sources of biological sound in temperate and tropical shallow-water areas (Au and Banks 1998). By rapidly closing one of its frontal chelae (claws), a snapping shrimp generates a forward jet of water and the cavitation of fast moving water produces a sound. Both the sound and the jet of water may function in feeding and territorial behaviors of alpheidae shrimp. Measured source SPLs for snapping ship were 183–189 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{p-p}$ and extended over a frequency range of 2–200 kHz.

D.1.2 Sound Detection

There is considerable debate about the hearing capabilities of aquatic invertebrates. Whether they are able to hear or not depends on how underwater sound and underwater hearing are defined. In contrast to the situation in fish and marine mammals, no physical structures have been discovered in aquatic invertebrates that are stimulated by the pressure component of sound. However, vibrations (i.e., mechanical disturbances of the water) are also characteristic of sound waves. Rather than being pressure-sensitive, aquatic invertebrates appear to be most sensitive to the vibrational component of sound (Breithaupt 2002). Statocyst organs may provide one means of vibration detection for aquatic invertebrates.

More is known about the acoustic detection capabilities in decapod crustaceans than in any other marine invertebrate group, although cephalopod acoustic capabilities are now becoming a focus of study. Crustaceans appear to be most sensitive to sounds of low frequencies (i.e., <1000 Hz) (Budelmann 1992; Popper et al. 2001). A study by Lovell et al. (2005) suggests greater sensitivity of the prawn *Palaemon serratus* to low-frequency sound than previously thought. Lovell et al. (2006) showed that *P. serratus* is capable of detecting a 500 Hz tone regardless of the prawn's body size and the related number and size of statocyst hair cells. Studies of American lobsters suggest that these crustaceans are more sensitive to higher frequency sounds than previously realized (Pye and Watson 2004).

It is possible that statocyst hair cells of cephalopods are directionally sensitive in a way that is similar to the responses of hair cells of the vertebrate vestibular and lateral line systems (Budelmann and Williamson 1994; Budelmann 1996). Kaifu et al. (2008) provided evidence that the cephalopod *Octopus ocellatus* detects particle motion with its statocyst. Studies by Packard et al. (1990), Rawizza (1995) and Komak et al. (2005) have tested the sensitivities of various cephalopods to water-borne vibrations, some of which were generated by low-frequency sound. Using the auditory brainstem response (ABR)

approach, Hu et al. (2009) showed that auditory evoked potentials can be obtained in the frequency ranges 400 to 1500 Hz for the squid *Sepiotheutis lessoniana* and 400 to 1000 Hz for the octopus *Octopus vulgaris*, higher than frequencies previously observed to be detectable by cephalopods.

In summary, only a few studies have been conducted on the sensitivity of certain invertebrate species to underwater sound. Available data suggest that they are capable of detecting vibrations but they do not appear to be capable of detecting pressure fluctuations.

D.1.3 Potential Seismic Effects

In marine invertebrates, potential effects of exposure to sound can be categorized as pathological, physiological, and behavioral. Pathological effects include lethal and sub-lethal injury to the animals, physiological effects include temporary primary and secondary stress responses, and behavioral effects refer to changes in exhibited behaviors (i.e., disturbance). The three categories should not be considered as independent of one another and are likely interrelated in complex ways.

Pathological Effects

In water, acute injury or death of organisms as a result of exposure to sound appears to depend on two features of the sound source: (1) the received peak pressure, and (2) the time required for the pressure to rise and decay. Generally, the higher the received pressure and the less time it takes for the pressure to rise and decay, the greater the chance of acute pathological effects. Considering the peak pressure and rise/decay time characteristics of seismic airgun arrays used today, the associated pathological zone for invertebrates would be expected to be small (i.e., within a few meters of the seismic source, at most). Few studies have assessed the potential for pathological effects on invertebrates from exposure to seismic sound.

The pathological impacts of seismic survey sound on marine invertebrates were investigated in a pilot study on snow crabs (*Chionoecetes opilio*) (Christian et al. 2003, 2004). Under controlled field experimental conditions, captive adult male snow crabs, egg-carrying female snow crabs, and fertilized snow crab eggs were exposed to variable SPLs (191–221 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$) and SELs (<130–187 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$). Neither acute nor chronic (12 weeks post-exposure) mortality was observed for the adult crabs. However, a significant difference in development rate was noted between the exposed and unexposed fertilized eggs/embryos. The egg mass exposed to seismic energy had a higher proportion of less-developed eggs than did the unexposed mass. It should be noted that both egg masses came from a single female and any measure of natural variability was unattainable (Christian et al. 2003, 2004).

In 2003, a collaborative study was conducted in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada, to investigate the effects of exposure to sound from a commercial seismic survey on egg-bearing female snow crabs (DFOC 2004). This study had design problems that impacted interpretation of some of the results (Chadwick 2004). Caged animals were placed on the ocean bottom at a location within the survey area and at a location outside of the survey area. The maximum received SPL was ~195 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. The crabs were exposed for 132 hr of the survey, equivalent to thousands of seismic shots of varying received SPLs. The animals were retrieved and transferred to laboratories for analyses. Neither acute nor chronic lethal or sub-lethal injury to the female crabs or crab embryos was indicated. DFOC (2004) reported that some exposed individuals had short-term soiling of gills, antennules and statocysts, bruising of the hepatopancreas and ovary, and detached outer membranes of oocytes. However, these differences could not be linked conclusively to exposure to seismic survey sound. Boudreau et al. (2009) presented the proceedings of a workshop held to evaluate the results of additional studies conducted to answer some

questions arising from the original study discussed in DFOC (2004). Proceedings of the workshop did not include any more definitive conclusions regarding the original results.

Payne et al. (2007) recently conducted a pilot study of the effects of exposure to airgun sound on various health endpoints of the American lobster. Adult lobsters were exposed either 20 to 200 times to 202 dB re 1μPa_{p-p} or 50 times to 227 dB re 1μPa_{p-p}, and then monitored for changes in survival, food consumption, turnover rate, serum protein level, serum enzyme levels, and serum calcium level. Observations extended over a period of a few days to several months. Results showed no delayed mortality or damage to the mechanosensory systems associated with animal equilibrium and posture (as assessed by turnover rate).

In a field study, Pearson et al. (1994) exposed Stage II larvae of the Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*) to single discharges from a seven-airgun array and compared their mortality and development rates with those of unexposed larvae. No statistically significant differences were found in immediate survival, long-term survival, or time to molt between the exposed and unexposed larvae, even those exposed within 1 m of the seismic source.

In 2001 and 2003, there were two incidents of multiple strandings of the giant squid (*Architeuthis dux*) on the north coast of Spain, and there was speculation that the strandings were caused by exposure to geophysical seismic survey sounds occurring at about the same time in the Bay of Biscay (Guerra et al. 2004). A total of nine giant squid, either stranded or moribund and floating at the surface, were collected at these times. However, Guerra et al. (2004) did not present any evidence that conclusively links the giant squid strandings and floaters to seismic activity in the area. Based on necropsies of seven (six females and one male) specimens, there was evidence of acute tissue damage. The authors speculated that one female with extensive tissue damage was affected by the impact of acoustic waves. However, little is known about the impact of strong airgun signals on cephalopods and the authors did not describe the seismic sources, locations, and durations of the Bay of Biscay surveys. In addition, there were no controls, the observations were circumstantial, and the examined animals had been dead long enough for commencement of tissue degradation.

McCauley et al. (2000a, b) exposed caged cephalopods to noise from a single 20-in^3 airgun with maximum SPLs of >200 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p}. Statocysts were removed and preserved, but at the time of publication, results of the statocyst analyses were not available. No squid or cuttlefish mortalities were reported as a result of these exposures.

Physiological Effects

Biochemical responses by marine invertebrates to acoustic exposure have also been studied to a limited degree. Such studies of stress responses could possibly provide some indication of the physiological consequences of acoustic exposure and perhaps any subsequent chronic detrimental effects. Stress responses could potentially affect animal populations by reducing reproductive capacity and adult abundance.

Stress indicators in the haemolymph of adult male snow crabs were monitored immediately after exposure of the animals to seismic survey sound (Christian et al. 2003, 2004) and at various intervals after exposure. No significant acute or chronic differences were found between exposed and unexposed animals in which various stress indicators (e.g., proteins, enzymes, cell type count) were measured.

Payne et al. (2007), in their study of the effects of exposure of adult American lobsters to airgun sound, noted decreases in the levels of serum protein, particular serum enzymes and serum calcium, in the haemolymph of animals exposed to the sound pulses. Statistically significant differences (P=0.05) were noted in serum protein at 12 days post-exposure, serum enzymes at 5 days post-exposure, and serum

calcium at 12 days post-exposure. During the histological analysis conducted 4 months post-exposure, Payne et al. (2007) noted more deposits of PAS-stained material, likely glycogen, in the hepatopancreas of some of the exposed lobsters. Accumulation of glycogen could be due to stress or disturbance of cellular processes.

Price (2007) found that blue mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) responded to a 10 kHz pure tone continuous signal by decreasing respiration. Smaller mussels did not appear to react until exposed for 30 min whereas larger mussels responded after 10 min of exposure. The oxygen uptake rate tended to be reduced to a greater degree in the larger mussels than in the smaller animals.

In general, the limited studies done to date on the effects of acoustic exposure on marine invertebrates have not demonstrated any serious pathological and physiological effects.

Behavioral Effects

Christian et al. (2003) investigated the behavioral effects of exposure to airgun sound on snow crabs. Eight animals were equipped with ultrasonic tags, released, and monitored for multiple days prior to exposure and after exposure. Received SPL and SEL were ~191 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$ and <130 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, respectively. The crabs were exposed to 200 discharges over a 33-min period. None of the tagged animals left the immediate area after exposure to the seismic survey sound. Five animals were captured in the snow crab commercial fishery the following year, one at the release location, one 35 km from the release location, and three at intermediate distances from the release location.

Another study approach used by Christian et al. (2003) involved monitoring snow crabs with a remote video camera during their exposure to airgun sound. The caged animals were placed on the ocean bottom at a depth of 50 m. Received SPL and SEL were ~202 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$ and 150 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, respectively. The crabs were exposed to 200 discharges over a 33-min period. They did not exhibit any overt startle response during the exposure period.

Christian et al. (2003) also investigated the pre- and post-exposure catchability of snow crabs during a commercial fishery. Received SPLs and SELs were not measured directly and likely ranged widely considering the area fished. Maximum SPL and SEL were likely similar to those measured during the telemetry study. There were seven pre-exposure and six post-exposure trap sets. Unfortunately, there was considerable variability in set duration because of poor weather. Results indicated that the catch-per-unit-effort did not decrease after the crabs were exposed to seismic survey sound.

Parry and Gason (2006) statistically analyzed data related to rock lobster (*Jasus edwardsii*) commercial catches and seismic surveying in Australian waters from 1978 to 2004. They did not find any evidence that lobster catch rates were affected by seismic surveys.

Caged female snow crabs exposed to airgun sound associated with a recent commercial seismic survey conducted in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada, exhibited a higher rate of 'righting' than those crabs not exposed to seismic survey sound (J. Payne, Research Scientist, DFOC, St. John's, Newfoundland, pers. comm.). 'Righting' refers to a crab's ability to return itself to an upright position after being placed on its back. Christian et al. (2003) made the same observation in their study.

Payne et al. (2007), in their study of the effects of exposure to airgun sound on adult American lobsters, noted a trend for increased food consumption by the animals exposed to seismic sound.

Andriguetto-Filho et al. (2005) attempted to evaluate the impact of seismic survey sound on artisanal shrimp fisheries off Brazil. Bottom trawl yields were measured before and after multiple-day shooting of an airgun array. Water depth in the experimental area ranged between 2 and 15 m. Results of the study

did not indicate any significant deleterious impact on shrimp catches. Anecdotal information from Newfoundland, Canada, indicated that catch rates of snow crabs showed a significant reduction immediately following a pass by a seismic survey vessel (G. Chidley, Newfoundland fisherman, pers. comm.). Additional anecdotal information from Newfoundland indicated that a school of shrimp observed via a fishing vessel sounder shifted downwards and away from a nearby seismic airgun sound source (H. Thorne, Newfoundland fisherman, pers. comm.). This observed effect was temporary.

Caged brown shrimp (*Crangon crangon*) reared under different acoustical conditions exhibited differences in aggressive behavior and feeding rate (Lagardère 1982). Those exposed to a continuous sound source showed more aggression and less feeding behavior. It should be noted that behavioral responses by caged animals may differ from behavioral responses of animals in the wild.

McCauley et al. (2000a, b) provided the first evidence of the behavioral response of southern calamari squid (*Sepioteuthis australis*) exposed to seismic survey sound. They reported on the exposure of caged cephalopods (50 squid and 2 cuttlefish) to noise from a single 20-in^3 airgun. The cephalopods were exposed to both stationary and mobile sound sources. The two-run total exposure times during the three trials ranged from 69 to 119 min. at a firing rate of once every 10–15 s. The maximum SPL was >200 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. Some of the squid fired their ink sacs apparently in response to the first shot of one of the trials and then moved quickly away from the airgun. In addition to the above-described startle responses, some squid also moved towards the water surface as the airgun approached. McCauley et al. (2000a, b) reported that the startle and avoidance responses occurred at a received SPL of 174 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. They also exposed squid to a ramped approach-depart airgun signal whereby the received SPL was gradually increased over time. No strong startle response (i.e., ink discharge) was observed, but alarm responses, including increased swimming speed and movement to the surface, were observed once the received SPL reached a level in the 156–161 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} range.

Komak et al. (2005) also reported the results of a study of cephalopod behavioral responses to local water movements. In this case, juvenile cuttlefish (*Sepia officinalis*) exhibited various behavioral responses to local sinusoidal water movements of different frequencies between 0.01 and 1000 Hz. These responses included body pattern changing, movement, burrowing, reorientation, and swimming. Similarly, the behavioral responses of the octopus (*Octopus ocellatus*) to non-impulse sound have been investigated by Kaifu et al. (2007). The sound stimuli, reported as having levels 120 dB re 1 µPa rms, were at various frequencies: 50, 100, 150, 200 and 1000 Hz. The respiratory activity of the octopus changed when exposed to sound in the 50–150 Hz range but not for sound at 200–1,000 Hz. Respiratory suppression by the octopus might have represented a means of escaping detection by a predator.

Low-frequency sound (<200 Hz) has also been used as a means of preventing settling/fouling by aquatic invertebrates such as zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*) (Donskoy and Ludyanskiy 1995) and balanoid barnacles (*Balanus* sp.) (Branscomb and Rittschof 1984). Price (2007) observed that blue mussels closed their valves upon exposure to 10 kHz pure tone continuous sound.

Although not demonstrated in the invertebrate literature, masking can be considered a potential effect of anthropogenic underwater sound on marine invertebrates. Some invertebrates are known to produce sounds (Au and Banks 1998; Tolstoganova 2002; Latha et al. 2005). The functionality and biological relevance of these sounds are not understood (Jeffs et al. 2003, 2005; Lovell et al. 2005; Radford et al. 2007). If some of the sounds are of biological significance to some invertebrates, then masking of those sounds or of sounds produced by predators, at least the particle displacement component, could potentially have adverse effects on marine invertebrates. However, even if masking does occur in some

invertebrates, the intermittent nature of airgun sound is expected to result in less masking effect than would occur with continuous sound.

D.2 FISH

D.2.1 Acoustic Capabilities

Sensory systems – like those that allow for hearing – provide information about an animal's physical, biological, and social environments, in both air and water. Extensive work has been done to understand the structures, mechanisms, and functions of animal sensory systems in aquatic environments (Atema et al. 1988; Kapoor and Hara 2001; Collin and Marshall 2003). All fish species have hearing and skin-based mechanosensory systems (inner ear and lateral line systems, respectively) that provide information about their surroundings (Fay and Popper 2000). Fay (2009) and some others refer to the ambient sounds to which fishes are exposed as 'underwater soundscapes'. Anthropogenic sounds can have important negative consequences for fish survival and reproduction if they disrupt an individual's ability to sense its soundscape, which often tells of predation risk, prey items, or mating opportunities. Potential negative effects include masking of key environmental sounds or social signals, displacement of fish from their habitat, or interference with sensory orientation and navigation.

Fish hearing via the inner ear is typically restricted to low frequencies. As with other vertebrates, fish hearing involves a mechanism whereby the beds of hair cells (Howard et al. 1988; Hudspeth and Markin 1994) located in the inner ear are mechanically affected and cause a neural discharge (Popper and Fay 1999). At least two major pathways for sound transmittance between sound source and the inner ear have been identified for fishes. The most primitive pathway involves direct transmission to the inner ear's otolith, a calcium carbonate mass enveloped by sensory hairs. The inertial difference between the dense otolith and the less-dense inner ear causes the otolith to stimulate the surrounding sensory hair cells. This motion differential is interpreted by the central nervous system as sound.

The second transmission pathway between sound source and the inner ear of fishes is via the swim bladder, a gas-filled structure that is much less dense than the rest of the fish's body. The swim bladder, being more compressible and expandable than either water or fish tissue, will differentially contract and expand relative to the rest of the fish in a sound field. The pulsating swim bladder transmits this mechanical disturbance directly to the inner ear (discussed below). Such a secondary source of sound detection may be more or less effective at stimulating the inner ear depending on the amplitude and frequency of the pulsation, and the distance and mechanical coupling between the swim bladder and the inner ear (Popper and Fay 1993).

A recent paper by Popper and Fay (2010) discusses the designation of fishes based on sound detection capabilities. They suggest that the designations 'hearing specialist' and 'hearing generalist' no longer be used for fishes because of their vague and sometimes contradictory definitions, and that there is instead a range of hearing capabilities across species that is more like a continuum, presumably based on the relative contributions of pressure to the overall hearing capabilities of a species.

According to Popper and Fay (2010), one end of this continuum is represented by fishes that only detect particle motion because they lack pressure-sensitive gas bubbles (e.g., swim bladder). These species include elasmobranchs (e.g., sharks) and jawless fishes, and some teleosts including flatfishes. Fishes at this end of the continuum are typically capable of detecting sound frequencies below 1,500 Hz.

The other end of the fish hearing continuum is represented by fishes with highly specialized otophysic connections between pressure receptive organs, such as the swim bladder, and the inner ear. These fishes include some squirrelfish, mormyrids, herrings, and otophysan fishes (freshwater fishes with Weberian

apparatus, an articulated series of small bones that extend from the swim bladder to the inner ear). Rather than being limited to 1.5 kHz or less in hearing, these fishes can typically hear up to several kHz. One group of fish in the anadromous herring sub-family Alosinae (shads and menhaden) can detect sounds to well over 180 kHz (Mann et al. 1997, 1998, 2001). This may be the widest hearing range of any vertebrate that has been studied to date. While the specific reason for this very high frequency hearing is not totally clear, there is strong evidence that this capability evolved for the detection of the ultrasonic sounds produced by echolocating dolphins to enable the fish to detect, and avoid, predation (Mann et al. 1997; Plachta and Popper 2003).

All other fishes have hearing capabilities that fall somewhere between these two extremes of the continuum. Some have unconnected swim bladders located relatively far from the inner ear (e.g., salmonids, tuna) while others have unconnected swim bladders located relatively close to the inner ear (e.g., Atlantic cod, Gadus morhua). There has also been the suggestion that Atlantic cod can detect 38 kHz (Astrup and Møhl 1993). However, the general consensus was that this was not hearing with the ear; probably the fish were responding to exceedingly high pressure signals from the 38-kHz source through some other receptor in the skin, such as touch receptors (Astrup and Møhl 1998).

It is important to recognize that the swim bladder itself is not a sensory end organ, but rather an intermediate part of the sound pathway between sound source and the inner ear of some fishes. The inner ear of fishes is ultimately the organ that translates the particle displacement component into neural signals for the brain to interpret as sound.

A third mechanosensory pathway found in most bony fishes and elasmobranchs (i.e., cartilaginous fishes) involves the lateral line system. It too relies on sensitivity to water particle motion. The basic sensory unit of the lateral line system is the neuromast, a bundle of sensory and supporting cells whose projecting cilia, similar to those in the ears, are encased in a gelatinous cap. Neuromasts detect distorted sound waves in the immediate vicinity of fishes. Generally, fishes use the lateral line system to detect the particle displacement component of low frequency acoustic signals (up to 160 to 200 Hz) over a distance of one to two body lengths. The lateral line is used in conjunction with other sensory systems, including hearing (Sand 1981; Coombs and Montgomery 1999).

D.2.2 Potential Effects on Fishes

Review papers on the effects of anthropogenic sources of underwater sound on fishes have been published recently (Popper 2009; Popper and Hastings 2009a, b). These papers consider various sources of anthropogenic sound, including seismic airguns. For the purposes of this review, only the effects of seismic airgun sound are considered.

Marine Fishes

Evidence for airgun-induced damage to fish ears has come from studies using pink snapper (*Pagrus auratus*) (McCauley et al. 2000a, b, 2003). In these experiments, fish were caged and exposed to the sound of a single moving seismic airgun every 10 s over a period of 1 h and 41 min. The source SPL at 1 m was about 223 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{p-p}$, and the received SPLs ranged from 165 to 209 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p}. The sound energy was highest over the 20–70 Hz frequency range. The pink snapper were exposed to more than 600 airgun discharges during the study. In some individual fish, the sensory epithelium of the inner ear sustained extensive damage as indicated by ablated hair cells. Damage was more extensive in fish examined 58 days post-exposure compared to those examined 18 h post-exposure. There was no evidence of repair or replacement of damaged sensory cells up to 58 days post-exposure. McCauley et al. (2000a, b, 2003) included the following caveats in the study reports: (1) fish were caged and unable to swim

away from the seismic source, (2) only one species of fish was examined, (3) the impact on the ultimate survival of the fish is unclear, and (4) airgun exposure specifics required to cause the observed damage were not obtained (i.e., a few high SPL signals or the cumulative effect of many low to moderate SPL signals).

The fish exposed to sound from a single airgun in this study also exhibited startle responses to short range start up and high-level airgun signals (i.e., with received SPLs of 182 to 195 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (McCauley et al. 2000a, b). Smaller fish were more likely to display a startle response. Responses were observed above received SPLs of 156 to 161 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. The occurrence of both startle response (classic C-turn response) and alarm responses (e.g., darting movements, flash school expansion, fast swimming) decreased over time. Other observations included downward distributional shift that was restricted by the 10 m x 6 m x 3 m cages, increase in swimming speed, and the formation of denser aggregations. Fish behavior appeared to return to pre-exposure state 15–30 min after cessation of seismic firing.

Pearson et al. (1992) investigated the effects of seismic airgun sound on the behavior of captive rockfishes (*Sebastes* sp.) exposed to the sound of a single stationary airgun at a variety of distances. The airgun used in the study had a source SPL at 1 m of 223 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{0\text{-}p}$, and measured received SPLs ranged from 137 to 206 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. The authors reported that rockfishes reacted to the airgun sounds by exhibiting varying degrees of startle and alarm responses, depending on the species of rockfish and the received SPL. Startle responses were observed at a minimum received SPL of 200 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$, and alarm responses occurred at a minimum received SPL of 177 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. Other observed behavioral changes included the tightening of schools, downward distributional shift, and random movement and orientation. Some fishes ascended in the water column and commenced to mill (i.e., "eddy") at increased speed, while others descended to the bottom of the enclosure and remained motionless. Pre-exposure behavior was reestablished from 20 to 60 min after cessation of seismic airgun discharge. Pearson et al. (1992) concluded that received SPL thresholds for overt and more subtle rockfish behavioral response are 180 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$ and 161 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$, respectively.

Using an experimental hook and line fishery approach, Skalski et al. (1992) studied the potential effects of seismic airgun sound on the distribution and catchability of rockfishes. The source SPL of the single airgun used in the study was 223 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{0\text{-}p}$, and the received SPLs at the bases of the rockfish aggregations ranged from 186 to 191 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. Characteristics of the fish aggregations were assessed using echosounders. During long-term stationary seismic airgun discharge, there was an overall downward shift in fish distribution. The authors also observed a significant decline in total catch of rockfishes during seismic discharge. It should be noted that this experimental approach was quite different from an actual seismic survey, in that duration of exposure was much longer.

In another study, caged European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) were exposed to multiple discharges from a moving seismic airgun array with a source SPL of about 256 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{0\text{-}p}$ (unspecified measure type) (Santulli et al. 1999). The airguns were discharged every 25 s during a 2-h period. The minimum distance between fish and seismic source was 180 m. The authors did not indicate any observed pathological injury to the sea bass. Blood was collected from both exposed fish (6 h post-exposure) and control fish (6 h pre-exposure) and subsequently analyzed for cortisol, glucose, and lactate levels. Levels of cortisol, glucose, and lactate were significantly higher in the sera of exposed fish compared to sera of control fish. The elevated levels of all three chemicals returned to pre-exposure levels within 72 h of exposure (Santulli et al. 1999).

Santulli et al. (1999) also used underwater video cameras to monitor fish response to seismic airgun discharge. Resultant video indicated slight startle responses by some of the sea bass when the seismic

airgun array discharged as far as 2.5 km from the cage. The proportion of sea bass that exhibited startle response increased as the airgun sound source approached the cage. Once the seismic array was within 180 m of the cage, the sea bass were densely packed at the middle of the enclosure, exhibiting random orientation, and appearing more active than they had been under pre-exposure conditions. Normal behavior resumed about 2 h after airgun discharge nearest the fish (Santulli et al. 1999).

Boeger et al. (2006) reported observations of coral reef fishes in field enclosures before, during and after exposure to seismic airgun sound. This Brazilian study used an array of eight airguns that was presented to the fishes as both a mobile sound source and a static sound source. Minimum distances between the sound source and the fish cage ranged from 0 to 7 m. Received sound levels were not reported by Boeger et al. (2006). Neither mortality nor external damage to the fishes was observed in any of the experimental scenarios. Most of the airgun array discharges resulted in startle responses although these behavioral changes lessened with repeated exposures, suggesting habituation.

Chapman and Hawkins (1969) investigated the reactions of free ranging whiting (silver hake) (*Merluccius bilinearis*), to an intermittently discharging stationary airgun with a source SPL of 220 dB re 1 μPa·$m_{0\text{-}p}$. Received SPLs were estimated to be 178 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. The whiting were monitored with an echosounder. Prior to any airgun discharge, the fish were located at a depth range of 25 to 55 m. In apparent response to the airgun sound, the fish descended, forming a compact layer at depths greater than 55 m. After an hour of exposure to the airgun sound, the fish appeared to have habituated as indicated by their return to the pre-exposure depth range, despite the continuing airgun discharge. Airgun discharge ceased for a time and upon its resumption, the fish again descended to greater depths, indicating only temporary habituation.

Hassel et al. (2003, 2004) studied the potential effects of exposure to airgun sound on the behavior of captive lesser sandeel (*Ammodytes marinus*). Depth of the study enclosure used to hold the sandeel was about 55 m. The moving airgun array had an estimated source SPL of 256 dB re 1 μPa·m (unspecified measure type). Received SPLs were not measured. Exposures were conducted over a 3-day period in a 10 km × 10 km area with the cage at its center. The distance between airgun array and fish cage ranged from 55 m when the array was overhead to 7.5 km. No mortality attributable to exposure to the airgun sound was noted. Behavior of the fish was monitored using underwater video cameras, echosounders, and commercial fishery data collected close to the study area. The approach of the seismic vessel appeared to cause an increase in tail-beat frequency although the sandeels still appeared to swim calmly. During seismic airgun discharge, many fish exhibited startle responses, followed by flight from the immediate area. The frequency of occurrence of startle response seemed to increase as the operating seismic array moved closer to the fish. The sandeels stopped exhibiting the startle response once the airgun discharge ceased. The sandeel tended to remain higher in the water column during the airgun discharge, and none of them were observed burying themselves in the soft substrate. The commercial fishery catch data were inconclusive with respect to behavioral effects.

Various species of demersal fishes, blue whiting, and some small pelagic fishes were exposed to a moving seismic airgun array with a source SPL of about 250 dB re 1 μPa·m (unspecified measure type) (Dalen and Knutsen 1986). Received SPLs estimated using the assumption of spherical spreading ranged from 200 to 210 dB re 1 μPa (unspecified measure type). Seismic sound exposures were conducted every 10 s during a one week period. The authors used echosounders and sonars to assess the pre- and post-exposure fish distributions. The acoustic mapping results indicated a significant decrease in abundance of demersal fish (36%) after airgun discharge but comparative trawl catches did not support this. Non-significant

reductions in the abundances of blue whiting and small pelagic fish were also indicated by post-exposure acoustic mapping.

La Bella et al. (1996) studied the effects of exposure to seismic airgun sound on fish distribution using echosounder monitoring and changes in catch rate of hake by trawl, and clupeoids by gill netting. The seismic array used was composed of 16 airguns and had a source SPL of 256 dB re 1 µPa ·m $_{0\text{-}p}$. The shot interval was 25 s, and exposure durations ranged from 4.6 to 12 h. Horizontal distributions did not appear to change as a result of exposure to seismic discharge, but there was some indication of a downward shift in the vertical distribution. The catch rates during experimental fishing did not differ significantly between pre- and post-seismic fishing periods.

Wardle et al. (2001) used video and telemetry to make behavioral observations of marine fishes (primarily juvenile saithe, adult pollock, juvenile cod, and adult mackerel) inhabiting an inshore reef off Scotland before, during, and after exposure to discharges of a stationary airgun. The received SPLs ranged from about 195 to 218 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. Pollock did not move away from the reef in response to the seismic airgun sound, and their diurnal rhythm did not appear to be affected. However, there was an indication of a slight effect on the long-term day-to-night movements of the pollock. Video camera observations indicated that fish exhibited startle responses ("C-starts") to all received levels. There were also indications of behavioral responses to visual stimuli. If the seismic source was visible to the fish, they fled from it. However, if the source was not visible to the fish, they often continued to move toward it.

The potential effects of exposure to seismic sound on fish abundance and distribution were also investigated by Slotte et al. (2004). Twelve days of seismic survey operations spread over a period of 1 month used a seismic airgun array with a source SPL of 222.6 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{p\text{-}p}$. The SPLs received by the fish were not measured. Acoustic surveys of the local distributions of various kinds of pelagic fish, including herring, blue whiting, and mesopelagic species, were conducted during the seismic surveys. There was no strong evidence of short-term horizontal distributional effects. With respect to vertical distribution, blue whiting and mesopelagics were distributed deeper (20 to 50 m) during the seismic survey compared to pre-exposure. The average densities of fish aggregations were lower within the seismic survey area, and fish abundances appeared to increase in accordance with increasing distance from the seismic survey area.

Fertilized capelin (*Mallotus villosus*) eggs and monkfish (*Lophius americanus*) larvae were exposed to seismic airgun sound and subsequently examined and monitored for possible effects of the exposure (Payne et al. 2009). The laboratory exposure studies involved a single airgun. Approximate received SPLs measured in the capelin egg and monkfish larvae exposures were 199 to 205 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{p\text{-}p}$ and 205 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{p\text{-}p}$, respectively. The capelin eggs were exposed to either 10 or 20 airgun discharges, and the monkfish larvae were exposed to either 10 or 30 discharges. No statistical differences in mortality/morbidity between control and exposed subjects were found at 1 to 4 days post-exposure in any of the exposure trials for either the capelin eggs or the monkfish larvae.

In uncontrolled experiments, Kostyvchenko (1973) exposed the eggs of numerous fish species (anchovy, red mullet, crucian carp, blue runner) to various sound sources, including seismic airguns. With the seismic airgun discharge as close as 0.5 m from the eggs, over 75% of them survived the exposure. Egg survival rate increased to over 90% when placed 10 m from the airgun sound source. The range of received SPLs was about 215 to 233 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$.

Eggs, yolk sac larvae, post-yolk sac larvae, post-larvae, and fry of various commercially important fish species (cod, saithe, herring, turbot, and plaice) were exposed to received SPLs ranging from 220 to 242 dB re 1 µPa (unspecified measure type) (Booman et al. 1996). These received levels corresponded to

exposure distances ranging from 0.75 to 6 m. The authors reported some cases of injury and mortality but most of these occurred as a result of exposures at very close range (i.e., <15 m). The rigor of anatomical and pathological assessments was questionable.

Saetre and Ona (1996) applied a "worst-case scenario" mathematical model to investigate the effects of seismic sound on fish eggs and larvae. They concluded that mortality rates caused by exposure to seismic airgun sound are so low compared to the natural mortality that the impact of seismic surveying on recruitment to a fish stock must be regarded as insignificant.

Freshwater Fishes

Popper et al. (2005) tested the hearing sensitivity of three Mackenzie River fish species after exposure to five discharges from a seismic airgun. The mean received peak SPL was 205 to 209 dB re 1 µPa per discharge, and the approximate mean received SEL was 176 to 180 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ per discharge. While the broad whitefish showed no TTS as a result of the exposure, adult northern pike and lake chub exhibited TTSs of 10 to 15 dB, followed by complete recovery within 24 h of exposure. The same animals were also examined to determine whether there were observable effects on the sensory cells of the inner ear as a result of exposure to seismic sound (Song et al. 2008). No damage to the ears of the fishes was found, including those that exhibited TTS.

In another part of the same Mackenzie River project, Jorgenson and Gyselman (2009) investigated the behavioral responses of arctic riverine fishes to seismic airgun sound. They used hydroacoustic survey techniques to determine whether fish behavior upon exposure to airgun sound can either mitigate or enhance the potential impact of the sound. The study indicated that fish behavioral characteristics were generally unchanged by the exposure to airgun sound. The tracked fish did not exhibit herding behavior in front of the mobile airgun array and, therefore, were not exposed to sustained high sound levels.

Anadromous Fishes

In uncontrolled experiments using a very small sample of different groups of young salmonids, including Arctic cisco, fish were caged and exposed to various types of sound. One sound type was either a single firing or a series of four firings 10 to 15 s apart of a 300-in^3 seismic airgun at 2000 to 2200 psi (Falk and Lawrence 1973). Swim bladder damage was reported but no mortality was observed when fish were exposed within 1 to 2 m of an airgun source with source level, as estimated by Turnpenny and Nedwell (1994), of ~230 dB re 1 µPa·m (unspecified measure).

Thomsen (2002) exposed rainbow trout and Atlantic salmon held in aquaculture enclosures to the sounds from a small airgun array. Received SPLs were 142 to 186 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p}. The fish were exposed to 124 pulses over a 3-day period. In addition to monitoring fish behavior with underwater video cameras, the authors also analyzed cod and haddock catch data from a longline fishing vessel operating in the immediate area. Only 8 of the 124 shots appeared to evoke behavioral reactions by the salmonids, but overall impacts were minimal. No fish mortality was observed during or immediately after exposure. The author reported no significant effects on cod and haddock catch rates, and the behavioral effects were hard to differentiate from normal behavior.

Weinhold and Weaver (1972, cited in Turnpenny et al. 1994) exposed caged coho salmon smolts to impulses from 330 and 660-in^3 airguns at distances ranging from 1 to 10 m, resulting in received levels estimated at ~214 to 216 dB (units not given). No lethal effects were observed.

It should be noted that, in a recent and comprehensive review, Hastings and Popper (2005) take issue with many of the authors cited above for problems with experimental design and execution, measurements, and

interpretation. Hastings and Popper (2005) deal primarily with possible effects of pile-driving sounds (which, like airgun sounds, are impulsive and repetitive). However, that review provides an excellent and critical review of the impacts to fish from other underwater anthropogenic sounds.

D.2.3 Indirect Effects on Fisheries

The most comprehensive experimentation on the effects of seismic airgun sound on catchability of fishes was conducted in the Barents Sea by Engås et al. (1993, 1996). They investigated the effects of seismic airgun sound on distributions, abundances, and catch rates of cod and haddock using acoustic mapping and experimental fishing with trawls and longlines. The maximum source SPL was about 248 dB re 1 μPa·m $_{0\text{-}p}$ based on back-calculations from measurements collected via a hydrophone at depth 80 m. Nomeasurements of the received SPLs were made. Davis et al. (1998) estimated the received SPL at the sea bottom immediately below the array and at 18 km from the array to be 205 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$ and 178 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$, respectively. Engås et al. (1993, 1996) concluded that there were indications of distributional change during and immediately following the seismic airgun discharge (45 to 64% decrease in acoustic density according to sonar data). The lowest densities were observed within 9.3 km of the seismic discharge area. The authors indicated that trawl catches of both cod and haddock declined after the seismic operations. While longline catches of haddock also showed decline after seismic airgun discharge, those for cod increased.

Løkkeborg (1991), Løkkeborg and Soldal (1993), and Dalen and Knutsen (1986) also examined the effects of seismic airgun sound on demersal fish catches. Løkkeborg (1991) examined the effects on cod catches. The source SPL of the airgun array used in his study was 239 dB re 1 μPa·m (unspecified measure type), but received SPLs were not measured. Approximately 43 h of seismic airgun discharge occurred during an 11-day period, with a 5-s interval between pulses. Catch rate decreases ranging from 55 to 80% within the seismic survey area were observed. This apparent effect persisted for at least 24 h within about 10 km of the survey area.

Turnpenny et al. (1994) examined results of these studies as well as the results of other studies on rockfish. They used rough estimations of received SPLs at catch locations and concluded that catchability is reduced when received SPLs exceed 160 to 180 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. They also concluded that reaction thresholds of fishes lacking a swim bladder (e.g., flatfish) would likely be about 20 dB higher. Given the considerable variability in sound transmission loss between different geographic locations, the SPLs that were assumed in these studies were likely quite inaccurate.

Turnpenny and Nedwell (1994) also reported on the effects of seismic airgun discharge on inshore bass fisheries in shallow U.K. waters (5 to 30 m deep). The airgun array used had a source level of 250 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{0\text{-}p}$. Received levels in the fishing areas were estimated to be 163–191 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. Using fish tagging and catch record methodologies, they concluded that there was not any distinguishable migration from the ensonified area, nor was there any reduction in bass catches on days when seismic airguns were discharged. The authors concluded that effects on fisheries would be smaller in shallow nearshore waters than in deep water because attenuation of sound is more rapid in shallow water.

Skalski et al. (1992) used a 100-in^3 airgun with a source level of 223 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{0\text{-}p}$ to examine the potential effects of airgun sound on the catchability of rockfishes. The moving airgun was discharged along transects in the study fishing area, after which a fishing vessel deployed a set line, ran three echo-sounder transects, and then deployed two more set lines. Each fishing experiment lasted 1 h 25 min. Received SPLs at the base of the rockfish aggregations ranged from 186 to 191 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$. The catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) for rockfish declined on average by 52.4% when the airguns were operating. Skalski et al. (1992) believed that the reduction in catch resulted from a change in behavior of the fishes.

The fish schools descended towards the bottom and their swimming behavior changed during airgun discharge. Although fish dispersal was not observed, the authors hypothesized that it could have occurred at a different location with a different bottom type. Skalski et al. (1992) did not continue fishing after cessation of airgun discharge. They speculated that CPUE would quickly return to normal in the experimental area, because fish behavior appeared to normalize within minutes of cessation of airgun discharge. However, in an area where exposure to airgun sound might have caused the fish to disperse, the authors suggested that a lower CPUE might persist for a longer period.

European sea bass were exposed to sound from seismic airgun arrays with a source SPL of 262 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{0\text{-}p}$ (Pickett et al. 1994). The seismic survey was conducted over a period of 4 to 5 months. The study was intended to investigate the effects of seismic airgun discharge on inshore bass fisheries. Information was collected through a tag and release program, and from the logbooks of commercial fishermen. Most of the 152 recovered fish from the tagging program were caught within 10 km of the release site, and it was suggested that most of these bass did not leave the area for a prolonged period. With respect to the commercial fishery, no significant changes in catch rate were observed (Pickett et al. 1994).

D.3 Literature Cited

Andriguetto-Filho, J.M., A. Ostrensky, M.R. Pie, U.A. Silva, and W.A. Boeger. 2005. Evaluating the impact of seismic prospecting on artisanal shrimp fisheries. Continental Shelf Research 25:1720-1727.

Atema, J., R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga. 1988. The Sensory Biology of Aquatic Animals. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Au, W.W.L. and K. Banks. 1998. The acoustics of snapping shrimp *Synalpheus parneomeris* in Kaneohe Bay. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 103:41-47.

Boeger, W.A., M.R. Pie, A. Ostrensky, and M.F. Cardoso. 2006. The effect of exposure to seismic prospecting on coral reef fishes. Brazilian Journal of Oceanography 54:235-239.

Booman, C., J. Dalen, H. Leivestad, A. Levsen, T. van der Meeren and K. Toklum. 1996. Effecter av luftkanonskyting på egg, larver og yngel. Fisken Og Havet 1996(3):1-83 (Norwegian with English summary).

Boudreau, M., S.C. Courtenay, and K. Lee, eds. 2009. Potential Impacts of Seismic Energy on Snow Crab: An Update to the September 2004 Review. Proceedings of a Workshop held 23 January 2007 at the Gulf Fisheries Center. Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2836.

Branscomb, E.S. and D. Rittschof. 1984. An investigation of low frequency sound waves as a means of inhibiting barnacle settlement. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 79:149-154.

Breithaupt, T. 2002. Sound perception in aquatic crustaceans. Pages 548-558 in K. Wiese, ed. The Crustacean Nervous System. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, Germany.

Budelmann, B.U. 1992. Hearing in crustacea. Pages 131-139 in D.B. Webster, R.R. Fay, and A.N. Popper, eds. Evolutionary Biology of Hearing. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Budelmann, B.U. 1996. Active marine predators: the sensory world of cephalopods. Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology 27:59-75.

Budelmann, B.U. and R. Williamson. 1994. Directional sensitivity of hair cell afferents in the octopus statocyst. Journal of Experimental Biology 187:245-259.

Chadwick, M. 2004. Proceedings of the Peer Review on Potential Impacts of Seismic Energy on Snow Crab. Gulf Region, Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Science Advisory Secretariat Proceedings Series 2004/045.

Chapman, C.J. and A.D. Hawkins. 1969. The importance of sound in fish behaviour in relation to capture by trawls. FAO Fisheries Report 62:717-729.

Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, D.H. Thomson, D. White, and R.A. Buchanan. 2003. Effect of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 144. Calgary, AB, Canada. November.

Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, and R.A. Buchanan. 2004. Chronic effects of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 158, Calgary, AB. March.

Collin, S.P. and N.J. Marshall, eds. 2003. Sensory Processing in Aquatic Environments. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Coombs, S. and J.C. Montgomery. 1999. The enigmatic lateral line system. Pages 319-362 *in* R.R. Fay and A.N. Popper, eds. Comparative Hearing: Fish and Amphibians. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research 11. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Dalen, J. and G.M. Knutsen. 1986. Scaring effects in fish and harmful effects on eggs, larvae and fry by offshore seismic explorations. Symposium on Underwater Acoustics, Halifax.

Davis, R.A., D. Thomson, and C.I. Malme. 1998. Environmental assessment of seismic exploration of the Scotian Shelf. Unpublished Report by LGL Ltd., environmental research associates, King City, ON and Charles I. Malme, Engineering and Science Services, Hingham, MA for Mobil Oil Canada Properties Ltd, Shell Canada Ltd., and Imperial Oil Ltd.

DFOC. 2004. Potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Habitat Status Report 2004/003.

Donskoy, D.M. and M.L. Ludyanskiy. 1995. Low frequency sound as a control measure for zebra mussel fouling. Proceedings of the Fifth International Zebra Mussel and Other Aquatic Nuisance Organisms Conference, February 1995, Toronto, Canada.

Engås, A., S. Løkkeborg, A.V. Soldal and E. Ona. 1993. Comparative trials for cod and haddock using commercial trawl and longline at two different stock levels. Journal of the Northwest Atlantic Fishery Science 19:83-90.

Engås, A, S. Løkkeborg, E. Ona, and A.V. Soldal. 1996. Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (*G. morhua*) and haddock (*M. aeglefinus*). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 53:2238-2249.

Falk, M.R. and M.J. Lawrence. 1973. Seismic exploration: its nature and effects on fish. Canada Technical Report Series No. CEN/T-73-9. Department of the Environment, Fisheries and Marine Service, Resource Management Branch, Fisheries Operations Directorate, Central Region (Environment), Winnipeg, MB.

Fay, R. 2009. Soundscapes and the sense of hearing of fishes. Integrative Zoology 4:26-32.

Fay, R.R. and A.N. Popper. 2000. Evolution of hearing in vertebrates: The inner ears and processing. Hearing Research 149:1-10.

Guerra, A., A.F. González, and F. Rocha. 2004. A review of the records of giant squid in the north-eastern Atlantic and severe injuries in *Architeuthis dux* stranded after acoustic explorations. Paper presented at the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Annual Science Conference, 22–25 September 2004, Vigo, Spain. ICES CM 2004/CC:29.

Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, S. Løkkeborg, K. Skaar, Ø. Østensen, E.K. Haugland, M. Fonn, Å. Høines, and O.A. Misund. 2003. Reaction of sandeel to seismic shooting: A field experiment and fishery statistics study. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway.

Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, K. Skaar, S. Løkkeborg, O.A. Misund, O. Ostensen, M. Fonn, and E.K. Haugland. 2004. Influence of seismic shooting on the lesser sandeel (*Ammodytes marinus*). ICES Journal of Marine Science 61:1165-1173.

Hastings, M.C. and A.N. Popper. 2005. Effects of Sound on Fish. Prepared for Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, CA, for California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA. 28 January.

Henninger, H.P. and W.H. Watson, III. 2005. Mechanisms underlying the production of carapace vibrations and associated waterborne sounds in the American lobster, *Homarus americanus*. Journal of Experimental Biology 208:3421-3429.

Howard J, W.M. Roberts, and A.J. Hudspeth. 1988. Mechanoelectrical transduction by hair cells. Annual Review of Biophysics and Chemistry 17:99-124.

Hu, M.Y., H.Y. Yan, W-S Chung, J-C Shiao, and P-P Hwang. 2009. Acoustically evoked potentials in two cephalopods inferred using the auditory brainstem response (ABR) approach. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology A 153:278-283.

Hudspeth, A.J. and V.S. Markin. 1994. The ear's gears: mechanical transduction by hair cells. Physics Today 47(2):22-28.

Jeffs, A., N. Tolimieri, and J.C. Montgomery. 2003. Crabs on cue for the coast: the use of underwater sound for orientation by pelagic crab stages. Marine and Freshwater Research 54:841-845.

Jeffs, A.G., J.C. Montgomery, and C.T. Tindle. 2005. How do spiny lobster post-larvae find the coast? New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 39:605-617.

Jorgenson, J.K. and E.C. Gyselman. 2009. Hydroacoustic measurements of the behavioral response of arctic riverine fishes to seismic airguns. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126:1598-1606.

Kaifu, K., S. Segawa, and K. Tsuchiya. 2007. Behavioral responses to underwater sound in the small benthic octopus *Octopus ocellatus*. Journal of the Marine Acoustical Society of Japan 34:46-53.

Kaifu, K., T. Akamatsu, and S. Segawa. 2008. Underwater sound detection by cephalopod statocyst. Fisheries Science 74:781-786.

Kapoor, B.G. and T.J. Hara, eds. 2001. Sensory Biology of Jawed Fishes: New Insights. Science Publishers, Inc., Enfield, NH.

Komak, S., J.G. Boal, L. Dickel, and B.U. Budelmann. 2005. Behavioural responses of juvenile cuttlefish (*Sepia officinalis*) to local water movements. Marine and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology 38:117-125.

Kostyvchenko, L.P. 1973. Effects of elastic waves generated in marine seismic prospecting on fish eggs in the Black Sea. Hydrobiological Journal 9:45-48.

La Bella, G., S. Cannata, C. Froglia, A. Modica, S. Ratti, and G. Rivas. 1996. First assessment of effects of air-gun seismic shooting on marine resources in the Central Adriatic Sea. Pages 227-238 *in* Society of Petroleum Engineers, International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment, New Orleans, Louisiana, 9-12 June.

Ladich, F. and A.N. Popper. 2004. Parallel evolution in fish hearing organs. Pages 95-127 *in* G.A. Manley, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Evolution of the Vertebrate Auditory System. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Lagardère, J.P. 1982. Effects of noise on growth and reproduction of *Crangon crangon* in rearing tanks. Marine Biology 71:177-186.

Latha, G., S. Senthilvadivu, R. Venkatesan, and V. Rajendran. 2005. Sound of shallow and deep water lobsters: Measurements, analysis, and characterization (L). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117: 2720-2723.

Løkkeborg, S. 1991. Effects of geophysical survey on catching success in longline fishing. Paper presented at the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Annual Science Conference. ICES CM B 40:1-9.

Løkkeborg, S. and A.V. Soldal. 1993. The influence of seismic explorations on cod (*Gadus morhua*) behaviour and catch rates. ICES Marine Science Symposium 196:62-67.

Lovell, J.M., M.M. Findley, R.M. Moate, and H.Y. Yan. 2005. The hearing abilities of the prawn *Palaemon serratus*. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A 140:89-100.

Lovell, J.M., R.M. Moate, L. Christiansen, and M.M. Findlay. 2006. The relationship between body size and evoked potentials from the statocysts of the prawn *Palaemon serratus*. Journal of Experimental Biology 209:2480-2485.

Mann, D.A., Z. Lu, and A.N. Popper. 1997. A clupeid fish can detect ultrasound. Nature 389(6649):341.

Mann, D.A., Z. Lu, M.C. Hastings, and A.N. Popper. 1998. Detection of ultrasonic tones and simulated dolphin echolocation clicks by a teleost fish, the American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*). Journal Acoustical Society of America 104:562-568.

Mann, D.A., D.M. Higgs, W.N. Tavolga, M.J. Souza, and A.N. Popper. 2001. Ultrasound detection by clupeiform fishes. Journal Acoustical Society of America 109:3048-3054.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: Analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Report from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, for Australian Petroleum Production Association, Sydney, NSW.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch and K. McCabe. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. APPEA Journal 40:692-706.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, and A.N. Popper. 2003. High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 113:638-642.

Moriyasu, M., R. Allain, K. Benhalima, and R. Claytor. 2004. Effects of Seismic and Marine Noise on Invertebrates: A Literature Review. Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Science. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2004/126.

Packard, A., H.E. Karlsen, and O. Sand. 1990. Low frequency hearing in cephalopods. Jorunal of Comparative Physiology A 166: 501-505.

Parry, G.D. and A. Gason. 2006. The effect of seismic surveys on catch rates of rock lobsters in western Victoria, Australia. Fisheries Research 79:272-284.

Payne, J.F., C.A. Andrews, L.L. Fancey, A.L. Cook, and J.R. Christian. 2007. Pilot study on the effects of seismic air gun noise on lobster (*Homarus americanus*). Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 2712.

Payne, J.F., C. Andrews, L. Fancey, D. White, and J. Christian. 2008. Potential Effects of Seismic Energy on Fish and Shellfish: An Update since 2003. Fisheries and Oceans Canada Science, Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2008/060.

Payne, J.F., J. Coady, and D. White. 2009. Potential effects of seismic airgun discharges on monkfish eggs (*Lophius americanus*) and larvae. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 170. St. John's, NL.

Pearson, W.H., J.R. Skalski, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on behavior of captive rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 49:1343-1356.

Pearson, W., J. Skalski, S. Sulkin, and C. Malme. 1994. Effects of seismic energy releases on the survival and development of zoeal larvae of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). Marine Environmental Research 38:93-113.

Pickett, G.D., D.R. Eaton, R.M.H. Seaby, and G.P. Arnold. 1994. Results of bass tagging in Poole Bay during 1992. Laboratory Leaflet Number 74. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Directorate of Fisheries Research, Lowestoft, UK.

Popper, A.N. 2009. Are we drowning out fish in a sea of noise? Marine Scientist 27:18-20.

Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 1993. Sound detection and processing by fish: critical review and major research questions. Brain Behavior and Evolution 41:14-38.

Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 1999. The auditory periphery in fishes. Pages 43-100 *in* R.R. Fay and A.N. Popper, eds. Comparative Hearing: Fish and Amphibians. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research 11. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 2010. Rethinking sound detection by fishes. Hearing Research (in press). doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2009.12.023.

Popper, A.N. and M.C. Hastings. 2009a. The effects of human-generated sound on fish. Integrative Zoology 4:43-52.

Popper, A.N. and M.C. Hastings. 2009b. The effects of anthropogenic sources of sound on fishes. Journal of Fish Biology 75:455-489.

Popper, A.N., M. Salmon, and K.W. Horch. 2001. Acoustic detection and communication by decapod crustaceans. Journal of Comparative Physiology A 187:83-89.

Popper, A.N., M.E. Smith, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, A.O. MacGillivray, M.E. Austin, and D.A. Mann. 2005. Effects of exposure to seismic airgun use on hearing of three fish species. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117:3958-3971.

Price, A. 2007. The effects of high frequency, high intensity underwater sound on the oxygen uptakes of *Mytilus edulis* (L.). B.S.(Hons.) Thesis, Heriot-Watt University, Scotland.

Pye, H.J., and W.H. Watson, III. 2004. Sound detection and production in the American lobster, *Homarus americanus*: sensitivity range and behavioral implications. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 115 (Part 2):2486.

Radford, C.A., A.G. Jeffs, and J.C. Montgomery. 2007. Orientated swimming behavior of crab postlarvae in response to reef sound. Poster at First International Conference on Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life, Nyborg, Denmark, August 2007.

Rawizza, H.E. 1995. Hearing and associative learning in cuttlefish, *Sepia officinalis*. Hopkins Marine Station Student Paper. Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine Mammals and Noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Saetre, R. and E. Ona. 1996. Seismiske undersøkelser og skader på fiskeegg og -larver en vurdering av mulige effekter pa bestandsniv. [Seismic investigations and damages on fish eggs and larvae; an evaluation of possible effects on stock level] Fisken og Havet 1996:1-17, 1-8. (in Norwegian with English summary).

Sand, O. 1981. The lateral line and sound reception. Pages 459-478 *in* W.N. Tavolga, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Hearing and Sound Communication in Fishes. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Santulli, A., C. Messina, L. Ceffa, A. Curatolo, G. Rivas, G. Fabi, and V. Damelio. 1999. Biochemical responses of European sea bass (*Dicentrachus labrax*) to the stress induced by offshore experimental seismic prospecting. Marine Pollution Bulletin 38:1105-1114.

Skalski, J.R., W.H. Pearson, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on catch-per-unit-effort in a hook-and-line fishery for rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 49:1357-1365.

Slotte, A., K. Hansen, J. Dalen, and E. Ona. 2004. Acoustic mapping of pelagic fish distribution and abundance in relation to a seismic shooting area off the Norwegian west coast. Fisheries Research 67:143-150.

Song, J., D.A. Mann, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, and A.N. Popper. 2008. The inner ears of Northern Canadian freshwater fishes following exposure to seismic air gun sounds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 124:1360-1366.

Thomsen, B. 2002. An experiment on how seismic shooting affects caged fish. Thesis, Faroese Fisheries Laboratory, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland. 16 August.

Tolstoganova, L.K. 2002. Acoustical behaviour in king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*). Pages 247-254 *in* A.J. Paul, E.G. Dawe, R. Elner, G.S. Jamieson, G.H. Kruse, R.S. Otto, B. Sainte-Marie, T.C. Shirley, and D. Woodby, eds. Crabs in Cold Water Regions: Biology, Management, and Economics. University of Alaska Sea Grant, AK-SG-02-01. Fairbanks, AK.

Turnpenny, A.W.H. and J.R. Nedwell. 1994. Consultancy Report: The Effects on Marine Fish, Diving Mammals and Birds of Underwater Sound Generated by Seismic Surveys. FCR 089/94. Prepared by Fawley aquatic research laboratories, Ltd. for the UK Offshore Operators Association (UKOOA).

Turnpenny, A.W.H., K.P. Thatcher, and J.R. Nedwell. 1994. Research Report: The Effects on Fish and Other Marine Animals of High-level Underwater Sound. FRR 127/94. Prepared by Fawley aquatic research laboratories, Ltd. for the Defence Research Agency.

Wardle, C.S., T.J. Carter, G.G. Urquhart, A.D.F. Johnstone, A.M. Ziolkowski, G. Hampson, and D. Mackie. 2001. Effects of seismic airguns on marine fish. Continental Shelf Research 21:1005-1027.

APPENDIX E:

REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF SEISMIC AND OCEANOGRAPHIC SONAR SOUNDS ON MARINE MAMMALS

APPENDIX E: REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF SEISMIC AND OCEANOGRAPHIC SONAR SOUNDS ON MARINE MAMMALS[1]

The following subsections review relevant information concerning the potential effects of airgun and sonar sounds on marine mammals, with the sonar section being focused on sonar systems similar to those operated during marine seismic operations including MBES, SBPs, and pingers. This background material is little changed from corresponding subsections included in IHA applications and EAs submitted to NMFS for previous NSF-funded seismic surveys from 2003 to date. Much of this information has also been included in varying formats in other reviews, assessments, and regulatory applications prepared by LGL Ltd., environmental research associates. Because this review is intended to be of general usefulness, it includes references to types of marine mammals that will not be found in some specific regions.

E.1 CATEGORIES OF NOISE EFFECTS

The effects of noise on marine mammals are highly variable, and can be categorized as follows (adapted from Richardson et al. 1995):

1. The noise may be too weak to be heard at the location of the animal, i.e., lower than the prevailing ambient noise level, the hearing threshold of the animal at relevant frequencies, or both;
2. The noise may be audible but not strong enough to elicit any overt behavioral response, i.e., the mammals may tolerate it, either without or with some deleterious effects (e.g., masking, stress);
3. The noise may elicit behavioral reactions of variable conspicuousness and variable relevance to the well being of the animal; these can range from subtle effects on respiration or other behaviors (detectable only by statistical analysis) to active avoidance reactions;
4. Upon repeated exposure, animals may exhibit diminishing responsiveness (habituation), or disturbance effects may persist; the latter is most likely with sounds that are highly variable in characteristics, unpredictable in occurrence, and associated with situations that the animal perceives as a threat;
5. Any man-made noise that is strong enough to be heard has the potential to reduce (mask) the ability of marine mammals to hear natural sounds at similar frequencies, including calls from conspecifics, echolocation sounds of odontocetes, and environmental sounds such as surf noise or (at high latitudes) ice noise. However, intermittent airgun or sonar pulses could cause strong masking for only a small proportion of the time, given the short duration of these pulses relative to the inter-pulse intervals;
6. Very strong sounds have the potential to cause temporary or permanent reduction in hearing sensitivity, or other physical or physiological effects. Received sound levels must far exceed the animal's hearing threshold for any temporary threshold shift to occur. Received levels must be even higher for a risk of permanent hearing impairment.

[1] By W. John Richardson and Valerie D. Moulton, with subsequent updates (to February 2010) by W. John Richardson, Valerie D. Moulton, Patrick Abgrall, William E. Cross, Meike Holst, and Mari A. Smultea, all of LGL Ltd., environmental research associates.

E.2 HEARING ABILITIES OF MARINE MAMMALS

The hearing abilities of marine mammals are functions of the following (Richardson et al. 1995; Au et al. 2000):

1. Absolute hearing threshold at the frequency in question (the level of sound barely audible in the absence of ambient noise). The "best frequency" is the frequency with the lowest absolute threshold.
2. Critical ratio (the signal-to-noise ratio required to detect a sound at a specific frequency in the presence of background noise around that frequency).
3. The ability to determine sound direction at the frequencies under consideration.
4. The ability to discriminate among sounds of different frequencies and intensities.

Marine mammals rely heavily on the use of underwater sounds to communicate and to gain information about their surroundings. Experiments and monitoring studies also show that they hear and may react to many man-made sounds including sounds made during seismic exploration (Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Tyack 2008).

E.2.1 Baleen Whales (Mysticetes)

The hearing abilities of baleen whales have not been studied directly. Behavioral and anatomical evidence indicates that they hear well at frequencies below 1 kHz (Richardson et al. 1995; Ketten 2000). Frankel (2005) noted that gray whales reacted to a 21–25 kHz whale-finding sonar. Some baleen whales react to pinger sounds up to 28 kHz, but not to pingers or sonars emitting sounds at 36 kHz or above (Watkins 1986). In addition, baleen whales produce sounds at frequencies up to 8 kHz and, for humpbacks, with components to >24 kHz (Au et al. 2006). The anatomy of the baleen whale inner ear seems to be well adapted for detection of low-frequency sounds (Ketten 1991, 1992, 1994, 2000; Parks et al. 2007b). Although humpbacks and minke whales (Berta et al. 2009) may have some auditory sensitivity to frequencies above 22 kHz, for baleen whales as a group, the functional hearing range is thought to be about 7 Hz to 22 kHz and they are said to constitute the "low-frequency" (LF) hearing group (Southall et al. 2007). The absolute sound levels that they can detect below 1 kHz are probably limited by increasing levels of natural ambient noise at decreasing frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). Ambient noise levels are higher at low frequencies than at mid frequencies. At frequencies below 1 kHz, natural ambient levels tend to increase with decreasing frequency.

The hearing systems of baleen whales are undoubtedly more sensitive to low-frequency sounds than are the ears of the small toothed whales that have been studied directly. Thus, baleen whales are likely to hear airgun pulses farther away than can small toothed whales and, at closer distances, airgun sounds may seem more prominent to baleen than to toothed whales. However, baleen whales have commonly been seen well within the distances where seismic (or other source) sounds would be detectable and often show no overt reaction to those sounds. Behavioral responses by baleen whales to seismic pulses have been documented, but received levels of pulsed sounds necessary to elicit behavioral reactions are typically well above the minimum levels that the whales are assumed to detect (see below). Baleen whales are also expected to hear sonar signals at frequencies within their functional hearing range if the whales are within the sonar beam.

E.2.2 Toothed Whales (Odontocetes)

Hearing abilities of some toothed whales have been studied in detail (reviewed in Chapter 8 of Richardson et al. [1995] and in Au et al. [2000]). Hearing sensitivity of several species has been determined as a function of frequency. The small to moderate-sized toothed whales whose hearing has

been studied have relatively poor hearing sensitivity at frequencies below 1 kHz, but extremely good sensitivity at, and above, several kHz. There are very few data on the absolute hearing thresholds of most of the larger, deep-diving toothed whales, such as the sperm and beaked whales. However, Cook et al. (2006) found that a stranded juvenile Gervais' beaked whale showed evoked potentials from 5 kHz up to 80 kHz (the entire frequency range that was tested), with the best sensitivity at 40–80 kHz. An adult Gervais' beaked whale had a similar upper cutoff frequency (80–90 kHz; Finneran et al. 2009).

Most of the odontocete species have been classified as belonging to the "mid-frequency" (MF) hearing group, and the MF odontocetes (collectively) have functional hearing from about 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al. 2007). However, individual species may not have quite so broad a functional frequency range. Very strong sounds at frequencies slightly outside the functional range may also be detectable. The remaining odontocetes—the porpoises, river dolphins, and members of the genera *Cephalorhynchus* and *Kogia*—are distinguished as the "high-frequency" (HF) hearing group. They have functional hearing from about 200 Hz to 180 kHz (Southall et al. 2007).

Airguns produce a small proportion of their sound at mid- and high-frequencies, although at progressively lower levels with increasing frequency. In general, most of the energy in the sound pulses emitted by airgun arrays is at low frequencies; strongest spectrum levels are below 200 Hz, with considerably lower spectrum levels above 1000 Hz, and smaller amounts of energy emitted up to ~150 kHz (Goold and Fish 1998; Sodal 1999; Goold and Coates 2006; Potter et al. 2007).

Despite the relatively poor sensitivity of small odontocetes at the low frequencies that contribute most of the energy in pulses of sound from airgun arrays, airgun sounds are sufficiently strong, and contain sufficient mid- and high-frequency energy, that their received levels sometimes remain above the hearing thresholds of odontocetes at distances out to several tens of kilometers (Richardson and Würsig 1997). There is no evidence that most small odontocetes react to airgun pulses at such long distances. However, beluga whales do seem quite responsive at intermediate distances (10–20 km) where sound levels are well above the ambient noise level (see below).

In summary, even though odontocete hearing is relatively insensitive to the predominant low frequencies produced by airguns, sounds from airgun arrays are audible to odontocetes, sometimes to distances of tens of kilometers. Odontocetes are also expected to hear sonar signals from most types of oceanographic sonars (with the exception of the highest frequency units operating above 160–180 kHz) if the animals are within the sonar beam.

E.2.3 Seals and Sea Lions (Pinnipeds)

Underwater audiograms have been obtained using behavioral methods for three species of phocinid seals, two species of monachid seals, two species of otariids, and the walrus (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995:211*ff*; Kastak and Schusterman 1998, 1999; Kastelein et al. 2002, 2009). The functional hearing range for pinnipeds in water is considered to extend from 75 Hz to 75 kHz (Southall et al. 2007), although some individual species—especially the eared seals—do not have that broad an auditory range (Richardson et al. 1995). In comparison with odontocetes, pinnipeds tend to have lower best frequencies, lower high-frequency cutoffs, better auditory sensitivity at low frequencies, and poorer sensitivity at the best frequency.

At least some of the phocid seals have better sensitivity at low frequencies (≤1 kHz) than do odontocetes. Below 30–50 kHz, the hearing thresholds of most species tested are essentially flat down to ~1 kHz, and range between 60 and 85 dB re 1 µPa. Measurements for harbor seals indicate that, below 1 kHz, their

thresholds under quiet background conditions deteriorate gradually with decreasing frequency to ~75 dB re 1 µPa at 125 Hz (Kastelein et al. 2009).

For the otariid (eared) seals, the high frequency cutoff is lower than for phocinids, and sensitivity at low frequencies (e.g., 100 Hz) is poorer than for seals (harbor seal).

Pinnipeds are also expected to hear sonar signals at frequencies within their functional hearing range if the animals are within the sonar beam. Phocids and otariids would hear sonars operating at frequencies up to about 75 kHz and 35 kHz, respectively.

E.2.4 Manatees and Dugong (Sirenians)

The West Indian manatee can apparently detect sounds and low-frequency vibrations from 15 Hz to 46 kHz, based on a study involving behavioral testing methods (Gerstein et al. 1999, 2004). A more recent study found that, in one Florida manatee, auditory sensitivity extended up to 90.5 kHz (Bauer et al. 2009). Thus, manatees may hear, or at least detect, sounds in the low-frequency range where most seismic energy is released. It is possible that they are able to feel these low-frequency sounds using vibrotactile receptors or because of resonance in body cavities or bone conduction.

Based on measurements of evoked potentials, manatee hearing is apparently best around 1–1.5 kHz (Bullock et al. 1982). However, behavioral tests suggest that best sensitivities are at 6–20 kHz (Gerstein et al. 1999) or 8-32 kHz (Bauer et al. 2009). The ability to detect high frequencies may be an adaptation to shallow water, where the propagation of low frequency sound is limited (Gerstein et al. 1999, 2004).

E.2.5 Sea Otter

No data are available on the hearing abilities of sea otters (Ketten 1998), although the in-air vocalizations of sea otters have most of their energy concentrated at 3–5 kHz (McShane et al. 1995; Thomson and Richardson 1995). Sea otter vocalizations are considered to be most suitable for short-range communication among individuals (McShane et al. 1995). However, Ghoul et al. (2009) noted that the in-air "screams" of sea otters are loud signals (source level of 93–118 dB re 20 μPa_{pk}) that may be used over larger distances; screams have a frequency of maximum energy ranging from 2 to 8 kHz. In-air audiograms for two river otters indicate that this related species has its best hearing sensitivity at the relatively high frequency of 16 kHz, with some sensitivity from about 460 Hz to 33 kHz (Gunn 1988). However, these data apply to a different species of otter, and to in-air rather than underwater hearing.

E.3 SEISMIC AIRGUN SOUNDS

E.3.1 Characteristics of Airgun Pulses

Airguns function by venting high-pressure air into the water. The pressure signature of an individual airgun consists of a sharp rise and then fall in pressure, followed by several positive and negative pressure excursions caused by oscillation of the resulting air bubble. The sizes, arrangement, and firing times of the individual airguns in an array are designed and synchronized to suppress the pressure oscillations subsequent to the first cycle. The resulting downward-directed pulse has a duration of only 10–20 ms, with only one strong positive and one strong negative peak pressure (Caldwell and Dragoset 2000). Most energy emitted from airguns is at relatively low frequencies. For example, typical high-energy airgun arrays emit most energy at 10–120 Hz. However, the pulses contain significant energy up to 500–1000 Hz and some energy at higher frequencies (Goold and Fish 1998; Potter et al. 2007). Studies in the Gulf of Mexico have shown that the horizontally-propagating sound can contain significant energy above the frequencies that airgun arrays are designed to emit (DeRuiter et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Tyack et al.

2006a). Energy at frequencies up to 150 kHz was found in tests of single 60-in^3 and 250-in^3 airguns (Goold and Coates 2006). Nonetheless, the predominant energy is at low frequencies.

The pulsed sounds associated with seismic exploration have higher peak levels than other industrial sounds (except those from explosions) to which whales and other marine mammals are routinely exposed. The nominal source levels of the 2- to 36-airgun arrays used by L-DEO from the R/V *Maurice Ewing* (now retired) and R/V Marcus G. Langseth are 236 to 265 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p}. These are the nominal source levels applicable to downward propagation. The effective source levels for horizontal propagation are lower than those for downward propagation when the source consists of numerous airguns spaced apart from one another. Explosions are the only man-made sources with effective source levels as high as (or higher than) a large array of airguns. However, high-power sonars can have source pressure levels as high as a small array of airguns, and signal duration can be longer for a sonar than for an airgun array, making the source energy levels of some sonars more comparable to those of airgun arrays.

Several important mitigating factors need to be kept in mind:

(1) Airgun arrays produce intermittent sounds, involving emission of a strong sound pulse for a small fraction of a second followed by several seconds of near silence. In contrast, some other sources produce sounds with lower peak levels, but their sounds are continuous or discontinuous but continuing for longer durations than seismic pulses.
(2) Airgun arrays are designed to transmit strong sounds downward through the seafloor, and the amount of sound transmitted in near-horizontal directions is considerably reduced. Nonetheless, they also emit sounds that travel horizontally toward non-target areas.
(3) An airgun array is a distributed source, not a point source. The nominal source level is an estimate of the sound that would be measured from a theoretical point source emitting the same total energy as the airgun array. That figure is useful in calculating the expected received levels in the far field, i.e., at moderate and long distances, but not in the near field. Because the airgun array is not a single point source, there is no one location within the near field (or anywhere else) where the received level is as high as the nominal source level.

The strengths of airgun pulses can be measured in different ways, and it is important to know which method is being used when interpreting quoted source or received levels. Geophysicists usually quote peak-to-peak (p-p) levels, in bar-meters or (less often) dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m$. The peak (= zero-to-peak, or 0-p) level for the same pulse is typically ~6 dB less. In the biological literature, levels of received airgun pulses are often described based on the "average" or "root-mean-square" (rms) level, where the average is calculated over the duration of the pulse. The rms value for a given airgun pulse is typically ~10 dB lower than the peak level, and 16 dB lower than the peak-to-peak value (Greene 1997; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). A fourth measure that is increasingly used is the energy, or Sound Exposure Level (SEL), in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$. Because the pulses, even when stretched by propagation effects (see below), are usually <1 s in duration, the numerical value of the energy is usually lower than the rms pressure level. However, the units are different.[2] Because the level of a given pulse will differ substantially depending on which of these measures is being applied, it is important to be aware which measure is in use when interpreting any

2 The rms value for a given airgun array pulse, as measured at a horizontal distance on the order of 0.1 km to 1–10 km in the units dB re 1 μPa, usually averages 10–15 dB higher than the SEL value for the same pulse measured in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (e.g., Greene 1997). However, there is considerable variation, and the difference tends to be larger close to the airgun array, and less at long distances (Blackwell et al. 2007; MacGillivray and Hannay 2007a, b). In some cases, generally at longer distances, pulses are "stretched" by propagation effects to the extent that the rms and SEL values (in the respective units mentioned above) become very similar (e.g., MacGillivray and Hannay 2007a, b).

quoted pulse level. In the past, NMFS has commonly referred to rms levels when discussing levels of pulsed sounds that might "harass" marine mammals.

Seismic sound pulses received at any given point will arrive via a direct path, indirect paths that include reflection from the sea surface and bottom, and often indirect paths including segments through the bottom sediments. Sounds propagating via indirect paths travel longer distances and often arrive later than sounds arriving via a direct path. However, sound traveling in the bottom may travel faster than that in the water, and thus may, in some situations, arrive slightly earlier than the direct arrival despite traveling a greater distance. These variations in travel time have the effect of lengthening the duration of the received pulse, or may cause two or more received pulses from a single emitted pulse. Near the source, the predominant part of a seismic pulse is ~10–20 ms in duration. In comparison, the pulse duration as received at long horizontal distances can be much greater. For example, for one airgun array operating in the Beaufort Sea, pulse duration was ~300 ms at a distance of 8 km, 500 ms at 20 km, and 850 ms at 73 km (Greene and Richardson 1988).

The rms level for a given pulse (when measured over the duration of that pulse) depends on the extent to which propagation effects have "stretched" the duration of the pulse by the time it reaches the receiver (e.g., Madsen 2005). As a result, the rms values for various received pulses are not perfectly correlated with the SEL (energy) values for the same pulses. There is increasing evidence that biological effects are more directly related to the received energy (e.g., to SEL) than to the rms values averaged over pulse duration (Southall et al. 2007).

Another important aspect of sound propagation is that received levels of low-frequency underwater sounds diminish close to the surface because of pressure-release and interference phenomena that occur at and near the surface (Urick 1983; Richardson et al. 1995; Potter et al. 2007). Paired measurements of received airgun sounds at depths of 3 vs. 9 or 18 m have shown that received levels are typically several decibels lower at 3 m (Greene and Richardson 1988). For a mammal whose auditory organs are within 0.5 or 1 m of the surface, the received level of the predominant low-frequency components of the airgun pulses would be further reduced. In deep water, the received levels at deep depths can be considerably higher than those at relatively shallow (e.g., 18 m) depths and the same horizontal distance from the airguns (Tolstoy et al. 2004a, b).

Pulses of underwater sound from open-water seismic exploration are often detected 50–100 km from the source location, even during operations in nearshore waters (Greene and Richardson 1988; Burgess and Greene 1999). At those distances, the received levels are usually low, <120 dB re 1 μPa on an approximate rms basis. However, faint seismic pulses are sometimes detectable at even greater ranges (e.g., Bowles et al. 1994; Fox et al. 2002). In fact, low-frequency airgun signals sometimes can be detected thousands of kilometers from their source. For example, sound from seismic surveys conducted offshore of Nova Scotia, the coast of western Africa, and northeast of Brazil were reported as a dominant feature of the underwater noise field recorded along the mid-Atlantic ridge (Nieukirk et al. 2004).

E.3.2 Masking Effects of Seismic Surveys

Masking is the obscuring of sounds of interest by interfering sounds, generally at similar frequencies (Richardson et al. 1995). Introduced underwater sound will, through masking, reduce the effective communication distance of a marine mammal species if the frequency of the source is close to that used as a signal by the marine mammal, and if the anthropogenic sound is present for a significant fraction of the time (Richardson et al. 1995). If little or no overlap occurs between the introduced sound and the frequencies used by the species, communication is not expected to be disrupted. Also, if the introduced

sound is present only infrequently, communication is not expected to be disrupted much if at all. The duty cycle of airguns is low; the airgun sounds are pulsed, with relatively quiet periods between pulses. In most situations, strong airgun sound will only be received for a brief period (<1 s), with these sound pulses being separated by at least several seconds of relative silence, and longer in the case of deep-penetration surveys or refraction surveys. A single airgun array might cause appreciable masking in only one situation: When propagation conditions are such that sound from each airgun pulse reverberates strongly and persists for much of or the entire interval up to the next airgun pulse (e.g., Simard et al. 2005; Clark and Gagnon 2006). Situations with prolonged strong reverberation are relatively infrequent, in our experience. However, it is common for reverberation to cause some lesser degree of elevation of the background level between airgun pulses (e.g., Guerra et al. 2009), and this weaker reverberation presumably reduces the detection range of calls and other natural sounds to some degree.

Although masking effects of pulsed sounds on marine mammal calls and other natural sounds are expected to be limited, there are few specific studies on this. Some whales continue calling in the presence of seismic pulses and whale calls often can be heard between the seismic pulses (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986; McDonald et al. 1995; Greene et al. 1999a, b; Nieukirk et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, b, 2006; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). However, there is one recent summary report indicating that calling fin whales distributed in one part of the North Atlantic went silent for an extended period starting soon after the onset of a seismic survey in the area (Clark and Gagnon 2006). It is not clear from that preliminary paper whether the whales ceased calling because of masking, or whether this was a behavioral response not directly involving masking. Also, bowhead whales in the Beaufort Sea may decrease their call rates in response to seismic operations, although movement out of the area might also have contributed to the lower call detection rate (Blackwell et al. 2009a, b). In contrast, Di Iorio and Clark (2010) found evidence of *increased* calling by blue whales during operations by a lower-energy seismic source—a sparker.

Among the odontocetes, there has been one report that sperm whales ceased calling when exposed to pulses from a very distant seismic ship (Bowles et al. 1994). However, but more recent studies of sperm whales found that they continued calling in the presence of seismic pulses (Madsen et al. 2002; Tyack et al. 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2006; Jochens et al. 2008). Madsen et al. (2006) noted that air-gun sounds would not be expected to mask sperm whale calls given the intermittent nature of airgun pulses. Dolphins and porpoises are also commonly heard calling while airguns are operating (Gordon et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, b; Potter et al. 2007). Masking effects of seismic pulses are expected to be negligible in the case of the smaller odontocetes, given the intermittent nature of seismic pulses plus the fact that sounds important to them are predominantly at much higher frequencies than are the dominant components of airgun sounds.

Pinnipeds, sirenians and sea otters have best hearing sensitivity and/or produce most of their sounds at frequencies higher than the dominant components of airgun sound, but there is some overlap in the frequencies of the airgun pulses and the calls. However, the intermittent nature of airgun pulses presumably reduces the potential for masking.

A few cetaceans are known to increase the source levels of their calls in the presence of elevated sound levels, or to shift their peak frequencies in response to strong sound signals, or otherwise modify their vocal behavior in response to increased noise (Dahlheim 1987; Au 1993; reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995:233*ff*, 364*ff*; Lesage et al. 1999; Terhune 1999; Nieukirk et al. 2005; Scheifele et al. 2005; Parks et al. 2007a, 2009; Hanser et al. 2009; Di Iorio and Clark 2010). It is not known how often these types of responses occur upon exposure to airgun sounds. However, blue whales in the St. Lawrence Estuary

significantly increased their call rates during sparker operations (Di Iorio and Clark 2010). The sparker, used to obtain seismic reflection data, emitted frequencies of 30–450 Hz with a relatively low source level of 193 dB re 1 μPa_{pk-pk}. If cetaceans exposed to airgun sounds sometimes respond by changing their vocal behavior, this adaptation, along with directional hearing and preadaptation to tolerate some masking by natural sounds (Richardson et al. 1995), would all reduce the importance of masking by seismic pulses.

E.3.3 Disturbance by Seismic Surveys

Disturbance includes a variety of effects, including subtle to conspicuous changes in behavior, movement, and displacement. In the terminology of the 1994 amendments to the MMPA, seismic noise could cause "Level B" harassment of certain marine mammals. Level B harassment is defined as "...disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering."

There has been debate regarding how substantial a change in behavior or mammal activity is required before the animal should be deemed to be "taken by Level B harassment". NMFS has stated that,

> "…a simple change in a marine mammal's actions does not always rise to the level of disruption of its behavioral patterns. … If the only reaction to the [human] activity on the part of the marine mammal is within the normal repertoire of actions that are required to carry out that behavioral pattern, NMFS considers [the human] activity not to have caused a disruption of the behavioral pattern, provided the animal's reaction is not otherwise significant enough to be considered disruptive due to length or severity. Therefore, for example, a short-term change in breathing rates or a somewhat shortened or lengthened dive sequence that are within the animal's normal range and that do not have any biological significance (i.e., do not disrupt the animal's overall behavioral pattern of breathing under the circumstances), do not rise to a level requiring a small take authorization." (NMFS 2001:9293).

Based on this guidance from NMFS, and on NRC (2005), simple exposure to sound, or brief reactions that do not disrupt behavioral patterns in a potentially significant manner, do not constitute harassment or "taking". In this analysis, we interpret "potentially significant" to mean in a manner that might have deleterious effects on the well-being of individual marine mammals or their populations.

Even with this guidance, there are difficulties in defining what marine mammals should be counted as "taken by harassment". Available detailed data on reactions of marine mammals to airgun sounds (and other anthropogenic sounds) are limited to relatively few species and situations (see Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Southall et al. 2007). Behavioral reactions of marine mammals to sound are difficult to predict in the absence of site- and context-specific data. Reactions to sound, if any, depend on species, state of maturity, experience, current activity, reproductive state, time of day, and many other factors (Richardson et al. 1995; Wartzok et al. 2004; Southall et al. 2007; Weilgart 2007). If a marine mammal reacts to an underwater sound by changing its behavior or moving a small distance, the impacts of the change are unlikely to be significant to the individual, let alone the stock or population. However, if a sound source displaces marine mammals from an important feeding or breeding area for a prolonged period, impacts on individuals and populations could be significant. (e.g., Lusseau and Bejder 2007; Weilgart 2007). Also, various authors have noted that some marine mammals that show no obvious avoidance or behavioral changes may still be adversely affected by noise (Brodie 1981; Richardson et al. 1995:317ff; Romano et al. 2004; Weilgart 2007; Wright et al. 2009). For example, some research suggests that animals in poor condition or in an already stressed state may not react as strongly to human disturbance as would more robust animals (e.g., Beale and Monaghan 2004).

Studies of the effects of seismic surveys have focused almost exclusively on the effects on individual species or related groups of species, with little scientific or regulatory attention being given to broader community-level issues. Parente et al. (2007) suggested that the diversity of cetaceans near the Brazil coast was reduced during years with seismic surveys. However, a preliminary account of a more recent analysis suggests that the trend did not persist when additional years were considered (Britto and Silva Barreto 2009).

Given the many uncertainties in predicting the quantity and types of impacts of sound on marine mammals, it is common practice to estimate how many mammals would be present within a particular distance of human activities and/or exposed to a particular level of anthropogenic sound. In most cases, this approach likely overestimates the numbers of marine mammals that would be affected in some biologically important manner. One of the reasons for this is that the selected distances/isopleths are based on limited studies indicating that some animals exhibited short-term reactions at this distance or sound level, whereas the calculation assumes that all animals exposed to this level would react in a biologically significant manner.

The definitions of "taking" in the MMPA, and its applicability to various activities, were slightly altered in November 2003 for military and federal scientific research activities. Also, NMFS is proposing to replace current Level A and B harassment criteria with guidelines based on exposure characteristics that are specific to particular groups of mammal species and to particular sound types (NMFS 2005). Recently, a committee of specialists on noise impact issues has proposed new science-based impact criteria (Southall et al. 2007). Thus, for projects subject to U.S. jurisdiction, changes in procedures may be required in the near future.

The sound criteria used to estimate how many marine mammals might be disturbed to some biologically significant degree by seismic survey activities are primarily based on behavioral observations of a few species. Detailed studies have been done on humpback, gray, bowhead, and sperm whales, and on ringed seals. Less detailed data are available for some other species of baleen whales and small toothed whales, but for many species there are no data on responses to marine seismic surveys.

Baleen Whales

Baleen whales generally tend to avoid operating airguns, but avoidance radii are quite variable among species, locations, whale activities, oceanographic conditions affecting sound propagation, etc. (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995 and Gordon et al. 2004). Whales are often reported to show no overt reactions to pulses from large arrays of airguns at distances beyond a few kilometers, even though the airgun pulses remain well above ambient noise levels out to much longer distances. However, baleen whales exposed to strong sound pulses from airguns often react by deviating from their normal migration route and/or interrupting their feeding and moving away. Some of the major studies and reviews on this topic are Malme et al. (1984, 1985, 1988); Richardson et al. (1986, 1995, 1999); Ljungblad et al. (1988); Richardson and Malme (1993); McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a, b); Miller et al. (1999, 2005); Gordon et al. (2004); Moulton and Miller (2005); Stone and Tasker (2006); Johnson et al. (2007); Nowacek et al. (2007) and Weir (2008a). Although baleen whales often show only slight overt responses to operating airgun arrays (Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008a), strong avoidance reactions by several species of mysticetes have been observed at ranges up to 6–8 km and occasionally as far as 20–30 km from the source vessel when large arrays of airguns were used. Experiments with a single airgun showed that bowhead, humpback and gray whales all showed localized avoidance to a single airgun of 20–100 in^3 (Malme et al. 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988; Richardson et al. 1986; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a, b).

Studies of gray, bowhead, and humpback whales have shown that seismic pulses with received levels of 160–170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} seem to cause obvious avoidance behavior in a substantial portion of the animals exposed (Richardson et al. 1995). In many areas, seismic pulses from large arrays of airguns diminish to those levels at distances ranging from 4–15 km from the source. More recent studies have shown that some species of baleen whales (bowheads and humpbacks in particular) at times show strong avoidance at received levels lower than 160–170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. The largest avoidance radii involved migrating bowhead whales, which avoided an operating seismic vessel by 20–30 km (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999). In the cases of migrating bowhead (and gray) whales, the observed changes in behavior appeared to be of little or no biological consequence to the animals—they simply avoided the sound source by displacing their migration route to varying degrees, but within the natural boundaries of the migration corridors (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985; Richardson et al. 1995). Feeding bowhead whales, in contrast to migrating whales, show much smaller avoidance distances (Miller et al. 2005; Harris et al. 2007), presumably because moving away from a food concentration has greater cost to the whales than does a course deviation during migration.

The following subsections provide more details on the documented responses of particular species and groups of baleen whales to marine seismic operations.

Humpback Whales.—Responses of humpback whales to seismic surveys have been studied during migration as well as on the summer feeding grounds and on Angolan winter breeding grounds; there has also been discussion of effects on the Brazilian wintering grounds. McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a) studied the responses of migrating humpback whales off Western Australia to a full-scale seismic survey with a 16-airgun 2678-in^3 array, and to a single 20 in^3 airgun with (horizontal) source level 227 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{p-p}$. They found that the overall distribution of humpbacks migrating through their study area was unaffected by the full-scale seismic program, although localized displacement varied with pod composition, behavior, and received sound levels. Observations were made from the seismic vessel, from which the maximum viewing distance was listed as 14 km. Avoidance reactions (course and speed changes) began at 4–5 km for traveling pods, with the CPA being 3–4 km at an estimated received level of 157–164 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). A greater stand-off range of 7–12 km was observed for more sensitive resting pods (cow-calf pairs; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). The mean received level for initial avoidance of an approaching airgun was 140 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} for humpback pods containing females, and at the mean CPA distance the received level was 143 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. One startle response was reported at 112 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. The initial avoidance response generally occurred at distances of 5–8 km from the airgun array and 2 km from the single airgun. However, some individual humpback whales, especially males, approached within distances of 100–400 m, where the maximum received level was 179 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. The McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a, b) studies show evidence of greater avoidance of seismic airgun sounds by pods with females than by other pods during humpback migration off Western Australia.

Humpback whales on their summer feeding grounds in southeast Alaska did not exhibit persistent avoidance when exposed to seismic pulses from a 1.64-L (100 in^3) airgun (Malme et al. 1985). Some humpbacks seemed "startled" at received levels of 150–169 dB re 1 µPa. Malme et al. (1985) concluded that there was no clear evidence of avoidance, despite the possibility of subtle effects, at received levels up to 172 re 1 µPa on an approximate rms basis.

Among wintering humpback whales off Angola (n = 52 useable groups), there were no significant differences in encounter rates (sightings/hr) when a 24-airgun array (3,147 in^3 or 5,085 in^3) was operating

vs. silent (Weir 2008a). There was also no significant difference in the mean CPA of the humpback sightings when airguns were on vs. off (3050 m vs. 2700 m, respectively).

It has been suggested that South Atlantic humpback whales wintering off Brazil may be displaced or even strand upon exposure to seismic surveys (Engel et al. 2004). The evidence for this was circumstantial and subject to alternative explanations (IAGC 2004). Also, the evidence was not consistent with subsequent results from the same area of Brazil (Parente et al. 2006), or with direct studies of humpbacks exposed to seismic surveys in other areas and seasons (see above). After allowance for data from subsequent years, there was "no observable direct correlation" between strandings and seismic surveys (IWC 2007:236).

Bowhead Whales.—Responsiveness of bowhead whales to seismic surveys can be quite variable depending on their activity (feeding vs. migrating). Bowhead whales on their summer feeding grounds in the Canadian Beaufort Sea showed no obvious reactions to pulses from seismic vessels at distances of 6–99 km and received sound levels of 107–158 dB on an approximate rms basis (Richardson et al. 1986); their general activities were indistinguishable from those of a control group. However, subtle but statistically significant changes in surfacing–respiration–dive cycles were evident upon statistical analysis. Bowheads usually did show strong avoidance responses when seismic vessels approached within a few kilometers (~3–7 km) and when received levels of airgun sounds were 152–178 dB (Richardson et al. 1986, 1995; Ljungblad et al. 1988; Miller et al. 2005). They also moved away when a single airgun fired nearby (Richardson et al. 1986; Ljungblad et al. 1988). In one case, bowheads engaged in near-bottom feeding began to turn away from a 30-airgun array with a source level of 248 dB re 1 μPa·m at a distance of 7.5 km, and swam away when it came within ~2 km; some whales continued feeding until the vessel was 3 km away (Richardson et al. 1986). This work and subsequent summer studies in the same region by Miller et al. (2005) and Harris et al. (2007) showed that many feeding bowhead whales tend to tolerate higher sound levels than migrating bowhead whales before showing an overt change in behavior. On the summer feeding grounds, bowhead whales are often seen from the operating seismic ship, though average sighting distances tend to be larger when the airguns are operating. Similarly, preliminary analyses of recent data from the Alaskan Beaufort Sea indicate that bowheads feeding there during late summer and autumn also did not display large-scale distributional changes in relation to seismic operations (Christie et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009).However, some individual bowheads apparently begin to react at distances a few kilometers away, beyond the distance at which observers on the ship can sight bowheads (Richardson et al. 1986; Citta et al. 2007). The feeding whales may be affected by the sounds, but the need to feed may reduce the tendency to move away until the airguns are within a few kilometers.

Migrating bowhead whales in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea seem more responsive to noise pulses from a distant seismic vessel than are summering bowheads. Bowhead whales migrating west across the Alaskan Beaufort Sea in autumn are unusually responsive, with substantial avoidance occurring out to distances of 20–30 km from a medium-sized airgun source at received sound levels of around 120–130 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999; see also Manly et al. 2007). Those results came from 1996–98, when a partially-controlled study of the effect of Ocean Bottom Cable (OBC) seismic surveys on westward-migrating bowheads was conducted in late summer and autumn in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Aerial surveys showed that some westward-migrating whales avoided an active seismic survey boat by 20–30 km, and that few bowheads approached within 20 km. Received sound levels at those distances were only 116–135 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. At times when the airguns were not active, many bowheads moved into the area close to the inactive seismic vessel. Avoidance of the area of seismic operations did not persist beyond 12–24 h after seismic shooting stopped. Preliminary analysis of recent data on traveling bowheads in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea also showed a stronger tendency to avoid operating airguns than was evident for feeding bowheads (Christie et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009).

Bowhead whale calls detected in the presence and absence of airgun sounds have been studied extensively in the Beaufort Sea. Early work on the summering grounds in the Canadian Beaufort Sea showed that bowheads continue to produce calls of the usual types when exposed to airgun sounds, although numbers of calls detected may be somewhat lower in the presence of airgun pulses (Richardson et al. 1986). Studies during autumn in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, one in 1996–1998 and another in 2007–2008, have shown that numbers of calls detected are significantly lower in the presence than in the absence of airgun pulses (Greene et al. 1999a, b; Blackwell et al. 2009a, b; Koski et al. 2009; see also Nations et al. 2009). This decrease could have resulted from movement of the whales away from the area of the seismic survey or a reduction in calling behavior, or a combination of the two. However, concurrent aerial surveys showed that there was strong avoidance of the operating airguns during the 1996–98 study, when most of the whales appeared to be migrating (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999). In contrast, aerial surveys during the 2007–08 study showed less consistent avoidance by the bowheads, many of which appeared to be feeding (Christie et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009). The reduction in call detection rates during periods of airgun operation may have been more dependent on actual avoidance during the 1996–98 study and more dependent on reduced calling behavior during the 2007–08 study, but further analysis of the recent data is ongoing.

There are no data on reactions of bowhead whales to seismic surveys in winter or spring.

Gray Whales.—Malme et al. (1986, 1988) studied the responses of feeding eastern gray whales to pulses from a single 100-in^3 airgun off St. Lawrence Island in the northern Bering Sea. They estimated, based on small sample sizes, that 50% of feeding gray whales stopped feeding at an average received pressure level of 173 dB re 1 μPa on an (approximate) rms basis, and that 10% of feeding whales interrupted feeding at received levels of 163 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. Malme at al. (1986) estimated that an average pressure level of 173 dB occurred at a range of 2.6–2.8 km from an airgun array with a source level of 250 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{0\text{-}p}$ in the northern Bering Sea. These findings were generally consistent with the results of studies conducted on larger numbers of gray whales migrating off California (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985) and western Pacific gray whales feeding off Sakhalin, Russia (Würsig et al. 1999; Gailey et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2007; Yazvenko et al. 2007a, b), along with a few data on gray whales off British Columbia (Bain and Williams 2006).

Malme and Miles (1985) concluded that, during migration off California, gray whales showed changes in swimming pattern with received levels of ~160 dB re 1 μPa and higher, on an approximate rms basis. The 50% probability of avoidance was estimated to occur at a CPA distance of 2.5 km from a 4000-in³ airgun array operating off central California. This would occur at an average received sound level of ~170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. Some slight behavioral changes were noted when approaching gray whales reached the distances where received sound levels were 140 to 160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}, but these whales generally continued to approach (at a slight angle) until they passed the sound source at distances where received levels averaged ~170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985).

There was no indication that western gray whales exposed to seismic noise were displaced from their overall feeding grounds near Sakhalin Island during seismic programs in 1997 (Würsig et al. 1999) and in 2001 (Johnson et al. 2007; Meier et al. 2007; Yazvenko et al. 2007a). However, there were indications of subtle behavioral effects among whales that remained in the areas exposed to airgun sounds (Würsig et al. 1999; Gailey et al. 2007; Weller et al. 2006a). Also, there was evidence of localized redistribution of some individuals within the nearshore feeding ground so as to avoid close approaches by the seismic vessel (Weller et al. 2002, 2006b; Yazvenko et al. 2007a). Despite the evidence of subtle changes in some quantitative measures of behavior and local redistribution of some individuals, there was no apparent

change in the frequency of feeding, as evident from mud plumes visible at the surface (Yazvenko et al. 2007b). It should be noted that the 2001 seismic program involved an unusually comprehensive combination of real-time monitoring and mitigation measures designed to avoid exposing western gray whales to received levels of sound above about 163 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (Johnson et al. 2007). The lack of strong avoidance or other strong responses was presumably in part a result of the mitigation measures. Effects probably would have been more significant without such intensive mitigation efforts.

Gray whales in British Columbia exposed to seismic survey sound levels up to ~170 dB re 1 µPa did not appear to be strongly disturbed. The few whales that were observed moved away from the airguns but toward deeper water where sound levels were said to be higher due to propagation effects (Bain and Williams 2006).

Rorquals.—Blue, sei, fin, and minke whales (all of which are members of the genus *Balaenoptera*) often have been seen in areas ensonified by airgun pulses (Stone 2003; MacLean and Haley 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006), and calls from blue and fin whales have been localized in areas with airgun operations (e.g., McDonald et al. 1995; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). Sightings by observers on seismic vessels during 110 large-source seismic surveys off the U.K. from 1997 to 2000 suggest that, during times of good sightability, sighting rates for mysticetes (mainly fin and sei whales) were similar when large arrays of airguns were shooting vs. silent (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). However, these whales tended to exhibit localized avoidance, remaining significantly further (on average) from the airgun array during seismic operations compared with non-seismic periods (P = 0.0057; Stone and Tasker 2006). The average CPA distances for baleen whales sighted when large airgun arrays were operating vs. silent were about 1.6 vs. 1.0 km. Baleen whales, as a group, were more often oriented away from the vessel while a large airgun array was shooting compared with periods of no shooting (P <0.05; Stone and Tasker 2006). In addition, fin/sei whales were less likely to remain submerged during periods of seismic shooting (Stone 2003).

In a study off Nova Scotia, Moulton and Miller (2005) found little difference in sighting rates (after accounting for water depth) and initial average sighting distances of balaenopterid whales when airguns were operating (mean = 1324 m) vs. silent (mean = 1303 m). However, there were indications that these whales were more likely to be moving away when seen during airgun operations. Baleen whales at the average sighting distance during airgun operations would have been exposed to sound levels (via direct path) of about 169 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (Moulton and Miller 2005). Similarly, ship-based monitoring studies of blue, fin, sei and minke whales offshore of Newfoundland (Orphan Basin and Laurentian Sub-basin) found no more than small differences in sighting rates and swim directions during seismic vs. non-seismic periods (Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a, b). Analyses of CPA data yielded variable results.[3] The authors of the Newfoundland reports concluded that, based on observations from the seismic vessel, some mysticetes exhibited localized avoidance of seismic operations (Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a).

Minke whales have occasionally been observed to approach active airgun arrays where received sound levels were estimated to be near 170–180 dB re 1 µPa (McLean and Haley 2004).

[3] The CPA of baleen whales sighted from the seismic vessels was, on average, significantly closer during non-seismic periods vs. seismic periods in 2004 in the Orphan Basin (means 1526 m vs. 2316 m, respectively; Moulton et al. 2005). In contrast, mean distances without vs. with seismic did not differ significantly in 2005 in either the Orphan Basin (means 973 m vs. 832 m, respectively; Moulton et al. 2006a) or in the Laurentian Sub-basin (means 1928 m vs. 1650 m, respectively; Moulton et al. 2006b). In both 2005 studies, mean distances were greater (though not significantly so) *without* seismic.

Discussion and Conclusions.—Baleen whales generally tend to avoid operating airguns, but avoidance radii are quite variable. Whales are often reported to show no overt reactions to airgun pulses at distances beyond a few kilometers, even though the airgun pulses remain well above ambient noise levels out to much longer distances. However, studies done since the late 1990s of migrating humpback and migrating bowhead whales show reactions, including avoidance, that sometimes extend to greater distances than documented earlier. Avoidance distances often exceed the distances at which boat-based observers can see whales, so observations from the source vessel can be biased. Observations over broader areas may be needed to determine the range of potential effects of some large-source seismic surveys where effects on cetaceans may extend to considerable distances (Richardson et al. 1999; Bain and Williams 2006; Moore and Angliss 2006). Longer-range observations, when required, can sometimes be obtained via systematic aerial surveys or aircraft-based observations of behavior (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986, 1999; Miller et al. 1999, 2005; Yazvenko et al. 2007a, b) or by use of observers on one or more support vessels operating in coordination with the seismic vessel (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004; Johnson et al. 2007). However, the presence of other vessels near the source vessel can, at least at times, reduce sightability of cetaceans from the source vessel (Beland et al. 2009), thus complicating interpretation of sighting data.

Some baleen whales show considerable tolerance of seismic pulses. However, when the pulses are strong enough, avoidance or other behavioral changes become evident. Because the responses become less obvious with diminishing received sound level, it has been difficult to determine the maximum distance (or minimum received sound level) at which reactions to seismic become evident and, hence, how many whales are affected.

Studies of gray, bowhead, and humpback whales have determined that received levels of pulses in the 160–170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} range seem to cause obvious avoidance behavior in a substantial fraction of the animals exposed. In many areas, seismic pulses diminish to these levels at distances ranging from 4 to 15 km from the source. A substantial proportion of the baleen whales within such distances may show avoidance or other strong disturbance reactions to the operating airgun array. However, in other situations, various mysticetes tolerate exposure to full-scale airgun arrays operating at even closer distances, with only localized avoidance and minor changes in activities. At the other extreme, in migrating bowhead whales, avoidance often extends to considerably larger distances (20–30 km) and lower received sound levels (120–130 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}). Also, even in cases where there is no conspicuous avoidance or change in activity upon exposure to sound pulses from distant seismic operations, there are sometimes subtle changes in behavior (e.g., surfacing–respiration–dive cycles) that are only evident through detailed statistical analysis (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986; Gailey et al. 2007).

Mitigation measures for seismic surveys, especially nighttime seismic surveys, typically assume that many marine mammals (at least baleen whales) tend to avoid approaching airguns, or the seismic vessel itself, before being exposed to levels high enough for there to be any possibility of injury. This assumes that the ramp-up (soft-start) procedure is used when commencing airgun operations, to give whales near the vessel the opportunity to move away before they are exposed to sound levels that might be strong enough to elicit TTS. As noted above, single-airgun experiments with three species of baleen whales show that those species typically do tend to move away when a single airgun starts firing nearby, which simulates the onset of a ramp up. The three species that showed avoidance when exposed to the onset of pulses from a single airgun were gray whales (Malme et al. 1984, 1986, 1988); bowhead whales (Richardson et al. 1986; Ljungblad et al. 1988); and humpback whales (Malme et al. 1985; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a, b). Since startup of a single airgun is equivalent to the start of a ramp-up (=soft start), this strongly suggests that many baleen whales will begin to move away during the initial stages of a ramp-up.

Data on short-term reactions by cetaceans to impulsive noises are not necessarily indicative of long-term or biologically significant effects. It is not known whether impulsive sounds affect reproductive rate or distribution and habitat use in subsequent days or years. However, gray whales have continued to migrate annually along the west coast of North America despite intermittent seismic exploration (and much ship traffic) in that area for decades (Appendix A *in* Malme et al. 1984; Richardson et al. 1995), and there has been a substantial increase in the population over recent decades (Angliss and Outlaw 2008). The western Pacific gray whale population did not seem affected by a seismic survey in its feeding ground during a prior year (Johnson et al. 2007). Similarly, bowhead whales have continued to travel to the eastern Beaufort Sea each summer (Richardson et al. 1987), and their numbers have increased notably (Angliss and Outlaw 2007). Bowhead also have been observed over periods of days or weeks in areas ensonified repeatedly by seismic pulses (Richardson et al. 1987; Harris et al. 2007). However, it is generally not known whether the same individual bowheads were involved in these repeated observations (within and between years) in strongly ensonified areas. In any event, in the absence of some unusual circumstances, the history of coexistence between seismic surveys and baleen whales suggests that brief exposures to sound pulses from any single seismic survey are unlikely to result in prolonged effects.

Toothed Whales

Little systematic information is available about reactions of toothed whales to noise pulses. Few studies similar to the more extensive baleen whale/seismic pulse work summarized above have been reported for toothed whales. However, there are recent systematic data on sperm whales (e.g., Gordon et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). There is also an increasing amount of information about responses of various odontocetes to seismic surveys based on monitoring studies (e.g., Stone 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Moulton and Miller 2005; Bain and Williams 2006; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Potter et al. 2007; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; Weir 2008a; Barkaszi et al. 2009; Richardson et al. 2009).

Delphinids (Dolphins and similar) and Monodontids (Beluga).—Seismic operators and marine mammal observers on seismic vessels regularly see dolphins and other small toothed whales near operating airgun arrays, but in general there seems to be a tendency for most delphinids to show some avoidance of operating seismic vessels (e.g., Goold 1996a, b, c; Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; Stone 2003; Moulton and Miller 2005; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008a; Richardson et al. 2009; see also Barkaszi et al. 2009). In most cases, the avoidance radii for delphinids appear to be small, on the order of 1 km or less, and some individuals show no apparent avoidance. Studies that have reported cases of small toothed whales close to the operating airguns include Duncan (1985), Arnold (1996), Stone (2003), and Holst et al. (2006). When a 3,959 in^3, 18-airgun array was firing off California, toothed whales behaved in a manner similar to that observed when the airguns were silent (Arnold 1996). Some dolphins seemed to be attracted to the seismic vessel and floats, and some rode the bow wave of the seismic vessel even when a large array of airguns was firing (e.g., Moulton and Miller 2005). Nonetheless, small toothed whales more often tend to head away, or to maintain a somewhat greater distance from the vessel, when a large array of airguns is operating than when it is silent (e.g., Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008a).

Weir (2008b) noted that a group of short-finned pilot whales initially showed an avoidance response to ramp up of a large airgun array, but that this response was limited in time and space. Although the ramp-up procedure is a widely-used mitigation measure, it remains uncertain how effective it is at alerting marine mammals (especially odontocetes) and causing them to move away from seismic operations (Weir 2008b).

Goold (1996a, b, c) studied the effects on common dolphins of 2D seismic surveys in the Irish Sea. Passive acoustic surveys were conducted from the "guard ship" that towed a hydrophone 180 m aft. The results indicated that there was a local displacement of dolphins around the seismic operation. However, observations indicated that the animals were tolerant of the sounds at distances outside a 1-km radius from the airguns (Goold 1996a). Initial reports of larger-scale displacement were later shown to represent a normal autumn migration of dolphins through the area, and were not attributable to seismic surveys (Goold 1996a, b, c).

The beluga appears to be a species that (at least at times) shows long-distance avoidance of seismic vessels. Aerial surveys conducted in the southeastern Beaufort Sea in summer found that sighting rates of belugas were significantly lower at distances 10–20 km compared with 20–30 km from an operating airgun array (Miller et al. 2005). The low number of beluga sightings by marine mammal observers on the vessel seemed to confirm there was a strong avoidance response to the 2,250 in^3 airgun array. More recent seismic monitoring studies in the same area have confirmed that the apparent displacement effect on belugas extended farther than has been shown for other small odontocetes exposed to airgun pulses (e.g., Harris et al. 2007).

Observers stationed on seismic vessels operating off the United Kingdom from 1997 to 2000 have provided data on the occurrence and behavior of various toothed whales exposed to seismic pulses (Stone 2003; Gordon et al. 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006). Dolphins of various species often showed more evidence of avoidance of operating airgun arrays than has been reported previously for small odontocetes. Sighting rates of white-sided dolphins, white-beaked dolphins, *Lagenorhynchus* spp., and all small odontocetes combined were significantly lower during periods when large-volume[4] airgun arrays were shooting. Except for the pilot whale and bottlenose dolphin, CPA distances for all of the small odontocete species tested, including killer whales, were significantly farther from large airgun arrays during periods of shooting compared with periods of no shooting. Pilot whales were less responsive than other small odontocetes in the presence of seismic surveys (Stone and Tasker 2006). For small odontocetes as a group, and most individual species, orientations differed between times when large airgun arrays were operating vs. silent, with significantly fewer animals traveling towards and/or more traveling away from the vessel during shooting. Observers' records suggested that fewer cetaceans were feeding and fewer were interacting with the survey vessel (e.g., bow-riding) during periods with airguns operating, and small odontocetes tended to swim faster during periods of shooting. For most types of small odontocetes sighted by observers on seismic vessels, the median CPA distance was ~0.5 km larger during airgun operations (Stone and Tasker 2006). Killer whales appeared to be more tolerant of seismic shooting in deeper waters.

Data collected during seismic operations in the Gulf of Mexico and off Central America show similar patterns. A summary of vessel-based monitoring data from the Gulf of Mexico during 2003–2008 showed that delphinids were generally seen farther from the vessel during seismic than during nonseismic periods (based on Barkaszi et al. 2009, excluding sperm whales). Similarly, during two NSF-funded L-DEO seismic surveys that used a large 20 airgun array (~7,000 in^3), sighting rates of delphinids were lower and initial sighting distances were farther away from the vessel during seismic than non-seismic periods (Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, 2006; Richardson et al. 2009). Monitoring results during a seismic survey in the Southeast Caribbean showed that the mean CPA of delphinids was 991 m during seismic operations vs. 172 m when the airguns were not operational (Smultea et al. 2004). Surprisingly,

[4] Large volume means at least 1,300 in^3, with most (79%) at least 3,000 in^3.

nearly all acoustic detections via a towed PAM array, including both delphinids and sperm whales, were made when the airguns were operating (Smultea et al. 2004). Although the number of sightings during monitoring of a seismic survey off the Yucatán Peninsula, Mexico, was small (*n*=19), the results showed that the mean CPA distance of delphinids there was 472 m during seismic operations vs. 178 m when the airguns were silent (Holst et al. 2005a). The acoustic detection rates were nearly 5 times higher during non-seismic compared with seismic operations (Holst et al. 2005a).

For two additional NSF-funded L-DEO seismic surveys in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, both using a large 36-airgun array (~6,600 in^3), the results are less easily interpreted (Richardson et al. 2009). During both surveys, the delphinid detection rate was lower during seismic than during non-seismic periods, as found in various other projects, but the mean CPA distance of delphinids was closer (not farther) during seismic periods (Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008).

During two seismic surveys off Newfoundland and Labrador in 2004–05, dolphin sighting rates were lower during seismic periods than during non-seismic periods after taking temporal factors into account, although the difference was statistically significant only in 2004 (Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a). In 2005, the mean CPA distance of dolphins was significantly farther during seismic periods (807 m vs. 652 m); in 2004, the corresponding difference was not significant.

Among Atlantic spotted dolphins off Angola (*n*=16 useable groups), marked short-term and localized displacement was found in response to seismic operations conducted with a 24-airgun array (3,147 in^3 or 5085 in^3) (Weir 2008a). Sample sizes were low, but CPA distances of dolphin groups were significantly larger when airguns were on (mean 1,080 m) vs. off (mean 209 m). No Atlantic spotted dolphins were seen within 500 m of the airguns when they were operating, whereas all sightings when airguns were silent occurred within 500 m, including the only recorded "positive approach" behaviors.

Reactions of toothed whales to a single airgun or other small airgun source are not well documented, but tend to be less substantial than reactions to large airgun arrays (e.g., Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). During 91 site surveys off the U.K. in 1997–2000, sighting rates of all small odontocetes combined were significantly lower during periods the low-volume[5] airgun sources were operating, and effects on orientation were evident for all species and groups tested (Stone and Tasker 2006). Results from four NSF-funded L-DEO seismic surveys using small arrays (up to 3 GI guns and 315 in^3) were inconclusive. During surveys in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (Holst et al. 2005b) and in the Northwest Atlantic (Haley and Koski 2004), detection rates were slightly lower during seismic compared to non-seismic periods. However, mean CPAs were closer during seismic operations during one cruise (Holst et al. 2005b), and greater during the other cruise (Haley and Koski 2004). Interpretation of the data was confounded by the fact that survey effort and/or number of sightings during non-seismic periods during both surveys was small. Results from another two small-array surveys in southeast Alaska were even more variable (MacLean and Koski 2005; Smultea and Holst 2008).

Captive bottlenose dolphins and beluga whales exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to strong pulsed sounds similar in duration to those typically used in seismic surveys (Finneran et al. 2000, 2002, 2005). Finneran et al. (2002) exposed a captive bottlenose dolphin and beluga to single impulses from a water gun (80 in^3). As compared with airgun pulses, water gun impulses were expected to contain proportionally more energy at higher frequencies because there is no significant gas-filled bubble, and thus little low-frequency bubble-pulse energy (Hutchinson and Detrick 1984). The captive animals sometimes

[5] For low volume arrays, maximum volume was 820 in^3, with most (87%) ≤180 in^3.

vocalized after exposure and exhibited reluctance to station at the test site where subsequent exposure to impulses would be implemented (Finneran et al. 2002). Similar behaviors were exhibited by captive bottlenose dolphins and a beluga exposed to single underwater pulses designed to simulate those produced by distant underwater explosions (Finneran et al. 2000). It is uncertain what relevance these observed behaviors in captive, trained marine mammals exposed to single transient sounds may have to free-ranging animals exposed to multiple pulses. In any event, the animals tolerated rather high received levels of sound before exhibiting the aversive behaviors mentioned above.

Odontocete responses (or lack of responses) to noise pulses from underwater explosions (as opposed to airgun pulses) may be indicative of odontocete responses to very strong noise pulses. During the 1950s, small explosive charges were dropped into an Alaskan river in attempts to scare belugas away from salmon. Success was limited (Fish and Vania 1971; Frost et al. 1984). Small explosive charges were "not always effective" in moving bottlenose dolphins away from sites in the Gulf of Mexico where larger demolition blasts were about to occur (Klima et al. 1988). Odontocetes may be attracted to fish killed by explosions, and thus attracted rather than repelled by "scare" charges. Captive false killer whales showed no obvious reaction to single noise pulses from small (10 g) charges; the received level was ~185 dB re 1 µPa (Akamatsu et al. 1993). Jefferson and Curry (1994) reviewed several additional studies that found limited or no effects of noise pulses from small explosive charges on killer whales and other odontocetes. Aside from the potential for causing auditory impairment (see below), the tolerance to these charges may indicate a lack of effect, or the failure to move away may simply indicate a stronger desire to feed, regardless of circumstances.

Phocoenids (Porpoises).—Porpoises, like delphinids, show variable reactions to seismic operations, and reactions apparently depend on species. The limited available data suggest that harbor porpoises show stronger avoidance of seismic operations than Dall's porpoises (Stone 2003; MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006). In Washington State waters, the harbor porpoise—despite being considered a high-frequency specialist—appeared to be the species affected by the lowest received level of airgun sound (<145 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} at a distance >70 km; Bain and Williams 2006). Similarly, during seismic surveys with large airgun arrays off the U.K. in 1997–2000, there were significant differences in directions of travel by harbor porpoises during periods when the airguns were shooting vs. silent (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). A captive harbor porpoise exposed to single sound pulses from a small airgun showed aversive behavior upon receipt of a pulse with received level above 174 dB re 1 μPa_{pk-pk} or SEL >145 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Lucke et al. 2009). In contrast, Dall's porpoises seem relatively tolerant of airgun operations (MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006), although they too have been observed to avoid large arrays of operating airguns (Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; Bain and Williams 2006). The apparent tendency for greater responsiveness in the harbor porpoise is consistent with their relative responsiveness to boat traffic and some other acoustic sources (Richardson et al. 1995; Southall et al. 2007).

Beaked Whales.—There are almost no specific data on the behavioral reactions of beaked whales to seismic surveys. Most beaked whales tend to avoid approaching vessels of other types (e.g., Würsig et al. 1998). They may also dive for an extended period when approached by a vessel (e.g., Kasuya 1986), although it is uncertain how much longer such dives may be as compared to dives by undisturbed beaked whales, which also are often quite long (Baird et al. 2006; Tyack et al. 2006b). In any event, it is likely that most beaked whales would also show strong avoidance of an approaching seismic vessel, regardless of whether or not the airguns are operating. However, this has not been documented explicitly. Northern bottlenose whales sometimes are quite tolerant of slow-moving vessels not emitting airgun pulses (Reeves et al. 1993; Hooker et al. 2001). The few detections (acoustic or visual) of northern bottlenose whales

from seismic vessels during recent seismic surveys off Nova Scotia have been during times when the airguns were shut down; no detections were reported when the airguns were operating (Moulton and Miller 2005; Potter et al. 2007). However, other visual and acoustic studies indicated that some northern bottlenose whales remained in the general area and continued to produce high-frequency clicks when exposed to sound pulses from distant seismic surveys (Gosselin and Lawson 2004; Laurinolli and Cochrane 2005; Simard et al. 2005).

There are increasing indications that some beaked whales tend to strand when military exercises involving MF sonar operation are ongoing nearby (e.g., Simmonds and Lopez-Jurado 1991; Frantzis 1998; NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001; Jepson et al. 2003; Barlow and Gisiner 2006; see also the "Strandings and Mortality" subsection below). These strandings are apparently at least in part a disturbance response, although auditory or other injuries or other physiological effects may also be a factor. Whether beaked whales would ever react similarly to seismic surveys is unknown. Seismic survey sounds are quite different from those of the sonars in operation during the above-cited incidents. No conclusive link has been established between seismic surveys and beaked whale strandings. There was a stranding of two Cuvier's beaked whales in the Gulf of California (Mexico) in September 2002 when the R/V *Ewing* was conducting a seismic survey in the general area (e.g., Malakoff 2002; Hildebrand 2005). However, NMFS did not establish a cause and effect relationship between this stranding and the seismic survey activities (Hogarth 2002). Cox et al. (2006) noted the "lack of knowledge regarding the temporal and spatial correlation between the [stranding] and the sound source". Hildebrand (2005) illustrated the approximate temporal-spatial relationships between the stranding and the R/V *Ewing*'s tracks, but the time of the stranding was not known with sufficient precision for accurate determination of the CPA distance of the whales to the R/V *Ewing*. Another stranding of Cuvier's beaked whales in the Galápagos occurred during a seismic survey in April 2000; however "There is no obvious mechanism that bridges the distance between this source and the stranding site" (Gentry 2002).

Sperm Whales.—All three species of sperm whales have been reported to show avoidance reactions to standard vessels not emitting airgun sounds (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995; Würsig et al. 1998; McAlpine 2002; Baird 2005). However, most studies of the sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) exposed to airgun sounds indicate that this species shows considerable tolerance of airgun pulses. The whales usually do not show strong avoidance (i.e., they do not leave the area) and they continue to call.

There were some early and limited observations suggesting that sperm whales in the Southern Ocean ceased calling during some (but not all) times when exposed to weak noise pulses from extremely distant (>300 km) seismic exploration. However, other operations in the area could also have been a factor (Bowles et al. 1994). This "quieting" was suspected to represent a disturbance effect, in part because sperm whales exposed to pulsed man-made sounds at higher frequencies often cease calling (Watkins and Schevill 1975; Watkins et al. 1985). Also, there was an early preliminary account of possible long-range avoidance of seismic vessels by sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico (Mate et al. 1994). However, this has not been substantiated by subsequent more detailed work in that area (Gordon et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009).

Recent and more extensive data from vessel-based monitoring programs in U.K. waters and off Newfoundland and Angola suggest that sperm whales in those areas show little evidence of avoidance or behavioral disruption in the presence of operating seismic vessels (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006; Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a; Weir 2008a). Among sperm whales off Angola (n = 96 useable groups), there were no significant differences in encounter rates (sightings/hr) when a 24-airgun array (3,147 in^3 or 5,085 in^3) was operating vs. silent (Weir 2008a). There was also no significant difference in the closest

observed approach distances of the sperm whale sightings when airguns were on vs. off (means 3039 m vs. 2594 m, respectively). Encounter rate tended to increase over the 10-month duration of the seismic survey. These types of observations are difficult to interpret because the observers are stationed on or near the seismic vessel, and may underestimate reactions by some of the more responsive animals, which may be beyond visual range. However, these results do seem to show considerable tolerance of seismic surveys by at least some sperm whales. Also, a study off northern Norway indicated that sperm whales continued to call when exposed to pulses from a distant seismic vessel. Received levels of the seismic pulses were up to 146 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p} (Madsen et al. 2002).

Similarly, a study conducted off Nova Scotia that analyzed recordings of sperm whale vocalizations at various distances from an active seismic program did not detect any obvious changes in the distribution or behavior of sperm whales (McCall Howard 1999).

Sightings of sperm whales by observers on seismic vessels operating in the Gulf of Mexico during 2003–2008 were at very similar average distances regardless of the airgun operating conditions (Barkaszi et al. 2009). For example, the mean sighting distance was 1,839 m when the airgun array was in full operation (n=612) vs. 1,960 m when all airguns were off (n=66).

A controlled study of the reactions of tagged sperm whales to seismic surveys was done recently in the Gulf of Mexico — the Sperm Whale Seismic Study or SWSS (Gordon et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). During SWSS, D-tags (Johnson and Tyack 2003) were used to record the movement and acoustic exposure of eight foraging sperm whales before, during, and after controlled exposures to sound from airgun arrays (Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). Whales were exposed to maximum received sound levels of 111–147 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (131–162 dB re 1 μPa_{pk-pk}) at ranges of ~1.4–12.8 km from the sound source (Miller et al. 2009). Although the tagged whales showed no discernible horizontal avoidance, some whales showed changes in diving and foraging behavior during full-array exposure, possibly indicative of subtle negative effects on foraging (Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009; Tyack 2009). Two indications of foraging that they studied were oscillations in pitch and occurrence of echolocation buzzes, both of which tend to occur when a sperm whale closes-in on prey. "Oscillations in pitch generated by swimming movements during foraging dives were on average 6% lower during exposure than during the immediately following post-exposure period, with all 7 foraging whales exhibiting less pitching (P = 0.014). Buzz rates, a proxy for attempts to capture prey, were 19% lower during exposure…" (Miller et al. 2009). Although the latter difference was not statistically significant (P = 0.141), the percentage difference in buzz rate during exposure vs. postexposure conditions appeared to be strongly correlated with airgun-whale distance (Miller et al. 2009:Figure 5; Tyack 2009).

Discussion and Conclusions.—Dolphins and porpoises are often seen by observers on active seismic vessels, occasionally at close distances (e.g., bow riding). However, some studies near the U.K., Newfoundland and Angola, in the Gulf of Mexico, and off Central America have shown localized avoidance. Also, belugas summering in the Canadian Beaufort Sea showed larger-scale avoidance, tending to avoid waters out to 10–20 km from operating seismic vessels. In contrast, recent studies show little evidence of conspicuous reactions by sperm whales to airgun pulses, contrary to earlier indications.

There are almost no specific data on responses of beaked whales to seismic surveys, but it is likely that most if not all species show strong avoidance. There is increasing evidence that some beaked whales may strand after exposure to strong noise from sonars. Whether they ever do so in response to seismic survey noise is unknown. Northern bottlenose whales seem to continue to call when exposed to pulses from distant seismic vessels.

Overall, odontocete reactions to large arrays of airguns are variable and, at least for delphinids and some porpoises, seem to be confined to a smaller radius than has been observed for some mysticetes. However, other data suggest that some odontocetes species, including belugas and harbor porpoises, may be more responsive than might be expected given their poor low-frequency hearing. Reactions at longer distances may be particularly likely when sound propagation conditions are conducive to transmission of the higher-frequency components of airgun sound to the animals' location (DeRuiter et al. 2006; Goold and Coates 2006; Tyack et al. 2006a; Potter et al. 2007).

For delphinids, and possibly the Dall's porpoise, the available data suggest that a ~~≥~~170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} disturbance criterion (rather than≥160 dB) would be appropriate . With a medium-to-large airgun array, received levels typically diminish to 170 dB within 1–4 km, whereas levels typically remain above 160 dB out to 4–15 km (e.g., Tolstoy et al. 2009). Reaction distances for delphinids are more consistent with the typical 170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} distances. The 160-dB (rms) criterion currently applied by NMFS was developed based primarily on data from gray and bowhead whales. Avoidance distances for delphinids and Dall's porpoises tend to be shorter than for those two mysticete species. For delphinids and Dall's porpoises, there is no indication of strong avoidance or other disruption of behavior at distances beyond those where received levels would be ~170 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}.

Pinnipeds

Few studies of the reactions of pinnipeds to noise from open-water seismic exploration have been published (for review of the early literature, see Richardson et al. 1995). However, pinnipeds have been observed during a number of seismic monitoring studies. Monitoring in the Beaufort Sea during 1996–2002 provided a substantial amount of information on avoidance responses (or lack thereof) and associated behavior. Additional monitoring of that type has been done in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas in 2006-2009. Pinnipeds exposed to seismic surveys have also been observed during seismic surveys along the U.S. west coast. Some limited data are available on physiological responses of pinnipeds exposed to seismic sound, as studied with the aid of radio telemetry. Also, there are data on the reactions of pinnipeds to various other related types of impulsive sounds.

Early observations provided considerable evidence that pinnipeds are often quite tolerant of strong pulsed sounds. During seismic exploration off Nova Scotia, gray seals exposed to noise from airguns and linear explosive charges reportedly did not react strongly (J. Parsons *in* Greene et al. 1985). An airgun caused an initial startle reaction among South African fur seals but was ineffective in scaring them away from fishing gear (Anonymous 1975). Pinnipeds in both water and air sometimes tolerate strong noise pulses from non-explosive and explosive scaring devices, especially if attracted to the area for feeding or reproduction (Mate and Harvey 1987; Reeves et al. 1996). Thus, pinnipeds are expected to be rather tolerant of, or to habituate to, repeated underwater sounds from distant seismic sources, at least when the animals are strongly attracted to the area.

In the U.K., a radio-telemetry study demonstrated short-term changes in the behavior of harbor (=common) seals and gray seals exposed to airgun pulses (Thompson et al. 1998). Harbor seals were exposed to seismic pulses from a 90 in^3 array (3 × 30 in^3 airguns), and behavioral responses differed among individuals. One harbor seal avoided the array at distances up to 2.5 km from the source and only resumed foraging dives after seismic stopped. Another harbor seal exposed to the same small airgun array showed no detectable behavioral response, even when the array was within 500 m. Gray seals exposed to a single 10 in^3 airgun showed an avoidance reaction: they moved away from the source, increased swim speed and/or dive duration, and switched from foraging dives to predominantly transit dives. These effects appeared to be short-term as gray seals either remained in, or returned at least once to, the foraging

area where they had been exposed to seismic pulses. These results suggest that there are interspecific as well as individual differences in seal responses to seismic sounds.

Off California, visual observations from a seismic vessel showed that California sea lions "typically ignored the vessel and array. When [they] displayed behavior modifications, they often appeared to be reacting visually to the sight of the towed array. At times, California sea lions were attracted to the array, even when it was on. At other times, these animals would appear to be actively avoiding the vessel and array" (Arnold 1996). In Puget Sound, sighting distances for harbor seals and California sea lions tended to be larger when airguns were operating; both species tended to orient away whether or not the airguns were firing (Calambokidis and Osmek 1998). Bain and Williams (2006) also stated that their small sample of harbor seals and sea lions tended to orient and/or move away upon exposure to sounds from a large airgun array.

Monitoring work in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea during 1996–2001 provided considerable information regarding the behavior of seals exposed to seismic pulses (Harris et al. 2001; Moulton and Lawson 2002). Those seismic projects usually involved arrays of 6–16 airguns with total volumes 560–1500 in^3. Subsequent monitoring work in the Canadian Beaufort Sea in 2001–2002, with a somewhat larger airgun system (24 airguns, 2250 in^3), provided similar results (Miller et al. 2005). The combined results suggest that some seals avoid the immediate area around seismic vessels. In most survey years, ringed seal sightings averaged somewhat farther away from the seismic vessel when the airguns were operating then when they were not (Moulton and Lawson 2002). Also, seal sighting rates at the water surface were lower during airgun array operations than during no-airgun periods in each survey year except 1997. However, the avoidance movements were relatively small, on the order of 100 m to (at most) a few hundreds of meters, and many seals remained within 100–200 m of the trackline as the operating airgun array passed by.

The operation of the airgun array had minor and variable effects on the behavior of seals visible at the surface within a few hundred meters of the airguns (Moulton and Lawson 2002). The behavioral data indicated that some seals were more likely to swim away from the source vessel during periods of airgun operations and more likely to swim towards or parallel to the vessel during non-seismic periods. No consistent relationship was observed between exposure to airgun noise and proportions of seals engaged in other recognizable behaviors, e.g., "looked" and "dove". Such a relationship might have occurred if seals seek to reduce exposure to strong seismic pulses, given the reduced airgun noise levels close to the surface where "looking" occurs (Moulton and Lawson 2002).

Monitoring results from the Canadian Beaufort Sea during 2001–2002 were more variable (Miller et al. 2005). During 2001, sighting rates of seals (mostly ringed seals) were similar during all seismic states, including periods without airgun operations. However, seals tended to be seen closer to the vessel during non-seismic than seismic periods. In contrast, during 2002, sighting rates of seals were higher during non-seismic periods than seismic operations, and seals were seen farther from the vessel during non-seismic compared to seismic activity (a marginally significant result). The combined data for both years showed that sighting rates were higher during non-seismic periods compared to seismic periods, and that sighting distances were similar during both seismic states. Miller et al. (2005) concluded that seals showed very limited avoidance to the operating airgun array.

Vessel-based monitoring also took place in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort seas during 2006–2008 (Reiser et al. 2009). Observers on the seismic vessels saw phocid seals less frequently while airguns were operating than when airguns were silent. Also, during airgun operations, those observers saw seals less frequently than did observers on nearby vessels without airguns. Finally, observers on the latter

"noairgun" vessels saw seals more often when the nearby source vessels' airguns were operating than when they were silent. All of these observations are indicative of a tendency for phocid seals to exhibit localized avoidance of the seismic source vessel when airguns are firing (Reiser et al. 2009).

In summary, visual monitoring from seismic vessels has shown only slight (if any) avoidance of airguns by pinnipeds, and only slight (if any) changes in behavior. These studies show that many pinnipeds do not avoid the area within a few hundred meters of an operating airgun array. However, based on the studies with large sample size, or observations from a separate monitoring vessel, or radio telemetry, it is apparent that some phocid seals do show localized avoidance of operating airguns. The limited nature of this tendency for avoidance is a concern. It suggests that one cannot rely on pinnipeds to move away, or to move very far away, before received levels of sound from an approaching seismic survey vessel approach those that may cause hearing impairment (see below).

Sirenians and Sea Otter

We are not aware of any information on the reactions of sirenians to airgun sounds.

Behavior of sea otters along the California coast was monitored by Riedman (1983, 1984) while they were exposed to a single 100 in^3 airgun and a 4089 in^3 airgun array. No disturbance reactions were evident when the airgun array was as close as 0.9 km. Sea otters also did not respond noticeably to the single airgun. These results suggest that sea otters may be less responsive to marine seismic pulses than some other marine mammals, such as mysticetes and odontocetes (summarized above). Also, sea otters spend a great deal of time at the surface feeding and grooming (Riedman 1983, 1984). While at the surface, the potential noise exposure of sea otters would be much reduced by pressure-release and interference (Lloyd's mirror) effects at the surface (Greene and Richardson 1988; Richardson et al. 1995).

E.3.4 Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects

Temporary or permanent hearing impairment is a possibility when marine mammals are exposed to very strong sounds. Temporary threshold shift (TTS) has been demonstrated and studied in certain captive odontocetes and pinnipeds exposed to strong sounds (reviewed in Southall et al. 2007). However, there has been no specific documentation of TTS let alone permanent hearing damage (i.e. PTS, in free-ranging marine mammals exposed to sequences of airgun pulses during realistic field conditions). Current NMFS policy regarding exposure of marine mammals to high-level sounds is that cetaceans and pinnipeds should not be exposed to impulsive sounds ≥180 and 190 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}, respectively (NMFS 2000). Those criteria have been used in establishing the safety (=shut-down) radii planned for numerous seismic surveys conducted under U.S. jurisdiction. However, those criteria were established before there was any information about the minimum received levels of sounds necessary to cause auditory impairment in marine mammals. As discussed below,

- the 180-dB criterion for cetaceans is probably quite precautionary (i.e., lower than necessary to avoid temporary auditory impairment let alone permanent auditory injury, at least for delphinids);
- TTS is not injury and does not constitute "Level A harassment" in MMPA terminology;
- the minimum sound level necessary to cause permanent hearing impairment ("Level A harassment") is higher, by a variable and generally unknown amount, than the level that induces barely-detectable TTS; and

- the level associated with the onset of TTS is often considered to be a level below which there is no danger of permanent damage. The actual PTS threshold is likely to be well above the level causing onset of TTS (Southall et al. 2007).

Recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria for marine mammals, frequency weighting procedures, and related matters were published recently (Southall et al. 2007). Those recommendations have not, as of late 2009, been formally adopted by NMFS for use in regulatory processes and during mitigation programs associated with seismic surveys. However, some aspects of the recommendations have been taken into account in certain EISs and small-take authorizations. NMFS has indicated that it may issue new noise exposure criteria for marine mammals that account for the now-available scientific data on TTS, the expected offset between the TTS and PTS thresholds, differences in the acoustic frequencies to which different marine mammal groups are sensitive, and other relevant factors. Preliminary information about possible changes in the regulatory and mitigation requirements, and about the possible structure of new criteria, was given by Wieting (2004) and NMFS (2005).

Several aspects of the monitoring and mitigation measures that are now often implemented during seismic survey projects are designed to detect marine mammals occurring near the airgun array, and to avoid exposing them to sound pulses that might, at least in theory, cause hearing impairment. In addition, many cetaceans and (to a limited degree) pinnipeds show some avoidance of the area where received levels of airgun sound are high enough such that hearing impairment could potentially occur. In those cases, the avoidance responses of the animals themselves will reduce or (most likely) avoid the possibility of hearing impairment.

Non-auditory physical effects may also occur in marine mammals exposed to strong underwater pulsed sound. Possible types of non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that might (in theory) occur include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, and other types of organ or tissue damage. It is possible that some marine mammal species (i.e., beaked whales) may be especially susceptible to injury and/or stranding when exposed to strong pulsed sounds. The following subsections summarize available data on noise-induced hearing impairment and non-auditory physical effects.

Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS)

TTS is the mildest form of hearing impairment that can occur during exposure to a strong sound (Kryter 1985). While experiencing TTS, the hearing threshold rises and a sound must be stronger in order to be heard. It is a temporary phenomenon, and (especially when mild) is not considered to represent physical damage or "injury" (Southall et al. 2007). Rather, the onset of TTS is an indicator that, if the animals is exposed to higher levels of that sound, physical damage is ultimately a possibility.

The magnitude of TTS depends on the level and duration of noise exposure, and to some degree on frequency, among other considerations (Kryter 1985; Richardson et al. 1995; Southall et al. 2007). For sound exposures at or somewhat above the TTS threshold, hearing sensitivity recovers rapidly after exposure to the noise ends. In terrestrial mammals, TTS can last from minutes or hours to (in cases of strong TTS) days. Only a few data have been obtained on sound levels and durations necessary to elicit mild TTS in marine mammals (none in mysticetes), and none of the published data concern TTS elicited by exposure to multiple pulses of sound during operational seismic surveys (Southall et al. 2007).

Baleen Whales.—There are no data, direct or indirect, on levels or properties of sound that are required to induce TTS in any baleen whale. The frequencies to which mysticetes are most sensitive are assumed to be lower than those to which odontocetes are most sensitive, and natural background noise levels at those low frequencies tend to be higher. As a result, auditory thresholds of baleen whales within their frequency

band of best hearing are believed to be higher (less sensitive) than are those of odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). From this, it is suspected that received levels causing TTS onset may also be higher in mysticetes (Southall et al. 2007). However, based on preliminary simulation modeling that attempted to allow for various uncertainties in assumptions and variability around population means, Gedamke et al. (2008) suggested that some baleen whales whose CPA to a seismic vessel is 1 km or more could experience TTS or even PTS.

In practice during seismic surveys, few if any cases of TTS are expected given the strong likelihood that baleen whales would avoid the approaching airguns (or vessel) before being exposed to levels high enough for there to be any possibility of TTS (see above for evidence concerning avoidance responses by baleen whales). This assumes that the ramp up (soft start) procedure is used when commencing airgun operations, to give whales near the vessel the opportunity to move away before they are exposed to sound levels that might be strong enough to elicit TTS. As discussed earlier, single-airgun experiments with bowhead, gray, and humpback whales show that those species do tend to move away when a single airgun starts firing nearby, which simulates the onset of a ramp up.

Toothed Whales.—There are empirical data on the sound exposures that elicit onset of TTS in captive bottlenose dolphins and belugas. The majority of these data concern non-impulse sound, but there are some limited published data concerning TTS onset upon exposure to a single pulse of sound from a watergun (Finneran et al. 2002). A detailed review of all TTS data from marine mammals can be found in Southall et al. (2007). The following summarizes some of the key results from odontocetes.

Recent information corroborates earlier expectations that the effect of exposure to strong transient sounds is closely related to the total amount of acoustic energy that is received. Finneran et al. (2005) examined the effects of tone duration on TTS in bottlenose dolphins. Bottlenose dolphins were exposed to 3 kHz tones (non-impulsive) for periods of 1, 2, 4 or 8 s, with hearing tested at 4.5 kHz. For 1-s exposures, TTS occurred with SELs of 197 dB, and for exposures >1 s, SEL $\geq$195 dB resulted in TTS (SEL is equivalent to energy flux, in dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$). At an SEL of 195 dB, the mean TTS (4 min after exposure) was 2.8 dB. Finneran et al. (2005) suggested that an SEL of 195 dB is the likely threshold for the onset of TTS in dolphins and belugas exposed to tones of durations 1–8 s (i.e., TTS onset occurs at a near-constant SEL, independent of exposure duration). That implies that, at least for non-impulsive tones, a doubling of exposure time results in a 3 dB lower TTS threshold.

The assumption that, in marine mammals, the occurrence and magnitude of TTS is a function of cumulative acoustic energy (SEL) is probably an oversimplification. Kastak et al. (2005) reported preliminary evidence from pinnipeds that, for prolonged non-impulse noise, higher SELs were required to elicit a given TTS if exposure duration was short than if it was longer, i.e., the results were not fully consistent with an equal-energy model to predict TTS onset. Mooney et al. (2009a) showed this in a bottlenose dolphin exposed to octave-band noise ranging from 4 to 8 kHz at SPLs of 130 to 178 dB re 1 µPa for periods of 1.88 to 30 min. Higher SELs were required to induce a given TTS if exposure duration short than if it was longer. Exposure of the aforementioned bottlenose dolphin to a sequence of brief sonar signals showed that, with those brief (but non-impulse) sounds, the received energy (SEL) necessary to elicit TTS was higher than was the case with exposure to the more prolonged octave-band noise (Mooney et al. 2009b). Those authors concluded that, when using (non-impulse) acoustic signals of duration ~0.5 s, SEL must be at least 210–214 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ to induce TTS in the bottlenose dolphin.

On the other hand, the TTS threshold for odontocetes exposed to a single impulse from a watergun (Finneran et al. 2002) appeared to be somewhat lower than for exposure to non-impulse sound. This was expected, based on evidence from terrestrial mammals showing that broadband pulsed sounds with rapid

rise times have greater auditory effect than do non-impulse sounds (Southall et al. 2007). The received energy level of a single seismic pulse that caused the onset of mild TTS in the beluga, as measured without frequency weighting, was ~186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ or 186 dB SEL (Finneran et al. 2002).[6] The rms level of an airgun pulse (in dB re 1 µPa measured over the duration of the pulse) is typically 10–15 dB higher than the SEL for the same pulse when received within a few kilometers of the airguns. Thus, a single airgun pulse might need to have a received level of ~196–201 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} in order to produce brief, mild TTS. Exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each has a flat-weighted received level near 190 dB_{rms} (175–180 dB SEL) could result in cumulative exposure of ~186 dB SEL (flat-weighted) or ~183 dB SEL (M_{mf}-weighted), and thus slight TTS in a small odontocete. That assumes that the TTS threshold upon exposure to multiple pulses is (to a first approximation) a function of the total received pulse energy, without allowance for any recovery between pulses.

The above TTS information for odontocetes is derived from studies on the bottlenose dolphin and beluga. For the one harbor porpoise tested, the received level of airgun sound that elicited onset of TTS was lower. The animal was exposed to single pulses from a small (20 in^3) airgun, and auditory evoked potential methods were used to test the animal's hearing sensitivity at frequencies of 4, 32, or 100 kHz after each exposure (Lucke et al. 2009). Based on the measurements at 4 kHz, TTS occurred upon exposure to one airgun pulse with received level ~200 dB re 1 μPa_{pk-pk} or an SEL of 164.3 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$. If these results from a single animal are representative, it is inappropriate to assume that onset of TTS occurs at similar received levels in all odontocetes (cf. Southall et al. 2007). Some cetaceans may incur TTS at lower sound exposures than are necessary to elicit TTS in the beluga or bottlenose dolphin.

Insofar as we are aware, there are no published data confirming that the auditory effect of a sequence of airgun pulses received by an odontocete is a function of their cumulative energy. Southall et al. (2007) consider that to be a reasonable, but probably somewhat precautionary, assumption. It is precautionary because, based on data from terrestrial mammals, one would expect that a given energy exposure would have somewhat less effect if separated into discrete pulses, with potential opportunity for partial auditory recovery between pulses. However, as yet there has been little study of the rate of recovery from TTS in marine mammals, and in humans and other terrestrial mammals the available data on recovery are quite variable. Southall et al. (2007) concluded that—until relevant data on recovery are available from marine mammals—it is appropriate to not to allow for any assumed recovery during the intervals between pulses within a pulse sequence.

Additional data are needed to determine the received sound levels at which small odontocetes would start to incur TTS upon exposure to repeated, low-frequency pulses of airgun sound with variable received levels. To determine how close an airgun array would need to approach in order to elicit TTS, it is necessary to determine the total energy that a mammal would receive as an airgun array approaches, passes at various CPA distances, and moves away (e.g., Erbe and King 2009). At the present state of knowledge, it is also necessary to assume that the effect is directly related to total received energy even though that energy is received in multiple pulses separated by gaps. The lack of data on the exposure levels necessary to cause TTS in toothed whales when the signal is a series of pulsed sounds, separated by silent periods, remains a data gap, as is the lack of published data on TTS in odontocetes other than the beluga, bottlenose dolphin, and harbor porpoise.

[6] If the low-frequency components of the watergun sound used in the experiments of Finneran et al. (2002) are downweighted as recommended by Southall et al. (2007) using their M_{mf}-weighting curve, the effective exposure level for onset of mild TTS was 183 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Southall et al. 2007).

Pinnipeds.—In pinnipeds, TTS thresholds associated with exposure to brief pulses (single or multiple) of underwater sound have not been measured. Two California sea lions did not incur TTS when exposed to single brief pulses with received levels of ~178 and 183 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} and total energy fluxes of 161 and 163 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Finneran et al. 2003). However, initial evidence from more prolonged (non-pulse) exposures suggested that some pinnipeds (harbor seals in particular) incur TTS at somewhat lower received levels than do small odontocetes exposed for similar durations (Kastak et al. 1999, 2005; Ketten et al. 2001). Kastak et al. (2005) reported that the amount of threshold shift increased with increasing SEL in a California sea lion and harbor seal. They noted that, for non-impulse sound, doubling the exposure duration from 25 to 50 min (i.e., a +3 dB change in SEL) had a greater effect on TTS than an increase of 15 dB (95 vs. 80 dB) in exposure level. Mean threshold shifts ranged from 2.9–12.2 dB, with full recovery within 24 hr (Kastak et al. 2005). Kastak et al. (2005) suggested that, for non-impulse sound, SELs resulting in TTS onset in three species of pinnipeds may range from 183 to 206 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, depending on the absolute hearing sensitivity.

As noted above for odontocetes, it is expected that—for impulse as opposed to non-impulse sound—the onset of TTS would occur at a lower cumulative SEL given the assumed greater auditory effect of broadband impulses with rapid rise times. The threshold for onset of mild TTS upon exposure of a harbor seal to impulse sounds has been estimated indirectly as being an SEL of ~171 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (Southall et al. 2007). That would be approximately equivalent to a single pulse with received level ~181–186 dB re 1 $\mu Pa_{rms,}$ or a series of pulses for which the highest rms values are a few dB lower.

At least for non-impulse sounds, TTS onset occurs at appreciably higher received levels in California sea lions and northern elephant seals than in harbor seals (Kastak et al. 2005). Thus, the former two species would presumably need to be closer to an airgun array than would a harbor seal before TTS is a possibility. Insofar as we are aware, there are no data to indicate whether the TTS thresholds of other pinniped species are more similar to those of the harbor seal or to those of the two less-sensitive species.

Sea Otter and Sirenians.—There are no available data on TTS in sea otters. However, TTS is unlikely to occur in sea otters if they are on the water surface, given the pressure release and Lloyd's mirror effects at the water's surface. Furthermore, sea otters tend to inhabit shallow coastal habitats where large seismic survey vessels towing large spreads of streamers may be unable to operate. TTS is also considered unlikely to occur in sirenians as a result of exposure to sounds from a seismic survey. They, like sea otters, tend to inhabit shallow coastal habitats and rarely range far from shore, whereas seismic survey vessels towing large arrays of airguns and (usually) even larger arrays of streamers normally must remain farther offshore because of equipment clearance and maneuverability limitations. Exposures of sea otters and sirenians to seismic surveys are more likely to involve smaller seismic sources that can be used in shallow and confined waters. The impacts of these are inherently less than would occur from a larger source of the types often used farther offshore.

Likelihood of Incurring TTS.—Most cetaceans show some degree of avoidance of seismic vessels operating an airgun array (see above). It is unlikely that these cetaceans would be exposed to airgun pulses at a sufficiently high level for a sufficiently long period to cause more than mild TTS, given the relative movement of the vessel and the marine mammal. TTS would be more likely in any odontocetes that bow- or wake-ride or otherwise linger near the airguns. However, while bow- or wake-riding, odontocetes would be at the surface and thus not exposed to strong sound pulses given the pressure-release and Lloyd Mirror effects at the surface. But if bow- or wake-riding animals were to dive intermittently near airguns, they would be exposed to strong sound pulses, possibly repeatedly.

If some cetaceans did incur mild or moderate TTS through exposure to airgun sounds in this manner, this would very likely be a temporary and reversible phenomenon. However, even a temporary reduction in hearing sensitivity could be deleterious in the event that, during that period of reduced sensitivity, a marine mammal needed its full hearing sensitivity to detect approaching predators, or for some other reason.

Some pinnipeds show avoidance reactions to airguns, but their avoidance reactions are generally not as strong or consistent as those of cetaceans. Pinnipeds occasionally seem to be attracted to operating seismic vessels. There are no specific data on TTS thresholds of pinnipeds exposed to single or multiple low-frequency pulses. However, given the indirect indications of a lower TTS threshold for the harbor seal than for odontocetes exposed to impulse sound (see above), it is possible that some pinnipeds close to a large airgun array could incur TTS.

NMFS (1995, 2000) concluded that cetaceans should not be exposed to pulsed underwater noise at received levels >180 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. The corresponding limit for pinnipeds has been set by NMFS at 190 dB, although the HESS Team (HESS 1999) recommended a 180-dB limit for pinnipeds in California. The 180 and 190 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} levels have not been considered to be the levels above which TTS might occur. Rather, they were the received levels above which, in the view of a panel of bioacoustics specialists convened by NMFS before TTS measurements for marine mammals started to become available, one could not be certain that there would be no injurious effects, auditory or otherwise, to marine mammals. As summarized above, data that are now available imply that TTS is unlikely to occur in various odontocetes (and probably mysticetes as well) unless they are exposed to a sequence of several airgun pulses stronger than 190 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. On the other hand, for the harbor seal, harbor porpoise, and perhaps some other species, TTS may occur upon exposure to one or more airgun pulses whose received level equals the NMFS "do not exceed" value of 190 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. That criterion corresponds to a single-pulse SEL of 175–180 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ in typical conditions, whereas TTS is suspected to be possible in harbor seals and harbor porpoises with a cumulative SEL of ~171 and ~164 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, respectively.

It has been shown that most large whales and many smaller odontocetes (especially the harbor porpoise) show at least localized avoidance of ships and/or associated seismic operations (see above). Even when avoidance is limited to the area within a few hundred meters of an airgun array, that should usually be sufficient to avoid TTS based on what is currently known about thresholds for TTS onset in cetaceans. In addition, ramping up airgun arrays, which is standard operational protocol for many seismic operators, should allow cetaceans near the airguns at the time of startup (if the sounds are aversive) to move away from the seismic source and to avoid being exposed to the full acoustic output of the airgun array (see above). Thus, most baleen whales likely will not be exposed to high levels of airgun sounds provided the ramp-up procedure is applied. Likewise, many odontocetes close to the trackline are likely to move away before the sounds from an approaching seismic vessel become sufficiently strong for there to be any potential for TTS or other hearing impairment. Therefore, there is little potential for baleen whales or odontocetes that show avoidance of ships or airguns to be close enough to an airgun array to experience TTS. In the event that a few individual cetaceans did incur TTS through exposure to strong airgun sounds, this is a temporary and reversible phenomenon unless the exposure exceeds the TTS-onset threshold by a sufficient amount for PTS to be incurred (see below). If TTS but not PTS were incurred, it would most likely be mild, in which case recovery is expected to be quick (probably within minutes).

Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

When PTS occurs, there is physical damage to the sound receptors in the ear. In some cases, there can be total or partial deafness, whereas in other cases, the animal has an impaired ability to hear sounds in

specific frequency ranges (Kryter 1985). Physical damage to a mammal's hearing apparatus can occur if it is exposed to sound impulses that have very high peak pressures, especially if they have very short rise times (rise time is the interval required for sound pressure to increase from the baseline pressure to peak pressure).

There is no specific evidence that exposure to pulses of airgun sound can cause PTS in any marine mammal, even with large arrays of airguns. However, given the likelihood that some mammals close to an airgun array might incur at least mild TTS (see above), there has been further speculation about the possibility that some individuals occurring very close to airguns might incur PTS (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995:372*ff*; Gedamke et al. 2008). Single or occasional occurrences of mild TTS are not indicative of permanent auditory damage, but repeated or (in some cases) single exposures to a level well above that causing TTS onset might elicit PTS.

Relationships between TTS and PTS thresholds have not been studied in marine mammals, but are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals (Southall et al. 2007). Based on data from terrestrial mammals, a precautionary assumption is that the PTS threshold for impulse sounds (such as airgun pulses as received close to the source) is at least 6 dB higher than the TTS threshold on a peak-pressure basis, and probably >6 dB higher (Southall et al. 2007). The low-to-moderate levels of TTS that have been induced in captive odontocetes and pinnipeds during controlled studies of TTS have been confirmed to be temporary, with no measurable residual PTS (Kastak et al. 1999; Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002, 2005; Nachtigall et al. 2003, 2004). However, very prolonged exposure to sound strong enough to elicit TTS, or shorter-term exposure to sound levels well above the TTS threshold, can cause PTS, at least in terrestrial mammals (Kryter 1985). In terrestrial mammals, the received sound level from a single non-impulsive sound exposure must be far above the TTS threshold for any risk of permanent hearing damage (Kryter 1994; Richardson et al. 1995; Southall et al. 2007). However, there is special concern about strong sounds whose pulses have very rapid rise times. In terrestrial mammals, there are situations when pulses with rapid rise times (e.g., from explosions) can result in PTS even though their peak levels are only a few dB higher than the level causing slight TTS. The rise time of airgun pulses is fast, but not as fast as that of an explosion.

Some factors that contribute to onset of PTS, at least in terrestrial mammals, are as follows:

- exposure to single very intense sound,
- fast rise time from baseline to peak pressure,
- repetitive exposure to intense sounds that individually cause TTS but not PTS, and
- recurrent ear infections or (in captive animals) exposure to certain drugs.

Cavanagh (2000) reviewed the thresholds used to define TTS and PTS. Based on this review and SACLANT (1998), it is reasonable to assume that PTS might occur at a received sound level 20 dB or more above that inducing mild TTS. However, for PTS to occur at a received level only 20 dB above the TTS threshold, the animal probably would have to be exposed to a strong sound for an extended period, or to a strong sound with rather rapid rise time.

More recently, Southall et al. (2007) estimated that received levels would need to exceed the TTS threshold by at least 15 dB, on an SEL basis, for there to be risk of PTS. Thus, for cetaceans exposed to a sequence of sound pulses, they estimate that the PTS threshold might be an M-weighted SEL (for the sequence of received pulses) of ~198 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (15 dB higher than the M_{mf}-weighted TTS threshold in a beluga, for a watergun impulse). Additional assumptions had to be made to derive a corresponding estimate for pinnipeds, as the only available data on TTS thresholds in pinnipeds pertained to non-impulse sound (see above). Southall et al. (2007) estimated that the PTS threshold could be a cumulative

M_{pw}-weighted SEL of ~186 dB re 1 μPa^2·s in the case of a harbor seal exposed to impulse sound. The PTS threshold for the California sea lion and northern elephant seal would probably be higher given the higher TTS thresholds in those species. Southall et al. (2007) also note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean or pinniped received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 230 or 218 dB re 1 μPa, respectively.

Thus, PTS might be expected upon exposure of cetaceans to either SEL≥198 dB re 1 μPa ^{2} · s or peak pressure ≥230 dB re 1 μPa. Corresponding proposed dual criteria for pinnipeds (at least harbor seals) are ≥186 dB SEL and ≥ 218 dB peak pressure (Southall et al. 2007). These estimates are all first approximations, given the limited underlying data, assumptions, species differences, and evidence that the "equal energy" model is not be entirely correct.

Sound impulse duration, peak amplitude, rise time, number of pulses, and inter-pulse interval are the main factors thought to determine the onset and extent of PTS. Ketten (1994) has noted that the criteria for differentiating the sound pressure levels that result in PTS (or TTS) are location and species-specific. PTS effects may also be influenced strongly by the health of the receiver's ear.

As described above for TTS, in estimating the amount of sound energy required to elicit the onset of TTS (and PTS), it is assumed that the auditory effect of a given cumulative SEL from a series of pulses is the same as if that amount of sound energy were received as a single strong sound. There are no data from marine mammals concerning the occurrence or magnitude of a potential partial recovery effect between pulses. In deriving the estimates of PTS (and TTS) thresholds quoted here, Southall et al. (2007) made the precautionary assumption that no recovery would occur between pulses.

The TTS section (above) concludes that exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each have flat-weighted received levels near 190 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} (175–180 dB re 1 μPa^2·s SEL) could result in cumulative exposure of ~186 dB SEL (flat-weighted) or ~183 dB SEL (M_{mf}-weighted), and thus slight TTS in a small odontocete. Allowing for the assumed 15 dB offset between PTS and TTS thresholds, expressed on an SEL basis, exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each have flat-weighted received levels near 205 dB_{rms} (190–195 dB SEL) could result in cumulative exposure of ~198 dB SEL (M_{mf}-weighted), and thus slight PTS in a small odontocete. However, the levels of successive pulses that will be received by a marine mammal that is below the surface as a seismic vessel approaches, passes and moves away will tend to increase gradually and then decrease gradually, with periodic decreases superimposed on this pattern when the animal comes to the surface to breathe. To estimate how close an odontocete's CPA would have to be for the cumulative SEL to exceed 198 dB SEL (M_{pa}-weighted), one would (as a minimum) need to allow for the sequence of distances at which airgun shots would occur, and for the dependence of received SEL on distance in the region of the seismic operation (e.g., Erbe and King 2009).

It is unlikely that an odontocete would remain close enough to a large airgun array for sufficiently long to incur PTS. There is some concern about bowriding odontocetes, but for animals at or near the surface, auditory effects are reduced by Lloyd's mirror and surface release effects. The presence of the vessel between the airgun array and bow-riding odontocetes could also, in some but probably not all cases, reduce the levels received by bow-riding animals (e.g., Gabriele and Kipple 2009). The TTS (and thus PTS) thresholds of baleen whales are unknown but, as an interim measure, assumed to be no lower than those of odontocetes. Also, baleen whales generally avoid the immediate area around operating seismic vessels, so it is unlikely that a baleen whale could incur PTS from exposure to airgun pulses. The TTS (and thus PTS) thresholds of some pinnipeds (e.g., harbor seal) as well as the harbor porpoise may be lower (Kastak et al. 2005; Southall et al. 2007; Lucke et al. 2009). If so, TTS and potentially PTS may

extend to a somewhat greater distance for those animals. Again, Lloyd's mirror and surface release effects will ameliorate the effects for animals at or near the surface.

Although it is unlikely that airgun operations during most seismic surveys would cause PTS in many marine mammals, caution is warranted given:

- the limited knowledge about noise-induced hearing damage in marine mammals, particularly baleen whales, pinnipeds, and sea otters;
- the seemingly greater susceptibility of certain species (e.g., harbor porpoise and harbor seal) to TTS and presumably also PTS; and
- the lack of knowledge about TTS and PTS thresholds in many species, including various species closely related to the harbor porpoise and harbor seal.

The avoidance reactions of many marine mammals, along with commonly-applied monitoring and mitigation measures (visual and passive acoustic monitoring, ramp ups, and power downs or shut downs when mammals are detected within or approaching the "safety radii"), would reduce the already-low probability of exposure of marine mammals to sounds strong enough to induce PTS.

Strandings and Mortality

Marine mammals close to underwater detonations of high explosives can be killed or severely injured, and the auditory organs are especially susceptible to injury (Ketten et al. 1993; Ketten 1995). However, explosives are no longer used in marine waters for NSF-funded or USGS seismic surveys; they have been replaced by airguns and other non-explosive sources. Airgun pulses are less energetic and have slower rise times, and there is no specific evidence that they can cause serious injury, death, or stranding even in the case of large airgun arrays. However, the association of mass strandings of beaked whales with naval exercises and, in one case, a seismic survey (Malakoff 2002; Cox et al. 2006), has raised the possibility that beaked whales exposed to strong "pulsed" sounds may be especially susceptible to injury and/or behavioral reactions that can lead to stranding (e.g., Hildebrand 2005; Southall et al. 2007). Hildebrand (2005) reviewed the association of cetacean strandings with high-intensity sound events and found that deep-diving odontocetes, primarily beaked whales, were by far the predominant (95%) cetaceans associated with these events, with 2% mysticete whales (minke). However, as summarized below, there is no definitive evidence that airguns can lead to injury, strandings, or mortality even for marine mammals in close proximity to large airgun arrays.

Specific sound-related processes that lead to strandings and mortality are not well documented, but may include (1) swimming in avoidance of a sound into shallow water; (2) a change in behavior (such as a change in diving behavior that might contribute to tissue damage, gas bubble formation, hypoxia, cardiac arrhythmia, hypertensive hemorrhage or other forms of trauma; (3) a physiological change such as a vestibular response leading to a behavioral change or stress-induced hemorrhagic diathesis, leading in turn to tissue damage; and (4) tissue damage directly from sound exposure, such as through acoustically mediated bubble formation and growth or acoustic resonance of tissues. Some of these mechanisms are unlikely to apply in the case of impulsive sounds. However, there are increasing indications that gas-bubble disease (analogous to "the bends"), induced in supersaturated tissue by a behavioral response to acoustic exposure, could be a pathologic mechanism for the strandings and mortality of some deep-diving cetaceans exposed to sonar. The evidence for this remains circumstantial and associated with exposure to naval MF sonar, not seismic surveys (Cox et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007).

Seismic pulses and MF sonar signals are quite different, and some mechanisms by which sonar sounds have been hypothesized to affect beaked whales are unlikely to apply to airgun pulses. Sounds produced

by airgun arrays are broadband impulses with most of the energy below 1 kHz. Typical military MF sonars emit non-impulse sounds at frequencies of 2–10 kHz, generally with a relatively narrow bandwidth at any one time (though the frequency may change over time). Thus, it is not appropriate to assume that the effects of seismic surveys on beaked whales or other species would be the same as the apparent effects of military sonar. For example, resonance effects (Gentry 2002) and acoustically-mediated bubble-growth (Crum et al. 2005) are implausible in the case of exposure to broad-band airgun pulses. Nonetheless, evidence that sonar signals can, in special circumstances, lead (at least indirectly) to physical damage and mortality (e.g., Balcomb and Claridge 2001; NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001; Jepson et al. 2003; Fernández et al. 2004, 2005; Hildebrand 2005; Cox et al. 2006) suggests that caution is warranted when dealing with exposure of marine mammals to any high-intensity 'pulsed' sound. One of the hypothesized mechanisms by which naval sonars lead to strandings might, in theory, also apply to seismic surveys. If the strong sounds sometimes cause deep-diving species to alter their surfacing–dive cycles in a way that causes bubble formation in tissue, that hypothesized mechanism might apply to seismic surveys as well as MF naval sonars. However, there is no specific evidence of this upon exposure to airgun pulses.

There is no conclusive evidence of cetacean strandings or deaths at sea as a result of exposure to seismic surveys, but a few cases of strandings in the general area where a seismic survey was ongoing have led to speculation concerning a possible link between seismic surveys and strandings. Suggestions that there was a link between seismic surveys and strandings of humpback whales in Brazil (Engel et al. 2004) were not well founded (IAGC 2004; IWC 2007). In September 2002, there was a stranding of two Cuvier's beaked whales in the Gulf of California, Mexico, when the L-DEO seismic vessel R/V *Ewing* was operating a 20-airgun, 8,490-in^3 airgun array in the general area. The evidence linking the stranding to the seismic survey was inconclusive and not based on any physical evidence (Hogarth 2002; Yoder 2002). The ship was also operating its MBES at the same time, but this had much less potential than the aforementioned naval sonars to affect beaked whales, given its downward-directed beams, much shorter pulse durations, and lower duty cycle. Nonetheless, the Gulf of California incident plus the beaked whale strandings near naval exercises involving use of MF sonar suggest a need for caution in conducting seismic surveys in areas occupied by beaked whales until more is known about effects of seismic surveys on those species (Hildebrand 2005).

Non-Auditory Physiological Effects

Based on evidence from terrestrial mammals and humans, sound is also a potential source of stress (Wright and Kuczaj 2007; Wright et al. 2007a, b, 2009). However, almost no information is available on the effect of sound-induced stress in marine mammals or on its potential (alone or in combination with other stressors) to affect the long-term well-being or reproductive success of marine mammals (Fair and Becker 2000; Hildebrand 2005; Wright et al. 2007a, b). Such long-term effects, if they occur, would be mainly associated with chronic noise exposure, which is characteristic of some seismic surveys and exposure situations (McCauley et al. 2000a:62*ff*; Nieukirk et al. 2009) but not of some others.

Available data on potential stress-related impacts of anthropogenic noise on marine mammals are extremely limited, and additional research on this topic is needed. We know of only two specific studies of noise-induced stress in marine mammals. Romano et al. (2004) examined the effects of single underwater impulse sounds from a seismic water gun (source level up to 228 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m_{p-p}$) and single, short-duration pure tones (sound pressure level up to 201 dB re 1 µPa) on the nervous and immune systems of a beluga and a bottlenose dolphin. They found that neural-immune changes to noise exposure were minimal. Although levels of some stress-released substances (e.g., catecholamines) changed significantly with exposure to sound, levels returned to baseline after 24 hr. Thomas et al. (1990) found

no changes in blood levels of stress-related hormones during playbacks of recorded drilling noise to four captive beluga whales. Long-term effects were not measured, and no short-term effects were detected. For both studies, caution is necessary when extrapolating these results to wild animals and to real-world situations given the small sample sizes, use of captive animals, and other technical limitations of the two studies.

Aside from stress, other types of physiological effects that might, in theory, be involved in beaked whale strandings upon exposure to naval sonar (Cox et al. 2006), such as resonance and gas bubble formation, have not been demonstrated and are not expected upon exposure to airgun pulses (see preceding subsection). If seismic surveys disrupt diving patterns of deep-diving species, this might perhaps result in bubble formation and a form of "the bends", as speculated to occur in beaked whales exposed to sonar. However, there is no specific evidence that exposure to airgun pulses has this effect.

In summary, very little is known about the potential for seismic survey sounds (or other types of strong underwater sounds) to cause non-auditory physiological effects in marine mammals. Such effects, if they occur at all, would presumably be limited to short distances and to activities that extend over a prolonged period. The available data do not allow identification of a specific exposure level above which non-auditory effects can be expected (Southall et al. 2007), or any meaningful quantitative predictions of the numbers (if any) of marine mammals that might be affected in these ways.

E.4 SONAR PULSES

The following subsections review relevant information on the potential effects of sonar sounds on marine mammals. Discussion focuses on the types of sonar systems operated during some marine seismic surveys, including MBESs, SBPs, ACPs, fathometers, and pingers. These systems are used to obtain information on (and map) water depths, bottom topography, and sub-bottom composition and stratigraphy; to monitor ocean currents; to track fish and concentrations of invertebrates; to locate and track hydrophone streamers and coring gear; and for other purposes. Relatively few studies have been conducted on the effects of these and other types of sonar systems on marine mammals. Given this, the present section also summarizes relevant data on the effects of other types of sonars similar to those used during some seismic surveys.

E.4.1 Characteristics of Sonar Pulses

Sonar is an acronym for sound navigation and ranging. Sonar is a technique that uses sound to determine water depth below a vessel and/or to detect and determine the position of underwater objects such as fish, geological features on the seafloor, mines, or underwater vessels.

Two broad categories of sonar are in use: passive and active sonar. Passive sonar involves listening to sounds created by other sources, but does not include the purposeful emission of sound. Active sonar involves emission of sounds with characteristics optimized for the specific purpose of that sonar. This section focuses on the available information concerning effects of active sonar on marine mammals.

Active sonar systems emit sound, some of which is reflected back if it strikes an object. Because the speed of sound in water is relatively constant, the distance to the object can be calculated by measuring the time between the transmission of the signal and the receipt of the reflected echo. Experienced sonar technicians often can tell the difference between echoes produced by a submarine, rocky outcrop, school of fish, or whale. Active sonars are in use throughout the world on private, commercial, research, and military vessels.

Because active sonars produce sound, they have the potential to impact the marine environment. This potential is a function of the output power, beamwidth, duty cycle of the device, the frequency of the sound, and the sound transmission characteristics of the marine environment. (Duty cycle refers to the percentage of the time when the source is emitting sound.) The potential for impact on an animal also depends on the animal's distance, position relative to the sonar beam, and the received sound level as well as the animal's auditory and behavioral sensitivity.

The auditory effects of sonar depend on whether the emitted sounds are impulsive or non-impulsive. Impulsive sounds involve very rapid increases in pressure (rapid rise time) and are broadband. Most sonar pulses are considered non-impulsive, in part because they are often narrowband (reviewed in Southall et al. 2007). In general, any sound that is a tone (rather than broadband), even if it is called a "tone pulse", is in the non-impulse category (see Southall et al. 2007). Examples of non-impulse sounds include military low-frequency active (LFA) sonar and tactical MF sonar, many acoustic harassment/deterrent devices, acoustic tomography sources (ATOC), and some signals from depth sounders. Examples of single or multiple impulse sounds include those from seismic airguns, some depth sounders and pingers, pile strikes, and explosions (Southall et al. 2007).

The characteristics of an active sonar system depend on the purpose of the system. A system that is required to detect objects at great distances necessitates a higher output strength (and lower frequency) than sonar systems designed to detect nearby objects. One way of classifying active sonars is by frequency (i.e., high, medium or mid-, and low). Herein, high frequency is >10 kHz, medium frequency is 1–10 kHz, and low frequency is <1 kHz. .

<u>High-frequency (HF) Sonar (</u>>10 kHz)

These sonars provide excellent resolution for locating small objects such as fish, zooplankton, and mines, and for mapping the sea-bed. Higher frequency sounds attenuate more rapidly in seawater than do lower frequency sounds. Hence, HF sonar systems are most practical for use in shallow water or over short distances. Side-scan sonars are among the most commonly used HF sonars available; they are used for object detection and sea-bed mapping. Side-scan sonars typically operate with a narrow along-track beamwidth (0.75–1.5º), a moderately broad vertical beamwidth (5–10º), and an operating frequency of ≥100 kHz. The range over which targets can be resolved is usually <1.6 km at the higher frequencies, and as much as 10 km at the lower-frequency end of the HF band. Forward-looking sonars are used for obstacle detection and avoidance, and are useful for fish-finding and area surveillance. These sonars may be pulsed or use continuous-transmission frequency modulation. Downward-looking HF sonars (consisting either of a single beam or a multibeam array) may also be used for bottom mapping, fish-finding, estimation of zooplankton biomass, or depth-sounding in shallow to intermediate water depths. MBESs, in which downward-pointing beams are directed vertically below and to the side of a ship, are commonly used to map the bottom contours. MBES systems have beams that are narrow in the foreaft direction and broader in directions perpendicular to the trackline. MBES systems designed for use in deep water operate in the lower-frequency portion of the HF band (e.g., 10–15.5 kHz) whereas MBESs designed for shallower areas may operate at higher frequencies.

<u>Mid-frequency (MF) Sonar (1-10 kHz)</u>

MF tactical sonars are used on naval vessels around the world and typically have a relatively narrow bandwidth at any one time (though the center frequency may change over time). Compared to HF systems, MF sonars have an extended detection range because of the decreased absorption of MF sound in seawater. However, they require a larger transducer array to achieve the same beamwidth. These systems may have a range of 10 to >100 km.

Low-frequency (LF) Sonar (<1 kHz)

The negligible attenuation of LF sound in seawater permits detection of objects at very long ranges (hundreds of kilometers), but this requires a high source level and a large array of transmitter elements. The U.S. Navy's Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) sonar is an example of a LF sonar system (100–500 Hz).

The "marine vibrator" is a seismic source that has been tested as a possible substitute for airguns. It can generate modulated low frequency sound at approximately 10–250 Hz. As a modulated source, the signal is emitted over several seconds, thereby decreasing instantaneous peak pressure but increasing the duty cycle compared to airguns. Through use of an array of sources, much of the energy is directed downward toward the seafloor.

E.4.2 Sonars Used during Marine Seismic Surveys

During marine seismic surveys with airguns as the primary acoustic source, one or more sonar systems usually operate simultaneously with the airguns, and sometimes while the airguns are not operating.

An MBES is commonly used during academic seismic surveys (and other oceanographic projects) to map characteristics of the ocean bottom. The MBES emits brief pulses of MF or HF sound in a fan-shaped beam that extends downward and to the sides of the ship, with a narrow beamwidth in the forward and aft directions. During seismic operations in deep water (>1000 m), an MBES usually operates at a frequency of 10–15 kHz, but for projects limited to shallow water (<100 m), a higher frequency MBES is often used. For example, the MBES used during seismic surveys from the R/V *Langseth* is the Simrad EM120. It operates at a frequency of 11.25–12.6 kHz and a maximum source level of 242 dB re 1 μPa·m (rms). The beam is fan-shaped, narrow (1º) in the fore-aft extent, and wide (150º) in the cross-track direction. In deep water, each ping consists of nine successive transmissions, each 15 ms in duration with 16 ms gaps between pulses. In shallow water, the pulse duration is reduced to 2 ms, and the number of beams is reduced.

An SBP operates at mid- to high frequencies and is generally used simultaneously with an MBES to provide information about the sedimentary features and bottom topography. SBP pulses are directed downward at typical frequencies of ~3–18 kHz. For example, the SBP used aboard the R/V *Langseth* uses seven beams simultaneously, with a beam spacing of≤15° and a fan width of ≤30°. Pulse duration is 0.4–100 ms at intervals of 1 s; a common mode of operation is to broadcast five pulses at 1-s intervals followed by a 5-s pause. The source level of the R/V *Langseth*'s SBP is 230 dB re 1 μPa·m. Other vessels use alternative SBP systems that may have a single downward-directed beam and pulsed signals differing in details from those described above, but generally within the 3–18 kHz band.

Some seismic research vessels also use an ACP to determine the speed, direction, depth, and dimension of water currents. The ACP transmits HF pings of sound into the water, generally at frequencies of 150–1200 kHz.

Pingers are typically used on airgun arrays, hydrophone streamers, coring equipment, OBS/OBH gear, and other instruments such as cameras to locate and track positions of these devices. Pingers typically operate at high frequencies. For example, pingers deployed from the R/V *Langseth* operate at 55–110 kHz and have a peak output of 183 dB re 1 μPa·m, with a maximum rate of 3 pings per 10 s per pinger; the transducers are powered by NiCad batteries. In addition, a 12-kHz pinger may be used during seismic survey cruises if ancillary bottom coring operations are done. The pinger is used to monitor the depth of the corer relative to the sea floor. It is a battery-powered acoustic beacon that is attached to the coring

mechanism. This pinger has a source output of ~192 dB re 1 µPa·m with one pulse of 0.5, 2, or 10 ms duration per second.

E.4.3 Masking by Sonar

Specific information is lacking on masking of sounds relevant to marine mammals by the types of sonars operated during marine seismic surveys. However, little masking is expected given the pulsed nature and low duty cycles of these sonar sounds and (for the MBES and SBP) the fact that the emitted sounds are limited to certain directions (beams).

E.4.4 Disturbance by Sonar

Most studies on the disturbance of marine mammals during seismic surveys have focused on the effects of sound from airguns and similar low-frequency sources, and have not been designed to address effects of sound from simultaneously-operating sonar systems. During a recent NSF-funded low-energy seismic survey from the R/V *Thompson*, the 30 kHz EM300 MBES operated most of the time, and many cetaceans and a small number of pinnipeds were seen by MMVOs aboard the ship (Ireland et al. 2005). Similarly, during most seismic operations by L-DEO's previous seismic research ship, the R/V *Ewing,* a 15.5 kHz MBES (and frequently also a 3.5-kHz sub-bottom profiler) were operated simultaneously, and numerous mysticetes, odontocetes, and pinnipeds were seen (and/or detected acoustically) from the ship at various times. Although the potential effects of these sonars could not be assessed given the simultaneous operation of one or more sonars plus airguns during most periods, results suggest that marine mammals often appear to tolerate the presence of these sources when they were operating within several kilometers, and sometimes within a few hundred meters. Given the directional nature of the sounds from these sonars, only a fraction of the marine mammals seen by observers were likely to have been within the beams before or during the time of the sightings. Many of these mammals probably were not exposed to the sonar sounds despite the proximity of the ship.

A small number of studies have more specifically assessed the behavioral effects of sonar sounds somewhat similar to those used during marine seismic surveys on some marine mammal species. The limited available information indicates that reactions vary by species and circumstance, as described below.

Baleen Whales

Humpback whales wintering in Hawaii moved away upon exposure to 3.3 kHz sonar pulses, and increased their swimming speeds and track linearity in response to 3.1- to 3.6-kHz sonar sweeps (Maybaum 1990, 1993). Humpbacks in Hawaii showed some changes in their songs and swimming patterns upon exposure to LFA sonar transmissions (Miller et al. 2000; Clark et al. 2001), but those prolonged low-frequency sounds are quite unlike the sonar signals emitted during seismic surveys. Frankel (2005) reported that migrating gray whales reacted to a 21–25 kHz "whale-finding" sonar (source level of 215 dB re 1 µPa·m) by orienting slightly away from the source and being deflected from their course by ~200 m. These responses were not obvious in the field and were only determined later during data analysis. In 1998–2000, a study in the ETP assessed the reactions of marine mammals to a 38-kHz echosounder and a 150-kHz ACP. Results indicated that mysticetes showed no significant responses when the echosounder and ACP were transmitting (Gerrodette and Pettis 2005).

Whaling catcher boats reported that baleen whales showed strong avoidance of echosounders that were sometimes used to track baleen whales underwater (Ash 1962; Richardson et al. 1995). "Ultrasonic" pulses emitted by "whale scarers" during whaling operations tended to scare baleen whales to the surface (Reeves 1992; Richardson et al. 1995). No reactions were noted by right, humpback, and fin whales to pingers and

sonars at and above 36 kHz, although these species often reacted to sounds at frequencies of 15 Hz to 28 kHz (Watkins 1986).

Toothed Whales

Little is known about reactions of odontocetes to underwater noise pulses, including sonar. Available data on responses to sonar are limited to a small number of species and conditions, including studies of captive animals. Most available data on odontocete responses to sonar are associated with beaked whales and high-intensity MF military sonars that are not comparable to the smaller and generally down- and/or laterally-directed echosounders, or the much weaker pingers, used during some marine seismic surveys.

Behavioral reactions of free-ranging odontocetes to echosounders such as MBES and SBP, and to ACP and pingers, appear to vary by species and circumstance. Various dolphin and porpoise species have been seen bowriding while the MBES, SBP, and airguns were operating during NSF-sponsored L-DEO seismic surveys (Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2004a, b; MacLean and Koski 2005). Gerrodette and Pettis (2005) assessed odontocete reactions to an echosounder and an ACP operated from oceanographic vessels in the ETP. Results indicated that when the echosounder and ACP were on, spotted and spinner dolphins were detected slightly more often and beaked whales less often during visual surveys (Gerrodette and Pettis 2005). Commercial whalers were judicious in their use of sonar when following sperm whales because it tended to make them scatter (Richardson et al. 1995). In response to 6–13 kHz pingers, some sperm whales stopped emitting pulses (Watkins and Schevill 1975). In contrast, sperm whales usually continued calling and did not appear to otherwise react to continual pulsing from echosounders, e.g., at 12 kHz (Backus and Schevill 1966; Watkins 1977).

Behavior of captive bottlenose dolphins in an open-sea enclosure appeared to change in response to sounds from a close and/or approaching marine geophysical survey vessel that was conducting seismic and bathymetric studies in the Red Sea (van der Woude 2007). The sonar sounds included a 1-kHz sparker, 375-kHz sidescan sonar, 95-kHz MBES, and two 20–50 kHz singlebeam echosounders. It was not clear which specific source(s) may have induced the behavioral changes. Captive bottlenose dolphins and a beluga exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to 1-s to 8-s tonal signals at high received levels and frequencies similar to those emitted by the MBES, and to shorter broadband pulsed signals. Behavioral changes typically involved what appeared to be deliberate attempts to avoid the sound exposure (Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002, 2005; Finneran and Schlundt 2004). The relevance of those data to free-ranging odontocetes is uncertain, and in any case, the test sounds were quite different in duration and total energy content as compared with those from a MBES.

There are increasing indications that beaked whales, particularly Cuvier's beaked whales, sometimes strand when naval exercises, including operation of MF tactical sonars, are ongoing nearby (e.g., Simmonds and Lopez-Jurado 1991; Frantzis 1998; NOAA and U.S. Navy 2001). It has been hypothesized that these strandings may be related to behavioral reactions (e.g., changes in dive behavior) that indirectly result in physiological damage leading to stranding (Jepson et al. 2003; Cox et al. 2006; D'Spain et al. 2006). MF tactical sonars used by naval vessels differ in important ways from the sonar systems used on research vessels. For example, the sonars on research vessels emit very brief pulses that are beamed downward, and individual mammals are unlikely to be in the beam for more than a brief period. Navy tactical sonars emit more prolonged signals that are often directed close to horizontal, and animals can be exposed repeatedly to these signals over an extended period. Also, cases of beaked whale strandings associated with navy operations usually involve more than one naval vessel operating in the same area. Research-vessel sonars are not expected to elicit the same types of reactions as navy tactical sonars.

Studies of reactions of odontocetes to underwater sounds other than sonar and seismic airguns have also been conducted and some of these may be of some relevance. Several studies indicate that underwater sounds from acoustic harassment devices and alarms displace some odontocetes. During a 15-year study of killer whales in Johnstone Strait and Broughton Archipelago, British Columbia, Canada, the occurrence of killer whales was significantly lower during a 7-year period when acoustic harassment devices (10 kHz at 194 dB re 1 µPa·m) were installed in the area; whales returned to baseline numbers when these sound sources were removed (Morton and Symonds 2002). Kraus et al. (1997) found acoustic alarms operating at 10 kHz with a source level of 132 dB re 1 µPa·m were an effective deterrent for harbor porpoises. Kastelein et al. (2008) subjected one harbor porpoise in a large floating pen to a continuous 50 kHz pure tone with a source level of 122 ± 3 dB re 1 µPa·m rms. The porpoise moved away from the sound at an estimated avoidance threshold of 108 ± 3 dB re 1 µPa rms and did not habituate to it despite 66 exposures. Other related studies, mainly on harbor porpoises, are summarized in Southall et al. (2007).

Pinnipeds

Very few data are available on the reactions of pinnipeds to sonar sounds at frequencies similar to those used during marine seismic operations. Hastie and Janik (2007) conducted a series of behavioral response tests on two captive gray seals to determine their reactions to underwater operation of a HF (375 kHz) multibeam imaging sonar that included significant signal components down to 6 kHz. Results indicated that the two seals reacted to the sonar signal by significantly increasing their dive duration; no significant differences were found in swimming direction relative to the operating sonar.

Fissipeds and Sirenians

We are not aware of any data on the reactions of sirenians and fissipeds to sonar sounds at frequencies similar to the MF and HF sounds produced during marine seismic operations.

E.4.5 TTS and Sonar Pulses

A general introduction to TTS is provided in the seismic section of this appendix (see Section E.3.4), and Southall et al. (2007) review all available data on TTS in marine mammals. There has been no specific documentation of TTS in free-ranging marine mammals exposed to sonar pulses of the types used during marine seismic surveys. However, data on TTS in captive marine mammals exposed to various related sounds provide some basis for estimating the circumstances in which TTS might occur in free-ranging cetaceans and pinnipeds. In general, studies indicate that TTS thresholds are higher for non-impulse sounds (such as most sonars) than for impulsive sounds (Southall et al. 2007). The following sections summarize the limited relevant information available on this topic.

Baleen Whales

For mysticetes, there are no data, direct or indirect, on levels or properties of sound that are required to induce TTS from active sonar of any type. In general, auditory thresholds of mysticetes within their frequency band of best hearing are believed to be higher (less sensitive) than are those of odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). If so, their TTS thresholds may also be higher (Southall et al. 2007).

Toothed Whales

The TTS threshold for the beluga whale and bottlenose dolphin has been measured in captivity to be ~195 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ for exposure to a single non-impulsive tonal sound (Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2005; reviewed in Southall et al. 2007).

Kremser et al. (2005) and other authors have noted that the probability of a cetacean swimming through the area of exposure when an MBES emits a pulse is small. The animal would have to pass the transducer at close range and be swimming at a speed and direction similar to the vessel in order to be subjected to repeated pulses and cumulative sound energy levels that could cause TTS (Kremser et al. 2005). For example, given the maximum source level of 242 dB re 1 $\mu Pa \cdot m$ (rms) for the R/V *Langseth*'s MBES, the received level for an animal within the sonar beam 100 m below the ship would be about 202 dB re 1 µPa (rms), assuming 40 dB of spreading loss. Given the MBES' narrow beam, only one pulse is likely to be received by a given animal as the ship passes overhead. The received energy level at 100 m range from a single pulse of duration 15 ms would be about 184 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, i.e., 202 dB + 10 log (0.015 s). That is below the TTS threshold for cetaceans receiving a non-impulse sound (195 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$). The corresponding received energy level at 10 m range would be <204 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, given that a location 10 m below the MBES transducers would be in the near field of this distributed source. An odontocete in the beam at that distance might incur some TTS (which would be fully recoverable).

Pinnipeds

TTS thresholds for sounds of the types produced by MBES, SBP, ACP and pingers have not been measured in pinnipeds. However, studies of TTS onset upon exposure to prolonged non-impulse sounds have been done in the harbor seal, California sea lion, and northern elephant seal (Kastak et al. 2005; Southall et al. 2007). Those studies suggest that some pinnipeds, e.g., the harbor seal, may incur TTS at somewhat lower received energy levels than do small odontocetes exposed for similar durations (Kastak et al. 1999, 2005; Ketten et al. 2001; Southall et al. 2007). In the harbor seal, the TTS threshold for non-impulse sounds is about 183 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$, as compared with ~195 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ in odontocetes (Kastak et al. 2005; Southall et al. 2007). TTS onset occurs at higher received energy levels in the California sea lion and northern elephant seal than in the harbor seal.

A harbor seal as much as 100 m below the *Langseth* could receive a single MBES pulse with received energy level of ≥184 dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \cdot s$ (as calculated in the toothed whale subsection above) and thus could incur slight TTS. Species of pinnipeds with higher TTS thresholds would not incur TTS unless they were closer to the transducers when a sonar ping was emitted. Given the intermittent nature of the sonar signals and the narrow MBES beam, only a small fraction of the pinnipeds below (and close to) the ship would receive a pulse as the ship passed overhead.

Fissipeds and Sirenians

There are no published data on TTS in sea otters, polar bears, or sirenians.

E.4.6 PTS and Sonar Pulses

There are no direct measurements of the sound exposure necessary to cause PTS in any marine mammal exposed to any type of sound. However, the general principles are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals (see Southall et al. 2007 and the seismic section above). The low-to-moderate levels of TTS that have been induced in captive odontocetes during controlled studies have

shown no measurable residual PTS (Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002; Nachtigall et al. 2003, 2004).

For non-impulsive sonar sounds, the PTS threshold is expected to be at least 20 dB higher, on a received energy basis, than is the TTS threshold (Southall et al. 2007). The PTS thresholds in cetaceans and pinnipeds are estimated to be ≥215 and ≥203 dB re 1 μPa ^{2}·s, respectively (Southall et al. 2007). Burkhardt et al. (2008) performed a theoretical risk assessment that included evaluating the likelihood of PTS in cetaceans upon exposure to sounds from a multibeam echosounder (i.e., Hydrosweep), a parametric echosounder, and a multi-frequency Simrad EK60 echosounder (i.e., "fish finder"). Source levels were 230–245 dB re 1 μPa·m (rms). Burkhardt et al. (2008) based their analysis on the SEL and peak pressure criteria proposed by Southall et al. (2007) for *impulsive* sources (i.e., ≥198 dB re 1 μPa^2·s and ≥230 dB re 1 μPa $_{peak}$). According to Southall et al. (2007), it would be appropriate to apply the criteria that they proposed for *non-impulse* sounds (i.e., 215 dB re 1 μPa^2·s and ≥230 dB re 1 μPa $_{peak}$). Thus, Burkhardt et al.'s (2008) SEL-based conclusions are precautionary, but their conclusions based on peak pressure are consistent with Southall et al.'s (2007) recommendations.

SEL: The maximum energy levels of the three sonars that they considered, at any point in the near field, were 200–210 dB re 1 μPa^2·s (Burkhardt et al. 2008). For cetaceans, the non-impulse SEL criterion for PTS (215 dB SEL) would not be exceeded even for a cetacean immediately adjacent to the transducers unless it remained there long enough to receive multiple pings. Burkhardt et al. (2008) did not address pinnipeds, but the non-impulse SEL criterion for PTS in pinnipeds (203 dB re 1 μPa^2·s) could be exceeded for a single ping received within a few meters of the transducers of the stronger sonars.

Peak pressure: Southall et al. (2007) note that, regardless of the SEL that might elicit onset of PTS, there is also concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean or pinniped received sound signals containing an instantaneous peak pressure exceeding, respectively, 230 or 218 dB re 1 μPa (peak). Burkhardt et al. (2008) reported that the maximum peak pressures in the water near the three sonars that they considered were 223–233 dB re 1 μPa$_{peak}$. Thus, a peak pressure ≥230 dB re 1 μPa would not occur beyond a few meters from their strongest source. However, a peak pressure of ≥218 dB re 1 μPa as relevant for pinnipeds could occur out to ~20 m from the strongest source.

Some caution is recommended in drawing conclusions about PTS effects given the limited knowledge of TTS, PTS and their relationships, but available information suggests that scientific sonars could only cause direct auditory injury if a marine mammal were very near the source and in the beam when one or more pings were emitted. As noted by Burkhardt et al. (2008), cetaceans are very unlikely to incur PTS from operation of scientific sonars on a ship that is underway. The risk of PTS could be somewhat higher for certain pinnipeds if they were close to the transducers. PTS might be possible if a cetacean or (more likely) pinniped dove under the ship near the operating transducers while the vessel was on station and remained there long enough to receive multiple pings.

E.4.7 Strandings and Mortality

There is no evidence that the operation of MBES, SBP, ACP, or pingers associated with seismic surveys induces strandings or mortality among marine mammals. However, there is evidence that MF tactical sonars on naval vessels can, directly or indirectly, result in strandings and mortality of some marine mammals, especially beaked whales. Detailed reviews of associations between MF navy sonar and cetacean strandings include Balcomb and Claridge (2001), NOAA and U.S. Navy (2001), Jepson et al. (2003), Fernández et al. (2004, 2005), Hildebrand (2005), Cox et al. (2006), and D'Spain et al. (2006).

The MBES and SBP (i.e., echosounders) used during typical seismic surveys are quite different from the high-intensity, MF tactical navy sonars associated primarily with beaked whales strandings. For example, pulse durations of the MBES (0.2 to 20 ms) and SBP (0.4–100 ms) used on the R/V *Langseth* are very short relative to naval sonars (at least a few hundred milliseconds, and sometimes longer). Thus, the sound energy received from an MBES and SBP would be substantially less than that received at a similar distance from a military tactical sonar. In addition, at any given location, an individual marine mammal would be in the beam of an MBES or SBP for much less time given the intermittent nature, narrow beamwidth, and generally downward orientation of the beam. (In contrast, Navy sonars often use near-horizontally-directed sound.) Animals close to the ship (where the beam is narrowest and has relatively high received levels) are especially unlikely to be ensonified for more than one or two pulses from the moving vessel. Those factors would all reduce the sound energy received from an MBES or SBP rather drastically relative to that from the sonars used by the Navy. The source levels of an ACP and pingers often used during seismic surveys are weaker than those of an MBES or SBP.

Burkhardt et al.'s (2008) theoretical risk assessment included assessing the likelihood of behaviorally-induced damage to beaked whales through use of sonars associated with marine scientific research. Results indicated that such immediate indirect injury is unlikely to occur during scientific applications based on available information used as input to the model. This assessment was based on the aforementioned fundamental hydroacoustic differences between the scientific echosounders versus the naval MF sonars associated with beaked whale strandings.

As noted earlier, in September 2002, there was a stranding of two Cuvier's beaked whales in the Gulf of California, Mexico, when a seismic survey by the R/V *Ewing* was underway in the general area (Malakoff 2002). The evidence linking these strandings to the seismic surveys was inconclusive (see seismic section above). The ship was also operating its MBES at the same time but, as discussed elsewhere, this sonar had much less potential than the aforementioned naval sonars to affect beaked whales.

E.5 LITERATURE CITED

Akamatsu, T., Y. Hatakeyama, and N. Takatsu. 1993. Effects of pulsed sounds on escape behavior of false killer whales. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 59:1297-1303.

Angliss R.P. and R.B. Outlaw. 2008. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2007. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-AFSC-180. National Marine Fisheries Service, Alaska Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA.

Anonymous. 1975. Phantom killer whales. South African Shipping News and Fishing Industry Review 30(7):50-53.

Arnold, B.W. 1996. Visual monitoring of marine mammal activity during the Exxon 3-D seismic survey: Santa Ynez unit, offshore California 9 November to 12 December 1995. Prepared by Impact Sciences Inc., San Diego, CA, for Exxon Company, U.S.A., Thousand Oaks, CA.

Ash, C. 1962. Whaler's Eye. Macmillan, New York, NY.

Au, W.W.L. 1993. The Sonar of Dolphins. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Au, W.W.L., A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay. 2000. Hearing by Whales and Dolphins. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research Volume 12. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.

Au, W.W.L., A.A. Pack, M.O. Lammers, L.M. Herman, M.H. Deakos and K. Andrews. 2006. Acoustic properties of humpback whale songs. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120:1103-1110.

Backus, R.H. and W.E. Schevill. 1966. *Physeter* clicks. Pages 510-528 *in* K.S. Norris, ed. Whales, dolphins, and porpoises. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Bain, D.E. and R. Williams. 2006. Long-range effects of airgun noise on marine mammals: responses as a function of received sound level and distance. Paper SC/58/E35 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts.

Baird, R.W. 2005. Sightings of dwarf (*Kogia sima*) and pygmy (*K. breviceps*) sperm whales from the main Hawaiian Islands. Pacific Science 59:461-466.

Baird, R.W., D.L. Webster, D.J. McSweeney, A.D. Ligon, G.S. Schorr, and J. Barlow. 2006. Diving behavior and ecology of Cuvier's (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and Blainville's (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) beaked whales in Hawaii. Canadian Journal of Zoology 84:1120-1128.

Balcomb, K.C., III and D.E. Claridge. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. Bahamas Journal of Science 8(2):2-12.

Barkaszi, M.J., D.M. Epperson, and B. Bennett. 2009. Six-year compilation of cetacean sighting data collected during commercial seismic survey mitigation observations throughout the Gulf of Mexico, USA. Pages 24-25 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Barlow, J. and R. Gisiner. 2006. Mitigating, monitoring and assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 7(3):239-249.

Bauer, G.B., J.C. Gaspard, K. Dziuk, A. Cardwell, L. Read, R.L. Reep, and D.A. Mann. 2009. The manatee audiogram and auditory critical ratios. Pages 27-28 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Beale, C.M. and P. Monaghan. 2004. Behavioural responses to human disturbance: a matter of choice? Animal Behavior 68:1065-1069.

Beland, J.A., B. Haley, C.M. Reiser, D.M. Savarese, D.S. Ireland and D.W. Funk. 2009. Effects of the presence of other vessels on marine mammal sightings during multi-vessel operations in the Alaskan Chukchi Sea. Page 29 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Berta, A., R. Racicot and T. Deméré. 2009. The comparative anatomy and evolution of the ear in Balaenoptera mysticetes. Page 33 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Blackwell, S.B., R.G. Norman, C.R. Greene Jr. and W.J. Richardson. 2007. Acoustic measurements. Pages 4-1 to 4-52 *in* Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by Shell Offshore Inc. in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, July-September 2006: 90-day report. LGL Rep. P891-1. Rep. from LGL Alaska Res. Assoc. Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Shell Offshore Inc., Houston, TX, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD, and U.S. Fish & Wildl. Serv., Anchorage, AK.

Blackwell, S.B., C.R. Greene, T.L. McDonald, C.S. Nations, R.G. Norman, and A. Thode. 2009a. Beaufort Sea bowhead whale migration route study. Chapter 8 *in* D.S. Ireland, D.W. Funk, R. Rodrigues, and W.R. Koski, eds. 2009. Joint Monitoring Program in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, Open Water Seasons, 2006-2007. LGL Alaska Report P971-2. Report from LGL Alaska Research Associates, Anchorage, AK for Shell Offshore Inc., Anchorage, AK.

Blackwell, S.B., C.S. Nations, T.L. McDonald, A.M. Thode, K.H. Kim, C.R. Greene, and M.A. Macrander. 2009b. Effects of seismic exploration activities on the calling behavior of bowhead whales in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Page 35 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Bowles, A.E., M. Smultea, B. Würsig, D.P. DeMaster, and D. Palka. 1994. Relative abundance and behavior of marine mammals exposed to transmissions from the Heard Island Feasibility Test. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 96:2469-2484.

Britto, M.K. and A. Silva Barreto. 2009. Marine mammal diversity registered on seismic surveys in Brazil, between 2000 and 2008. Page 41 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada

Brodie, P.F. 1981. Energetic and behavioural considerations with respect to marine mammals and disturbance from underwater noise. Pages 287-290 *in* N.M. Peterson, ed. The Question of Sound from Icebreaker Operations: Proceedings of a Workshop. Arctic Pilot Project, Petro-Canada, Calgary, AB.

Bullock, T.H., T.J. O'Shea, and M.C. McClune. 1982. Auditory evoked-potentials in the West Indian manatee (Sirenia, *Trichechus manatus*). Journal of Comparative Physiology 148:547-554.

Burgess, W.C. and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Physical acoustics measurements. Pages 3-1 to 3-63 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA22303. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Burkhardt, E., O. Boebel, H. Bornemann, and C. Ruholl. 2008. Risk assessment of scientific sonars. Bioacoustics 17:235-237.

Calambokidis, J. and S.D. Osmek. 1998. Marine mammal research and mitigation in conjunction with air gun operation for the USGS `SHIPS' seismic surveys in 1998. Final Report. Prepared by Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA, for U.S. Geological Survey, NMFS, and MMS. July.

Caldwell, J. and W. Dragoset. 2000. A brief overview of seismic air-gun arrays. The Leading Edge 19:898-902.

Cavanagh, R.C. 2000. Criteria and thresholds for adverse effects of underwater noise on marine animals. AFRL-HE-WP-TR-2000-0092. Prepared by Science Applications International Corporation, McLean, VA, for Air Force Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.

Christie, K., C. Lyons, W.R. Koski, D.S. Ireland, and D.W. Funk. 2009. Patterns of bowhead whale occurrence and distribution during marine seismic operations in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Page 55 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Citta, J.J., L.T. Quakenbush, R.J. Small and J.C. George. 2007. Movements of a tagged bowhead whale in the vicinity of a seismic survey in the Beaufort Sea. Poster Paper, Society for Marine Mammalogy 17th Biennial Meeting, Cape Town, South Africa.

Clark, C.W. and W.T. Ellison. 2004. Potential use of low-frequency sounds by baleen whales for probing the environment: Evidence from models and empirical measurements. Pages 564-589 *in* J.A. Thomas, C.F. Moss and M. Vater, eds. Echolocation in Bats and Dolphins. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Clark, C.W. and G.C. Gagnon. 2006. Considering the temporal and spatial scales of noise exposures from seismic surveys on baleen whales. International Whaling Commission Working Pap. SC/58/E9.

Clark, C.W., P. Tyack, and W.T. Ellison. 2001. Revised Overseas Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Statement for Surveillance Towed Array Sensor System Low Frequency Active (SURTASS LFA) Sonar Technical Report 1: Low frequency Sound Scientific Research Program Technical Report (Responses of four species of whales to sounds of SURTASS LFA sonar transmissions). Prepared for the U.S. Department of the Navy. January.

Cook, M.L.H., R.A. Varela, J.D. Goldstein, S.D. McCulloch, G.D. Bossart, J.J. Finneran, D. Houser, and A. Mann. 2006. Beaked whale auditory evoked potential hearing measurements. Journal of Comparative Physiology A 192:489-495.

Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G. D'Spain, A. Fernández, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hildebrand, D. Houserp, R. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. Macleod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D.C. Mountain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Meads, and L. Benner. 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 7:177-187.

Crum, L.A., M.R. Bailey, J. Guan, P.R. Hilmo, S.G. Kargl, and T.J. Matula. 2005. Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue ex vivo and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. Acoustic Research Letters Online 6:214-220.

Dahlheim, M.E. 1987. Bio-acoustics of the gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*). Ph.D. Dissertation, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC.

DeRuiter, S.L., P.L. Tyack, Y.-T. Lin, A.E. Newhall, J.F. Lynch and P.J.O. Miller. 2006. Modeling acoustic propagation of airgun array pulses recorded on tagged sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120:4100-4114.

Di Iorio, L. and C.W. Clark. 2010. Exposure to seismic survey alters blue whale acoustic communication. Biology Letters 6:51-54.

D'Spain, G.L., A. D'Amico, and D.M. Fromm. 2006. Properties of the underwater sound fields during some well documented beaked whale mass stranding events. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 7:223-238.

Duncan, P.M. 1985. Seismic sources in a marine environment. Pages 56-88 *in* Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, N.S. Technical Report 5. Canadian Oil & Gas Lands Administration, Environmental Protection Branch, Ottawa, Ont.

Dunn, R.A. and O. Hernandez. 2009. Tracking blue whales in the eastern tropical Pacific with an ocean-bottom seismometer and hydrophone array. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126:1084-1094.

Engel, M.H., M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F.O. Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos. 2004. Are seismic surveys responsible for cetacean strandings? An unusual mortality of adult humpback whales in Abrolhos Bank, northeastern coast of Brazil. Paper SC/56/E28 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 19-22 July, Sorrento, Italy.

Erbe, C. and A.R. King. 2009. Modeling cumulative sound exposure around marine seismic surveys. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 125:2443-2451.

Fair, P.A. and P.R. Becker. 2000. Review of stress in marine mammals. Journal of Aquatic Ecosystem Stress and Recovery 7:335-354.

Fernández, A., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, E. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and P.D. Jepson. 2004. Pathology: whales, sonar and decompression sickness (reply). Nature 428(6984, 15 Apr.).

Fernández, A., J.F. Edwards, F. Rodriquez, A.E. de los Monteros, P. Herráez, P. Castro, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, and M. Arbelo. 2005. "Gas and fat embolic syndrome" involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. Veterinary Pathology 42:446-457.

Finneran, J.J. and C.E. Schlundt. 2004. Effects of intense pure tones on the behavior of trained odontocetes. Technical Report 1913. Space and Naval Warfare (SPAWAR) Systems Center, San Diego, CA. February.

Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, D.A. Carder, J.A. Clark, J.A. Young, J.B. Gaspin, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Auditory and behavioral responses of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) and beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*) to impulsive sounds resembling distant signatures of underwater explosions. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 108:417-431.

Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2002. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 111:2929-2940.

Finneran, J.J., R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2003. Auditory and behavioral responses of California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*) to single underwater impulses from an arc-gap transducer. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 114:1667-1677.

Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt, and S.H. Ridgway. 2005. Temporary threshold shift in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to mid-frequency tones. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 118(4):2696-2705.

Finneran, J.J., D.S. Houser, B. Mase-Guthrie, R.Y. Ewing and R.G. Lingenfelser. 2009. Auditory evoked potentials in a stranded Gervais' beaked whale (Mesoplodon europaeus). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126:484-490.

Fish, J.F. and J.S. Vania. 1971. Killer whale, *Orcinus orca*, sounds repel white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*. Fisheries Bulletin 69:531-535.

Fox, C.G., R.P. Dziak, and H. Matsumoto. 2002. NOAA efforts in monitoring of low-frequency sound in the global ocean. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 112(5, Pt. 2):2260 (Abstract).

Frankel, A.S. 2005. Gray whales hear and respond to a 21–25 kHz high-frequency whale-finding sonar. Page 97 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.

Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? Nature 392(6671):29.

Frost, K.J., L.F. Lowry, and R.R. Nelson. 1984. Belukha whale studies in Bristol Bay, Alaska. Pages 187-200 *in* B.R. Melteff and D.H. Rosenberg, eds. Proceedings of the Workshop on Biological Interactions among Marine Mammals and Commercial Fisheries in the Southeastern Bering Sea, Oct. 1983, Anchorage, AK. University of Alaska Sea Grant Report 84-1. University of Alaska, Fairbanks, AK.

Gabriele, C.M. and B. Kipple. 2009. Measurements of near-surface, near-bow underwater sound from cruise ships. Page 86 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Gailey, G., B. Würsig, and T.L. McDonald. 2007. Abundance, behavior, and movement patterns of western gray whales in relation to a 3-D seismic survey, northeast Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134(1-3):75-91.

Gedamke, J., S. Frydman, and N. Gales. 2008. Risk of baleen whale hearing loss from seismic surveys: preliminary results from simulations accounting for uncertainty and individual variation. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/60/E9.

Gentry, R., ed. 2002. Report of the workshop on acoustic resonance as a source of tissue trauma in cetaceans. 24-25 April, NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 19 pp.

Gerrodette, T. and J. Pettis. 2005. Responses of tropical cetaceans to an echosounder during research vessel Surveys. Page 104 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.

Gerstein, E.R., L.A. Gerstein, S.E. Forsythe, and J.E. Blue. 1999. The underwater audiogram of a West Indian manatee (*Trichechus manatus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 105:3575-3583.

Gerstein, E., L. Gerstein, S. Forsythe and J. Blue. 2004. Do manatees utilize infrasonic communication or detection? Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 115(5, Pt. 2):2554-2555 (Abstract).

Ghoul, A., C. Reichmuth, and J. Mulsow. 2009. Source levels and spectral analysis of southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) scream vocalizations. Page 90 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Goold, J.C. 1996a. Acoustic assessment of common dolphins off the West Wales coast, in conjunction with 16th round seismic surveying. Report from School of Ocean Sciences, University of Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd., Repsol Exploration (UK) Ltd., and Aran Energy Exploration Ltd.

Goold, J.C. 1996b. Acoustic assessment of populations of common dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in conjunction with seismic surveying. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the U.K. 76:811-820.

Goold, J.C. 1996c. Acoustic cetacean monitoring off the west Wales coast. Rep. from School of Ocean Sciences, Univ. Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Explor. (UK) Ltd, and Aran Energy Explor. Ltd.

Goold, J.C. and R.F.W. Coates. 2006. Near source, high frequency air-gun signatures. Paper SC/58/E30 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts.

Goold, J.C. and P.J. Fish. 1998. Broadband spectra of seismic survey air-gun emissions, with reference to dolphin auditory thresholds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 103:2177-2184.

Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M.P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. 2004. A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. Marine Technology Society Journal 37(4):16-34.

Gordon, J., R. Antunes, N. Jaquet and B. Würsig. 2006. An investigation of sperm whale headings and surface behaviour before, during and after seismic line changes in the Gulf of Mexico. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/58/E45.

Gosselin, J.-F. and J. Lawson. 2004. Distribution and abundance indices of marine mammals in the Gully and two adjacent canyons of the Scotian Shelf before and during nearby hydrocarbon seismic exploration programmes in April and July 2003. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Proceedings Series 2004/133.

Greene, C.R., Jr. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. Pages 3-1 to 3-63 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Northstar marine mammal monitoring program, 1996: marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of a seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. LGL Report 2121-2. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ON, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Explor. (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Greene, C.R., Jr. and W.J. Richardson. 1988. Characteristics of marine seismic survey sounds in the Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 83(6):2246-2254.

Greene, G.D., F.R. Engelhardt, and R.J. Paterson, eds. 1985. Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, NS. Technical Report 5. Canadian Oil & Gas Lands Administration, Environmental Protection Branch, Ottawa, Ont.

Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999a. Bowhead whale calls. Pages 6-1–6-23 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ONT, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman and W.J. Richardson. 1999b. The influence of seismic survey sounds on bowhead whale calling rates. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 106(4, Pt. 2):2280 (Abstract).

Guerra, M., A.M. Thode, S.B. Blackwell, C.R. Greene, Jr. and M. Macrander. 2009. Quantifying masking effects of seismic survey reverberation off the Alaskan North Slope. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126(4, Pt. 2):2230 (Abstract).

Gunn, L.M. 1988. A behavioral audiogram of the North American river otter (*Lutra canadensis*). M.S. thesis, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

Haley, B., and W.R. Koski. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, July–August 2004. LGL Report TA2822-27. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. November.

Hanser, S.F., L.R. Doyle, A.R. Szabo, F.A. Sharpe and B. McCowan. 2009. Bubble-net feeding humpback whales in Southeast Alaska change their vocalization patterns in the presence of moderate vessel noise. Page 105 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Harris, R.E., G.W. Miller, and W.J. Richardson. 2001. Seal responses to airgun sounds during summer seismic surveys in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Marine Mammal Science 17:795-812.

Harris, R.E., T. Elliott, and R.A. Davis. 2007. Results of mitigation and monitoring program, Beaufort Span 2-D marine seismic program, open-water season 2006. LGL Rep. TA4319-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for GX Technology Corp., Houston, TX.

Hastie, G.D. and V.M. Janik. 2007. Behavioural responses of grey seals to multibeam imaging sonars. Abstracts of the 17th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 29 Nov.–3 Dec., Cape Town, South Africa.

Hauser, D., M. Holst, and V.D. Moulton. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, April–August 2008. LGL Report TA4656/7-1. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, St. John's, NF and King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

HESS Team. 1999. High Energy Seismic Survey review process and interim operational guidelines for marine surveys offshore Southern California. Report from High Energy Seismic Survey Team for California State Lands Commission and MMS, Camarillo, CA.

Hildebrand, J.A. 2005. Impacts of anthropogenic sound. Pages 101-124 *in* J.E. Reynolds, W.F. Perrin, R.R. Reeves, S. Montgomery, and T. Ragen, eds. Marine Mammal Research: Conservation Beyond Crisis. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.

Hogarth, W.T. 2002. Declaration of William T. Hogarth in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 23 Oct. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division.

Holst, M. and M.A. Smultea. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off Central America, February–April 2006. LGL Report TA4342-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd. environmental research associates, King City, ONT, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005a. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off the Northern Yucatán Peninsula in the Southern Gulf of Mexico, Jan.–Feb. 2005. LGL Report TA2822-31. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. June.

Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005b. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean off Central America, November–December 2004. LGL Report TA2822-30. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. April.

Holst, M., W.J. Richardson, W.R. Koski, M.A. Smultea, B. Haley, M.W. Fitzgerald, and M. Rawson. 2006. Effects of large- and small-source seismic surveys on marine mammals and sea turtles. Eos Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Supplement, Abstract OS42A-01. 23-26 May, Baltimore, MD.

Hooker, S.K., R.W. Baird, S. Al-Omari, S. Gowans, and H. Whitehead. 2001. Behavioral reactions of northern bottlenose whales (*Hyperoodon ampullatus*) to biopsy darting and tag attachment procedures. Fisheries Bulletin 99:303-308.

Hutchinson, D.R. and R.S. Detrick. 1984. Water gun vs. air gun: a comparison. Marine Geophysical Research 6:295-310.

IAGC. 2004. Further analysis of 2002 Abrolhos Bank, Brazil humpback whale strandings coincident with seismic surveys. International Association of Geophysical Contractors, Houston, TX.

Ireland, D., M. Holst, and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program off the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, July-August 2005. LGL Rep. TA4089-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.

IWC. 2007. Report of the standing working group on environmental concerns. Annex K to Report of the Scientific Committee. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 9(Suppl.):227-260.

Jefferson, T.A. and B.E. Curry. 1994. Review and evaluation of potential acoustic methods of reducing or eliminating marine mammal-fishery interactions. Report from the Marine Mammal Research Program, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX, for U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, Washington, DC.

Jepson, P.D., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, F. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and A. Fernández. 2003. Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans. Nature 425(6958):575-576.

Jochens, A. D. Biggs, K. Benoit-Bird, D. Engelhaupt, J. Gordon, C. Hu, N. Jaquet, M. Johnson, R. Leben, B. Mate, P. Miller, J. Ortega-Ortiz, A. Those, P. Tyack, and B. Würsig. 2008. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/Synthesis report. OCS Study MMS 2008-006. Report from the Department of Oceanography, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, for the Minerals Management Service, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.

Johnson, M.P. and P.L. Tyack. 2003. A digital acoustic recording tag for measuring the response of wild marine mammals to sound. IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering 28:3-12.

Johnson, S.R., W.J. Richardson, S.B. Yazvenko, S.A. Blokhin, G. Gailey, M.R. Jenkerson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, A.S. Perlov, S.A. Rutenko, B. Würsig, C.R. Martin, and D.E. Egging. 2007. A western gray whale mitigation and monitoring program for a 3-D seismic survey, Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134(1-3):1-19.

Kastak, D. and R.J. Schusterman. 1998. Low-frequency amphibious hearing in pinnipeds: methods, measurements, noise and ecology. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 103:2216-2228.

Kastak, D. and R.J. Schusterman. 1999. In-air and underwater hearing sensitivity of a northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 77:1751-1758.

Kastak, D., R.L. Schusterman, B.L. Southall, and C.J. Reichmuth. 1999. Underwater temporary threshold shift induced by octave-band noise in three species of pinnipeds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 106:1142-1148.

Kastak, D., B.L. Southall, R.J. Schusterman, and C. Reichmuth Kastak. 2005. Underwater temporary threshold shift in pinnipeds: effects of noise level and duration. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 118:3154-3163.

Kastelein, R.A., P. Mosterd, B. van Santen, M. Hagedoorn, and D. de Haan. 2002. Underwater audiogram of a Pacific walrus (*Odobenus rosmarus divergens*) measured with narrow-band frequency-modulated signals. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 112:2173-2182.

Kastelein, R.A., W.C. Verboom, N. Jennings, and D. de Haan. 2008. Behavioral avoidance threshold level of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) for a continuous 50 kHz pure tone (L). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 123:1858-1861.

Kastelein, R.A., P.J. Wensveen, L. Hoek, W.C. Verboom and J.M. Terhune. 2009. Underwater detection of tonal signals between 0.125 and 100 kHz by harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*). Journal of Acoustical Society of America 125:1222-1229.

Kasuya, T. 1986. Distribution and behavior of Baird's beaked whales off the Pacific coast of Japan. Scientific Report of the Whales Research Institute 37:61-83.

Ketten, D.R. 1991. The marine mammal ear: specializations for aquatic audition and echolocation. Pages 717-750 *in* D. Webster, R. Fay and A. Popper, eds. The Biology of Hearing. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Ketten, D.R. 1992. The cetacean ear: form, frequency, and evolution. Pages 53-75 *in* J.A. Thomas, R.A. Kastelein, and A. Ya Supin, eds. Marine Mammal Sensory Systems. Plenum, New York, NY.

Ketten, D.R. 1994. Functional analysis of whale ears: adaptations for underwater hearing. IEEE Proceedings of Underwater Acoustics 1:264-270.

Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals from underwater explosions. Pages 391-407 *in* R.A. Kastelein, J.A. Thomas, and P.E. Nachtigall, eds. Sensory Systems of Aquatic Mammals. De Spil Publishers, Woerden, Netherlands.

Ketten, D.R. 1998. Marine mammal auditory systems: a summary of audiometric and anatomical data and its implications for underwater acoustic impacts. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-256. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA.

Ketten, D.R. 2000. Cetacean ears. Pages 43-108 *in* W.W.L. Au, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay, eds. Hearing by Whales and Dolphins. Springer-Verlag, New York. 485 pp.

Ketten, D.R., J. Lien and S. Todd. 1993. Blast injury in humpback whale ears: evidence and implications. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 94(3, Pt. 2):1849-1850 (Abstract).

Ketten, D.R., J. O'Malley, P.W.B. Moore, S. Ridgway, and C. Merigo. 2001. Aging, injury, disease, and noise in marine mammal ears. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 110(5, Pt. 2):2721 (Abstract).

Klima, E.F., G.R. Gitschlag, and M.L. Renaud. 1988. Impacts of the explosive removal of offshore petroleum platforms on sea turtles and dolphins. Marine Fisheries Review 50(3):33-42.

Koski, W.R., D.W. Funk, D.S. Ireland, C. Lyons, K. Christie, A.M. Macrander, and S.B. Blackwell. 2009. An update on feeding by bowhead whales near an offshore seismic survey in the central Beaufort Sea. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/61/BRG3.

Kraus, S., A. Read, A. Solov, K. Baldwin, T. Spradlin, E. Anderson, and J. Williamson. 1997. Acoustic alarms reduce porpoise mortality. Nature 388(6642):525.

Kremser, U., P. Klemm, and W.D. Kötz. 2005. Estimating the risk of temporary acoustic threshold shift, caused by hydroacoustic devices, in whales in the Southern Ocean. Antarctic Science 17(1):3-10.

Kryter, K.D. 1985. The Effects of Noise on Man. 2nd edition. Academic Press, Orlando, FL.

Kryter, K.D. 1994. The Handbook of Hearing and the Effects of Noise. Academic Press, Orlando, FL.

Laurinolli, M.H. and N.A. Cochrane. 2005. Hydroacoustic analysis of marine mammal vocalization data from ocean bottom seismometer mounted hydrophones in the Gully. Pages 89-95 *in* K. Lee, H. Bain and G.V. Hurley, eds. Acoustic Monitoring and Marine Mammal Surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf Before and During Active Seismic Surveys. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 151.

Lesage, V., C. Barrette, M.C.S. Kingsley, and B. Sjare. 1999. The effect of vessel noise on the vocal behavior of belugas in the St. Lawrence River estuary, Canada. Marine Mammal Science 15:65-84.

Ljungblad, D.K., B. Würsig, S.L. Swartz, and J.M. Keene. 1988. Observations on the behavioral responses of bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) to active geophysical vessels in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. Arctic 41(3):183-194.

Lucke, K., U. Siebert, P.A. Lepper, and M.-A. Blanchet. 2009. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after exposure to seismic airgun stimuli. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 125:4060-4070.

Lusseau, D. and L. Bejder. 2007. The long-term consequences of short-term responses to disturbance experience from whalewatching impact assessment. International Journal of Comparative Psychology 20:228-236.

MacGillivray, A.O. and D. Hannay. 2007a. Summary of noise assessment. Pages 3-1 to 3-21 *in* Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc., in the Chukchi Sea, July-October 2006. LGL Rep. P903-2 (Jan. 2007). Rep. from LGL Alaska Res. Assoc. Inc., Anchorage, AK, and JASCO Res. Ltd., Victoria, B.C., for ConocoPhillips Alaska Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.

MacGillivray, A. and D. Hannay. 2007b. Field measurements of airgun array sound levels. Pages 4-1 to 4-19 *in* Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by GX Technology in the Chukchi Sea, October-November 2006: 90-day report. LGL Rep. P891-1 (Feb. 2007). Rep. from LGL Alaska Res. Assoc. Inc., Anchorage, AK, and JASCO Res. Ltd., Victoria, B.C., for GX Technology, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.

MacLean, S.A. and B. Haley. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Støregga Slide area of the Norwegian Sea, August - September 2003. LGL Rep.TA2822-20. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.

MacLean, S.A. and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Gulf of Alaska, August–September 2004. LGL Report TA2822-28. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Madsen, P.T. 2005. Marine mammals and noise: problems with root mean square sound pressure levels for transients. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117:3952-3957.

Madsen, P.T., B. Mohl, B.K. Nielsen, and M. Wahlberg. 2002. Male sperm whale behavior during exposures to distant seismic survey pulses. Aquatic Mammals 28:231-240.

Madsen, P.T., M. Johnson, P.J.O. Miller, N. Aguilar de Soto, J. Lynch, and P.L. Tyack. 2006. Quantitative measures of air gun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 120:2366–2379.

Malakoff, D. 2002. Suit ties whale deaths to research cruise. Science 298(5594):722-723.

Malme, C.I. and P.R. Miles. 1985. Behavioral responses of marine mammals (gray whales) to seismic discharges. Pages 253-280 *in* G.D. Greene, F.R. Engelhard, and R.J. Paterson, eds. Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, NS. Technical Report 5. Canadian Oil & Gas Lands Administration, Environmental Protection Branch, Ottawa, ON.

Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. 1984. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Report 5586. Prepared by Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Alaska OCS Region, Anchorage, AK.

Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, P. Tyack, C.W. Clark, and J.E. Bird. 1985. Investigation of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on feeding humpback whale behavior. BBN Report 5851; OCS Study MMS 85-0019. Prepared by BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK.

Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1986. Behavioral responses of gray whales to industrial noise: feeding observations and predictive modeling. Outer Continental Shelf Environmental Assessment Program, Final Report. BBN Rep. 6265. OCS Study MMS 88-0048. Prepared by BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for NMFS and MMS, Anchorage, AK.

Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, B., J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1988. Observations of feeding gray whale responses to controlled industrial noise exposure. Pages 55-73 *in* W.M. Sackinger, M.O. Jeffries, J.L. Imm, and S.D. Treacy, eds. Port and Ocean Engineering Under Arctic Conditions. Vol. II. Symposium on Noise and Marine Mammals. University of Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK.

Manly, B.F.J., V.D. Moulton, R.E. Elliott, G.W. Miller, and W.J. Richardson. 2007. Analysis of covariance of fall migrations of bowhead whales in relation to human activities and environmental factors, Alaskan Beaufort Sea: Phase I, 1996-1998. LGL Report TA2799-2; OCS Study MMS 2005-033. Report from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and WEST Inc., Cheyenne, WY, for Minerals Management Service, Herndon, VA, and Anchorage, AK.

Mate, B.R. and J.T. Harvey. 1987. Acoustical deterrents in marine mammal conflicts with fisheries. ORESU-W-86-001. Oregon State University, Sea Grant College Program, Corvallis, OR.

Mate, B.R., K.M. Stafford, and D.K. Ljungblad. 1994. A change in sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) distribution correlated to seismic surveys in the Gulf of Mexico. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 96(5, Pt. 2):3268-3269 (Abstract).

Maybaum, H.L. 1990. Effects of a 3.3 kHz sonar system on humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, in Hawaiian waters. Eos 71(2):92.

Maybaum, H.L. 1993. Responses of humpback whales to sonar sounds. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 94(3, Pt. 2):1848-1849 (Abstract).

McAlpine, D.F. 2002. Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales. Pages 1007-1009 *in* W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

McCall Howard, M.P. 1999. Sperm whales *Physeter macrocephalus* in the Gully, Nova Scotia: Population, distribution, and response to seismic surveying. B.Sc. (Honours) Thesis. Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS.

McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. APPEA Journal 38:692-707.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: Analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Report from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, for Australian Petroleum Production & Exploration Association, Sydney, NSW.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, M.-N. Jenner, M-N., C. Jenner, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, K. McCabe and J. Murdoch. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys - a study of environmental implications. APPEA Journal 40:692-708.

McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.C. Webb. 1995. Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the Northeast Pacific. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 98(2, Pt. 1):712-721.

McShane, L.J., J.A. Estes, M.L. Riedman, and M.M. Staedler. 1995. Repertoire, structure, and individual variation of vocalizations in the sea otter. Journal of Mammalogy 76:414-427.

Meier, S.K., S.B. Yazvenko, S.A. Blokhin, P. Wainwright, M.K. Maminov, Y.M. Yakovlev and M.W. Newcomer. 2007. Distribution and abundance of western gray whales off northeastern Sakhalin Island, Russia, 2001-2003. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134(1-3):107-136.

Miller, G.W., R.E. Elliott, W.R. Koski, V.D. Moulton, and W.J. Richardson. 1999. Whales. Pages 5-1 to 5-109 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Report TA2230-3. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.

Miller, G.W., V.D. Moulton, R.A. Davis, M. Holst, P. Millman, A. MacGillivray, and D. Hannay. 2005. Monitoring seismic effects on marine mammals—southeastern Beaufort Sea, 2001-2002. Pages 511-542 *in* S.L. Armsworthy, P.J. Cranford, and K. Lee, eds. Offshore Oil and Gas Environmental Effects Monitoring/Approaches and Technologies. Battelle Press, Columbus, OH.

Miller, P.J.O., N. Biassoni, A. Samuels, and P.L. Tyack. 2000. Whale songs lengthen in response to sonar. Nature 405(6789):903.

Miller, P.J.O., M.P. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, N. Biassoni, M. Quero, and P.L. Tyack. 2009. Using at-sea experiments to study the effects of airguns on the foraging behavior of sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico. Deep-Sea Research I 56:1168-1181.

Mooney, T.A., P.E. Nachtigall, M. Breese, S. Vlachos, and W.W.L. Au, 2009a. Predicting temporary threshold shifts in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*): the effects of noise level and duration. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 125:1816-1826.

Mooney, T.A., P.E. Nachtigall, and S. Vlachos. 2009b. Sonar-induced temporary hearing loss in dolphins. Biology Letters 4:565-567.

Moore, S.E. and Angliss, R.P. 2006. Overview of planned seismic surveys offshore northern Alaska, July-October 2006. Paper SC/58/E6 presented to IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St Kitts.

Morton A.B. and H.K. Symonds. 2002. Displacement of *Orcinus orca* (L.) by high amplitude sound in British Columbia, Canada. ICES Journal of Marine Science 59:71-80

Moulton, V.D. and J.W. Lawson. 2002. Seals, 2001. Pages 3-1 to 3-48 *in* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of WesternGeco's open water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 2001. LGL Rep. TA2564-4. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for WesternGeco, Houston, TX, and NMFS, Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 95 pp.

Moulton, V.D. and G.W. Miller. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring of a seismic survey on the Scotian Slope, 2003. Pages 29-40 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain, and G.V. Hurley, eds. Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in the Gully and outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic programs. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report 151.

Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish and R.A. Buchanan. 2005. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Resources' 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2004. LGL Report SA817. Prepared by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NL, for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, AB, ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, NF, and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, AB.

Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, R.E. Harris and R.A. Buchanan. 2006a. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Limited's 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2005. LGL Report SA843. Prepared by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NF, for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, AB, ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, NF, and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, AB.

Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish and R.A. Buchanan. 2006b. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of ConocoPhillips' 3-D seismic program in the Laurentian Sub-basin, 2005. LGL Report SA849. Prepared by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NF, for ConocoPhillips Canada Resources Corp., Calgary, AB.

Nachtigall, P.E., J.L. Pawloski, and W.W.L. Au. 2003. Temporary threshold shifts and recovery following noise exposure in the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 113:3425-3429.

Nachtigall, P.E., A.Y. Supin, J. Pawloski, and W.W.L. Au. 2004. Temporary threshold shifts after noise exposure in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) measured using evoked auditory potentials. Marine Mammal Science 20:673-687

Nations, C.S., S.B. Blackwell, K.H. Kim, A.M. Thode, C.R. Greene, Jr., A.M. Macrander, and T.L. McDonald. 2009. Effects of seismic exploration in the Beaufort Sea on bowhead whale call distributions. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 126(4, Pt. 2):2230 (Abstract).

Nieukirk, S.L., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, R.P. Dziak, and C.G. Fox. 2004. Low-frequency whale and seismic airgun sounds recorded in the mid-Atlantic Ocean. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 115:1832-1843.

Nieukirk, S.L., D.K. Mellinger, J.A. Hildebrand, M.A. McDonald, and R.P. Dziak. 2005. Downward shift in the frequency of blue whale vocalizations. Page 205 *in* Abstracts of the 16th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 December, San Diego, CA.

Nieukirk, S.L., S.L. Heimlich, S.E. Moore, K.M. Stafford, R.P. Dziak, M. Fowler, J. Haxel, J. Goslin and D.K. Mellinger. 2009. Whales and airguns: an eight-year acoustic study in the central North Atlantic. Pages 181-182 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

NMFS. 1995. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; offshore seismic activities in southern California. Federal Register 60:53753-53760.

NMFS. 2000. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; marine seismic-reflection data collection in southern California. Federal Register 65:16374-16379.

NMFS. 2001. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; oil and gas exploration drilling activities in the Beaufort Sea/Notice of issuance of an incidental harassment authorization. Federal Register 66:9291-9298.

NMFS. 2005. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. Federal Register 70:1871-1875.

NOAA and U.S. Navy. 2001. Joint interim report: Bahamas marine mammal stranding event of 15-16 March 2000. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations and Environment, Washington, DC.

Nowacek, D.P., L.H. Thorne, D.W. Johnston, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. Mammal Review 37:81-115.

NRC. 2005. Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise: Determining When Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects. U. S. National Research Council, Ocean Studies Board. (Authors D.W. Wartzok, J. Altmann, W. Au, K. Ralls, A. Starfield, and P.L. Tyack). National Academies Press, Washington, DC.

Parente, C.L., M.C.C. Marcondes, and M.H. Engel. 2006. Humpback whale strandings and seismic surveys in Brazil from 1999 to 2004. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/58/E41.

Parente, C.L., J.P. de Araújo, and M.E. de Araújo. 2007. Diversity of cetaceans as tool in monitoring environmental impacts of seismic surveys. Biota Neotropica 7:1-7.

Parks, S.E., C.W. Clark, and P.L. Tyack. 2007a. Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: the potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 122:3725-3731.

Parks, S.E., D.R. Ketten, J.T. O'Malley, and J. Arruda. 2007b. Anatomical predictions of hearing in the North Atlantic right whale. Anatomical Record 290:734-744.

Parks, S.E., I. Urazghildiiev, and C.W. Clark. 2009. Variability in ambient noise levels and call parameters of North Atlantic right whales in three habitat areas. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 125:1230-1239.

Potter, J.R., M. Thillet, C. Douglas, M.A. Chitre, Z. Doborzynski, and P.J. Seekings. 2007. Visual and passive acoustic marine mammal observations and high-frequency seismic source characteristics recorded during a seismic survey. IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering 32:469-483.

Reeves, R.R. 1992. Whale responses to anthropogenic sounds: A literature review. Sci. & Res. Ser. 47. New Zealand Department of Conservation, Wellington.

Reeves, R.R., E. Mitchell, and H. Whitehead. 1993. Status of the northern bottlenose whale, *Hyperoodon ampullatus*. Canadian Field-Naturalist 107:490-508.

Reeves, R.R., R.J. Hofman, G.K. Silber, and D. Wilkinson. 1996. Acoustic deterrence of harmful marine mammal-fishery interactions: proceedings of a workshop held in Seattle, Washington, 20-22 March 1996. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-OPR-10. NMFS, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Seattle, WA.

Reiser, C.M., B. Haley, J. Beland, D.M. Savarese, D.S. Ireland, and D.W. Funk. 2009. Evidence of short-range movements by phocid species in reaction to marine seismic surveys in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort seas. Page 211 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Richardson, W.J. and C.I. Malme. 1993. Man-made noise and behavioral responses. Pages 631-700 *in* J.J. Burns, J.J. Montague, and C.J. Cowles, eds. The Bowhead Whale. Special Publication Number 2, Society for Marine Mammalogy, Lawrence, KS.

Richardson, W.J. and B. Würsig. 1997. Influences of man-made noise and other human actions on cetacean behaviour. Marine and Freshwater Behavior and Physiology 29:183-209.

Richardson, W.J., B. Würsig, and C.R. Greene. 1986. Reactions of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, to seismic exploration in the Canadian Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 79:1117-1128.

Richardson, W.J., R.A. Davis, C.R. Evans, D.K. Ljungblad, and P. Norton. 1987. Summer distribution of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, relative to oil industry activities in the Canadian Beaufort Sea, 1980-84. Arctic 40:93-104.

Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine Mammals and Noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Richardson, W.J., G.W. Miller, and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Displacement of migrating bowhead whales by sounds from seismic surveys in shallow waters of the Beaufort Sea. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 106(4, Pt. 2):2281 (Abstract).

Richardson, W.J., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and M. Cummings. 2009. Responses of cetaceans to large-source seismic surveys by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. Page 213 *in* Abstracts of the 18th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 12-16 October 2009, Québec City, Canada.

Riedman, M.L. 1983. Studies of the effects of experimentally produced noise associated with oil and gas exploration and development on sea otters in California. Report from Center for Coastal Marine Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK.

Riedman, M.L. 1984. Effects of sounds associated with petroleum industry activities on the behavior of sea otters in California. Pages D-1 to D-12 *in* C.I. Malme, P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise form petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Report 5586. Prepared by BBN Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK.

Romano, T.A., M.J. Keogh, C.Kelly, P. Feng, L. Berk, C.E. Schlundt, D.A. Carder, and J.J. Finneran. 2004. Anthropogenic sound and marine mammal health: measures of the nervous and immune systems before and after intense sound exposure. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 61:1124-1134.

SACLANT. 1998. Estimation of cetacean hearing criteria levels. Section II, Chapter 7 *in* SACLANTCEN Bioacoustics Panel Summary Record and Report. Prepared by NATO Undersea Research Center.

Scheifele, P.M., S. Andrew, R.A. Cooper, M. Darre, F.E. Musiek and L. Max. 2005. Indication of a Lombard vocal response in the St. Lawrence River beluga. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 117(3, Pt. 1):1486-1492.

Schlundt, C.E., J.J. Finneran, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Temporary shift in masking hearing thresholds of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*, after exposure to intense tones. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America 107:3496-3508.

Simard, Y., F. Samaran and N. Roy. 2005. Measurement of whale and seismic sounds in the Scotian Gully and adjacent canyons in July 2003. Pages 97-115 *In:* K. Lee, H. Bain and C.V. Hurley, eds. Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151.

Simmonds, M. P. and L.F. Lopez-Jurado. 1991. Whales and the military. Nature 351(6326):448.

Smultea, M.A. and M. Holst. 2008. Marine mammal monitoring during a University of Texas Institute for Geophysics seismic survey in the Northeast Pacific Ocean, July 2008. LGL Report TA4584-2. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, ON, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Smultea, M.A., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and S. Stoltz. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean, April-June 2004. LGL Report TA2822-26. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for L-DEO, Columbia University, Palisades, NY.

Sodal, A. 1999. Measured underwater acoustic wave propagation from a seismic source. Proceedings of the Airgun Environmental Workshop, 6 July, London, UK.

Southall, B.L., A.E. Bowles, W.T. Ellison, J.J. Finneran, R.L. Gentry, C.R. Greene Jr., D. Kastak, D.R. Ketten, J.H. Miller, P.E. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, J.A. Thomas, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. Aquatic Mammals 33:411-522.

Stone, C.J. 2003. The effects of seismic activity on marine mammals in UK waters 1998-2000. JNCC Report 323. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Stone, C.J. and M.L. Tasker. 2006. The effects of seismic airguns on cetaceans in UK waters. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 8:255-263.

Terhune, J.M. 1999. Pitch separation as a possible jamming-avoidance mechanism in underwater calls of bearded seals (*Erignathus barbatus*). Canadian Journal of Zoology 77:1025-1034.

Thomas, J.A., R.A. Kastelein, and F.T. Awbrey. 1990. Behavior and blood catecholamines of captive belugas during playbacks of noise from an oil drilling platform. Zoo Biology 9:393-402.

Thompson, D., M. Sjöberg, E.B. Bryant, P. Lovell, and A. Bjørge. 1998. Behavioural and physiological responses of harbour (*Phoca vitulina*) and grey (*Halichoerus grypus*) seals to seismic surveys. Page 134 *in* Abstracts of the 12th Biennial Conference and World Marine Mammal Science Conference, 20-25 Jan., Monte Carlo, Monaco.

Thomson, D.H. and W.J. Richardson. 1995. Marine mammal sounds. Pages 159-204 *in* W.J. Richardson, C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. Marine Mammals and Noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA.

Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, S. Webb, D. Bohnenstiehl, and E. Chapp. 2004a. Acoustic calibration measurements. Chapter 3 *In:* W.J. Richardson, ed. Marine mammal and acoustic monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's acoustic calibration study in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 2003. Revised. Prepared by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.

Tolstoy, M., J.B. Diebold, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohenstiehl, E. Chapp, R.C. Holmes, and M. Rawson. 2004b. Broadband calibration of R/V *Ewing* seismic sources. Geophysical Research Letters 31:L14310. doi: 10.1029/2004GL020234

Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, L. Doermann, S. Nooner, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, T.J. Crone, and R.C. Holmes. 2009. Broadband calibration of the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* four-string seismic sources. Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems 10(8):1-15.

Tyack, P.L. 2008. Implications for marine mammals of large-scale changes in the marine acoustic environment. Journal of Mammalogy 89:549-558.

Tyack, P.L. 2009. Human-generated sound and marine mammals. Physics Today 62(11, Nov.):39-44.

Tyack, P., M. Johnson, and P. Miller. 2003. Tracking responses of sperm whales to experimental exposures of airguns. Pages 115-120 *in* A.E. Jochens and D.C. Biggs, eds. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/Annual Report: Year 1. OCS Study MMS 2003-069. Prepared by Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, for MMS, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.

Tyack, P.L., M.P. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, P.J. Miller, and J. Lynch. 2006a. Biological significance of acoustic impacts on marine mammals: examples using an acoustic recording tag to define acoustic exposure of sperm whales, *Physeter catodon*, exposed to airgun sounds in controlled exposure experiments. Eos Transactions of the American Geophysical Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Supplement, Abstract OS42A-02. 23-26 May, Baltimore, MD.

Tyack, P.L., M. Johnson, N. Aguilar Soto, A. Sturlese, and P.T. Madsen. 2006b. Extreme diving of beaked whales. Journal of Experimental Biology 209:4238-4253.

Urick, R.J. 1983. Principles of Underwater Sound. 3rd edition. Peninsula Publishing, Los Altos, CA.

van der Woude, S. 2007. Assessing effects of an acoustic marine geophysical survey on the behaviour of bottlenose dolphins. *Tursiops truncatus*. Abstracts of the 17th Biennial Conference on the Biology of Marine Mammals, 29 Nov.-3 Dec., Cape Town, South Africa.

Wartzok, D., A.N. Popper, J. Gordon, and J. Merrill. 2004. Factors affecting the responses of marine mammals to acoustic disturbance. Marine Technology Society Journal 37(4):6-15.

Watkins, W.A. 1977. Acoustic behavior of sperm whales. Oceanus 20(2):50-58.

Watkins, W.A. 1986. Whale reactions to human activities in Cape Cod waters. Marine Mammal Science 2:251-262.

Watkins, W.A. and W.E. Schevill. 1975. Sperm whales (*Physeter catodon*) react to pingers. Deep-Sea Research 22(3):123-129.

Watkins, W.A., K.E. Moore, and P. Tyack. 1985. Sperm whale acoustic behaviors in the southeast Caribbean. Cetology 49:1-15.

Weilgart, L.S. 2007. A brief review of known effects of noise on marine mammals. International Journal of Comparative Psychology 20:159-168.

Weir, C.R. 2008a. Overt responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), and Atlantic spotted dolphins (*Stenella frontalis*) to seismic exploration off Angola. Aquatic Mammals 34:71-83.

Weir, C.R. 2008b. Short-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*) respond to an airgun ramp-up procedure off Gabon. Aquatic Mammals 34:349-354.

Weller, D.W., Y.V. Ivashchenko, G.A. Tsidulko, A.M. Burdin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2002. Influence of seismic surveys on western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia in 2001. Paper SC/54/BRG14, IWC, Western Gray Whale Working Group Meeting, 22-25 Oct., Ulsan, South Korea.

Weller, D.W., S.H. Rickards, A.L. Bradford, A.M. Burdin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2006a. The influence of 1997 seismic surveys on the behavior of western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia. Paper SC/58/E4 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts.

Weller, D.W., G.A. Tsidulko, Y.V. Ivashchenko, A.M. Burdin and R.L. Brownell Jr. 2006b. A re-evaluation of the influence of 2001 seismic surveys on western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia. Paper SC/58/E5 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, IWC Annual Meeting, 1-13 June, St. Kitts.

Wieting, D. 2004. Background on development and intended use of criteria. Page 20 *in* S. Orenstein, L. Langstaff, L. Manning, and R. Maund, eds. Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals, Final Meeting Summary. Second Meeting, April 28-30, 2004, Arlington, VA. Sponsored by the Marine Mammal Commission. 10 August.

Winsor, M.H. and B.R. Mate. 2006. Seismic survey activity and the proximity of satellite tagged sperm whales. International Whaling Commission Working Pap. SC/58/E16.

Wright, A.J. and S. Kuczaj. 2007. Noise-related stress and marine mammals: An introduction. International Journal of Comparative Psychology. 20(2-3):iii-viii.

Wright, A.J., N. Aguilar Soto, A.L. Baldwin, M. Bateson, C.M. Beale, C. Clark, T. Deak, E.F. Edwards, A. Fernández, A. Godinho, L.T. Hatch, A. Kakuschke, D. Lusseau, D. Martineau, L.M. Romero, L.S. Weilgart, B.A. Wintle, G. Notarbartolo-di-Sciara, and V. Martin. 2007a. Do marine mammals experience stress related to anthropogenic noise? International Journal of Comparative Psychology 20:274-316.

Wright, A.J., N. Aguilar Soto, A.L. Baldwin, M. Bateson, C.M. Beale, C. Clark, T. Deak, E.F. Edwards, A. Fernández, A. Godinho, L.T. Hatch, A. Kakuschke, D. Lusseau, D. Martineau, L.M. Romero, L.S. Weilgart, B.A. Wintle, G. Notarbartolo-di-Sciara and V. Martin. 2007b. Anthropogenic noise as a stressor in animals: A multidisciplinary perspective. International Journal of Comparative Psychology 20: 250-273.

Wright, A.J., T. Deak, and E.C.M. Parsons. 2009. Concerns related to chronic stress in marine mammals. International Whaling Commission Working Paper SC/61/E16.

Würsig, B., S.K. Lynn, T.A. Jefferson, and K.D. Mullin. 1998. Behaviour of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. Aquatic Mammals 24:41-50.

Würsig, B.G., D.W. Weller, A.M. Burdin, S.H. Reeve, A.L Bradford, S.A. Blokhin, and R.L Brownell, Jr. 1999. Gray whales summering off Sakhalin Island, Far East Russia: July-October 1997. A joint U.S.-Russian scientific investigation. Final Report. Prepared by Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, and Kamchatka Institute of Ecology and Nature Management, Russian Academy of Sciences, Kamchatka, Russia, for Sakhalin Energy Investment Co. Ltd and Exxon Neftegaz Ltd, Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia.

Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, R.M. Nielson, V.L. Vladimirov, and P.W. Wainwright. 2007a. Distribution and abundance of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134(1-3):45-73.

Yazvenko, S. B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, H.R. Melton, and M.W. Newcomer. 2007b. Feeding activity of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 134(1-3):93-106.

Yoder, J.A. 2002. Declaration James A. Yoder in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 28 October 2002. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division.

APPENDIX F:

LOW-ENERGY ACOUSTIC SOURCES

Appendix F: Low-Energy Acoustic Sources

Definition of Low-Energy Source

For the purposes of this EIS/OEIS, a low-energy source is defined as a towed acoustic source whose received pressure level is ≤180 dB re 1 μPa (rms) at 100 m, as well as any towed sparker, boomer, water gun or chirp system with a source level ≤205 dB re 1 μPa-m (Table 1). A received pressure level of 180 dB re 1 μPa (rms) is equivalent to an energy level of 170 dB SEL. This appendix uses the energy metric rather than the pressure metric.

Examples of Low-Energy Acoustic Sources

Generator Injector (GI) Guns:

- Any single or any two GI guns.
- Three or four GI guns, within the allowable range of tow depths and element separations (Table 1).

Generic single-chamber airguns:

- A tuned array of four airguns (volumes between 25 and 160 in^3) within the allowable range of tow depths and element separations (Table 1).
- A single pair of clustered airguns with individual volumes 250 in^3 or less.
- Two small 2-clusters (four airguns) maximum volume 45 in^3.
- Any single airgun 425 in^3 or smaller, at any tow depth.

Sparker, boomer, water gun, or chirp system:

- Any system towed from the research vessel at any depth and with a source level <205 dB re 1 μPa-m.

Table 1. Low-Energy Sources

Acoustic Source	*Volume*	*Tow Depth*	*Spacing*
GI GUNS			
1 – 2 GI Guns	Any	Any	Any
3 – 4 GI Guns	Table 3	Table 3	Table 3
GENERIC SINGLE CHAMBER AIRGUNS			
Tuned array of 4	25 – 160 in^3	Table 4	Table 4
1 clustered pair	≤ 250 in^3 each	Any	Any
2 small clustered pairs	≤ 45 in^3 each	Any	Any
1 single	≤ 425 in^3	Any	N/A
Acoustic Source	*Source Level*	*Tow Depth*	
BOOMER, SPARKER, WATER GUN, AND CHIRP	≤205 dB re 1 μPa-m	Any	

N/A = Not applicable.

Variables Affecting the Sound Field of an Acoustic Source

Several factors influence the sound field around an array and thus the distances at which various sound levels are received. Principal among these are array layout or spacing, tow depth, and tuning (Table 2).

Table 2. Variables Affecting Radius Size

Variable	*Decrease Radius*	*Increase Radius*
Airgun spacing	Larger	Smaller
Tow Depth	Shallower	Deeper
Tuning	Better tuning	Poor tuning

Airgun Spacing. Along any particular azimuth, the sound level versus distance curve will be affected to a great extent by the dimension of the array in that direction. The most extreme contours will always fall athwart ship to the axis of a linear array, or in the direction of the minimum extent of a non-linear array. When the spacing gets large enough, side lobes develop, and when these are large enough, spacing alone cannot control the directivity of the sound.

Tow Depth. Shallow towing of the acoustic source typically improves tuning and also allows free surface reflection ("Lloyd's mirror") effects.

Tuning. There are three ways to improve tuning:

1) stabilizing the bubble by injecting additional air into it, as accomplished by the GI gun;
2) mixing chamber sizes; and
3) clustering.

Sometimes the latter two are combined, but this typically requires more airguns than the number which can be included in a low-energy source array.

Examples of Variables Affecting the Sound Field

The first series of examples illustrates the effects of array layout (gun spacing) and tow depth. The sources used are GI guns, which have two air chambers. The first "Generator" (or "G") chamber produces the seismic pulse. As the "G" air bubble starts to collapse, air in the "Injector" chamber is released, preventing the "G" bubble from reverberating. This provides excellent tuning. All volumes given are for the Generator chambers as the Injector volumes are used to diminish, rather than increase, the signal's energy content.

For a source array of four 105/105 GI guns, towed at a depth of 3 m, with a minimum spacing between guns of 5 m, the most extreme SEL contours fall within a radius of 100 m from the center of source. This particular source array is rectangular, and the directivity is shown in Figures 1 and 2 below.



Figure 1. SEL contours (side view) for Four 105/105 in3 GI Guns (Tow Depth 3 m, Spacing 5 m)



Figure 2. SEL contours (top view) for Four 105/105 in3 GI Guns (Tow Depth 3 m, Spacing 5 m)

The most extreme contour direction is the same as the minimum dimension of the array. In this case, that dimension is 5 m. If the individual sources are arranged in a 5-m square, they will fall upon a circle roughly 7 m in diameter, and will produce a circular directivity as shown in Figure 3.



Figure 3. SEL contours (top view) for Four 105/105 in3 GI Guns (Tow Depth 3 m, Spacing 5 m)

Therefore, an array containing up to four 105 in^3 GI guns towed at 3 m or less with minimum spacing in every direction of 5 m, constitutes a "low-energy source."

Often, researchers want to employ greater tow depths, in order to enhance low frequencies. Figure 4 illustrates what happens when the same 4 x 105 in^3 GI gun array is towed at a depth of 5 m.



Figure 4. SEL contours (side view) for Four 105/105 in3 GI Guns (Tow Depth 5 m, Spacing 5 m)

In this case, the 170 dB SEL (≈ 180 dB re 1 μParms) contour extends well beyond 100 m, and therefore the source does not meet the "low-energy" criteria. Two approaches may be taken to reduce the SEL contours: increase the spacing between the guns or employ smaller sources. If the spacing is increased, the SEL contours are reduced as shown in Figure 5.



Figure 5. SEL contours (side view) for Four 105/105 in3 GI Guns (Tow Depth 5 m)

The 12-m diameter requires a minimum source spacing of 8.5 m, which may be too large for some ships. The maximum tow depth is 5 m at which it is possible to successfully constrain the SEL contours by increasing the array dimensions for the 4 x 105 in^3 GI gun array. For deeper arrays, the greater minimum spacing that might be required allows the upper bulge, just beginning to appear in the previous figure, to expand, greatly exceeding the 100-m radius. This bulge can be called a side lobe.

Smaller GI guns can be used (standard sizes are 45, 75 and 105 in^3) to reduce the SEL contours (Figures 5 and 6).



Figure 5. SEL contours (side view) for Four 45 in3 GI Guns (Tow Depth 5 m)



Figure 6. SEL contours (side view) for Four 75 in^3 GI Guns (Tow Depth 4 m)

Modeling of this kind results in the following matrix of allowable parameters for 4-GI-gun quadrilateral arrays (Table 3).

Table 3. Allowable Combinations of Tow Depths and Minimum Element Spacing for Quadrilateral Arrays of Identically Sized GI guns

Tow Depth (m)	*Minimum Airgun Spacing (m)*									
	2	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*
3	45 in^3	75 in^3	105 in^3							
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										

Tuned Arrays

It may in some cases be preferable to turn away from GI guns (usually for considerations of compressed air consumption) and use a small tuned array. A reasonable example is an array of single-chamber airguns with volumes of 25, 55, 100 and 160 in^3, totaling 340 in^3 (Figure 7). In comparison, a 4 x 105 in^3 GI-gun array consumes 840 in^3 per discharge, so if compressed air volume is limited, a tuned airgun array may be preferable.



Figure 7. SEL contours (top view) for Tuned Four-Airgun (340 in^3) Array (Tow Depth 5 m)

Due to the quadrilateral layout, this array has an approximately circular directivity pattern, despite the varying element volumes. As in the case of the GI-gun arrays, there are tradeoffs between airgun tow depth and spacing (Table 4).

Table 4. Tuned Airgun Quadrangle Array with 25 in^3, 55 in^3, 100 in^3, and 160 in^3 Airguns

Tow Depth (m)	*Minimum Airgun Spacing (m)*									
	2	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										

[This page intentionally left blank.]

APPENDIX G:

SUMMARY OF NSF-FUNDED MARINE SEISMIC SURVEYS (2003-2009)

NSF-Funded Marine Seismic Surveys (2003-2009)

Cruise Year	Region	Description	Survey Dates*	Lead	PI (Institution)	Ship	Cruise Length*	Array Size	Vol (in^3)	Survey Lines* (km)	Seismic Ops* (hr)	Status	PAM	~Location Lat.	~Location Long.	Water Depth (m)	Available Documents: EA	NSF FONSI	IHA Appl.	IHA Issued	FedReg Notices	90-d Rep.	NMFS BO	USFWS LOC/BO	Notes
	N Gulf of Mexico	Calibration cruise	May-Jun 03	L-DEO	Diebold (L-DEO)	Ewing	4 d	2 GI guns 6-20 airguns	105 1,350-8,600	16 306	1 16	Compl.	Y	29°N	87°W	<100 - >1,000	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
	Hess Deep - E Trop Pac	W of Galapagos Isl	Jul 03	L-DEO	Christesen (UT-A)	Ewing	12 d	10 airguns 12 aiguns	3,005 3,721	1,580	192	Compl.	N	2°N	102°W	2,000-3,400	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
2003	Norwegian Sea	Storegga slide area	Aug-Sep 03	L-DEO	Holbrook (UWY)	Ewing	27 d	2 GI guns 6 airguns	210 1,350	127 2,339	14 252	Compl.	N	64°N	3°W	<100 - 5,000	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
	Mid-Atlantic	TAG	Oct 03	L-DEO	Sohn (WHOI)	Ewing	6 d	20 airguns	8,575	302	37	Compl.	N	26°N	45°W	1,500 - 4,500	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
	NW Atlantic	Bermuda Rise	Nov 03	L-DEO	McNutt (MBARI)							CANC.					Y		Y	Y	Y		Y		Cruise deferred; 90-d report is a letter report
	SE Caribbean	off Venezuela	Apr-May 04	L-DEO	Sawyer (Rice) & Mann (UTIG)	Ewing	40 d	20 airguns	6,947	6,605	755	Compl.	Y	13°N	65°W	15 - 6,000	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y		
	N Gulf of Mexico	Calibration cruise										CANC.							Y						For EA see 2003 GoM; cruise cancelled
	NW Atlantic	ADWC - far SE of Nfld.	Jul-Aug 04	L-DEO	Norris (SIO)	Knorr	23 d	1 GI gun	75	3,757	419	Compl.	N	40°N	48°W	2,468 - 5,372	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		For EA, IHA App, FR, BO - see 2003 mid-Atlantic
2004	Gulf of Alaska	Nearshore waters	Sep 04	L-DEO	Mix (OSU) & Jaeger (UFG)	Ewing	17 d	2 GI guns	210	1,111	131	Compl.	N	59°N	141°W	30 - >3,000	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y		
	NE Pacific	Blanco, Off Oregon	Oct-Nov 04	L-DEO	Christesen & McIntosh (UTIG)	Ewing	7 d	10 airguns 12 airguns	3,050 3,705	988	119	Compl.	Y	43°N	130°W	1,600 - 5,000	Y		Y		Y	Y			
	ETP-C America	W of Nicaragua	Nov-Dec 04	L-DEO	Fulthorpe & McIntosh (UTIG)	Ewing	29 d	3 GI guns	135 315	3,184	394	Compl.	Y	12°N	87°W	<100 - >5,000	Y		Y		Y	Y			
	S Gulf of Calif.		May 04	SIO	Lonsdale (SIO)							CANC.					Y		Y		Y				Because of concerns by Mexico, the seismic component of the project was cancelled.
	S Gulf of Mexico (Yucatan)	Chicxulub crater	Jan-Feb 05	L-DEO	Barton (U Cambridge) & Gulick (UTIG)	Ewing	23 d	20 airguns	6,970	1,892	205	Compl.	Y	22°N	90°W	<100	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y		
2005	Aleutians		Jul-Aug 05	L-DEO	Yogodzinski (USCarolina) et al.	Thompson	4 d	1 GI gun	45	537	44	Compl.	N	var.	var.	100 - 3,500	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y		
	Trans-Arctic	Alaska to Svalbard	Aug-Sep 05	UAF	Coakley (UAF) et al.	Healy	33 d	2 G guns	500	2,273	294	Compl.	Y	var.	var.	223 - 4,873	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y		
	SW Pacific	far S of Tahiti	Feb-Mar 05	SIO	Lyle (BSU)	Melville	41 d	2 GI guns	90	unk.	unk.	Compl.		var.	var.	4,000 - 5,000	Y		Y		Y	Y			
	S Pacific - Louisville Ridge	E of New Zealand	Jan-Feb 06	SIO	Lonsdale & Gee (SIO)	Revelle	21 d	2 GI guns	90	unk.	unk.	EA	N	var.	var.	800 - 2,300	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y		
2006	Arctic Ocean	W Cdn Basin, Chukchi & Mendeleev Ridge	Jul-Aug 06	UTIG	Lawver (UTIG) et al.	Healy	21 d	4 G guns 2-3 airguns	1,840 - 2,340	339	77	Compl.		var.	var.	35 - 3,899	Y		Y			Y			
	NW Atlantic	Bermuda Rise	Oct-Nov 06	L-DEO	McNutt (MBARI)							CANC.					Y								Cancelled; copy of Ltr of Refusal from Gov't of Bermuda
	E Trop Pacific	IODP	Mar 06	SIO	Lyle (BSU) et al.	Revelle	unk.	2 GI guns	90	unk.	unk.			var.	var.	3,900 - 5,200			Y		Y				
2006-07	S Pacific	E of NZ - IODP	Dec 06-Jan 07	SIO	D'Hondt (URI) et al.	Revelle	40 d	2 GI guns	90	unk.	unk.	EA		var.	var.	3,200 - 5,700	Y		Y						
	NE Pacific	Off coast of OR	Sep 07	SIO	Trehu (OSU)	Wecoma	2 d	1 GI gun	45		53	Compl.	N	45°N	125°W	110 - 3,050	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y			Doc of EFH determination included
2007	NE Indian Ocean	90 E Ridge - IODP	May-Jul 07	SIO	Sager (TA&M) et al.	Revelle	55 d	2 GI guns	90	2,700	245	EA	N	var.	var.	1,600 - 5,100	Y		Y						
	Queen Charlotte Snd	BATHOLITHS	Fall									CANC.													
2007-08	N Gulf of Mexico	Calibration cruise	Nov 07-Feb 08	L-DEO	Diebold (L-DEO)	Langseth	14 d	18 airguns 36 airguns	3,300 6,600	865	104	Compl.	Y	28°N	95°W	<100 - >1,000	Y		Y		Y	Y			Adopted 2003 Ewing calibration cruise EA
	C America - Carib & C America - Pacific	off Costa Rica	Feb-Mar08 Mar-Apr 08	L-DEO	Holbrook (UWY)	Langseth	14 d 27 d	36 airguns 36 airguns	6,600 6,600	2,204 4,257	264 540	Compl.	Y	var.	var.	<100 - >2,500	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		
	NE Pacific	Off coast of OR	Jun-Jul 08	SIO	Bangs (UTIG)	Thompson	15 d	2 GI guns	150	974	189	Compl.	N	45°N	125°W	650 - 1,650	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Adopted 2007 EA (Trehu) for NE Pacific; also includes Suppl. EA prepared by NMFS to support issuance of 2008 IHA.
2008	E Gulf of Alaska	STEEP	Sep-Oct 08	L-DEO	Gulick & Christesen (UTIG)	Langseth	11 d	36 airguns	6,600	1,633	203	Compl.	Y	59°N	140°W	40 - 4,000	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		
	E Trop Pacific	QDG EPR	Apr-May 08 Jun-Aug 08	L-DEO	McGuire (WHOI) et al.	Langseth	4 d 32 d	36 airguns 18 airguns	6,600 3,300	146 3,045	20 379	Compl.	Y	var.	var.	>2,000	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		
	Santa Barbara Channel		Nov 08	SIO	Nicholson (UCSB)	Melville	12 d	Boomer/sparker 1 GI gun	1.5-2 kJ 25-45	~1,100	unk.	EA	N	34°N	120°W	<50 - 580	Y	Y		Y				Y	
	SE Asia	TAIGER	Apr-Jul 09	L-DEO	McIntosh (UTIG) & Wu (SUNYB)	Langseth	~90 d	36 airguns	6,600	15,143	1,879	Compl.	Y	var.	var.	20 - 6,800	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Numerous supplementals included.
	SW Pacific	E Lau Spreading Ctr	Jan-Mar 09	L-DEO	Wiens (Wash. U) et al.	Langseth	26 d	36 airguns	6,600	4,784	592	Compl.	Y	20°S	176°W	>1,000	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
2009	NW Atlantic	continental shelf off MA	Aug 09	Rice	Dugan (Rice)	Endeavor	15 d	1-2 GI guns or sparker	45-90	1,444	197	Compl.	N	41°N	70°W	25 - 200	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
	NE Pacific	Off coast of OR	Jul 09	SIO	Trehu (OSU)	Wecoma	5 d	1 GI gun	45		32	EA	N	45°N	125°W	110 - 3,050	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y		
	NE Pacific	ETOMO BC, Canada	Aug-Sep 09	LDEO	Toomey (UO)	Langseth	15 d	36 airguns	6,600	3,002	210	Compl.	Y	48°N	128°W	>1,000	Y		Y	Y		Y	Y		

Status: Canc. = cancelled; Compl. =completed

* If the cruise was completed, values are from the post-cruise 90-d report; if cruise was not been completed, values are based on the EA and are estimated. "Cruise length" is the duration of active seismic operations (if known) not total cruise length.

APPENDIX H:

ACOUSTIC CALIBRATION AND MODELING OF SEISMIC SOURCES ON THE RV *LANGSETH* (2007-2008)

Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems G3

Article
Volume 11, Number 12
29 December 2010
Q12012, doi:10.1029/2010GC003216
ISSN: 1525-2027

Published by AGU and the Geochemical Society

R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* seismic source: Modeling and calibration

John B. Diebold, Maya Tolstoy, Lindsey Doermann, Scott L. Nooner, Spahr C. Webb, and Timothy J. Crone

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Earth Institute at Columbia University, 61 Route 9W, Palisades, New York 10964, USA (tolstoy@ldeo.columbia.edu)

[1] This paper presents analyses of calibration data of the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* seismic sources that were collected in 2007–2008. The analysis includes measurements of the levels and azimuthal directivity of the *Langseth* two-string source, which is used for 3-D seismic surveys and compares these data with multichannel seismic hydrophone array data in shallow water. The analysis also shows the important contribution of seafloor and subseafloor reflected and refracted arrivals and the associated effects of water depth and seafloor slope. As expected and predicted by modeling, azimuthal directivity depends greatly on the "footprint" dimensions of the seismic array. In shallow water, where the acoustic field is dominated by near-vertically traveling reflected and refracted waves, data recorded using a towed MCS array are a useful proxy for single hydrophone calibration data. In deeper water, the easily modeled direct arrivals are exceeded in amplitude by seafloor reflected and subseafloor refracted energy at offsets which depend upon the water depth, limiting the applicability of a priori modeling that does not include these interactions. In addition, in a seafloor sloping environment, amplitudes depend greatly on whether the receivers are upslope or downslope from the source.

Components: 6000 words, 18 figures.

Keywords: seismic source; calibration; modeling; marine mammals.

Index Terms: 3025 Marine Geology and Geophysics: Marine seismics (0935, 7294); 0902 Exploration Geophysics: Computational methods: seismic; 0550 Computational Geophysics: Model verification and validation.

Received 7 May 2010; **Revised** 25 October 2010; **Accepted** 3 November 2010; **Published** 29 December 2010.

Diebold, J. B., M. Tolstoy, L. Doermann, S. L. Nooner, S. C. Webb, and T. J. Crone (2010), R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* seismic source: Modeling and calibration, *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, *11*, Q12012, doi:10.1029/2010GC003216.

1. Introduction

[2] Calibration of the "standard" R/V *Langseth* seismic source arrays was carried out in the NW gulf of Mexico during late 2007 and early 2008 (Figure 1). Initial calibration results for the *Langseth* four-string source array that is typically used for 2-D seismic reflection and refraction surveys were presented by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009] for the two end-member environments (shallow and deep water) chosen for the calibration effort. Here we present work that includes further refining of the navigation of the calibration buoy hydrophone at the intermediate/slope and deep water sites, as well as analysis of the two-string array results, including its directivity and effects due to subseafloor interaction of sound waves at those sites. The two-string array is typically used for 3-D seismic reflection in a flip-flop mode where four strings are deployed, but only two strings are fired per source point.

[3] One of the fundamental motivations for the *Langseth* calibration efforts was the need to assess

Copyright 2010 by the American Geophysical Union



Figure 1. Location map for the three calibration sites, superimposed upon GEODAS bathymetry. Contours are labeled in meters. The shallow site was occupied during cruises MGL0707 and MGL0802; the slope and deep sites were occupied only during MGL0802.

and verify the accuracy and applicability of modeling which has been used to estimate sound pressure levels (SPL) for adherence to marine mammal mitigation guidelines. The amount of time available for the calibration work limited the number of parameters and configurations that could be tested, especially source towing depth, which in practice may vary between 6 and 18 m. If the modeling can be verified for a few basic configurations, then it can be used to reliably predict the effects of small configuration changes.

[4] Previous results were presented using two metrics: SEL (sound exposure level, which is equivalent to energy flux density) and the 90% RMS values favored in the past for evaluation of behavioral responses of marine mammals to anthropogenic noise. Under certain circumstances, these two measures produce the same result, but for impulsive sources, including air gun arrays, 90% RMS is usually higher. As *Madsen* [2005] demonstrated, the exact difference is highly variable, depending on impulsivity, which may vary greatly for signals containing similar energy levels. *Southall et al.* [2007] have recommended that SEL be used instead, and we follow this practice here.

[5] In this paper we present the direct arrival modeling technique used for a priori SPL prediction, and then discuss calibration measurements from the shallow, deep and slope sites and compare. Our goal is to provide calibration results useful for mitigation purposes during *Langseth* operations, and to illustrate how modeling and in situ work can help refine these results for specific sites of operation. We also provide an overview of different factors that should be considered with respect to water depth and source configuration when planning mitigation efforts.

2. Direct Arrival Modeling for Mitigation

[6] A simple ray trace–based modeling approach, assuming an isovelocity sound speed profile, has been used to establish a priori safety radii for marine mammal mitigation during *Langseth* expeditions,

and, previously, for R/V *Ewing*. One of the many motivating factors for the *Langseth* calibration efforts was to assess the accuracy of that modeling. Briefly, the modeling process is this:

[7] 1. Define the air gun array in terms of the size and relative location of each air gun [X, Y, Z].

[8] 2. Model the near field signatures using PGS Nucleus's MASOMO (Marine Source Modeling) and extract them (http://www.pgs.com/upload/Nucleus.pdf).

[9] 3. Decide upon a 2-D mesh of points, for example within a plane intersecting the center of the air gun array. Coarse meshes produce smoother contours, but may not fully represent the pressure field, especially near the free surface. A typical mesh is 100 × 50.

[10] 4. For each of the points in the mesh, create the signal that would be observed there when every air gun in the array was fired simultaneously.

[11] 5. For that signal, determine the desired statistic: Peak-to-peak dB, Peak dB, RMS dB, maximum psi, etc.

[12] 6. Contour the mesh.

[13] 7. Determine radii and the trajectory of maximum SPL from contour lines (Figure 2).

[14] Most of the work lies in step 4, which has steps of its own:

[15] 1. For each of the air guns in the array, determine the distances, and thus the time of flight between the air gun and the mesh point, as well as the free surface ghost "image" of the air gun and the mesh point.

[16] 2. Scale and shift the air gun near field signal, dividing by the point-to-point distance and moving forward in time according to time of flight.

[17] 3. Scale and shift the near field signal's ghost image, as above, in addition multiplying by the free surface reflection coefficient (typically between −0.9 and −0.95).

[18] 4. Sum the results. For the *Langseth* 36–air gun array, that requires combining the 72 scaled and shifted direct and ghost signals at each mesh point.

[19] These steps are all carried out in the time domain, necessitating resampling. With fine meshes, some numerical jitter is introduced (Figures 2 and 3).

[20] As illustrated in Figure 2, sound levels recorded by the calibration hydrophones will not always be the maximum values, which should be used for mitigation. Nonetheless, the modeling can be easily adapted to compare it directly with the calibration results (Figure 3). Modeled data points can be calculated and plotted along any desired line (Figure 3) or plane (Figures 2 and 4). Choosing a horizontal plane, as in the case of Figure 4, produces an image of an array's azimuthal directivity.

3. Experiment Design

[21] The calibration field program was conducted over two short cruises (MGL0707 and MGL0802) with the goal of calibrating the R/V *Marcus Langseth* seismic sources, and comparing them with calibration of the R/V *Maurice Ewing* seismic sources conducted in the Gulf of Mexico in 2003 [*Tolstoy et al.*, 2004]. The 2003 measurements were carried out in an area of strong gyre activity, so the *Langseth* effort was moved westward to try to avoid the fast and curved drifting of the unanchored buoy observed away from the shallow sites for the *Ewing* calibration.

[22] Details of the air gun array and the spar buoy used to record it are provided by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009]. The receiver, a spar buoy with two hydrophone channels, was moored at the shallow site (Figure 1) and floated freely at the deeper sites. Detected signals were recorded internally at the buoy, whose position was periodically relayed to *Langseth* by radio. Two issues complicate our analysis. First, a continuous series of low-level noise bursts was superimposed on the recorded calibration buoy data, resulting from the regular radio transmissions of its GPS position. Second, due to the fact that the calibration legs were carried out concurrently with the initial setup and testing of *Langseth*'s seismic equipment, that was not yet complete, the relative positioning of the multistring air gun array, normally provided by GPS signals from modules located within each subarray, or "string" was not yet available. As a result of this, changes in the overall width of the multistring source arrays, expected to occur during turns, could not be verified. Due to the resulting uncertainty, data acquired during tight turns was excluded from the analysis in some cases.

4. Shallow Site: Two-String Array and Its Directivity

[23] Analysis of the four-string *Langseth* source calibration measurements at the shallow site was presented by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009]. Similar analyses for the two-string array measurements are pre-



Figure 2. The direct arrival model relevant for deep water for *Langseth*'s four-string air gun array, towed at 6 m depth, the configuration used during the calibration procedure. While the calibration results should be compared to values modeled along the constant depth "hydrophone" line, the maximum values, used for mitigation radii, are found along the slanted, dashed line. Energy which would be postcritically (i.e., totally) reflected or refracted at or below the seafloor propagates from the source and the sea surface in the field labeled "postcritical." The angle of the dividing line separating precritical and postcritical depends on the velocity of sound below the seafloor, and the x value of the point at which this line intersects the seafloor is called the "critical distance."

sented here. The two-string array is essentially a subset of the four-string array, comprising two of the four identical nine-element linear subarrays with the same 8 m string-to-string separation used in the four-string array. The two-string array is thus aerially 1/3 as wide as the four-string array, while having the same length. Thus its predicted azimuthal directivity is considerably different (Figure 4). Like an antenna, the directivity of a source array is highly dependent upon its dimensions. The larger the dimension of the array in any particular direction, the smaller and more tightly focused its beam pattern in the same direction. Since the *Langseth* two-string and four-string arrays have the same along-track dimensions, the difference in their inline power is controlled only by the number of air guns in the respective arrays, two to one, equating to a 6 dB difference. In the cross-line or athwartships direction, however, the difference in physical extent tends to counteract the difference in number of elements, and received energy levels are nearly the same for both arrays.

[24] As described by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009] the shallow site shooting pattern was designed to maximize the number of impulses recorded in the orthogonal fore and aft (inline) and athwartships (cross-line) directions. Measurements of the two-string array were made twice at the shallow site, and thus this site provides the best coverage, especially in the cross-line direction. Figure 5a shows the sound exposure level (SEL) for the cross-line direction and Figure 5b shows the SEL for the inline shots. In the inline direction, the measured two-string array levels are about half (6 dB) those of the four-string array. In the athwartship, or cross-



Figure 3. The modeled sound exposure levels along the hydrophone depth and maximum SPL lines drawn in Figure 2. The green line should be compared to the calibration results, while the red line is used to establish mitigation radii.

line direction, the measured levels are about 5 dB higher, thus almost equivalent to those of the four-string array. For comparison with the root-mean-square (RMS) method of calculating received levels RMS and SEL values for all shallow site shots are shown in Figure 5c.

[25] In general, exposure levels produced by the two-string array are nearly twice as high (5 dB) to the side as they are inline. In addition, there is a pronounced increase in local variation in the athwartships levels. This variation appears to be due to topography, rather than array effects. This explanation is based upon the high level of similarity in the variations in two physically coincident data sets, where data from the four-string and two-string arrays can be directly compared. The conclusion that amplitude variations in the athwartships direction are controlled by subtle changes in topography is supported by a comparison of parts of the MGL0707 four-string and MGL0802 two-string calibration data that were shot along a physically coincident part of the spiral track (Figure 7).

[26] Criteria for the shallow site were that it be free of obstructions, removed from ship traffic, and relatively flat. The chosen 35 × 22 km area met those conditions, and the spiral pattern was aligned with the long, inline segment along strike, as determined from preexisting bathymetric charts. Echo sounder records from MGL0707 (Figure 6a) show that in fact, the seafloor dips gently along this line, and is about 5 m deeper at the WSW end than it is 35 km to the ENE (Figure 6b). More variation (15 m) is seen in the dip direction, covered by the spiral pattern, which spans 22 km (Figure 6b). Although these latter variations are slight, they do affect the data.

[27] The most profound amplitude variations are the deep and sharply notched lows observed along the spiral track at source-receiver offsets of 11 km, 12.4 km and 14 km (Figure 7). Flanking (possibly) high values are more smoothly spread out. There is no complete high-resolution bathymetry map of the area, but it is likely that the sharp, low values are due to topographic shadowing or defocusing. The observation that these low values are present for both source arrays leads to the conclusion that they do not result from the directivity of the two-string array.

[28] Another remarkable amplitude anomaly is the abrupt increase at source-receiver offsets of 800 m in the inline direction (Figure 5b). A likely explanation, borne out by previous observation and modeling [*Diebold et al.*, 2006] is that the lower, near-offset trend corresponds to direct arrivals; those with the minimum source-receiver path, and that the higher, larger-offset trend corresponds to postcritically refracted and water-borne multiply reflected arrivals. This interpretation is supported by the multichannel seismic (MCS) data collected



Figure 4. Modeled aerial directivity for the *Langseth* two-string seismic source with the same 6 m tow depth that was used in the calibrations, as observed at 500 m below the sea surface. 500 m was the intended hydrophone depth used at the intermediate and deep calibration sites. (In practice, depths to the hydrophone range between 350 and 500 m [see *Tolstoy et al.*, 2009].) Predicted sound exposure levels are distinctly higher in the athwartships ("cross-line") direction than fore and aft ("inline").

along the inline track during MGL0802 using the two-string source and a 5850 m long hydrophone array. Each of this array's 468 channels comprised 14 individual hydrophones spread out over 17.75 m with a nominal group spacing of 12.5 m (4 hydrophones at the extremity of each group are shared with the adjacent group). As a result, direct, horizontally traveling arrivals are attenuated, while near-vertically traveling reflected and refracted energy is enhanced. Figure 8a shows an MCS shot gather along the inline track with the two-string source coincident with position previously occupied by the calibration buoy. It can thus be compared directly with buoy results without concern for subtle bathymetric variations. The comparison is shown in Figure 8b. It is clear that the sound exposure levels derived from the towed hydrophone array data are very similar to the calibration hydrophone data.

[29] Since acoustic propagation in shallow water environments may vary greatly with bottom type and topography [cf. *Barton et al.*, 2006] it seems logical and advantageous that MCS data should be monitored in real time to fine tune a priori mitigation radii in shallow water (100 m and less) environments. These data demonstrate that MCS


A
2 - string crossline
SEL, dB re:1μPa
offset, km
B
2 - string in-line
seafloor-reflected arrivals
SEL, dB re:1μPa
offset, km
C
RMS
SEL
SEL (blue)/RMS (red), dB re:1μPa
offset, km

Figure 5

(streamer) data can provide an accurate assessment of SEL levels at the relevant ranges for mitigation in shallow water environments.

5. Deep Site: Two-String Array and Bottom Interaction

[30] Results for the four-string deep site direct arrivals were presented by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009]. In Figure 9a we show the direct arrivals at this site for the two-string array. Inline arrivals are green, and cross-line arrivals are magenta. The directivity seen at the shallow site is still present, with about the same ~5 dB difference observed at the shallow site, where cross-line coverage is more complete. Modeled levels for the inline and cross-line directions are also shown. It is apparent that in one case (1.2 km) the measured levels slightly exceed the model. For comparison with the root-mean-square (RMS) method of calculating received levels RMS and SEL values for all shallow site shots are shown in Figure 9b. These data were shot during a small-radius circular turn (Figure 10) and the increase is almost certainly due to the natural tendency of the two towed, linear subarrays to crowd closer together, reducing the separation from the intended 8 m, and thus changing the directivity of the array. The *Langseth* source subarrays are normally equipped with individual GPS units, whose readings can determine the string-to-string spacing, but these were not completely operational during the early stage of operations during which the calibration was carried out. It should also be noted that this kind of sharp turning is not included as part of normal seismic surveys, and data from such turns has not been included in most of the results presented henceforth.

[31] For data recorded at the deep and slope sites, it was possible to separate the direct arrivals from later arrivals, which were reflected from the seafloor or postcritically reflected from (or refracted within) underlying layers. *Tolstoy et al.* [2009] presented only the direct arrival data at the deep site. While at the shallow site the observed wavefield is completely dominated by later arrivals (Figure 8a) at the deep water site the amplitudes of the seafloor arrivals outweigh those of the direct arrivals only beyond 2.5 km (Figure 11). Amplitudes of these arrivals fall off more or less linearly with increasing offset, except for the increase at about 5.2 km, which almost certainly corresponds to the critical point of the reflected/refracted arrivals. The source-receiver offset at which this critical point is observed depends on water depth and on the velocity of sound in the reflecting layer. The average water depth is 1540 m. The reflection velocity for a 5.2 km critical distance at this water depth is about 1.75 km/s. At the shallow site, the water depth is 50 m and the critical point, as observed in Figures 8a and 8b, is seen at a little less than 1 km offset. This reflected and refracted energy travels at incidence angles closer to vertical than the direct arrivals, and observed amplitudes are much less sensitive to hydrophone depth than those for the direct arrivals. It is thus meaningful to compare these reflected and refracted arrival amplitudes to the maximum amplitude mitigation model results, as is done in Figure 11.

[32] In Figure 12, we present the analogous plot for the four-string source array at the deep calibration site. Again, the critical distance is about 5 km, and the postcritically reflected and refracted arrival amplitudes fall below the mitigation model. It is also clear that the local amplitude structure of the precritical reflections is quite dependent upon the seafloor topography. The SEL of all of the arrivals again fall below the maximum amplitude mitigation model.

6. Slope Site: Four-String Array, Intermediate Water Depth, and Updip and Downdip Variations

[33] Data from the slope site were not presented by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009]. Only the full, four-string array was tested at this location. The calibration buoy was drifting rapidly during the entire shooting period, and the ship track included many small-radius circular turns. It was apparent that the spread of the four source strings was greatly reduced during these turns (though to an unknown extent) and this required some of the turn data to be eliminated from the analysis. In addition, only shots within 5 km of the buoy hydrophone could be

Figure 5. (a) Sound exposure levels for the cross-line (side aspect) arrivals recorded along the spiral track at the shallow water calibration site, with a 95th percentile fit (using the methods described by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009]). (b) Sound exposure levels and 95th percentile fits for inline shots recorded at the shallow site. There is a clear difference in the trend between zero and 0.8 km and that beyond 0.8 km. Separate 95th percentile fits are shown for each trend. (c) Sound exposure levels (blue) versus root-mean-square (red) values for all shallow water shots illustrating the ~8–10 dB offset between the two methods of calculating acoustic received levels.


A
-95°12'
-95°06'
-95°00'
-94°54'
28°18'
28°12'
28°06'
38m
40m
42m
44m
46m
48m
50m
52m
54m
56m
spiral track
"in line" track
B
In Line
ENE, Departing
WSW, Approaching
depth, m
offset, km
Spiral
depth, m
offset, km

Figure 6



Figure 7. MGL0707 four-string and MGL0802 two-string cross-line source levels recorded along coincident portions of the spiral track (Figure 6a) show strong similarities, particularly in the sharply low levels at 11, 12.4, and 14 km. Offsets correspond to those in Figure 6b, and the low values are likely due to shadowing by slightly elevated knolls. To separate amplitude variations due to changes in source-receiver offset from those due to topography, these sound levels have been back projected to a notional distance of 1 m from the source, i.e., multiplied by a factor equal to the source-receiver offset in meters.

used for the compilation of direct arrivals. At greater source-receiver offsets, windowing of the direct arrival tended to fail, as the measured levels lost coherence because the data were obviously dominated by systematic, ambient, and/or previous shot noise. The source points included in the analysis are shown in Figure 13.

[34] The direct arrival amplitudes for this site are very similar to those observed at the deep site for the two-string and four-string arrays. Figure 14 shows these levels, compared to those predicted by modeling. The fit is good, except at near offsets, where the model underpredicts the observed source levels. This situation is the opposite of the observations at the deep site [*Tolstoy et al.*, 2009] where the near-field effects cause a diminution in source levels at close proximity. It is likely that two factors contribute to this. One hypothesis is that the inter-string spacing was smaller than intended during these close approaches, but due to the lack of complete GPS positioning on the array strings, this cannot be verified. Second, the sound velocity profile changed considerably between acquisition of the deep and slope site data. An intervening storm increased the thickness of the mixed layer, reduced its velocity, and strongly altered the shape of the thermocline (Figure 15). As in the two previously presented cases (Figures 9 and 12) measured levels fall well below the mitigation model predictions at offsets greater than 2.5 km, due to the downward focusing sound velocity profile.

[35] In Figure 16, energy levels for seafloor-reflected and subseafloor-refracted arrivals are superimposed on the direct arrival levels. At this intermediate-depth site, the crossover is located at 2 km offset, compared to 2.5 km at the deep site. An increase in amplitude, corresponding to the critical distance, beyond which postcritically reflected and refracted

Figure 6. (a) Water depths along the MGL0707 shallow site ship track. Spiral and inline tracks were also occupied during MGL0802. The location of the calibration buoy for both legs is shown by the red solid star. Depths increase modestly from NNW to SSE. (b) Water depths along the inline and spiral tracks of Figure 6a. Along 33 m of inline track, the water depth varies by 5 m. Across 22 km in the orthogonal direction, water depths vary by nearly 15 m. Though small, these differences and local variations in topography affect received sound levels.



Figure 8. (a) An MCS shot gather along the inline track, with the two-string source coincident with the position previously occupied by the calibration buoy. The peak level for each of the 268 traces is shown in orange (positive data amplitudes are in gray, negative amplitudes are in black, and peaks may be negative as well as positive). Between zero and 0.8 km., the peaks are mostly found on the seafloor primary and multiple reflections, while at larger offsets, they are on the primary and multiple postcritical reflections from deeper layers. (b) SEL, as derived from the MCS shot gather of Figure 8a, compared to the two-string inline calibration buoy data, acquired along the same track.

arrivals are generated, is seen at about 4 km (as compared to 5 km for the deep site). The singular excursion observed as peaking at 2.9 km is certainly due to seafloor topography, though the exact cause was not determined. There is a notable bifurcation of levels for the bottom-interacting arrivals at source-receiver offsets greater than 5 km.

[36] It is clear in Figure 16 that the reflected and refracted arrival amplitudes with source-receiver



Figure 9. (a) Direct arrivals from the *Langseth* two-string source array, recorded at the deep calibration site. Sound exposure levels for shots with an inline aspect (the receiving buoy in front of or behind the array, ±30°) are colored green, and others (cross-line, or athwartships) are colored magenta. Model results for a 500 m deep hydrophone are shown in red for cross-line geometry and in blue for inline geometry. (b) Sound exposure levels (blue) versus root-mean-square (red) values for all deep water shots. The offset between the two methods of calculating acoustic received levels varies between 10 and 20 dB for close ranges, gradually decreasing with increasing offset to 5–10 dB.

offsets greater than about 5 km fall along two diverging trajectories. When the source and receiver locations where these trajectories are best defined were identified, it was clear that the differences correspond to the source-receiver geometry in relation to the sloping bathymetry at this calibration site. In Figure 17a, the amplitudes for these arrivals are colored red for shots where the calibration buoy was positioned downdip from the source, and blue for the case where the buoy was upslope from the source points. These relationships are shown in Figures 17b and 17c.

[37] Average water depth for the downdip (red) shots was 800 m, compared to 1050 m for the updip (blue) shots. Despite this difference the critical distance for both sets of shots is about the same: 3.5–4 km. The reason for this, and for the differences in amplitude, is the sloping seafloor. When shooting up dip, rays are concentrated toward the source, focusing energy and shortening the critical distance, while the converse is true when shooting downdip [*Levin*, 1971; *Diebold and Stoffa*, 1981].

7. Spectral Content With Offset

[38] Figure 18 shows the variation in the energy spectral density with offset for the inline shots for the deep (Figure 18a) and shallow (Figure 18b) sites. Spectra for some individual shots are shown by *Tolstoy et al.* [2009], but this approach allows for a more comprehensive display of the change in spectral content with increasing distance from the source. The parallel bands in both the vertical and horizontal directions, that are more pronounced in Figure 18b, are due to bursts of electronic noise associated with the GPS receiver on the recording buoy and is not associated with the *Langseth* sound source. Leakage of the broad spectrum periodic noise into the calibration data was associated with common ground between the data logger and the GPS receiver that was largely resolved for the 2008 deployment by optically isolating the signal coming in. Hence the signal is more pronounced in the shallow inline data that was collected during the first calibration leg in 2007, and barely visible in the deep water data that was collected in 2008. Note that for the deep water site (Figure 18a) the hydrophone is at 350–500 m depth, so the true distances to the source are greater than for the shallow site and change with offset due to the slant range. Offsets shown on the plot are based on surface location of the buoy not considering the depth of the hydrophone. Figure 18a illustrates the rapid drop off in energy with distance from the source, particularly at higher frequencies.

8. Conclusions

[39] Single hydrophone source calibration results in shallow water are sufficient to predict radiated sound levels in similar environments. When calibrations are carried out with a single hydrophone in



Figure 10. Source and receiver locations for the MGL0802 deep site, with regional depth contours in meters. Two-string locations are shown in blue, and four-string locations are shown in red. The path of the slowly drifting hydrophone buoy is also shown in blue and red.

deeper water, however, the results must be combined with modeling results for extrapolations to full water depths. Our observations and analyses show that the propagation of sound between a marine seismic source comprising an array of air guns and a receiver can be satisfactorily characterized by modeling along direct pathways, though this modeling could be improved by including realistic sound velocity profiles within the water column.

[40] The source array directivity due to the dimensions of the overall footprint of the array, predicted by modeling, is confirmed by a comparison to the results from the R/V *Langseth*'s two-string and four-string array calibrations. Under some conditions (sharp turns, failure of towing equipment) this footprint can be changed, thus altering the array's directivity. Therefore it is essential that the individual source arrays be positioned by differential GPS antennas and, when appropriate, acoustic transponders. Sharp turns are not normally part of standard seismic operations.

[41] In all water depths, contributions due to acoustic interaction at and below the seafloor are likely to be important as well. These interactions may result from shadowing or focusing due to subtle physical and topographic features, an effect particularly apparent in shallow water and for near-vertically reflected precritical arrivals in deeper water, and are typically difficult to model accurately without a considerable amount of a priori knowledge. In the shallow water environment of our shallow calibration, topographic shadowing effects appear to greatly outweigh focusing effects, if any are indeed present.

[42] Our results indicate that directly propagated arrivals play a small role beyond a few thousand meters range, but that in water depths of 850 m and



Figure 11. The direct arrival energy flux density (SEL) values of Figure 9a overlain with those of the seafloor and subseafloor reflected and refracted arrivals for the two-string array. These arrivals go postcritical at about 5 km but still fall almost entirely below the maximum amplitude mitigation model. Beyond about 5 km, the direct arrival amplitudes become incoherent, as the data windowing begins to fail and/or instrument and other ambient noise begins to dominate the true arrivals.

more, the seafloor and subseafloor interactions, while present and important, do not exceed safety criteria. Lower sound exposure levels, thought to induce behavioral responses in some animals, will likely be achieved at relatively large distances, but our results show that in intermediate and deep water depths, the levels observed are not greater than those predicted by the simple modeling currently in use.



Figure 12. SEL for direct and reflected/refracted arrivals from the four-string array at the deep calibration site.



Figure 13. Track map for the slope site calibration. Shots used in the analysis are highlighted in red for those used in the direct arrival compilation and blue for additional shots used in the seafloor and subseafloor compilation. The corresponding buoy locations are mustard colored.



Figure 14. Energy flux density (SEL) values for direct arrivals at the slope site. Inline and cross-line aspects are color coded as before. The four-string model with 6 m tow depth and receiver depth of 400 m is shown for comparison. The model is only exceeded by the data at small offsets.



Figure 15. XBT-derived sound velocity profiles covering a span of 6 days during MGL0802. The profiles are very consistent for the first three casts, but a storm on 1 February significantly altered the top part of the profile, after which the slope site data were acquired.



Figure 16. As in Figures 11 and 12, measured levels for seafloor reflected and subseafloor refracted arrivals at the slope site are superimposed on the direct arrival values. Since the water is shallower at this site, the critical distance is 4 km, rather than the 5 km observed at the deep site. All observed levels (except at very near offsets) fall below the mitigation model predictions.



Figure 17. (a) Two subsets of the reflected/refracted arrival levels of Figure 16. Although the critical distances seem similar, there is a clear bifurcation in amplitude falloff at greater offsets (4–10 km). (b) Source and receiver locations for the arrivals of Figure 17a. Color coding (red when the receiver is downdip from the sources and blue for the converse) matches that of Figures 17a and 17c. (c) Seafloor depths beneath the source points used in Figure 17a, projected onto a N–S trending plane. The stars show the latitude and average seafloor depths beneath the calibration buoy hydrophone for the corresponding source points.



Figure 18. (a) Energy spectral density versus distance for inline shots at the deep site. (b) Energy spectral density versus distance for inline shots at the shallow site. Note the horizontal and vertical lines are due to leakage of a noise burst associated with the GPS receiver on the buoy and are not related to the R/V *Marcus Langseth* sound source. See text for a full discussion. Color scale is the same for both plots.

[43] In shallow water, it has been shown that sound exposure levels determined from arrivals recorded with a towed MCS array match calibration levels very well. Additional work would be needed to predict the entire range of water depths in which this observation is true, but it does suggest that, in some environments, sound exposure levels may be observed on site and in real time, allowing mitigation efforts to be adjusted accordingly.

Acknowledgments

[44] This work was supported by NSF grant OCE-0624599. We thank two anonymous reviewers for constructive comments that improved the manuscript. We thank the captain, crew, and technical and science party of MGL0707 and MGL0802. This paper is LDEO contribution 7414.

References

Barton, P. J., J. Diebold, and S. Gulick (2006), Water-borne noise levels from airgun arrays–examples from surprisingly quiet Chicxulub survey, paper presented at 68th EAGE Conference and Exhibition, Eur. Assoc. of Geosci. and Eng., Vienna.

Diebold, J. B., and P. L. Stoffa (1981), The traveltime equation, tau-p mapping and inversion of common midpoint data, *Geophysics*, *46*(3), 238–254, doi:10.1190/1.1441196. (Reprinted in *Slant-Stack Processing*, *Geophys. Reprint Ser.*, vol. 14, edited by G. H. F. Gardner and F. K. Levin, pp. 151–167, Soc. of Explor. Geophys., Tulsa, Okla., 1991.)

Diebold, J. B., M. Tolstoy, P. J. Barton, and S. P. Gulick (2006), Propagation of exploration seismic sources in shallow water, *Eos Trans. AGU*, *87*(36), Jt. Assem. Suppl., Abstract OS41A-03.

Levin, F. K. (1971), Apparent velocity from dipping interface reflections, *Geophysics*, *36*, 510–516, doi:10.1190/1.1440188.

Madsen, P. T. (2005), Marine mammals and noise: Problems with root mean square sound pressure levels for transients, *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.*, *117*, 3952–3957, doi:10.1121/1.1921508.

Southall, B. L., et al. (2007), Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: Initial scientific recommendations, *Aquat. Mamm.*, *33*(4), 411–521.

Tolstoy, M., J. B. Diebold, S. C. Webb, D. R. Bohnenstiehl, E. Chapp, R. C. Holmes, and M. Rawson (2004), Broadband calibration of R/V *Ewing* seismic sources, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *31*, L14310, doi:10.1029/2004GL020234.

Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, L. Doermann, S. Nooner, S. C. Webb, D. R. Bohnenstiehl, T. J. Crone, and R. C. Holmes (2009), Broadband calibration of the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* four-string seismic sources, *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.*, *10*, Q08011, doi:10.1029/2009GC002451.

APPENDIX I:

DISTRIBUTION OF AND PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC EIS/OEIS

Notice of Availability (NOA) and Distribution List for the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Service area	Applicant name	Estimated annualized funding amount
WI–5	Legal Action of Wisconsin	3,689,622
NWI–1	Wisconsin Judicare	178,726
WI–2	Wisconsin Judicare	1,014,258
Wyoming:		
MWY	Legal Aid of Wyoming	14,324
NWY–1	Legal Aid of Wyoming	199,098
WY–4	Legal Aid of Wyoming	569,030

These grants and contracts will be awarded under the authority conferred on LSC by the Legal Services Corporation Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2996e(a)(1)). Awards will be made so that each service area is served, although none of the listed organizations are guaranteed an award or contract. This public notice is issued pursuant to the LSC Act (42 U.S.C. 2996f(f)), with a request for comments and recommendations concerning the potential grantees within a period of thirty (30) days from the date of publication of this notice. Grants will become effective and grant funds will be distributed on or about January 1, 2011.

Dated: September 29, 2010.

Janet LaBella,

Director, Office of Program Performance, Legal Services Corporation.

[FR Doc. 2010–25245 Filed 10–7–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7050–01–P

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice: (10–122)]

Notice of Information Collection

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

ACTION: Notice of information collection.

SUMMARY: The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (Pub. L. 104–13, 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

DATES: All comments should be submitted within 60 calendar days from the date of this publication.

ADDRESSES: All comments should be addressed to Lori Parker, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, DC 20546–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Lori Parker, NASA PRA Officer, NASA Headquarters, 300 E Street, SW., JF0000, Washington, DC 20546, (202) 358–1351, *Lori.Parker@nasa.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

The KEEP is a job shadowing program intended to provide students with career exploration under the mentorship of a Kennedy Space Center (KSC)NASA of contractor employee. Participation in the program is limited to students who are U.S. citizens, 16 years or older, who have been recommended by a teacher, guidance counselor, or other school official. Students may shadow for 1 day or up to 1 week.

II. Method of Collection

The collection of information will be made by the use of a Web-based on-line application system and a database of applicant information will be developed. We believe this is the most efficient and cost effective way to collect the information.

III. Data

Title: Kennedy Educational Experiences program (KEEP).

OMB Number: 2700–0135.

Type of Review: Extension, without change, of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Individuals or households.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 20.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 20.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Government: $0.

IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (1) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of NASA, including whether the information collected has practical utility; (2) the accuracy of NASA's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (3) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including automated collection techniques or the use of other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection. They will also become a matter of public record.

Lori Parker,

NASA PRA Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010–25446 Filed 10–7–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Notice of Public Hearings and the Availability of a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS/OEIS)

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice of public hearings and request for public comments on a Draft PEIS/OEIS for Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS).

SUMMARY: NSF gives notice of the availability of a Draft PEIS/OEIS (hereafter Draft PEIS) for marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS and requests public review and comment on the document. NSF also provides notice of public hearings on the Draft PEIS.

The Division of Ocean Sciences in the Directorate for Geosciences (GEO/OCE) has prepared the Draft PEIS as the lead agency with support from the cooperating agencies, USGS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

The Draft PEIS assesses the potential impacts of marine seismic research on the human and natural environment. Under the Proposed Action, a variety of

acoustic sources used for research activities funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS would be operated from various research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions or government agencies. The seismic acoustic sources would include various airgun configurations (particularly strings or arrays with as little as 2 to as many as 36 seismic airguns), as well as low-energy seismic and non-seismic acoustic sources.

The Draft PEIS examines the potential impacts that may result from geophysical exploration and scientific research using seismic surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS in non-Arctic waters. The Proposed Action is for academic and U.S. government scientists in the U.S., and possible international collaborators, to conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions and government agencies. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to fund the investigation of the geology and geophysics of the seafloor by collecting seismic reflection and refraction data that reveal the structure and stratigraphy of the crust and/or overlying sediment below the world's oceans. NSF has a continuing need to fund seismic surveys that enable scientists to collect data essential to understanding the complex Earth processes beneath the ocean floor.

Two action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative have been carried forward for analysis. The Draft PEIS is available for public review for a 45-day period. Comments must be submitted on or before November 22, 2010.

NSF will conduct two public hearings to receive oral and written comments on the Draft PEIS. Federal, state, and local agencies and interested individuals are invited to be present or represented at the public hearings. This notice announces the dates and locations of the public hearings for this Draft PEIS.

An open house session will precede the scheduled public hearing at each of the locations listed below and will allow individuals to review the information presented in the Draft PEIS. NSF and USGS representatives will be available during the open house sessions to clarify information related to the Draft PEIS.

Dates & Addresses: All hearings will start with an open house session, followed by a presentation, and then the formal oral public comment period. Public hearings will be held on the following dates and at the following locations:

• Monday, October 25, 2010, 5–7 p.m. at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University California-San Diego, Vaughn Hall, Room 100, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA.

• Wednesday, October 27, 2010, 5–7 p.m. at the National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 110, Arlington, VA.

The Draft PEIS is available on NSF's Web site at: *http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp.* Electronic or printed copies of the Draft PEIS are also available upon request from: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230. *Telephone:* (703) 292–8583. *E-mail: nepacomments@nsf.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Currently, individual Environmental Assessments (EAs) are prepared for individual or small numbers of related cruises to assess the impact of the generated seismic survey noise on the marine environment. In the 7 years from 2003 through 2009, NSF prepared 31 EAs assessing the impact of sound from seismic surveys on marine resources and species listed under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) during research projects investigating the geology and geophysics of the seafloor. These EAs were prepared for various worldwide, academic research cruises that required the use of various marine seismic sources involving different airgun configurations deployed from the primary U.S. academic seismic survey ship, or smaller airgun sources deployed from other research vessels, often with concurrent operations of non-seismic acoustic sources such as echosounders and bottom profilers.

For past seismic research cruise actions, an EA has been used as the basis for consultation with the NOAA Office of Protected Resources (OPR) under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. For each of the research cruises, NOAA OPR issued a Biological Opinion (BO) and related Incidental Take Statements (ITSs), which included terms and conditions to reduce impacts on threatened and endangered species. In parallel with this effort, when applicable, a separate application for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) under Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA was submitted for each cruise to another division within NOAA OPR, which subsequently issued the IHA. The MMPA procedures for issuance of an IHA involve publication of a proposed IHA notice in the **Federal Register** and solicitation of comments on that notice.

To reduce this apparent duplication of effort in environmental documentation and to address the potential for cumulative effects of marine seismic research acoustic sources upon marine resources, NSF and the USGS have decided that a PEIS should be prepared. Preparing a PEIS for NSF and USGS marine seismic research serves several purposes. First, it provides a format for a comprehensive cumulative impacts analysis by taking a view of the planned marine seismic research activities as a whole. This is accomplished by assembling and analyzing the broadest range of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with all marine seismic research activities in addition to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the region of influence. Furthermore, the collective analysis of representative project locations will provide a strong technical basis for a more global assessment of the potential cumulative impacts of NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic activities in the future.

A PEIS also sets up a framework for streamlining the preparation of subsequent environmental documents where needed for individual cruises. It is expected that time- and location-specific aspects, or similarly detailed technical information if necessary to evaluate unique impacts of specific cruises and projects, will be addressed in EIS supplements, tiered EAs, or other appropriate environmental documentation that would follow the publication of this Draft PEIS. Thus, while NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research is reviewed under this Draft PEIS, the analysis of site-specific impacts from future cruises may be reserved for future analysis. Tiering of environmental documents in this manner makes subsequent documents of greater use and meaning to the public as NSF's and USGS's marine seismic research develops, without duplicating previous paperwork and environmental analyses. Finally, a PEIS enables the identification of an appropriate and prudent set of standard mitigation measures to be integrated into future NSF-funded and USGS cruises, which is a key goal of NSF and USGS.

Federal, state, local agencies, Native American Tribes and Nations, and interested parties are invited to be present or represented at the public hearings. Written comments can also be submitted anytime during the public hearings or during the 45-day public review period of the Draft PEIS. Comments must be submitted on or before November 22, 2010.

Oral statements will be heard and transcribed by a stenographer; however, to ensure the accuracy of the record, all statements should be submitted in writing. All statements, both oral and

written, will become part of the public record on the Draft PEIS and will be responded to in the Final PEIS. Equal weight will be given to both oral and written statements. In the interest of time, and to ensure all who wish to give an oral statement have the opportunity to do so, each speaker's comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. If a long statement is to be presented, it should be summarized at the public hearing with the full text submitted either in writing at the hearing or mailed to: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, Room 725, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Arlington, VA 22230. In addition, comments may be submitted via e-mail at: *nepacomments@nsf.gov.* All written comments must be postmarked by November 22, 2010 to ensure they become part of the official record.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information regarding the Draft PEIS contact: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230; *telephone:* (703) 292–8583; *e-mail: nepacomments@nsf.gov.*

Dated: October 5, 2010.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2010–25378 Filed 10–7–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. NRC–2010–0235]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The NRC published a **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period on this information collection on August 3, 2010.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Extension.

2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR Part 39—Licenses and Radiation Safety Requirements for Well Logging.

3. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150–0130.

4. *The form number if applicable:* N/A.

5. *How often the collection is required:* Applications for new licenses and amendments may be submitted at any time. Applications for renewal are submitted every 10 years. Reports are submitted as events occur.

6. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Applicants for and holders of specific licenses authorizing the use of licensed radioactive material for well logging.

7. *An estimate of the number of annual responses:* 2,827 (346 NRC Licensees + 2,481 Agreement State Licensees).

8. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 278 (34 NRC Licensees + 244 Agreement State Licensees).

9. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 60,296 hours (7,375 total NRC licensees hrs + 52,921 total Agreement State licensees hrs). The NRC licensees total burden is 7,375 hours (108 reporting hrs + 7,267 recordkeeping hrs). The Agreement State licensees total burden is 52,921 hours (767 reporting hrs + 52,154 recordkeeping hrs). The average burden per response for both NRC licensees and Agreement State licensees is 19.4 hours and the burden per recordkeeper is 214 hours.

10. *Abstract:* 10 CFR Part 39 establishes radiation safety requirements for the use of radioactive material in well logging operations. The information in the applications, reports and records is used by the NRC staff to ensure that the health and safety of the public is protected and that licensee possession and use of source and byproduct material is in compliance with license and regulatory requirements.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O–1 F21, Rockville, Maryland 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC worldwide Web site: *http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html.* The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by November 8, 2010. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given to comments received after this date.

Christine J. Kymn, Desk Officer, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150–0130), NEOB–10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be e-mailed to *Christine.J.Kymn@omb.eop.gov* or submitted by telephone at (202) 395–4638.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Tremaine Donnell, (301) 415–6258.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of *September* 2010.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Tremaine Donnell,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.

[FR Doc. 2010–25406 Filed 10–7–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. NRC–2010–0234]

Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The NRC published a **Federal Register** Notice with a 60-day comment period on this information collection on July 7, 2010.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Extension.

2. *The title of the information collection:* 10 CFR Part 63, "Disposal of High-Level Radioactive Wastes in a Proposed Geologic Repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada."

3. *Current OMB approval number:* 3150–0199.

rates, which resulted in an increase in labor cost.

Dated: October 4, 2010.

John Moses,

Director, Collection Strategies Division.

[FR Doc. 2010–25428 Filed 10–7–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[ER–FRL–8993–1]

Environmental Impacts Statements; Notice of Availability

Responsible Agency: Office of Federal Activities, General Information (202) 564–1399 or *http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/*.

Weekly receipt of Environmental Impact Statements

Filed 09/27/2010 through 10/01/2010. Pursuant to 40 CFR 1506.9.

Notice

In accordance with Section 309(a) of the Clean Air Act, EPA is required to make its comments on EISs issued by other Federal agencies public. Historically, EPA has met this mandate by publishing weekly notices of availability of EPA comments, which includes a brief summary of EPA's comment letters, in the **Federal Register**. Since February 2008, EPA has been including its comment letters on EISs on its Web site at: *http://www.epa.gov/compliance/nepa/eisdata.html.* Including the entire EIS comment letters on the Web site satisfies the Section 309(a) requirement to make EPA's comments on EISs available to the public. Accordingly, on March 31, 2010, EPA discontinued the publication of the notice of availability of EPA comments in the **Federal Register.**

EIS No. 20100389, Final EIS, USFS, OR, D-Bug Hazard Reduction Timber Sales Project, To Lessen the Fuel and Safety Hazards Associated With the On-Going Outbreak of Mountain Pine Beetles, Diamond Lake Ranger District, Umpqua National Forest, Douglas County, OR, Wait Period Ends: 11/08/2010, Contact: Joyce Thompson 541–957–3457.

This document is available on the Internet at: *http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/umpqua/projects/projectdocs/d-bug-ts/index.shtml.*

EIS No. 20100390, Draft EIS, NSF, 00, Programmatic—Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey, To Fund the Investigation of the Geology and Geophysics of the Seafloor by Collecting Seismic Reflection and Refraction Data, Across the World's Ocean, Comment Period Ends: 11/22/2010, Contact: Holly Smith 703–292–8593.

This document is available on the Internet at *http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp.*

EIS No. 20100391, Final EIS, USACE, NC, Surf City and North Topsail Beach Project, To Evaluate Coastal Storm Damage Reduction, Topsail Island, Pender and Onslow Counties, NC, Wait Period Ends: 11/22/2010, Contact: Doug Piatkowski 910–251–4908.

EIS No. 20100392, Draft EIS, BR, CA, Nimbus Hatchery Fish Passage Project, To Create and Maintain a Reliable System for Collecting Adult Fish to Allow Reclamation, Rancho Cordova, Gold River, CA, Comment Period Ends: 11/30/2010, Contact: David Robinson 916–989–7179.

EIS No. 20100393, Final EIS, DOE, WA, Cushman Hydroelectric Project (FERC No. 0456), Design and Construction of New 3.6–MW Powerhouse on the North Fork of the Skokomish River, Mason County, WA, Wait Period Ends: 11/08/2010, Contact: Jane Summerson 202–340–9626.

EIS No. 20100394, Draft EIS, FHWA, NC, NC–109 Corridor Improvement Study, From Old Greensboro Road (NC–1798) to I–40/US 311, Davidson and Forsyth Counties, NC, Comment Period Ends: 11/22/2010, Contact: Vince Rhea 919–733–7844.

EIS No. 20100395, Final EIS, USACE, LA, Convey Atchafalaya River Water to Northern Terrebonne Marshes and Multipurpose Operation of Houma Navigation Lock, Integrated Feasibility Study, Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Implementation, Lafourche, Terrebonne, St. Mary Parish, LA, Wait Period Ends: 11/08/2010, Contact: Dr. Nathan Dayan 504–862–2530.

EIS No. 20100396, Final EIS, USACE, LA, Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA)—Louisiana, Terrebonne Basin Barrier Shoreline Restoration, Feasibility Study, Implementation. Terrebonne Parish, LA, Wait Period Ends: 11/08/2010, Contact: Dr. William P. Klein, Jr. 504–862–2540.

EIS No. 20100397, Final EIS, USACE, LA, Small Diversion at Convent/Blind River, Proposes to construct a Freshwater Diversion Project, Integrated Feasibility Study, Louisiana Coastal Area, St. James Parish, LA, Wait Period Ends: 11/08/2010, Contact: Dr. William P. Klein, Jr. 504–862–2540.

EIS No. 20100398, Final EIS, USACE, LA, Medium Diversion at White Ditch, Integrated Feasibility Study, Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Ecosystem Restoration, Implementation, Plaquemines Parish, LA, Wait Period Ends: 11/08/2010, Contact: Dr. Nathan Dayan 504–862–2530.

EIS No. 20100399, Final EIS, USACE, LA, Amite River Diversion Canal Modification Element of the Section 7006(E)(3) Ecosystem Restoration Project, Feasibility Study, Louisiana Coastal Area (LCA) Ascension and Livingston Parishes, LA, Wait Period Ends: 11/08/2010, Contact: Dr. William P. Klein, Jr. 504–862–2540.

Amended Notices

EIS No. 20100370, Final EIS, FHWA, WY, Jackson South Project, US/26/89/189/91 Improvements, Funding and Right-of-Way Approval, Teton County, WY, Wait Period Ends: 11/17/2010, Contact: Lee Potter 307–771–2946.

Revision to FR Notice Published 09/17/2010: Extending Comment Period from 10/18/2010 to 11/17/2010.

Dated: October 5, 2010.

Robert W. Hargrove,

Director, NEPA Compliance Division, Office of Federal Activities.

[FR Doc. 2010–25470 Filed 10–7–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560–50–P

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL–9212–5]

Science Advisory Board Staff Office; Notification of Two Public Teleconferences of the Science Advisory Board Ecological Processes and Effects Committee Augmented for Ballast Water

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) Staff Office announces two public teleconferences of the Science Advisory Board Ecological Processes and Effects Committee, augmented, to discuss its advice on the effectiveness of shipboard ballast water treatment processes and ways to improve future assessments of ballast water treatment systems to minimize the impacts of invasive species in vessel ballast water discharge.

DATES: The teleconference dates are October 26, 2010, from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
4201 WILSON BOULEVARD
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22230

1 October 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR: ALL INTERESTED GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, INDIVIDUALS, AND ORGANIZATIONS

FROM: National Science Foundation (NSF)

Notice of Public Hearings and the Availability of a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS/OEIS)

NSF gives notice of the availability of a Draft PEIS/OEIS (hereafter Draft PEIS) for marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and requests public review and comment on the document. NSF also provides notice of public hearings on the Draft PEIS.

The Division of Ocean Sciences in the Directorate for Geosciences (GEO/OCE) has prepared the Draft PEIS as the lead agency with support from the cooperating agencies, USGS and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

The Draft PEIS assesses the potential impacts of marine seismic research on the human and natural environment. Under the Proposed Action, a variety of acoustic sources used for research activities funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS would be operated from various research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions or government agencies. The seismic acoustic sources would include various airgun configurations (particularly strings or arrays with as little as 2 to as many as 36 seismic airguns), as well as low-energy seismic and non-seismic acoustic sources.

The Draft PEIS examines the potential impacts that may result from geophysical exploration and scientific research using seismic surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS in non-Arctic waters. The Proposed Action is for academic and U.S. government scientists in the U.S., and possible international collaborators, to conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions and government agencies. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to fund the investigation of the geology and geophysics of the seafloor by collecting seismic reflection and refraction data that reveal the structure and stratigraphy of the crust and/or overlying sediment below the world's oceans. NSF has a continuing need to fund seismic surveys that enable scientists to collect data essential to understanding the complex Earth processes beneath the ocean floor.

Two action alternatives and the No-Action Alternative have been carried forward for analysis. The Draft PEIS is available for public review for a 45-day period. Comments must be received before or postmarked by November 22, 2010.

NSF will conduct two public hearings to receive oral and written comments on the Draft PEIS. Federal, state, and local agencies and interested individuals are invited to be present or represented at the public hearings. An open house session will precede the scheduled public hearing at each of the locations listed below and will allow individuals to review the information presented in the Draft PEIS. NSF and USGS representatives will be available during the open house sessions to clarify information related to the Draft PEIS.

Dates & Addresses: All hearings will start with an open house session, followed by a presentation, and then the formal oral public comment period. Public hearings will be held on the following dates and at the following locations:

- Monday, October 25, 2010, 5:00-7:00 p.m. at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University California-San Diego, Vaughn Hall, Room 100, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA.
- Wednesday, October 27, 2010, 5:00-7:00 p.m. at the National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 110, Arlington, VA.

The Draft PEIS is available on NSF's website at: http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp. Electronic or printed copies of the Draft PEIS are also available upon request from: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 292-8583. Email: nepacomments@nsf.gov.

Supplementary Information: Currently, individual Environmental Assessments (EAs) are prepared for individual or small numbers of related cruises to assess the impact of the generated seismic survey noise on the marine environment. In the 7 years from 2003 through 2009, NSF prepared 31 EAs assessing the impact of sound from seismic surveys on marine resources and species listed under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) during research projects investigating the geology and geophysics of the seafloor. These EAs were prepared for various worldwide, academic research cruises that required the use of various marine seismic sources involving different airgun configurations deployed from the primary U.S. academic seismic survey ship, or smaller airgun sources deployed from other research vessels, often with concurrent operations of non-seismic acoustic sources such as echosounders and bottom profilers.

For past seismic research cruise actions, an EA has been used as the basis for consultation with the NOAA Office of Protected Resources (OPR) under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. For each of the research cruises, NOAA OPR issued a Biological Opinion (BO) and related Incidental Take Statements (ITSs), which included terms and conditions to reduce impacts on threatened and endangered species. In parallel with this effort, when applicable, a separate application for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) under Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA was submitted for each cruise to another division within NOAA OPR, which subsequently issued the IHA. The MMPA procedures for issuance of an IHA involve publication of a proposed IHA notice in the *Federal Register* and solicitation of comments on that notice.

To reduce this apparent duplication of effort in environmental documentation and to address the potential for cumulative effects of marine seismic research acoustic sources upon marine resources, NSF and the USGS have decided that a PEIS should be prepared. Preparing a PEIS for NSF and USGS marine seismic research serves several purposes. First, it provides a format for a comprehensive cumulative impacts analysis by taking a view of the planned marine seismic research activities as a whole. This is accomplished by assembling and analyzing the broadest range of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with all marine seismic research activities in addition to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects in the region of influence. Furthermore, the collective analysis of representative project locations will provide a strong technical basis for a more global assessment of the potential cumulative impacts of NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic activities in the future.

A PEIS also sets up a framework for streamlining the preparation of subsequent environmental documents where needed for individual cruises. It is expected that time- and location-specific aspects, or similarly detailed technical information if necessary to evaluate unique impacts of specific cruises and projects, will be addressed in EIS supplements, tiered EAs, or other appropriate environmental documentation that

would follow the publication of this Draft PEIS. Thus, while NSF-funded and USGS marine seismic research is reviewed under this PEIS, the analysis of site-specific impacts from future cruises may be reserved for future analysis. Tiering of environmental documents in this manner makes subsequent documents of greater use and meaning to the public as NSF's and USGS's marine seismic research develops, without duplicating previous paperwork and environmental analyses. Finally, a PEIS enables the identification of an appropriate and prudent set of standard mitigation measures to be integrated into future NSF-funded and USGS cruises, which is a key goal of NSF and USGS.

Federal, state, local agencies, Native American Tribes and Nations, and interested parties are invited to be present or represented at the public hearings. Written comments can also be submitted anytime during the public hearings or during the 45-day public review period of the Draft PEIS. Comments must be received before or postmarked by November 22, 2010.

Oral statements will be heard and transcribed by a stenographer; however, to ensure the accuracy of the record, all statements should be submitted in writing. All statements, both oral and written, will become part of the public record on the Draft PEIS and will be responded to in the Final PEIS. Equal weight will be given to both oral and written statements. In the interest of time, and to ensure all who wish to give an oral statement have the opportunity to do so, each speaker's comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. If a long statement is to be presented, it should be summarized at the public hearing with the full text submitted either in writing at the hearing or mailed to: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230. In addition, comments may be submitted via e-mail at: nepacomments@nsf.gov. Therefore, comments may be submitted 3 ways:

1. Mailed to: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230.
2. Sent via email at nepacomments@nsf.gov.
3. Submitted in writing at the public hearings.

All written comments submitted by mail must be postmarked by November 22, 2010 to ensure they become part of the official record.

For Further Information: For further information regarding the Draft PEIS contact:

Holly Smith
National Science Foundation
Division of Ocean Sciences
4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230
Telephone: (703) 292-8583
Email: nepacomments@nsf.gov

Enclosure: CD containing Draft PEIS/OEIS and appendices.

DISTRIBUTION LIST
DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC EIS/OEIS FOR MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH
FUNDED BY NSF OR CONDUCTED BY USGS

FEDERAL AGENCIES

USEPA

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Federal Activities
EIS Filing Section
Mail Code 2252-A, Room 7241
Ariel Rios Building (South Oval Lobby)
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460

U.S. EPA – Region 9
75 Hawthorne Street, 13th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

U.S. Department of State

John Field
U.S. Department of State
7203 Central Ave.
Takoma Park, MD 20912

BOEMRE

Jill Lewandowski, Protected Species Biologist
Environmental Assessment Branch
BOEMRE
381 Elden Street
Herndon, VA 20170

Casey Rowe
Gulf of Mexico OCS Region
BOEMRE
1201 Elmwood Park Boulevard (MS 5412)
New Orleans, LA 70123–2394

James Price
Marine Mammals Env. Studies Coordinator
BOEMRE
381 Elden Street, MS 4041
Herndon, VA 20170-4817

Deborah Epperson
BOEMRE
1201 Elmwood Park Boulevard (MS 5432)
New Orleans, LA 70123–2394

Wayne Crayton
BOEMRE
3801 Centerpoint Drive, Suite 500
Anchorage, AK 99503

USGS

Esther Eng
Chief, Environmental Management Branch
U.S. Geological Survey
MS-207
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston VA 20192

James Devine
Senior Advisor for Science Applications
U.S. Geological Survey Headquarters
MS-106
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston, VA 20192

John Haines
Coordinator for Coastal & Marine Geology
U.S. Geological Survey Headquarters
12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Mail Stop 915B
Reston, VA 20192-0002

Navy

John Quinn
Deputy Director
Environmental Readiness Division (OPNAV N45)
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway
Suite 2000
Arlington, VA 22202

James E. Eckman
Marine Mammals & Biological Oceanography Program
Office of Naval Research – Code 322
One Liberty Center, Rm 1073
875 N. Randolph St.
Arlington, VA 22203-1995

Michael J. Weise
Marine Mammals & Biological Oceanography Program
Office of Naval Research - Code 32
One Liberty Center, Rm 1068
875 N. Randolph St.
Arlington, VA 22203-1995

USFWS

John Fay
Division of Endangered Species
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
420 ARLSQ
4401 N. Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203

NOAA-NMFS

Steve Leathery, National NEPA Coordinator
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Highway, Room 14555
Silver Spring, MD 20910

James Lecky, Director
Office of Protected Resources
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Angela Somma, Chief Endangered Species Division
Office of Protected Resources
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Hwy
Silver Spring, MD 20901

Karen Abrams
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Highway
SSMC3, 14th Floor F/HC
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Brad Smith
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
222 W. 7th St.
Box 43
Anchorage, AK 99513

Jolie Harrison
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Jay Barlow
NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service
8604 La Jolla Shores Dr.
La Jolla, CA 92038

MMC

Tim Ragen
Marine Mammal Commission
4340 East-West Highway, Suite 700
Bethesda, MD 20814

STATE AGENCIES

Clyde W. Namu'o, Administrator
State of Hawai'i
Office of Hawaiian Affairs
711 Kapi'olani Blvd., Suite 500
Honolulu, HI 96813

Mark Delaplaine
Federal Consistency Supervisor
California Coastal Commission
45 Fremont St., Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94105

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES

Jessica Bertenshan
9500 Gilman Dr.
UC-San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

John Collins
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
MS-34
360 Woods Hole Rd.
Woods Hole, MA 02543

Pat Cooper
School of Ocean and Earth Sciences and Technology
University of Hawaii
1680 East-West Road, POST 802
Honolulu HI 96822

Meagan Cummings
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
P.O. Box 1000
61 Route 9W
Palisades, NY 10964-1000

John Eastlund
IODP
1000 Discovery Dr.
College Station, TX 77845

Lois Epstein
Cook Inlet Keeper
308 G St., Suite 219
Anchorage, AK 99501

Benny Gallaway
LGL
1410 Cavitt St.
Bryan, TX 77801

David Goldberg
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
P.O. Box 1000
61 Route 9W
Palisades, NY 10964-1000

Jessica Gribbon
EarthTech
675 N. Washington St.
Alexandria, VA 22307

Richard Hammer
CSA Inc.
759 Parkway St.
Jupiter, FL 33477

Sean Higgins
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
P.O. Box 1000
61 Route 9W
Palisades, NY 10964-1000

R.D. Hofman
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

Cara Horowitz
Natural Resources Defense Council
1314 Second St.
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Doug Johnson
College Station, TX 77845

Art June
Metcalf and Eddy
2751 Prospect Ave., Suite 200
Fairfax, VA 22031

George Krasnick
1003 Bishop St., Suite 1550
Pauahi Tower
Honolulu, HI 96813

Bill Lang
Mandeville, LA 70448

James Lima
Anchorage, AK 99501

Michael Link
LGL Alaska
1101 E 76th Ave., Suite B
Anchorage, AK 99513

Jeff McGuire
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
MS-24
360 Woods Hole Rd.
Woods Hole, MA 02543

Stephen Miller
9500 Gilman Dr.
UC-San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

Margo Morell
Consortium for Ocean Leadership
1201 New York Ave., Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005

Rebecca Nadel
Houston, TX 77079

Michael Purdy
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
P.O. Box 1000
61 Route 9W
Palisades, NY 10964-1000

Scott Sloughter
CRE
11 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Brandon Southall
SEA, Inc.
911 Center Street, Suite B
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Karen Stokesbury
CSA Inc.
759 Parkway St.
Jupiter, FL 33477

Lucy Swartz
Battelle
4112 Franklin St.
Kensington, MD 20895

Russell Tait
The Woodlands, TX 77382

Brian Taylor
School of Ocean and Earth Sciences and Technology
University of Hawaii
1680 East-West Road, POST 802
Honolulu HI 96822

Goldy Thach
La Jolla, CA 92037

Dean Welch
Honolulu, HI 96815

Andrew Wigton
URC-GW3-866B
PO Box 2189
Houston, TX 77252

John Young
Houston, TX 77060

R/V *Marcus G. Langseth Science Oversight Committee:*

Graham M. Kent
Director Nevada Seismology Lab
Mail Stop 0174
University of Nevada/Reno
1664 N. Virginia St.
Reno, NV 89557

W. Steven Holbrook
Dept. Geology and Geophysics
University of Wyoming
Laramie, WY 82071-3006

Michael E. Enachescu
ER4030
Dept. of Earth Sciences
Memorial University of Newfoundland
Newfoundland, Canada A1B 3X7C

Nathan Bangs
Institute for Geophysics
University of Texas, Austin
10100 Burnet Road
Austin, TX 78758

H. Paul Johnson
School of Oceanography WB-10
Box 357940
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-7940

Alexander (Sandy) Shor
School of Ocean and Earth Sciences and Technology
University of Hawaii
1680 East-West Road, POST 802
Honolulu HI 96822

Mitchell Lyle
TAMU 3146
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77840-3146

Raymond W. Schmitt
Dept. Physical Oceanography
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution
Mail Stop #21
Woods Hole, MA 02543

David W. Scholl
Emeritus Senior Scientist
U.S. Geological Survey
345 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Maya Tolstoy
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
PO Box 1000
61 Rt 9 W
Palisades, NY 10964

Paul Ljunggren
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
PO Box 1000
61 Rt 9 W
Palisades, NY 10964

Jeff Rupert
Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
PO Box 1000
61 Rt 9 W
Palisades, NY 10964

Public Hearings on the
Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Posters Used during the Public Hearings on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

WELCOME

Public Hearing for
Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS for Marine Seismic Research
Funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF)
or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

This public hearing is an opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS to help us improve our environmental impact analysis



YOUR PARTICIPATION AND INPUT ARE IMPORTANT

- **Please ask questions. NSF, USGS, and NOAA representatives are here to answer your questions about the Proposed Action and to talk with you about your concerns.**
- **Please provide comments to help us understand your concerns. There are 3 ways to comment:**
  1. **Provide written comments at today's hearing.**
  2. **Submit comments via email to nepacomments@nsf.gov.**
  3. **Mail your comment sheet to:**

     Holly Smith
     Division of Ocean Sciences
     National Science Foundation
     4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725
     Arlington, VA 22230

- **Please add your name to the mailing list to receive future notices about the NSF-USGS Marine Seismic Research Programmatic EIS/OEIS.**

Comments received today and during the entire 45-day public comment period (Oct. 8 - Nov. 22, 2010) will be addressed during the preparation of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

NEPA guides the environmental impact analysis.

The Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS assesses the potential impacts from the use of acoustic sources and associated activities in support of marine geophysical surveys funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS on the following resources:

Natural Resources

Marine Acoustics

Essential Fish Habitat

Water Quality

Marine Mammals, Fish, Birds, and Invertebrates

Threatened and Endangered Species

Hazardous Materials

Hazardous Waste

Cultural Resources

Historic and Archaeological Resources

Human Resources

Socioeconomics (Private and Commercial Fisheries)

Recreation

Health and Safety

Your involvement is essential to the NEPA process

The Programmatic EIS Timeline

Notice of Intent Published Sept. 22, 2005

Scoping Sept. 22 - Oct. 28, 2005

Preparation of Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Notice of Availability of Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS (Oct. 8, 2010)

Public Comment Period 45 Days (Oct. 8 - Nov. 22, 2010)

Public Hearings
Oct. 25 - La Jolla, CA
Oct. 27 - Arlington, VA

Preparation of Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Notice of Availability of Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS

30-day Wait Period

Record of Decision

There are many opportunities for your involvement in the Programmatic EIS/OEIS process.

- **Participate** in public hearings
- **Identify** community-specific issues and concerns
- **Ensure** you are on the mailing list
- **Read and comment** on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS
- **Review** the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS for Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by the USGS Proposed Action

Under the Proposed action, NSF and the USGS would conduct marine seismic research operations from various research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions or government agencies. The primary research vessel would be the R/V Marcus G. Langseth (owned by NSF and operated by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University), which has unique 2D and 3D seismic research capabilities within the U.S. academic fleet. The Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS addresses the variety of airgun configurations that would be operated from the R/V Langseth, as well as multi-beam echosounders, sub-bottom profilers, and other standard active acoustic sources that would be deployed in support of typical marine seismic surveys. In addition, the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS considers low-energy seismic sources (e.g., 1-2 airguns and GI guns, sparkers, boomers, chirp systems) that are used by the USGS or are funded by NSF on other academic research vessels.

World-wide marine seismic research operations (excluding Arctic and Antarctic waters) would occur throughout the year on the R/V Langseth and other seismic research vessels. The research voyages can last anywhere from 1 day to 2 months, and operate 24/7 depending upon the scientific experiment and the ship capabilities and endurance.



Longhurst Biomes and Proposed Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas



Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS for Marine Seismic Research Funded by NSF or Conducted by the USGS

R/V Langseth, the primary research vessel for NSF-funded marine seismic research.

General Seismic Programs

A close-up of the seismic airgun releasing air bubbles at the water surface immediately after a pulse of air is released.

- NSF and the USGS use conventional seismic methodology to conduct academic geophysical studies of ocean bottom structures.
- NSF-funded studies are conducted by universities from around the world, including graduate students. Examples of research topics include tectonic plate formation, mapping and aging of ocean floor sediment layers, and underwater crater and crevasse structure.
- USGS research has been directed progressively more to nearshore and inner shelf coastal research, where low-energy acoustic sources are generally adequate.
- Seismic surveys introduce high levels of Low Frequency (predominantly < 250 Hz) intermittent sound into the marine environment.
- Airguns are arranged in an array designed to focus sound downward; however, some sound propagates horizontally.
- Airguns emit strong pulses of compressed air that result in sound pulses ~0.1 sec in duration near the source, lengthening to ~1 sec at a distance. Each pulse is followed by ~6-120 sec of silence.
- Airgun array is towed near the water surface ~30-50 m behind the vessel.
- Returning acoustic signals are received passively by hydrophones in 1 - 4 streamers, each up to 3-8 km long, and/or Ocean Bottom Seismometers (OBSs).
- Narrow-beam sub-bottom profilers and multibeam echosounders are used to study shallow sediment layers and water depth by directing intermittent sonic "chirps" towards ocean bottom.

The R/V Langseth proposed for use during the NSF marine seismic academic studies. Other vessels deploying smaller sound sources would also be used.

Measuring Sound in Water

- Seismic noise is measured in decibels (dB), a measure of loudness, which is a logarithmic scale. The level can also be measured in terms of pressure or energy. A 10 times increase in pressure produces a 20 dB increase, whereas a 10 times increase in energy produces a 10 dB increase. These are potentially confusing, so it is important to clearly define the terms being used.
- Reported dB levels in air and water are not directly comparable due to differences in standard units and in the density of air vs. water, thus 117 dB *in air* ≈180 dB *in water*.
- Frequency: in number of oscillations per second, referred to as Hertz (Hz).
- Because the airgun array (multiple airguns) is a distributed sound source rather than a single point source, the highest sound levels measurable at any location in the water will be less than the normal source level.

An engineer prepares to deploy a single airgun from the vessel as part of an "array" of airguns. Each airgun is suspended about 8 m below the water surface from a white or pink float shown here. The energy to the airguns is compressed air supplied by compressors on board the source vessel.

General Concept of Marine Seismic Reflection and Refraction Surveys



Mitigation and Monitoring

- Monitoring and mitigation are conducted to minimize and avoid (as possible) potential effects of seismic operations on marine mammals and sea turtles
- Below are examples of how NSF-funded seismic studies have been incorporating monitoring and mitigation into their geophysical research programs conducted from aboard seismic vessels

The observer station aboard the R/V Langseth and an observer actively searching for marine mammals and sea turtles. Two "big-eye" binoculars, handheld binoculars, and a data collection "desk" are used by experienced Protected Species Visual Observers (PSVOs) to monitor and record their observations. When marine mammals or sea turtles are seen in or near the "safety zone", the observers immediately contact the airgunners to implement a power down or shut down of the airguns as required by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Monitoring

Visual observations

- With naked eye and "reticle" and "big-eye" binoculars
- During all daytime seismic operations

Passive acoustic monitoring

- Listen for mammal vocalizations during all day & night seismic operations when high-energy sources are in use
- Software estimates bearings to vocalizing mammals, which are relayed to PSVOs



The passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) station used by marine mammal observers below deck in the science lab. The biologist on duty listens for live sounds of marine mammals detected by hydrophones while simultaneously watching a real-time spectrographic display for frequency ranges produced by calling animals. When sounds are detected, the direction to those sounds is determined when possible. This information is communicated to the PSVOs on the observation tower to aid in locating the animals when they surface

Noise Criteria for Mitigation

Current NMFS criteria:

- Cetaceans and pinnipeds should not be exposed to pulsed sounds with received levels ≥180 and 190 dB re 1 microPa (rms), Respectively
- 180 dB (rms) criterion sometimes applied for sea turtles
- No specific criteria for other marine animals

Updated criteria allowing for recent data on auditory effects are being developed for marine mammals, fish, and sea turtles

Mitigation

Program design

- Timing, location, avoidance of sensitive areas
- Use smallest possible acoustic source level

Ramp-up

- "Soft" start over 30-35 minutes

Safety radius

- Power or shut down for sightings within the radius
- Whales/dolphins/turtles (180 dB [rms])
- Seals/sea lions (190 dB [rms])



An example of a "decision flow chart" used to aid in determining what type of mitigation to implement for marine mammals and sea turtles while conducting observations during a marine seismic study. A flow chart is developed specifically for each project. Conditions and mitigation requirements differ depending on a number of factors such as water depth, expected species, number and configuration of airguns, etc.

Mitigation Based on Predicting and Modeling Effects

- Goal is to estimate and predict the exposure level of marine mammals and sea turtles to seismic sounds
- This information is used to develop appropriate mitigation to minimize exposure of marine mammals and sea turtles

Predicting sound levels underwater is complicated

- Sound paths and received levels are affected by changes in temperature, salinity, water depth, and bottom conditions
- An animal's exposure to sound is affected by its depth and distance from the seismic source

To address these issues in the Draft Programmatic EIS, sophisticated acoustic propagation models (i.e., MONM) have been used to predict the sound field. These have been combined with models of animal movement (i.e., AIM) that account for differences in behavior among different species.

Potential Effects of Sounds from Marine Seismic Research Sources on Marine Animals

Range of Potential Effects

- **No response/tolerance** commonly noted
- **Habituation** often occurs (i.e., get used to sound)
- **Masking** or "blocking out" of animal sounds by seismic research sound sources likely minimal because sound sources are not continuous
- ***Possible*** **hearing impairment and other physical effects** demonstrated for fish close to sound source, not demonstrated in any marine mammal



The R/V Marcus Langseth towing an airgun array during a marine seismic study.

Effects and Concerns Differ by Species

- Little information on most species
- Some species studied more than others
- Few systematic studies
- Monitoring during seismic operations shows variable reactions and often tolerance

Toothed Whales (Dolphins, Porpoises)

- Dolphins and porpoises often seen from seismic vessels, including bowriding; evidence of some localized avoidance
- Sperm whales recent comprehensive studies indicate no strong overt responses
- Beaked whales, no data; inhabit deep offshore waters

Concern: beaked whales appear sensitive to sonar sounds, but nothing is known about effects of airgun sounds; dolphins and porpoises do not always avoid the safety zone

Pinnipeds (Seals, Sea Lions)

- Some indication of slight avoidance & behavior changes
- Radio tagging work indicates stronger (but temporary) avoidance than is evident from visual observations

Concern: pinnipeds do not always avoid the safety zone

Baleen Whales (Large whales such as gray, blue, and fin)

Systematic studies of humpback, bowhead, gray whales:

- Most avoid by 3-8 km (migrating bowheads by up to 35 km)
- Some approach
- Most sensitive during migration, but migration/feeding continues
- Respiratory changes
- Avoidance is usually localized, short-term

Concern: most baleen whales are endangered or threatened and are especially sensitive to low-frequency sounds

Sea Turtles

- Increase swimming speed, change behavior, move away from sound based on studies in captivity and at sea

Concern: little quantitative information about sound levels that elicit response

Marine Fish

- Airgun energy <2 m away can damage/kill eggs and larvae (natural mortality of eggs & larvae >99%)
- Airgun pulses >180 dB re 1 µPa can damage snapper ears
- Studies of freshwater species: no lasting damage
- Some move away from seismic sounds

Concern: seismic may impact spawning and migration, scare fish away from fishing areas

Marine Invertebrates

- Impacts presumed to be low
- No mortality or impact on crab eggs or females

Concern: effects largely unknown

Relationship of Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM) and Acoustic Integration Model (AIM)



Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM) (©JASCO)

- *Sound propagation model – predicts the amount of sound projected from the airgun in each direction.*
- *Computes the expected sound attenuation from the airgun.*
- *Predicts the received levels of sound at specific locations from the airgun as a function of bearing, distance, and depth.*
- *Includes site-specific environmental data such as propagation and attenuation based on bathymetry, bottom conditions (i.e., sand, mud, rock, etc.), sound velocity profile, water temperature, etc.*

Acoustic Integration Model (AIM) (©Marine Acoustics Incorporated [MAI])

- *Animal movement and acoustics model – integrates information on the estimated propagation of sound from the airgun and on the predicted movement patterns of simulated marine mammals (animats) to model the anticipated frequency distribution of sound levels that those animats receive. Animats in this scenario are modeled representations of marine mammals.*
- *Predicted sound levels at specific locations are derived from MONM.*
- *For each modeled area, levels of sound received by a population of animats are calculated as a function of time. Animats are programmed to move in a way that takes account of species- or group-specific information such as density, seasonal occurrence, habitat preferences, group size, and swimming and dive behavior.*
- *The resulting distribution of predicted received sound levels can be used, in conjunction with impact or "take" criteria, to predict the number of animals that might be exposed to specified sound levels ("take estimates").*
- *Model includes mitigation shutdowns, but does not account for animat avoidance of airgun noise.*

Slides from the NSF Presentation Given at the Public Hearings on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

WELCOME

to the Public Hearing on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS for Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)



Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey



Public Hearings:

La Jolla, CA
October 25, 2010

Arlington, VA
October 27, 2010



NSF USGS science for a changing world NOAA

NSF

- NSF is an Independent federal agency, created by Congress in 1950 "to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense…"
- Funds ~20% of federally supported basic research at U.S. colleges and universities
- Issues ~11,000 grants annually to fund proposals judged by merit-review
- Annual budget of ~$6.9B (FY 2010)
- NSF-funded researchers have won more than 180 Nobel Prizes as well as other honors

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

- Scientific federal agency with no regulatory responsibility
- Within the US Department of the Interior
- The largest U.S. agency dealing with water, earth, and biological sciences. The USGS also has responsibility for civilian mapping (including offshore)
- Collects, monitors, analyzes, and provides scientific understanding about conditions, issues, and problems associated with natural resources, hazards, environments, and climate change.

USGS
science for a changing world

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

- Within the US Department of Commerce ‘s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- Lead federal agency responsible for the stewardship of the nation's offshore living marine resources and their habitat
- Manages, conserves and protects fish, whales, dolphins, sea turtles and other living ocean creatures
- NMFS’ Office of Protected Resources works to conserve, protect, and recover species under the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act

Purpose & Need for the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

- Examines the potential impacts that may result from geophysical exploration and scientific research seismic surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS
- Proposed Action is for academic and US government scientists to conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by US academic institutions and government agencies
- Purpose of the proposed action is the investigation of the geology and geophysics of the Earth beneath the oceans using seismic data to reveal the underlying structure and stratigraphy of the sediments and deeper crust to help inform our understanding of complex Earth and atmospheric processes which is in support of the NSF & USGS missions.

The Science…

Plate Tectonics



Image created by NASA

Seafloor and Subsurface Features





Image from http://nwrota2009.blogspot.com/

Submarine Volcanoes

Image from www.world-science.net

Mid-Ocean Ridges

Degassing lava erupts onto the seafloor at NW Rota-1 volcano. (photo credit: copyright Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution). http://oregonstate.edu/dept/ncs/newsarch/2009/May09/rota.html

Magma Chamber

Crust and mantel boundary beneath melt sill (Singh et al. 2006)



Natural Hazards



2010 Chile Earthquake - Santiago
Photo credit: Esteban Maldonado

Earthquakes

Coastal Landslide caused by the 2010 Haiti Earthquake.
Image from www.gallery.usgs.gov

Landslides

Tsunami

March 28, 1964, **S**eward, Alaska. Image from
http://wcatwc.arh.noaa.gov/web_tsus/19640328/19640328.htm

Marine Seismic Research

NSF-funded marine seismic research:

- Science driven: Proposal & merit review process
- Globally ranging, spanning domestic, international, and foreign territorial waters, usually in water deeper than ~1000 m or conducted along transects from shallow to deeper water
- NSF funds 4-7 surveys/year, each lasting 1 to 7 weeks
- *R/V Marcus G. Langseth*: Primary vessel used for high energy surveys
- Other academic vessels used for low energy surveys

R/V *Langseth*

USGS Marine Seismic Research

USGS Activities

Low energy (e.g., Chirp)

- mostly within 5 nm of the shoreline
- 8 to 12 surveys/yr, each of 1 to 3 weeks' duration
- water depths up to 1000 m on the West Coast, 500 m in the Gulf of Mexico, and 100 m on the East Coast

High energy (e.g., multiple airguns or GI guns)

- 1 to 2 surveys per year, with more frequent surveys possible in the future; duration up to a few weeks
- deepwater cruises both inside and outside the 200 nm limit

USGS Coastal and Marine Science objectives include:

- mapping associated with the Convention on the Law of the Sea to determine the outer limits of U.S. sovereign rights beyond 200 nm
- understanding the dynamic offshore environment for slope failures that may cause tsunamis,

  coastal erosion, faults, gas seeps, and other features
- researching marine aspects of global change, sea level rise, and their impacts on society

USGS
science for a changing world

Different types of Marine Seismic Surveys

- 2-D
- 3-D
- Other: VSP; 4-D; OBC





Track line coverage for 3D MCS along the East Pacific Rise. S. Carbotte, LDEO.

Reflection & Refraction Surveys



Not to Scale

Figure 2-1
General Concept of Marine Seismic Reflection and Refraction Surveys

Energy Level Categorization

- Seismic surveys were divided into two categories in the Draft PEIS:
  - High Energy – Generally > 4 airguns
  - Low energy – Generally ≤ 4 airguns, boomer, sparkers, waterguns, chirp
- Factors that influence categorization include: Source, source volume, tow depth, and spacing

Representative Airgun

Streamer Reels on *R/V Langseth*

WHOI Active=Source/Rapid Response OBS/H

PEIS Analysis Approach

- 5 representative Detailed Analysis Areas (DAAs) & 8 Qualitative Analysis Areas (QAAs)
  - Sites where future surveys are likely to occur
  - Sites within a wide range of Longhurst Biomes
- Survey season
- Source levels & configurations (number & type of airguns,2D, 3D, etc.)
- Modeling (AASM, MONM, AIM) to predict **Take Estimates**
- Monitoring and mitigation measures
- Affected environment and environmental consequences of the proposed action on the following resources:
  - Animals: marine invertebrates, fish, sea turtles, seabirds, marine mammals (cetaceans, pinnipeds, sea otter, manatee)
  - Socioeconomics
  - Cultural Resources
- Cumulative Impacts

Harbor seal
(Photo: T. Mangelson, Alaska Sea Grant)

Exemplary (Representative) Analysis Areas



Figure 2-18
Longhurst Biomes and Proposed Detailed and Qualitative Analysis Areas

Modeling



Not to Scale

Figure 2-27
Relationship of Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM)
and Acoustic Integration Model (AIM)

Modeling

- Considered both rms and SEL
  - Used existing NMFS guidance on "take" for pulsed sounds:
    - Level A Harassment (Injury) = 180 (cetaceans)/190 (pinnipeds) dB re 1 µPa (rms)
    - Level B Harassment (Behavioral) = 160 dB re 1 µPa (rms)
  - Used the proposed energy (SEL) criterion:
    - Level A Harassment (Injury) = 198 (cetaceans)/186 (pinnipeds) dB re 1 $\mu Pa^2 \bullet sec$
- Considered both flat and M-weighting
- Considered site specific environmental "context"
  - seafloor, temperature, salinity



From Appendix B (AMR): **Figure B-10. Illustration of Pressure-based Exposure or "Take" Methodology (not to scale)**

Monitoring & Mitigation

- Mitigation during survey planning phases
- Visual monitoring
- Passive Acoustic Monitoring (PAM)
- Proposed Safety Radii or “Mitigation Zone”
- Mitigation during Operations:
  - Vessel speed/course alteration
  - Airgun power down & shut down
  - Airgun ramp-up
  - Special mitigation measures for circumstances/species of particular concern

Alternatives

- Alternative A: Conduct marine seismic research using cruise-specific mitigation measures
  - *for expected no take situations:*
    - *Standard 200-m FMZ*
  - *for expected take situations:*
    - *Calculate FMZ & MZ for high & low energy sources*

- Alternative B (Preferred): Conduct marine seismic research using cruise-specific mitigation measures with generic mitigation measures for low-energy acoustic sources
  - *for expected no take situations:*
    - *Standard 200-m FMZ*
  - *for expected take situations:*
    - *Calculate FMZ for high & low energy sources,*
    - *Calculate MZ for high energy sources*
    - *Standard 100m MZ for low energy sources*
- No Action Alternative

Potential Environmental Impacts

Environmental Consequences:

- Direct and indirect affects of the proposed action mainly as a result of noise from acoustic energy sources (e.g. airguns)
- Potential impacts to species are expected to be limited to short-term and localized behavioral disturbances (such as Level B), and not significant to populations.
- Although noise modeling results for DAAs indicate that Level A injury impacts to marine mammals or threatened and endangered species may occur, for actual surveys, additional mitigation measures would be added to the cruise parameters to reduce and eliminate Level A impacts or the potential for injury.

Cumulative Impacts:

- Results indicate no significant cumulative effects to the affected environment from proposed actions.
- Monitoring and mitigation, pre-cruise planning, evaluation of other regional activities influence results

Future surveys:

- When future surveys are identified, a site specific environmental analysis will be developed.
- All future seismic surveys would be permitted according to the rules and regulations of the applicable agencies of U.S. federal, state, and foreign governments.
- Incorporate technological advances made in seismic sources, monitoring/mitigation techniques and tools, which demonstrate reduction in environmental impacts.

Thank you!

- Scripps Institution of Oceanography
- USGS
- NMFS
- John Diebold, LDEO

California sea lion
(Photo: Indianapolis Zoo)

There are 3 ways to comment on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS:

1. Submit written or oral comments at this hearing.
2. Email comments to: nepacomments@nsf.gov
3. Mail comments to:

   Holly Smith
   Division of Ocean Sciences
   National Science Foundation
   4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725
   Arlington, VA 22230

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (NSF) – U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (USGS)
DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC EIS/OEIS FOR MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH

Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Location: _____

Date: _____

Thank you for providing your comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS for proposed marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS. Public involvement is a fundamental part of the development of the Programmatic EIS/OEIS and NSF wants and appreciates your comments. Please provide comments no later than November 22, 2010 to ensure consideration in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS. Comments may be submitted at this meeting, via email at nepacomments@nsf.gov, or via U.S. Postal Service to the address below. The Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS can be downloaded from http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/ under "Draft PEIS for Marine Seismic Research."

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

****Please print – additional space is provided on back****

1. Name: _____
2. Address: _____

   _____
3. Please check here ☐ if you would like to be on the mailing list.
4. Please check here ☐ if you would like your name/address kept private. ***(Please note, your comments may be published in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS; please do not provide any personal information [e.g., your address] if you do not wish this information to be made public.)***
5. Would you like to receive a hard copy ☐ or CD ☐ of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS?

Please give this form to one of the EIS Team representatives, place in the comment drop box, or mail by November 22 to:

Holly Smith, Division of Ocean Sciences
National Science Foundation
4201 Wilson Blvd, Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230

Or via email to: nepacomments@nsf.gov

(comments continued from front)

NSF-USGS Marine Seismic Research Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD AND SPEAKER CARD

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY Date _____

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Name of official, organization, or group you represent (if applicable): _____

- ❑ Check if you want to **SPEAK PUBLICLY**
- ❑ Check if you want a paper copy of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS
- ❑ Check if you want a CD of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Please Note

Comments will be published in the Final EIS/OEIS. The name, city, and state locations of persons making comments will appear in the Final EIS/OEIS. Specific address information of commenters and meeting attendees will not be printed in the Final EIS/OEIS, but will be used to create a mailing list for the document.

NSF-USGS Marine Seismic Research Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

PUBLIC HEARING ATTENDANCE RECORD AND SPEAKER CARD

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY Date _____

Name _____

Address _____

City, State, Zip _____

Name of official, organization, or group you represent (if applicable): _____

- ❑ Check if you want to **SPEAK PUBLICLY**
- ❑ Check if you want a paper copy of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS
- ❑ Check if you want a CD of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Please Note

Comments will be published in the Final EIS/OEIS. The name, city, and state locations of persons making comments will appear in the Final EIS/OEIS. Specific address information of commenters and meeting attendees will not be printed in the Final EIS/OEIS, but will be used to create a mailing list for the document.

ATTENDANCE RECORD AND SPEAKER CARD BACK

Data Required by the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 USC 552A)

1. Authority: 42 USC 4321-4370a.
2. Principal Purpose: Information is used to compile a list of hearing attendees for the administrative record.
3. Routine Uses
   a. The card is used to signify an individual's desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of the hearing.
   b. Names and addresses will be used to compile distribution lists for future documents.
   c. Specific address information of persons making comments and meeting attendees will not be printed in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS. The names and city and state locations of commenters will appear in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS. Comments will also be published in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS.
4. Effect of individual not providing address information: Failure to provide mailing address information may prevent receipt of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

ATTENDANCE RECORD AND SPEAKER CARD BACK

Data Required by the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 USC 552A)

1. Authority: 42 USC 4321-4370a.
2. Principal Purpose: Information is used to compile a list of hearing attendees for the administrative record.
3. Routine Uses
   a. The card is used to signify an individual's desire to make a statement during the public comment portion of the hearing.
   b. Names and addresses will be used to compile distribution lists for future documents.
   c. Specific address information of persons making comments and meeting attendees will not be printed in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS. The names and city and state locations of commenters will appear in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS. Comments will also be published in the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS.
4. Effect of individual not providing address information: Failure to provide mailing address information may prevent receipt of the Final Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

NSF-USGS MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH
DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC EIS/OEIS

Public Hearing Guidelines for Oral Comments

- If you wish to provide oral comments, please mark the speaker card appropriately (available at the registration desk).

- Please limit your comments to the analyses contained within the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS for Marine Seismic Research funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS.

- Speakers will be organized in the following priority:
  - Elected officials (e.g., individuals officially representing federal, state, and local government and tribal offices), and
  - Individuals, organizations, and other interested parties.

- Comments will be limited to 3 minutes:
  - The 3 minutes will begin after you enter your name for the record,
  - After 2 minutes have elapsed, a yellow card will be shown by the timekeeper to indicate you have 1 minute left to finish your comment,
  - At the end of 3 minutes, a red card will be shown and you will need to finish your comments, and
  - Depending on the number of speakers and the duration of the public hearing, the public hearing moderator may offer individuals additional time to speak; however, written comments are encouraged to ensure your input is completely received.

- Comments should always be directed towards the presiding public hearing moderator. This will help ensure your comments are recorded accurately by the court reporter.

- Please speak clearly and start your comments with your name and organization that you represent (if this is applicable).

- Please note that all oral comments are being transcribed by a court reporter and the transcripts will become part of the public and administrative record for the Programmatic EIS/OEIS.

- The audience is requested to please minimize movement and talking while others are making comments. If you need to leave the room, please take advantage of the time when we are changing speakers.

- Depending on the number of speakers, the public hearing moderator may ask that speakers move to a reserved seating area to minimize time between speakers. This will ensure that everyone has an opportunity to provide oral comments.

- Please avoid applause or open remarks during comments. This makes it difficult to hear the speaker and takes time away from that and subsequent speakers.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Public Hearing on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS:

Scripps Institution of Oceanography

La Jolla, CA – October 25, 2010

The San Diego Union-Tribune. SIGN ON SAN DIEGO enlace Classifieds

P.O. Box 120191, San Diego, CA 92112-0191

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

TEC, INC.
514 VIA DE LA VALLE, SUITE 308
ATTN: CLAUDIA TAN
SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075

STATE OF CALIFORNIA} ss.
County of San Diego}

The Undersigned, declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California: That she is a resident of the County of San Diego. That she is and at all times herein mentioned was a citizen of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years, and that she is not a party to, nor interested in the above entitled matter; that she is Chief Clerk for the publisher of

The San Diego Union-Tribune

a newspaper of general circulation , printed and published daily in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and which newspaper is published for the dissemination of local news and intelligence of a general character, and which newspaper at all the times herein mentioned had and still has a bona fide subscription list of paying subscribers, and which newspaper has been established, printed and published at regular intervals in the said City of San Diego, County of San Diego, for a period exceeding one year next preceding the date of publication of the notice hereinafter referred to, and which newspaper is not devoted to nor published for the interests, entertainment or instruction of a particular class, profession, trade, calling, race, or denomination, or any number of same; that the notice of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in said newspaper in accordance with the instructions of the person(s) requesting publication, and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

Oct 1, 2010

Chief Clerk for the Publisher

10/13/10

Date

Affidavit of Publication of

Legal Advertisement
Ad # 0010436117
ORDERED BY: CLAUDIA TAN

NOTICE

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces the notice of the availability of a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS) for marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS and requests public review and comment on the document. NSF also provides notice of public hearings on the Draft PEIS. The Draft PEIS assesses the potential impacts of marine seismic research on the human and natural environment. Under the Proposed Action, a variety of acoustic sources used for research activities funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS would be operated from various research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions or government agencies. The seismic acoustic sources would include various airgun configurations, as well as low-energy seismic and non-seismic acoustic sources. The Draft PEIS examines the potential impacts that may result from geophysical exploration and scientific research using seismic surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS in non-Arctic waters.

NSF will conduct public hearings to receive oral and written comments on the Draft PEIS. Federal, state, and local agencies and interested individuals are invited to be present or represented at the public hearings. The hearings will start with an open house session, followed by a presentation, and then the formal oral public comment period. The public hearings will be held on the following date and at the following locations:

- Monday, October 25, 2010, 5:00 - 7:00 p.m. at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University California-San Diego, Vaughn Hall, Room 100, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA.
- Wednesday, October 27, 2010, 5:00-7:00 p.m. at the National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 110, Arlington, VA.

The Draft PEIS is available on NSF's website at:

http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp. Electronic or printed copies of the Draft PEIS are also available upon request from: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 292-8583. Email: nepacomments@nsf.gov.

PUBLIC HEARING SIGN-IN SHEET

National Science Foundation (NSF) – U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
Marine Seismic Research Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Location: La Jolla, CA

Date: October 25, 2010

(CD or hardcopy)

Name	Mailing/E-mail Address (please print clearly)	I would like a copy of the Final EIS/OEIS
JIM FAHEY	JIM@CALIFORNIAKELPANDSCIENCE.COM	~~YES~~ NO
ROBT BARTO	SOLARBART@AOL.COM	NO
Jim Holik	NSF	NO
Nancy Lo	Nancy.Lo@NOAA.GOV	NO
Meagan Cummings	L-DEO/~~Meagan.C~~ Cummings@ldeo.columbia.edu	NO
Mark Lambert	mark_e_lambert@raytheon.com	No
Candace Nachman	Candace.Nachman@noaa.gov	NO
Adrian Hill	ah2427@columbia.edu	NO
Dave Goldberg	goldberg@ldeo.columbia.edu	No
Mike Purdy	mpurdy@ldeo.columbia.edu	NO
Bob WILSON		NO
Steve Holbrook	steveh@uwyo.edu	No

PUBLIC HEARING SIGN-IN SHEET

National Science Foundation (NSF) – U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
Marine Seismic Research Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Location: La Jolla, CA

Date: October 25, 2010

Name	Mailing/E-mail Address (please print clearly)	I would like a copy of the Final EIS/OEIS
GRAHAM KENT	gkent@unr.edu	HAVE ONE
MAIA TOLSTOY	mt2290@columbia.edu	NO
TIM SCHNOOR	TIM.SCHNOOR@NAVY.MIL	NO
BRUCE APPELGATE	tbse ucsd.edu	NO
JON ALBERTS	JON@UNOLS.ORG.	~~YES~~ NO
ALEXANDER SHOR	SHOR@HAWAII.EDU	YES online
WOODY SUTHERLAND	woodys@ucsd.edu	YES online
Nathan Bangs	nathan@ig.utexas.edu	No
[illegible]	hpdupres@aol.com	No

21

In The Matter Of:

National Science Foundation Public Hearing on the Draft P.E.I.S.

Public Hearing Proceedings
October 25, 2010

National Court Reporters Inc. 888.800.9656

Original File NSFFINAL.TXT

Min-U-Script®

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION (NSF)

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE

DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (PEIS)

FOR MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME I

(Pages 1 - 29, inclusive)

TAKEN ON: October 25, 2010

TAKEN AT: Scripps Institute of Oceanography
Vaughn Hall, Room 100,
Discovery Way
La Jolla, California

REPORTED BY: Katrina F. Burlason,
RPR, CSR No. 5898

APPEARANCES

RICK SPAULDING, PROJECT MANAGER
TEC, Inc.
6765 NE Day Road
Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110
206.855.4997
rlspaulding@tecinc.com

HOLLY SMITH, PROJECT MANAGER
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

I N D E X

OPENING STATEMENT FOR NSF:	PAGE 4
OPENING STATEMENT FOR TEC, INC.:	PAGE 7
(Recess for Viewing Posters and for Discussion)	
OVERVIEW OF EIS AND PROPOSED ACTION:	PAGE 9
(Recess)	
MODERATOR'S STATEMENT:	PAGE 24
PUBLIC COMMENTS:	
Prof. Mike Purdy	PAGE 27
MODERATOR'S CLOSING STATEMENT:	PAGE 29

LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA, MONDAY, OCTOBER 25, 2010

(Open house portion of the hearing began at 5:00 p.m., where discussions were held off the record and posters were on display.)

MS. SMITH: I guess we can get started.

I want to welcome everybody to the meeting tonight. I'm Holly Smith, in the Division of Ocean Sciences at the National Science Foundation. I currently serve as the project manager for the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, Overseas Environmental Impact Statement, commonly referred to as the Draft Programmatic EIS. So this is funded by NSF and USGS. We are very appreciative of your time for coming out here, and we look forward to hearing your comments.

This hearing is being held in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, and the regulations that are published by the Council on Environmental Quality. The purpose of this hearing is to receive public comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS. The USGS and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, are cooperating agencies in the preparation of the Programmatic EIS.

And before I go further, can everyone hear me okay?

Although during the open house/poster session you may have met many of the representatives from NSF, USGS, NOAA, and the contractors that assisted us in the preparation of the Draft Programmatic EIS, I would like the members of the EIS project team to introduce themselves and state their role in the process. I'll start over here.

Caroline?

MS. BLANCO: I'm Caroline Blanco. I'm an environmental attorney at National Science Foundation.

MR. SPAULDING: I'm Rick Spaulding. I'm the Project Manager for TEC; in other words, the manager for writing of the document.

MS. ENG: Hi. I'm Esther Eng, with the U.S. Geological Survey. I'm the chief of the Environmental Management Branch at headquarters.

MR. DEVINE: I'm Jim Devine, U.S. Geological Survey. I'm the senior proving officer for NEPA Processes.

MS. SMITH: Jon?

MR. CHILDS: Jon Childs, geophysicist. I'm a member of the U.S. Geological Survey, and I participated as a reviewer and expert witness, I guess.

MS. SMITH: Candace?

MS. NACHMAN: Hi. Candace Nachman, with NOAA Fisheries, back in Silver Spring, and we're a cooperating agency for marine mammals and sea turtle issues.

MS. SMITH: Anyone else?

MS. BROWNLOW: I'm Jackie Brownlow. I'm with TEC, and I'm assisting Rick with this hearing.

MS. SMITH: And --

MR. FRANKEL: I'm Adam Frankel. I'm an acoustic biologist with Marine Acoustics, Incorporated, and I helped prepare some of the EIS chapters.

MS. SMITH: And in the back of the room?

MS. TAN: I'm Claudia Tan. I'm with TEC, and I'm helping with the hearing process.

MS. GRAY: I'm Liza Gray. And I am also with TEC, and I'm assisting with the public hearing.

MS. SMITH: All right. Team members will remain here for the duration of the hearing, so please feel free to approach anyone from the EIS team if you would like to discuss the project.

The hearing will be conducted in three parts. First, after this brief introduction, Rick Spaulding, who works for TEC, will provide an overview of the format and guidelines for tonight's meeting. After his

overview, I will make a presentation on the purpose and need for the Programmatic EIS for NSF-USGS marine seismic research and will summarize the analytical approach taken. The third part of this hearing will be an opportunity to provide NSF and USGS with oral comments on the Draft Programmatic EIS and make statements for the record. The input that you provide will guide us in the Programmatic EIS process with valuable information about your concerns and questions about the Draft Programmatic EIS analysis so that we may address those concerns in preparation of the Final Programmatic EIS.

MR. SPAULDING: Thank you, Holly.

As Holly said, my name is Rick Spaulding. I'm the project manager for the contractor that is preparing the Draft and the Final Programmatic EIS, and I'll act as the sort of moderator or facilitator for the meeting tonight.

One of the things I want to sort of encourage is I'd ask you to keep in mind that this is a public hearing. It's not a debate. It's not a popularity vote on the analysis presented in the Draft Programmatic EIS, nor is it designed as a question-and-answer session, although legitimate clarifying questions as part of your comments may be asked and be recorded for clarification

in the Final Programmatic EIS.

This hearing is about the adequacy of the analysis presented in the Draft Programmatic EIS. Concerns about non-environmental issues should not be raised at this hearing. They will not add anything to the record and will simply take away from other speakers' times and opportunities to comment on the Draft Programmatic EIS.

When you came in, you should have been asked to fill out a speaker card if you're interested in presenting an oral comment tonight. If you have not filled out a card and you do wish to make a comment tonight, please fill out one now, and we will use those to call your name during the comment period.

Please keep in mind also that all of the proceedings, from when Holly began, are being recorded by a court reporter, and they'll become part of the official public record and they'll be included in the appendix of the Final EIS.

Should you choose to submit any comments in writing, this would be the appropriate time and place to do that. We have comment sheets outside on the table as you enter. You can leave your comments in the box in the back there with the cookies. It's to encourage you to come and look at the comments sheets, so that's why

we put the cookies there.

If you wish to comment in other ways on the Programmatic EIS, there are a number of ways you can do that. You can either provide written comments tonight -- As I have stated, you can provide written comments by mail or you can provide them via e-mail at a later date -- and the address we will show you later, but it's all in the materials -- or you can present them to the court reporter tonight as an oral comment. Written comments submitted by mail will be accepted until November 22nd, 2010, at the end of the 45-day comment period. All comments made at the hearing or provided in writing will be given equal consideration.

And at this time I would like to have Holly come back and give a brief presentation on the Programmatic EIS.

MS. SMITH: Thank you.

First, again I'd like to thank you all for coming to tonight's public hearing. As Rick mentioned, I'll provide a brief overview of the Draft Programmatic EIS, but further details on the information I will describe can be found in the actual document. After my presentation, formal comments can be provided as part of the formal public hearing process, as Rick just mentioned.

The preparation of this Programmatic EIS was initiated in 2005 with NSF as the lead agency and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service, or NMFS, as a cooperating agency because of their regulatory oversight. USGS joined the effort several years ago and is an official cooperating agency. Both NSF and USGS are action agencies, whereas NMFS is involved as a regulating agency.

NSF is an independent federal agency and was created in the 1950s to promote the progress of science. NSF funds approximately 20 percent of the federally supported basic research at U.S. colleges and universities. We receive approximately 40,000 proposals each year for research, education, and training projects, which are judged by a rigorous merit-review process. NSF awards approximately 11,000 grants annually, which is approximately a 27 percent proposal success rate. NSF's current budget is nearly $7 billion. NSF-funded researchers have made important contributions to science and have received a multitude of distinguished awards and honors; notably, more than 180 Nobel Prizes.

The USGS is a bureau within the Department of the Interior. It's a scientific federal agency with no

regulatory responsibility. It has the largest U.S. agency budget studying issues of water, earth, and biological sciences. USGS also has responsibility for all civilian mapping efforts. The USGS collects, monitors, analyzes, and provides scientific understanding about conditions, issues, and problems associated with natural resources, hazards, environments, and climate change.

The National Marine Fisheries Service is part of the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It's the lead federal agency responsible for the stewardship of the nation's offshore living marine resources and their habitat.

NMFS manages, conserves, and protects fish, whales, dolphins, sea turtles, and other living ocean creatures. NMFS's Office of Protected Resources works to conserve, protect, and recover species under the Endangered Species Act and Marine Mammal Protection Act.

The Draft Programmatic EIS examines the potential environmental impacts that may result from marine seismic research surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS.

The proposed action is for academic and U.S. government scientists to conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by academic institutions

and government agencies. The purpose of the proposed action, however, is to study the earth beneath the ocean using seismic data to reveal the underlying structure and stratigraphy of the sediments and deeper crust. This geologic information helps expand our understanding of the intricate Earth and atmospheric processes, which support the NSF and USGS missions, and benefits society.

As I just mentioned, the purpose is to increase the scientific understanding of the earth beneath the oceans. Data collected by seismic surveys have been used by scientists in a variety of ways, including hypothesizing, and subsequently demonstrating, the validity of the theory of plate tectonics.

Seismic surveys can be used to directly image the sea floor and subsurface features, such as submarine volcanoes, magma chambers, and mid-ocean ridges. Seismic data can provide images of ocean faults and subduction zones, which are key to improving our understanding of, and better planning for, natural hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, and tsunamis.

NSF's mission of funding basic research has a broader scientific scope than most mission agencies have. NSF-funded marine seismic research is driven by the scientific community -- scientists submit proposals on a wide range of geologic topics of interest for

funding consideration and, as previously mentioned, proposals are vetted through a peer-based, merit-review process.

As a result of the broader scientific scope, NSF-funded seismic surveys are globally ranging, spanning domestic, international, and foreign territorial waters. Typically surveys are conducted in water deeper than 1000 meters or are conducted along transects from shallow to deeper water. NSF funds approximately four to seven surveys per year, each lasting typically one to seven weeks.

The primary vessel used for high-energy surveys is the "R/V Marcus G. Langseth." The vessel is owned by NSF and operated under a Cooperative Agreement with Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. Other research vessels that are part of the U.S. academic fleet are sometimes used for NSF-funded low-energy surveys.

USGS mainly conducts low-energy surveys and are mostly within five nautical miles of the shoreline. They conduct approximately 8 to 12 surveys each year, each of one to three weeks' duration. Surveys typically are in water depths up to 1000 meters on the West Coast, 500 meters in the Gulf of Mexico, and 100 meters on the East Coast.

USGS also conducts one to two high-energy surveys per year, with potential for more frequent surveys in the future. Surveys could last up to a few weeks each and would likely be deep-water cruises conducted both inside and outside the 200-nautical-mile limit, the US EEZ boundary.

USGS Coastal and Marine Science objectives include: Mapping to define the outer limits of the U.S. extended continental shelf under Law of the Sea; understanding the dynamic offshore environment for slope failures, coastal erosion, faults, gas leaks, and other features, and researching marine aspects of global change and their impacts on society.

The Draft PEIS describes the different types of marine seismic surveys which may potentially be funded by NSF or conducted by USGS. The most common include two-dimensional and three-dimensional reflection and refraction surveys. Occasionally other types of surveys, such as four-dimensional, vertical seismic profiling, or surveys using ocean bottom cables are employed by researchers. The type of marine seismic survey that is conducted varies depending on the scientific objectives identified by the researchers.

As depicted in this graphic, for reflection surveys, seismic signals bounce off the sea floor and

discontinuities beneath the sea floor and are typically collected by a towed hydrophone streamer. For refraction surveys, seismic signals bend through the layers of the earth and travel near horizontally to recording instruments (ocean bottom seismometers) that are commonly stationary on the sea floor. Signals collected are then processed to construct an image or map of the Earth's internal structure. The draft PEIS includes further information on the types of surveys and equipment illustrated here as well as other types of equipment that are used during seismic surveys.

I mentioned earlier in my presentation "high energy surveys" and "low energy surveys." Seismic surveys were divided into these two categories in the Draft PEIS. The groupings were based on analysis of a variety of acoustic energy source types, such as GI or G-guns, and configuration scenarios that took into consideration source volume, tow depth, and airgun spacing -- factors that influence sound propagation.

In general, experiments using four airguns or less, boomers, sparker, water guns, or chirp systems are likely to fall into the low-energy classification. As I just noted, however, certain factors do influence sound propagation and, therefore, there are exceptions to this general rule of thumb. Appendix F of the Draft

Programmatic EIS provides further details about the various configurations and scenarios that meet the low-energy configuration parameters.

I'd like to now give a general overview of our approach to analysis. Some items I will just touch on briefly; however, I will discuss some items in slightly more detail in subsequent slides. Further details on all points, however, can be found in the Draft Programmatic EIS.

First, five sites were selected to be analyzed and modeled quantitatively. These were referred to as the Detailed Analysis Areas or DAAs. Eight additional areas were identified and were analyzed qualitatively and were not modeled. These were referred to in the Draft PEIS as QAAs, Qualitative Analysis Areas. DAAs and QAAs were selected both with the consideration of where future surveys are likely to occur and for representing a variety of Longhurst biomes -- marine areas that demonstrate similar ecological dynamics. Survey seasons and source levels and configurations were selected taking into consideration operational constraints, such as weather, and likely scientific goals.

For the DAAs, modeling was conducted to predict take estimates of marine mammals. The Draft

PEIS includes monitoring and mitigation to minimize and avoid potential effects of seismic operations on the marine environment, such as marine mammals and sea turtles.

The affected environment and environmental consequences of the proposed action were evaluated for the DAAs and QAAs. Impacts on the associated marine resources, including marine invertebrates, fish, sea turtles, sea birds, and marine mammals, were considered. Additionally, the impacts to socioeconomic and cultural resources, such as commercial fishing, recreational activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and archeological sites, such as shipwrecks, were identified and analyzed. The survey activities were then assessed to determine the cumulative impacts.

This slide illustrates where the five DAAs and eight QAAs are located around the globe and the Longhurst biomes they represent. The DAAs are highlighted with the red circles, and the QAAs, with the green. These sites and associated environments are described in detail in a Draft Programmatic EIS.

For a quantitative assessment of the potential impacts of each exemplary marine seismic survey at a DAA, the predicted (or modeled) seismic survey sound fields were integrated with the expected distribution of

marine animals at each site. An Airgun Array Source Model, or AASM, was used at each DAA to predict the amount of sound that would be projected in each direction from the proposed airgun configuration.

The Marine Operations Noise Model created by JASCO then incorporated the AASM information and used it to predict the received levels of airgun sound as a function of bearing, distance, and depth in the water column. This model takes into account the best available site-specific environmental information that would affect the propagation and attenuation of sound as it travels outward from the airgun array.

Finally, the Acoustic Integration Model, or AIM, developed by Marine Acoustics Inc. was applied to estimate the number of marine mammals of each species or species group that would potentially receive various amounts of sound energy, and develop "take" estimates. The model also took into account certain mitigation strategies identified in the Draft Programmatic EIS, such as shutdowns for species simulated entering the 180- and 190-dB isopleth Mitigation Zone and subsequent shutdown period.

The modeling used in the Draft Programmatic EIS incorporated the current NMFS "take" criterion for pulsed sounds. However, the Draft Programmatic EIS also

incorporated the criterion recommended by the Noise Criteria Group, identified by Southall, et al., in 2007, and is viewed to be a more scientifically based mitigation approach.

The Noise Criteria Group suggests that auditory effects should be measured using the Sound Exposure Level metric, or SEL, which is the total energy contained within a pulse. This is different than the existing NMFS guidance, which uses a metric of sound pressure, referred to as "RMS."

The Noise Criterion Group also recommended the use of M-weighting, which takes into account that marine mammals have different sensitivities to sound. M-weighting places greater emphasis on frequencies which a species is deemed to be more sensitive to and less emphasis on other frequencies. For example, baleen whales are believed to be more sensitive to low frequency sounds and less sensitive to higher frequency sounds. A model which uses M-weighting would take this sensitivity into consideration. Flat weighting does not take into consideration species or group-specific frequency sensitivities.

The Draft PEIS models calculated both M-weighting and flat-weighting approaches. As previously mentioned, the modeling software used in the

analysis also took into consideration site-specific environmental context such as bathymetry, sub-bottom conditions, and sound velocity profile -- conditions which influence sound propagation.

Mitigation and monitoring strategies were described in the Draft Programmatic EIS and include: During pre-cruise planning, considering such factors as to whether science objectives could be met with a smaller source level; and cruise timing, taking into consideration migratory patterns and periods of anticipated high species density; visual monitoring; Passive Acoustic Monitoring for high-energy surveys; establishing Mitigation Zones; and using mitigation strategies operations, such as airgun powerdowns and shutdowns.

The agencies considered a number of Action Alternatives. Some were considered but eliminated from further analysis; however, two were carried forward for analysis. The first is Alternative A and is considered in detail in the Draft PEIS. Under Alternative A, academic and U.S. Government scientists supported with funds from NSF or USGS would conduct marine seismic research using cruise-specific mitigation measures. Under this scenario, for expected take situations the Full Mitigation Zone (the 160 dB isopleth) and the

Mitigation Zone (the 180/190 dB isopleths) would be calculated for both high- and low-energy sources. However, for expected no-take situations, there would be a standard fixed 200-meter Full Mitigation Zone.

Action Alternative B is our preferred alternative. Under Alternative B, the academic and U.S. government scientists supported with funds from NSF or USGS would conduct marine seismic research using cruise-specific mitigation measures. However, for low-energy acoustic sources, generic mitigation measures would be employed.

In this scenario, expected no-take situations would remain the same as for Alternative A, with a standard, fixed 200-meter Full Mitigation Zone. For expected take situations, the Full Mitigation Zone for high- and low-energy sources would be modeled. The Mitigation Zone, the 180/190 dB isopleths, for high-energy sources would also be modeled. However, under Alternative B there would be a standard, fixed 100-meter Mitigation Zone for low-energy sources in water deeper than 100 meters.

In addition to the Action Alternatives, the No-Action Alternative was considered. In this situation, NSF would not fund, and USGS would not conduct, marine seismic research. Under this scenario,

NSF and USGS would not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action in support of agencies' missions. Geologic and geophysical data of great significance and societal benefit would not be collected, and a segment of our national academicians and would be unable to perform experiments and expand the knowledge base of Earth processes. Improvements to our knowledge and national preparedness of a variety of natural hazards would be foregone, as would be the potential prevention of societal harm resulting from them.

Direct and indirect affects of the proposed action are mainly a result of noise from the acoustic energy sources (such as airguns). Potential impacts to species are expected to be limited to short-term and localized behavioral disturbances (such as Level B harassment) and are not significant to populations. Although noise modeling results for the DAAs indicate that Level A injury impacts to marine mammals or threatened and endangered species may occur, additional mitigation measures would be added to the cruise parameters to reduce and eliminate Level A impacts or the potential for injury. In addition, the Draft Programmatic EIS modeling analysis overestimates Level A exposure because it does not account for characteristic avoidance behavior expected by some species.

The results of the cumulative impacts analysis indicate that there would not be any significant cumulative effects of the affected environment from the proposed NSF-funded or USGS-conducted marine seismic research. The monitoring and mitigation measures planned -- including pre-cruise planning efforts to reduce impacts, consideration of other regional activities which may influence the environment, and operational actions such as powerdowns and shutdowns of acoustic sources -- influence this conclusion.

When future surveys are identified, a site-specific environmental analysis will be developed. All future seismic surveys would be permitted according to the rules and regulations of the applicable agencies of U.S. federal, state, and foreign governments, including the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act and Endangered Species Act.

NSF will continue to consider incorporating new or improved technologies to enhance the existing mitigation and monitoring tools and equipment used during seismic surveys and reduce potential for impacts.

Similarly, NSF will continue to evaluate advances made to existing and alternative seismic energy sources which result in the reduction of potential environmental impacts, and meet the purpose and needs of

marine seismic research objectives, and will consider them for future use.

So that basically concludes my presentation. And I really want to thank, first of all, Scripps, for allowing us to meet here and for hosting this. I'd also like to thank you, our cooperating agencies, for all the help they've put into the project, especially Candace Nachman from NMFS and Carolyn Ruppel from USGS, who can't be here but who will be at the Arlington public hearing, and also, of course, John Diebold, who spent quite a bit of time working on this with us. So thank you very much.

I forgot to thank you all for coming, especially the MLSOC, whom I encourage highly this evening for coming out, and Woody also, for helping to make these arrangements, and Bruce, wherever he is.

Rick?

THE REPORTER: Could I have a moment, please?

(Recess taken.)

MR. SPAULDING: Thank you for your patience. We're ready to begin.

Thank you, Holly, for your presentation.

Before we begin the public comment period, I'd like to reiterate some of the guidelines we'll be using tonight. The guidelines were presented to you back when

you walked in, but I want to reiterate those.

This is the part of the process that gives you the opportunity to provide NSF and USGS with information and to make statements for the record. This input ensures that the decision-makers may benefit from your knowledge of the issues and proposed activities and your comments on the analysis. All of your comments, whether written or oral, will be responded to in the Final EIS and will be part of the public record.

Public officials that choose to speak will be given an opportunity to speak first, then members of the public will be called upon, in the order in which they were received, from the cards that have been handed in that indicate you wish to make a public comment.

Please speak only after I have recognized you, and address your remarks to me. Speak clearly, identifying yourself, stating your first name and your address and the capacity in which you wish to appear if you're representing anyone other than yourself. We need this to ensure that the court reporter gets an accurate record of what is said tonight.

Each person will be allowed three minutes to speak. This time limit applies to everyone: Public officials, spokespersons, and people representing themselves. You do not have to speak for the full three

minutes; however, if you choose to speak for the full three minutes, when you have only one minute remaining to speak, a yellow card will be raised, and when your time has expired, a red card will be raised.

Out of respect for others who would like to make comments, I ask that you please honor any request from me to stop speaking. If you think you have more comments than you can present in the time allotted, make the most appropriate comments first. If you do not get a chance to voice all of your comments, you can and should submit additional comments in writing at the end of this hearing. If you have a written comment or statement, you may simply hand it in or read it aloud within the time limit or do both. This hearing is scheduled to end at 7:00 p.m. If we have time, we may give you another three minutes to expand on your remarks or continue your remarks.

You may have noticed that the court reporter will record everything that is said tonight. The transcript of this proceeding will become a part of the hearing and will be included in the Final Programmatic EIS.

Finally, I would like to remind you to limit your comments to the analysis presented in the Draft Programmatic EIS. That is the purpose of this public

comment period. Also, I ask that you avoid repeating what another speaker has said. There is nothing inappropriate about agreeing with other speakers, but to repeat the same thing just delays others in making their comments. If you agree with a previous speaker on a particular issue, you may just state your agreement.

We will start with comments from public officials. Following their remarks, we will take oral comments -- although no one filled in any cards -- we will take them in the order in which we have received them. Again, I wish to remind you of the three-minute time limit on speaking.

As of now, we have no official cards submitted for anyone wishing to make an oral comment. Is there anybody that would wish to make a comment at this time that did not fill out a card?

Okay. Yes, sir.

PROF. PURDY: Do I have to fill out a card?

MR. SPAULDING: No. Please stand and state your name.

PROF. PURDY: My name is Mike Purdy. I'm a Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Columbia University. I am Director of the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, and as such I understand the imperative of accelerating our knowledge

of the processes that control the generation of earthquakes and other hazards to humankind and also to accelerate the rate at which we understand the forces that are causing our climate to change. History shows that a large percentage of all our knowledge on these issues is based on the use of sound, widely varying frequencies, especially in the oceanic regime, and as such, certainly researchers at Columbia University understand that we must continue to use sound in very judicious ways to help us understand the processes that control how the earth is evolving and the safety in hazardous zones for humankind.

I see the development of this Programmatic EIS as a very positive step forward in this regard. It will provide important guidance for the academic research community and allow us to balance the joint imperatives of advancing our knowledge and protecting all life in the oceans, which remains one of our key priorities. And I'd like to acknowledge and thank the cooperative nature of this effort between the cooperating agencies and acknowledge the hard work that's gone into it.

Thank you.

MR. SPAULDING: Thank you very much.

Anybody else wish to make a comment at this time? If not, we'll take a brief adjournment and you

can feel free to mingle around the posters, talk amongst yourselves, ask questions of the EIS representatives, and then we'll come back in, say, 10 minutes, and then I'll ask if anybody else would like to make a comment.

(Recess taken.)

MR. SPAULDING: Excuse me, may I have your attention?

Does anybody wish to make any comments at this time?

If not, I will -- We will stay open until 7:00 o'clock, and if anybody wishes to make a comment, please approach me, and we will convene and listen to your comment.

(Recess taken from 6:40 - 7:00 p.m.)

MR. SPAULDING: Thank you all for coming tonight. If you have any comments, please submit them as written comments. All comments will be addressed in the Final EIS.

I hearby call this meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

---o0o---

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
:
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO)

I, Katrina F. Burlason, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I reported stenographically the proceedings held in the foregoing matter on the 25th day of October, 2010; that my stenotype notes were later transcribed into typewriting under my direction, and the foregoing 29 pages contain a true and complete record of the proceedings had at said hearing.

Dated at San Diego, California, on the 11th day of November, 2010.

Katrina F. Burlason

Katrina F. Burlason
RPR, CSR No. 5898

Public Hearing on the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS:

Office of Marine Acoustics Inc. (MAI)

Arlington, VA – October 27, 2010

AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

AD# 14571075

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ss,
Personally appeared before me, CHIZUKO CARTER,
a Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia,

CARL S. JOHNSON, who is being duly sworn according to law, an oath says that he is an AUTHORIZED AGENT of THE WASHINGTON TIMES, L.L.C., publisher of

The Washington Times

Circulated daily, in the City of Washington, District of Columbia, and that the advertisement, of which the annexed is a true copy, was published in said newspaper 1 time(s) on the following dates:

2010 OCTOBER 26

at the rate of $ 2.91 per line

Total Cost $ 458.33 Dollars

Subscribed and sworn to before me

OCTOBER 26, 2010

Notary Public

Chizuko Carter
Notary Public, District of Columbia
My Commission Expires 7/31/2011

My Commission expires _____

The National Science Foundation (NSF) announces the notice of the availability of a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (Draft PEIS) for marine seismic research funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS and requests public review and comment on the document. NSF also provides notice of public hearings on the Draft PEIS. The Draft PEIS assesses the potential impacts of marine seismic research on the human and natural environment. Under the Proposed Action, a variety of acoustic sources used for research activities funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS would be operated from various research vessels operated by U.S. academic institutions or government agencies. The seismic acoustic sources would include various airgun configurations, as well as low-energy seismic and non-seismic acoustic sources. The Draft PEIS examines the potential impacts that may result from geophysical exploration and scientific research using seismic surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by the USGS in non-Arctic waters.

NSF will conduct a public hearing to receive oral and written comments on the Draft PEIS. Federal, state, and local agencies and interested individuals are invited to be present or represented at the public hearings. The hearings will start with an open house session, followed by a presentation, and then the formal oral public comment period. The public hearings will be held on the following date and at the following locations:

- Wednesday, October 27, 2010, 5:00-7:00 p.m. at the National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Room 110, Arlington, VA.
- Monday, October 25, 2010, 5:00 – 7:00 p.m. at Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University California-San Diego, Vaughn Hall, Room 100, Discovery Way, La Jolla, CA.

The Draft PEIS is available on NSF's website at; http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp. Electronic or printed copies of the Draft PEIS are also available upon request from: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230. Telephone: (703) 292-8583. Email: nepacomments@nsf.gov.

portion of this meeting, from 1 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. on December 2nd, will be open to the public for a policy discussion. The remainder of the meeting, from 9 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on December 1st and from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. to 5 p.m. on December 2nd, will be closed.

Literature (application review): December 3, 2010 in Room 730. This meeting, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., will be closed.

Arts Education (application review): December 6, 2010 in Room 730. This meeting, from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m., will be closed.

Museums (application review): December 6–8, 2010 in Room 716. This meeting, from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on December 6th, from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on December 7th, and from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. on December 8th, will be closed.

Theater (application review): December 7–10, 2010 in Room 714. A portion of this meeting, from 9 a.m. to 10 a.m. on December 9th, will be open to the public for a policy discussion. The remainder of the meeting, from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on December 7th, from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on December 8th, from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m. on December 9th, and from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. on December 10th, will be closed.

Media Arts (application review): December 8–10, 2010 in Room 730. This meeting, from 9 a.m. to 5:45 p.m. on December 8th, from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on December 9th, and from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. on December 10th, will be closed.

Opera (application review): December 9–10, 2010 in Room 716. This meeting, from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on December 9th and from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. on December 10th, will be closed.

Opera (application review): December 10, 2010 in Room 716. This meeting, from 3 p.m. to 3:45 p.m., will be closed.

Presenting (application review): December 14–16, 2010 in Room 714. This meeting, from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on December 14th and 15th and from 9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. on December 16th, will be closed.

The closed portions of meetings are for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendations on financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including information given in confidence to the agency. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman of November 10, 2009, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsection (c)(6) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Any person may observe meetings, or portions thereof, of advisory panels that are open to the public, and if time allows, may be permitted to participate in the panel's discussions at the discretion of the panel chairman. If you need any accommodations due to a disability, please contact the Office of AccessAbility, National Endowment for the Arts, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506, 202/682–5532, TDY–TDD 202/682–5496, at least seven (7) days prior to the meeting.

Further information with reference to these meetings can be obtained from Ms. Kathy Plowitz-Worden, Office of Guidelines & Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC, 20506, or call 202/682–5691.

Dated: November 8, 2010.

Kathy Plowitz-Worden,

Panel Coordinator, Panel Operations, National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 2010–28481 Filed 11–10–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7537–01–P

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Notice Regarding Changed Venue for Public Hearing On a Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS)

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice regarding changed venue for public hearing.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) held public hearings on the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/ Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation or Conducted by the US Geological Survey (PEIS) on October 25, 2010 in San Diego, CA and October 27, 2010 in Arlington, VA. The Arlington, VA public hearing location was originally planned to be held at the NSF building located at 4201 Wilson Blvd. Unfortunately, due to a fire in the NSF building on the afternoon of October 27, 2010, the public hearing location was moved to Marine Acoustics Inc., located at 4100 Fairfax Drive (a building two blocks from NSF). Signs were posted on the outside doors of the NSF building announcing the new hearing location, and a security guard stationed at the main NSF entrance outside the meeting room directed hearing attendees who were unaware of the NSF emergency to the new hearing venue. NSF apologizes for any confusion or inconvenience that may have resulted from the emergency situation which prompted the change in public hearing venue. Should you have any questions or concerns about the Public Hearing, or Draft PEIS, please contact Holly Smith, NSF, at 703–292–8583 or *nepacomments@nsf.gov*.

The presentation slides used by NSF at the public hearings are posted on the NSF Web site at: *http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp*. Please note, however, that if there is any perceived inconsistency between the presentation and the Draft PEIS, the language in the Draft PEIS controls. The public comment period will remain open until November 22, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For further information regarding the Draft PEIS contact: Holly Smith, National Science Foundation, Division of Ocean Sciences, 4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725, Arlington, VA 22230; telephone: (703) 292–8583; e-mail: *nepacomments@nsf.gov*.

Dated: November 8, 2010.

Suzanne H. Plimpton,

Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 2010–28450 Filed 11–10–10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2010–0352]

Notice of Public Meeting

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of NRC/DOE joint public meeting.

SUMMARY: The NRC and the DOE announce their intent to conduct a public meeting to discuss agency interactions and activities in accordance with each agency's responsibilities under Section 3116 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2005. The meeting date, time, and location are listed below:

Date: Monday, November 15, 2010.

Time: 7 p.m. to 10 p.m.

Location: The Aiken Municipal Building Conference Center, 215 The Alley, Aiken, SC 29801, Phone: 803–642–7654.

Draft Agenda:

7–7:10 Introductions and Opening Remarks.

7:10–8 NDAA Section 3116 Process.

8–9 NDAA Section 3116 Challenges and Accomplishments.

9–10 Opportunity for Public Questions and/or Comment.

Background

On October 9, 2004, the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization

PUBLIC HEARING SIGN-IN SHEET

National Science Foundation (NSF) – U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)
Marine Seismic Research Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS

Location: Arlington, VA

Date: October 27, 2010

Name	Mailing/E-mail Address (please print clearly)	I would like a copy of the Final EIS/OEIS
ROGER GENTRY	Rogergentry@comcast.net	+
BRUCE TACKETT	EXXON Mobil	YES
BILL LANG	Southmec@yahoo.com	yes
MEAGHAN CUMMINGS	cummings@LDEO.Columbia.edu	NO
HOWIE GOLDSTEIN	HOWARD.GOLDSTEIN@NOAA.GOV	YES
Jeannine Cody	jeannine.cody@noaa.gov	yes
Ben Laws	benjamin.laws@noaa.gov	yes
Jon Childs	jchilds@usgs.gov	no
Jennifer Dorton	dortonj@uncw.edu	
SUSAN BANAHAN	SBANAHAN@OCEANLEADERSHIP.ORG	NO, THANK YOU

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE

DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

FOR MARINE SEISMIC RESEARCH

4100 North Fairfax Drive

Suite 730

Arlington, Virginia

Wednesday, October 27, 2010

The hearing was convened, pursuant to notice, at 5:00 p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BLANCO: The public hearing on the draft programmatic environmental impact statement was originally to take place at the Headquarters of the National Science Foundation Building in Arlington, Virginia. Due to a fire in the early afternoon of October 27th, the building was closed and the meeting, the public hearing, had to be relocated.

The public hearing was relocated to the offices of Marine Acoustics, Inc., in Arlington, Virginia, less than two blocks away. Signage was posted at all entrances of the National Science Foundation Building entrances and an employee of the environmental contractor was posted there to address any questions raised by members of the public who intended to attend the public hearing at the National Science Foundation and to direct them in the right direction.

At the building of Marine Acoustics, Incorporated, signs were posted at all entrances and the guard was informed to direct members of the public to the proper location. Signs were posted at all elevators, on the ground floor and on the seventh floor, and signs were

posted all along the hallway to direct members of the public to the location of the hearing.

The hearing commenced on schedule at 5:00 p.m. and the open house took place.

Thank you.

(Recess from 5:24 p.m. to 5:38 p.m.)

MS. SMITH: I appreciate your patience with our situation today. The NSF Building had a transformer blow on the second floor of the parking garage about maybe 1:00, 1:15, 1:15, right after I sent an email out to some of our audience members. So we were evacuated from the building and we haven't been able to get back inside and there's no power.

Fortunately, MAI, about an hour before we thought we were going to cancel, allowed us to meet in their conference room. So we're very appreciative to MAI. Thank you very much for hosting tonight.

I also want to thank you all for coming. I know you have plenty of things to do.

This hearing's going to be in three parts: first, I'm just going to welcome you; and after I do that, Rick Spaulding from TEC is going to take over and describe

some of the format of the hearing. Then I am going to give a brief overview of our presentation -- brief presentation of the document, an overview.

Then, you members of the public and team are welcome to give public comments. They will be official and you will direct them to TEC and our Court Reporter, who will record them.

I should mention that this hearing is being held in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, and the regulations that are published by the Council on Environmental Quality.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive public comments on the draft programmatic EIS. The USGS and the National and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, are cooperating agencies on this effort.

You may have met some of us already, but we are going to introduce the members of the team right now. As I mentioned, I'm Holly Smith and I'm the project manager for NSF for this effort. I'm going to turn to the rest of the team.

MR. SPAULDING: My name is Rick Spaulding. I

work for TEC. I'm the project manager for the preparation of the EIS, the contractor project manager.

MR. FRANKEL: My name is Adam Frankel. I'm an acoustic biologist and I did some of the animal modeling for the EIS.

MS. BLANCO: I'm Caroline Blanco. I'm assistant general counsel in charge of environmental matters at NSF.

MR. HUNT: I'm Jim Hunt. We're the local office of TEC. Sarah Murray is here with us.

MS. MURRAY: Sarah Murray with TEC.

MR. CHILDS: I'm Jon Childs with the U.S. Geological Survey at Menlo Park, a reflection seismology geophysicist.

MS. ENG: Esther Eng with the Geological Survey, and I'm with the Environmental Management Branch.

MR. DEVINE: I'm James Devine, U.S. Geological Survey, and I'm the senior approving officer for the NEPA documents.

MS. RUPPEL: I'm Carolyn Ruppel. I'm a research geophysicist at the U.S. Geological Survey, and I along with Debbie Hutchinson were the primary technical people from the U.S. Geological Survey involved in the

preparation of our components of this EIS.

MS. NACHMAN: Candace Nachman from NOAA Fisheries, primary technical reviewer for fisheries.

MS. SMITH: I think that's it -- oh, so sorry.

MR. HOLMES: Topher Holmes, NOAA Fisheries, NEPA coordination with the EIS.

MR. SPAULDING: When you're speaking, whether now or when you're making comments, please speak up loudly so the court reporter can hear you and record everything. Thank you.

MS. SMITH: Caroline, anything else to add?

MS. BLANCO: No.

MS. SMITH: So, just so you know, the team members will remain here for the duration of the hearing, so until 7:00 p.m. So you're welcome to approach any of us, ask any questions if you like. However, formal questions or comments should be directed to TEC and the court reporter.

You're going to talk about the forms?

So thank you again.

MR. SPAULDING: Thank you, Holly.

As Holly said, my name is Rick Spaulding. I'm the project manager for this EIS, and I'm here to kind of introduce the format for the meeting before Holly gives a brief presentation on the proposed action. My role is to ensure that we have a fair, orderly, and impartial hearing and that all who wish to be heard have an opportunity to speak.

Throughout this hearing, I ask that you keep in mind that this public hearing is not a debate, nor is it a popularity vote on the analysis presented in the draft programmatic EIS, nor is it designed as a question and answer session, although legitimate clarifying questions as part of your comments may be asked and recorded for clarification in the final programmatic EIS.

This hearing is about the adequacy of the analysis presented in the draft programmatic EIS. Concerns about non-environmental issues should not be raised at this hearing. They will not add anything to the record and will simply take away from others' opportunity to comment on the draft programmatic EIS.

When you came in, you should have been presented or had the opportunity to fill out a speaker card. This

card you fill out, and then at the time of the oral comment period I will call them up in the order in which they were received. If you have not filled out a card and still do wish to make a public comment, an oral comment, you may do so at any time, and please step to the back and fill out a card, and you can stand up and make an oral comment later.

Should you wish to submit comments in writing, this would be the appropriate place. So if you want to comment on the draft programmatic EIS, but do not want to speak tonight, or if you do speak tonight but still want to make additional comments in writing, you may elect to provide written comments tonight. There are comment sheets in the back with a -- and here's the comment reception box (indicating).

You can provide comments by email or mail at a later date. At the end of the hearing, the addresses will be up. Some of your materials have the NEPAcomments@nsf.gov email address that you can send comments in to. We also have the mailing address if you wish to mail in comments. You can also present your comments orally to the court reporter if you wish to do

that.

It's important to remember that all your comments will be made part of the administrative record and will be addressed and responded to in the final EIS.

Written comments submitted by mail will be accepted until November 22, 2010, at the address shown in your hearing materials. All comments made at the hearing or provided in writing will be given equal consideration. So whether they're email, written, or oral, they'll all receive equal consideration.

Now, at this time I'd like to have Holly come back and do her presentation.

MS. SMITH: I'm shutting off my cellphone, so I'm going to ask everyone else, if you don't mind, to please shut off your cellphones.

Adam Frankel is just going to make an announcement about some logistics for this meeting space.

MR. FRANKEL: Again, thank you for coming to the impromptu location. If anyone needs, there are restrooms out the door. Just out that door, turn left. If you go out to the restroom, you need to come back around to the door you came back in, and just knock on the door or ring

the bell and someone will let you back in. That's all.

MS. SMITH: So I guess we'll begin the presentation.

(Screen.)

The preparation of this programmatic EIS was initiated in 2005, with NSF as the lead agency and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service, or NMFS, as the cooperating agency because of their regulatory oversight. And USGS joined the effort several years ago and is an official cooperating agency as well. Both NSF and USGS are action agencies, whereas NMFS is involved as a regulating agency.

Next slide.

(Screen.)

NSF is an independent federal agency and was created in 1950 "to promote the progress of science." NSF funds approximately 20 percent of the federally supported basic research at U.S. colleges and universities. We receive approximately 40,000 proposals each year for research, education, and training projects, which are judged by a rigorous merit review process. NSF awards approximately 11,000 grants annually, which is

approximately a 27 percent proposal success rate.

NSF's current annual building is $7 billion. NSF-funded researchers have made important contributions to science and have achieved a multitude of distinguished awards and honors, notably more than 180 Nobel Prizes.

(Screen.)

The USGS is a bureau within the U.S. Department of Interior. It is a scientific federal agency with no regulatory responsibility. It has the largest -- it is the largest U.S. agency studying issues of water, earth, and biological sciences. The USGS also has responsibility for all civilian mapping efforts.

The USGS collects, monitors, analyzes, and provides scientific understanding about conditions, issues, and problems associated with the natural resources, hazards, environments, and climate change.

(Screen.)

The National Marine Fisheries Service is part of the U.S. Department of Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It is the lead federal agency responsible for the stewardship of the nation's offshore living marine resources and their habitat. NMFS manages,

conserves, and protects fish, whales, dolphins, sea turtles, and other living ocean creatures. NMFS' Office of Protected Resources works to conserve, protect, and recover species under the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

The draft programmatic EIS examines the potential environmental impacts that may result from marine seismic research surveys that are funded by NSF or conducted by USGS.

The proposed action is for academic and U.S. government scientists to conduct marine seismic research from research vessels operated by academic institutions and government agencies.

The purpose of the proposed action, however, is to study the Earth beneath the ocean, using seismic data to reveal the underlying structure and stratigraphy of the sediments and deeper crust. This geologic information helps expand our understanding of intricate Earth processes and atmospheric processes, which support the NSF and USGS missions and benefit society.

(Screen.)

As I just mentioned, the purpose is to increase

scientific understanding of the Earth beneath the oceans.

Data collected by seismic surveys have been used by scientists in a variety of ways, including hypothesizing and subsequently demonstrating the validity of the theory of plate tectonics.

(Screen.)

Seismic surveys can be used to directly image the seafloor and sub-surface features, such as submarine volcanoes, magma chambers, and mid-ocean ridges.

(Screen.)

Seismic data can provide images of ocean faults and subduction zones, which are key to improving our understanding of and better planning for natural hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, and tsunamis.

(Screen.)

NSF's mission of funding basic research has a broader scientific scope than most research agencies have. NSF-funded marine seismic research is driven by the scientific community. Scientists submit proposals on a wide range of geologic topics of interest for funding consideration. And, as previously mentioned, proposals

are vetted through a peer-based, merit review process.

As a result of the broader scientific scope, NSF-funded seismic surveys are globally ranging, spanning domestic, international, and foreign territorial waters.

Typically, surveys are conducted in water deeper than 1,000 meters or are conducted along transects from shallow to deeper water.

NSF funds approximately four to seven surveys per year, each lasting one to seven weeks.

The primary vessel used for high-energy surveys is the R/V MARCUS G. LANGSETH. The vessel is owned by NSF and operated by Columbia University's Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory. Other research vessels that are part of the U.S. academic fleet are sometimes used for NSF-funded low-energy seismic surveys.

(Screen.)

USGS mainly conducts low-energy surveys and are mostly within five nautical miles of the shoreline. The conduct approximately 8 to 12 surveys per year, each of 1 to 3 weeks' duration. Surveys typically are in waters of up to 1,000 meters on the West Coast, 500 meters in the Gulf of Mexico, and 100 meters on the East Coast.

USGS also conducts one to two high-energy surveys per year, with potential for more frequent surveys in the near future.

Surveys could last up to a few weeks each and would likely be deepwater cruises conducted inside and outside the 200 nautical mile limit of the U.S. EEZ boundary.

USGS coastal and marine science objectives include: mapping to define the outer limits of the U.S. extended continental shelf under the Law of the Sea; understanding the dynamic offshore environment for slope failures, coastal erosion, faults, gas seeps, and other features; and researching marine aspects of global change and their impacts on society.

(Screen.)

The draft PEIS describes the different types of marine seismic surveys which may potentially be funded by NSF or conducted by USGS. The most common include two-dimensional and three-dimensional reflection and refraction surveys. Occasionally other types of surveys, such as four-dimensional, vertical seismic profiling, or surveys using ocean bottom cables, are employed by

researchers. The types of marine seismic surveys that are conducted vary depending on the science objectives identified by the researchers.

(Screen.)

As depicted in this graphic, for reflection surveys seismic signals bounce off the seafloor and discontinuities beneath the seafloor, and are typically collected by a towed hydrophone streamer. For refraction surveys, seismic signals bend through the layers of the Earth and travel near-horizontally to recording instruments, ocean bottom seismometers, that are commonly stationary on the seafloor.

Signals collected are then processed to construct an image or map of the Earth's internal structure.

The draft PEIS includes further information on the types of surveys and equipment illustrated here, as well as other types of equipment that are used during seismic surveys.

(Screen.)

I mentioned earlier in my presentation high-energy surveys and low-energy surveys. Seismic surveys

were divided into these two categories in the draft PEIS. The groupings were based on analysis of a variety of acoustic energy source types, such as GI or G-guns, and configuration scenarios that took into consideration source volume, tow depth, and airgun spacing, factors that influence sound propagation.

In general, experiments using four airguns or less, boomers, sparkers, or waterguns are likely to fall into the low-energy classification. As I just noted, however, certain factors do influence sound propagation and therefore there are exceptions to this general rule of thumb.

Appendix F of the draft programmatic EIS provides further details about the various configurations and scenarios that meet the low-energy categorization parameters.

(Screen.)

I'd now like to give a general overview of our approach to analysis. Some items I will touch on briefly. However, I will discuss some items in slightly more detail in subsequent slides. Further details on all points, however, can be found in the draft programmatic

EIS.

First, five sites were selected to be analyzed and modeled quantitatively. These are referred to as the detailed analysis areas, or DAAs. Eight additional areas were identified and were analyzed qualitatively and were not modeled. These are referred to in the draft programmatic EIS as qualitative analysis areas, or QAAs.

DAAs and QAAs were selected both with the consideration of where future surveys are likely to occur and for representing a wide variety of Longhurst biomes, marine areas that demonstrate similar ecological dynamics. Survey seasons and source levels and configurations were selected taking into consideration operational constraints, such as weather, and likely scientific goals. For the DAAs, modeling was conducted to predict take estimates of marine mammals.

The draft PEIS includes monitoring and mitigation to minimize and avoid potential effects of seismic operations on the marine environment, such as marine mammals and sea turtles.

The affected environment and environmental consequences of the proposed action were evaluated for the

DAAs and QAAs. Impacts on the associated marine resources, including marine invertebrates, fish, sea turtles, seabirds, and marine mammals, were considered.

Additionally, the impacts to socioeconomic and cultural resources, such as commercial fishing, recreational activities, subsistence hunting and fishing, and archaeological sites, such as shipwrecks, were identified and analyzed.

The survey activities were then assessed to determine the cumulative impacts.

(Screen.)

This slide illustrates where the five DAAs and QAAs are located around the globe and the Longhurst biomes that they represent. The DAAs are highlighted by the red circles and the QAAs with the green circles. These sites and associated environments are described in detail in the programmatic EIS.

(Screen.)

For a quantitative assessment of the potential impacts of each exemplary marine seismic survey at a DAA, the predicted or modeled seismic survey sound fields were integrated with the expected distribution of marine

mammals at each site. An Airgun Array Source Model, or AASM, was used at each DAA to predict the amount of sound that would be projected in each direction from the proposed airgun configuration.

The Marine Operations Noise Model created by JASCO then incorporated the AASM information and used it to predict the received levels of airgun sound as a function of bearing, distance, and depth in the water column. This model takes into consideration the best available site-specific environmental information that would affect the propagation and attenuation of sound as it travels outward from the airgun array.

Finally, the Acoustic Integration Model, or AIM, developed by Marine Acoustics Inc. was applied to estimate the number of marine mammals of each species or species group that would potentially receive various amounts of sound energy and develop take estimates. This model also took into account certain mitigation strategies identified in the draft programmatic EIS, such as shutdowns for species simulated entering the 180/190dB isopleth Mitigation Zone and subsequent shutdown period.

(Screen.)

The modeling used in the draft programmatic EIS incorporated the current NMFS "take" criterion for pulsed sounds. However, the draft programmatic EIS also incorporated the criterion recommended by the Noise Criteria Group, identified by Southall et al. in 2007, and is viewed to be a more scientifically based mitigation approach.

The Noise Criteria Group suggests that auditory effects should be measured using the sound explore level metric, or SEL, which is the total energy contained within a pulse. This is different than the existing NMFS guidance, which uses a metric of sound pressure referred to as "rms."

The Noise Criterion Group also recommended the use of M-weighting, which takes into account that marine mammals have different sensitivities to sound. M-Weighting places greater emphasis on frequencies which a species is deemed to be more sensitive to and less emphasis on other frequencies. For example, baleen whales are believed to be more sensitive to low-frequency sounds and less sensitive to higher-frequency sounds. A model which uses M-Weighting would take this sensitivity into

consideration.

Flat weighting does not take into consideration species or group-specific frequency sensitivities.

The draft PEIS models calculated both M-Weighting and flat weighting approaches. As previously mentioned, the modeling software used in the analysis also took into consideration site specific environmental context, such as bathymetry, sub-bottom conditions, and sound velocity profile, conditions which influence sound propagation.

(Screen.)

Monitoring and mitigation strategies were described in the draft programmatic EIS and include:

During pre-cruise planning, considering such factors as whether science objectives could be met with a smaller source level; and cruise timing, taking into consideration migratory patterns and periods of anticipated high species density;

Visual monitoring;

Passive Acoustic Monitoring for high-energy surveys;

Establishing mitigation zones;

And using mitigation strategies during operations, such as airgun powerdowns and shutdowns.

(Screen.)

The agencies considered a number of action alternatives. Some were considered but eliminated from further analysis. However, two were carried forward for analysis.

The first is Alternative A and is considered in detail in the draft programmatic EIS. Under Alternative A, academic and U.S. government scientists supported with funds from NSF or USGS would conduct marine seismic research using cruise-specific mitigation measures. Under this scenario, for expected take situations the full mitigation zone, the 160dB isopleth, and the mitigation zone, the 180-190dB isopleth, will be calculated for both high and low-energy sources. However, for expected no-take situations there would be a standard, fixed 200-meter full mitigation zone.

Action Alternative B is our preferred alternative. Under Alternative B, academic and U.S. government scientists supported with funds from NSF or USGS would conduct marine seismic research using cruise-

specific mitigation measures. However, for low-energy acoustic sources generic mitigation measures would be employed.

In this scenario, expected no-take situations would remain the same as for Alternative A, with a standard, fixed 200-meter full mitigation zone. For expected take situations, the full mitigation zone for high and low energy sources would be modeled. The mitigation zone, the 180/190dB isopleths, for high-energy sources would also be modeled. However, under Alternative B there would be a standard, fixed 100-meter mitigation zone for low-energy sources in water deeper than 100 meters.

In addition to the action alternatives, the no-action alternative was considered. In this situation, NSF would not fund and USGS would not conduct marine seismic research. Under this scenario, NSF and USGS would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action in support of the agencies' missions. Geologic and geophysical data of great significance and societal benefit would not be collected and a segment of our national academics would be unable to perform experiments

and expand the knowledge base of Earth processes. Improvements to our knowledge and national preparedness of a variety of natural hazards would be foregone, as would the potential prevention of societal harm resulting from them.

(Screen.)

Direct and indirect effects of the proposed action are mainly a result of the noise from the acoustic energy sources, such as airguns. Potential impacts to species are expected to be limited to short-term and localized behavioral disturbances, such as Level B Harassment, and are not significant to populations.

Although noise modeling results for the DAAs indicate that Level A injury impacts to marine mammals or threatened and endangered species may occur, for actual surveys additional mitigation measures would be added to technology cruise parameters to reduce and eliminate Level A impacts or the potential for injury.

In addition, the draft PEIS modeling analysis overestimates Level A exposure because it does not account for characteristic avoidance behavioral expected by some species.

The results of the cumulative impact analysis indicate that there would not be any significant cumulative effects to the affected environment from the proposed NSF-funded or USGS-conducted marine seismic research. The monitoring and mitigation measures planned, including pre-cruise planning efforts to reduce impact, consideration of other regional activities which may influence the environment and operational actions, such as powerdowns and shutdowns of acoustic sources, influence this conclusion.

When future surveys are identified, a site-specific environmental analysis will be developed. All future seismic surveys would be permitted according to the rules and regulations of the applicable U.S. federal, state, and foreign governments, including the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act.

NSF will continue to consider incorporating new or improved technologies to enhance the existing mitigation and monitoring tools and equipment used during seismic surveys and reduce potential for impacts.

Similarly, NSF will continue to evaluate advances made to existing and alternative seismic energy

sources which result in the reduction of potential environmental impacts and meet the purpose and needs of the marine seismic research objectives, and will consider them for future use.

(Screen.)

I want to thank you all for listening to the presentation. I'd like to thank MAI again for hosting us at this last-minute hour and for enabling us to proceed with this public hearing.

I'd also again like to thank Scripps for hosting the public hearing that was held on Monday at their campus. I'd also like to thank USGS for their wonderful contributions over the past several years, especially Carolyn Ruppel, who was able to join us this evening, as well as the USGS NEPA folks, and Jon Childs as well for his participation both at the San Diego-La Jolla public hearing and this one as well.

And NMFS; we can't forget NMFS, for their wonderful participation over the years. Many thanks to Candice Nachman and Topher Holmes and other members of the NMFS team who are actually present today and those that were unable to come today.

I'd also like to thank publicly John Diebold for his hard work over the years to push this through, and it's quite unfortunate he was not able to see this to its fruition. So again, many thanks to John and Lamont for their support.

So that concludes my presentation. I'm going to turn it back to Rick to begin the next portion of the public hearing.

MR. SPAULDING: Thank you, Holly.

As Holly said, this is now the beginning of the actual public comment period. This is part of the process that gives you the opportunity to provide NSF and USGS with information and to make statements for the record. This input ensures that the decisionmakers may benefit from your knowledge of the issues and proposed activities and your comments on the analysis.

Public officials that choose to speak will be given an opportunity to speak first. Then members of the public will be called upon in the order that they are received from the cards that have been handed in to indicate your desire to speak. Please speak only after I have recognized you and please address your remarks to me.

Please speak clearly, state your first name, your address, and your capacity in which you appear if you are representing anyone other than yourself. State your affiliation if that is appropriate. We need this to ensure that the court reporter gets an accurate record of what is said tonight.

Keep in mind that all comments, whether written or oral or emails, will be addressed in the final EIS and that all responses will be provided in the EIS as an appendix.

Each person will be allowed three minutes to speak. This time limit applies to everyone -- public officials, spokespersons, and individuals speaking for themselves. You do not have to speak for the full three minutes. However, if you choose to speak for the full three minutes, when you have one minute remaining a yellow card will be shown. This means you have two minutes left -- you have one minute left. Then when your time has expired, a red card will be shown.

Out of respect for others who would like to make comments, I ask that you please honor any request to stop speaking. If you think you have more comments than you

can present in the time allotted, make the most important comments first. If you do not get a chance to voice all of your comments, you can either submit them in writing, submit them by email, or, if you have a written statement, you can add that to the written comments after your presentation.

This hearing is scheduled to end at 7:00 p.m. If we have time, we may give you another three minutes opportunity to expand on your remarks later after all others have been heard.

You may have noticed that the court reporter records everything that is said tonight. The transcript of these proceedings will become part of the public record of the hearing and be included in the final programmatic EIS.

Finally, I would like to remind you to limit your comments to the analysis presented in the draft programmatic EIS. That is the purpose of this public comment period. Also, I ask you to avoid repeating what other speakers have said. There is nothing inappropriate about agreeing with other speakers, but to repeat the same thing just takes away from the ability for other speakers

to speak.

We will start with comments from public officials. Following their remarks, we will take oral comments from those of you who have filled in cards in the order in which they were received.

Again, I wish to remind you of the three-minute limit on speaking.

I'd now like to begin the oral comment period. We have no signed, filled-in cards as of yet. Does anybody wish to make an oral comment at this time? I want to encourage you, whether it's a pro, con -- any comment at all, even in support of the process is valuable for the public record and for the entire analysis.

So, would anybody like to make an oral statement or comment at this time?

(No response.)

MS. SMITH: Again, I'd like to just insert and just welcome anyone to make a comment. If it goes on too long, I'll break in. But I don't think we need to worry too much about that. So I'd just like to welcome some people to go ahead and speak if they're moved. Go ahead, even if you haven't filled out the card. It's fine. So

anyone is welcome. Feel free. Raise a hand.

Otherwise, you're welcome to start milling around. Feel free to look at the posters further. You can go ahead and ask any members of the team some questions, informal questions. But we will remain here for the full time of the hearing, which goes until 7:00. But you're not required to stay for it, but the team members will be here for it.

MR. SPAULDING: We'll remain, and if during this time you wish to make a comment, just approach one of us and we will sort of take a pause and have you make your comment so the court reporter can record it. But otherwise, feel free to mill around, ask questions, fill out a comment sheet, drink some water, eat some cookies.

Thank you.

(Recess from 6:46 p.m. to 6:47 p.m.)

MR. SPAULDING: Excuse me. We have a member of the public who wishes to make an oral comment.

MS. BANAHAN: It'll be brief.

MR. SPAULDING: If you would state your name and affiliation.

MS. BANAHAN: Susan Banahan, with the Consortium

for Ocean Leadership. The comment I just wanted to make was I did look through the draft PEIS. I thought it was a very comprehensive treatment. I thought it addressed actually all the questions, first order questions I would have about seismic research in the proposed areas. So job well done.

That's it. Thank you.

MR. SPAULDING: Thank you, Sue.

Does anybody else have any comment at this time?

(Pause.)

MR. GENTRY: I do have a comment, but I'll write it down.

MR. SPAULDING: Yes, written comments are fine, and the address and the various ways you may submit comments are up on the board right now, mail, email, oral, or written.

Thank you.

(Recess from 6:47 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.)

MR. SPAULDING: I would like to thank everyone who came tonight for attending this public hearing for the draft programmatic EIS. It is now 7:00 o'clock. I officially adjourn this hearing. Thank you again.

(Whereupon, at 7:00 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) ss.:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA)

I, **MARK T. EGAN,** the officer before whom the foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby certify that the witness whose testimony appears in the foregoing deposition was duly sworn by me; that the testimony of said witness was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Mark T. Egan

Notary Public in and for

the Commonwealth of Virginia

APPENDIX J:

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE OCTOBER 2010 DRAFT PROGRAMMATIC EIS/OEIS

COMMENT RESPONSE MATRIX
Public Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS for NSF-Funded and USGS-Conducted Marine Seismic Research
(Comment Period: October 8 – November 22, 2010)

JEAN PUBLIC, WHITEHOUSE STATION, NJ (OCTOBER 8, 2010)

Comment	*NSF Response*
i object to and oppose this action for seismic surveys. i do not beliee in drilling in arctic areas. i do not believe there is adequate ways to stop spills and do not believe america should be poolluting this area like bp was allowed to pollute the gulf of mexico courtesy of nsf.	*Thank you for your comments. Please note that the proposed action would involve marine seismic research funded by NSF and conducted by the USGS and not drilling or exploring for oil and gas. In addition, the Draft Programmatic EIS/OEIS does not include activities within Arctic waters (refer to Section 1.7 of the Final PEIS). The Department of the Interior's Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, not NSF or USGS, is the agency responsible for permitting offshore oil and gas activities in U.S. waters, such as BP's exploratory well in the Gulf of Mexico. The proposed action described in this PEIS is for marine seismic research to understand geologic features on the seafloor, not to explore for oil and gas resources in the oceans (refer to Section 1.3 of the Final PEIS).*
ea should not be permitted. any project like this should be done via eis. this is a way to sneak past nepa regulations used by sneaky agencies that attempt to use a cheap, poorly constructed ea. ea's need to be banned since they are incomplete and laszy and cheap ways to evaluate the effect on the environment. the american public wants an eis. nsf is trying to sneak something through without adeqaute evaluation.	*The environmental compliance document prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for proposed marine seismic research funded by NSF and conducted by USGS is a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) and not an Environmental Assessment (EA) (Refer to Chapter 1, introductory paragraph 1, of the Final PEIS).*
if nsf did 7years and 3l ea's they sure were busy sneaking through inadequate investigation. there is much damage done by siesmic surveys. america is sick of pollution. this agency is attempting to sneak another one through. i do not approve of this proporsal. it is lazy, it is cheap. it allows pollution and harm and amage to the environmetn to happen.	*As stated above, the environmental compliance document prepared under NEPA for proposed marine seismic research funded by NSF and conducted by USGS is a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (EIS/OEIS) and not an Environmental Assessment (EA) (Refer to Chapter 1, introductory paragraph 1, of the Final PEIS). The previous EAs were prepared in accordance with the NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA. Those documents completely and adequately described the proposed action, a range of alternatives, and the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts on the human environment (refer to Section 1.4 of the Final PEIS).*

CENTER FOR REGULATORY EFFECTIVENESS (CRE), WASHINGTON, DC (NOVEMBER 16, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
The proprietary acoustic models used in the draft PEIS/OEIS lack practical utility and do not meet Information Quality Act ("IQA") Guidelines. They are accurate, if at all, only when modeling an SEL metric, and all U.S. agencies including NMFS regulate seismic on an rms SPL metric. They do not regulate seismic on SEL. Moreover, the draft PEIS/OEIS' proposed applications of these models have not been validated in accordance with EPA's Council for Regulatory Environmental Modeling Guidelines. The CREM guidance reflects Information Quality Act standards. The models also violate IQA Guidelines because NMFS has not produced "especially rigorous robustness checks" for the proprietary models. The draft PEIS/OEIS acoustic models are intended to help NSF meet current seismic regulatory requirements. They are useless for this purpose because they cannot accurately model compliance with current federal regulatory requirements, which are based on an rms SPL sound metric. Consequently, these models and the draft PEIS/OEIS advocating them violate the practical utility requirement of NSF's Information Quality Act guidelines. These guidelines define "practical utility" as involving "the usefulness of the information to its intended users." The draft PEIS/OEIS models lack practical utility because they are useless for their intended regulatory purpose.	*The acoustic modeling and associated results are provided in both rms SPL and SEL, and the PEIS does provide impact analyses based on the rms SPL metric. Therefore, the models and information provided in the draft PEIS/OEIS are useful and appropriate for assessing impacts and implementing regulatory requirements as related to marine mammals. NSF and USGS closely consulted with NMFS, the regulatory agency charged with technical expertise on underwater acoustic impacts to marine mammals, on the appropriate model. After meeting with its acoustics expert, NMFS viewed the NSF/USGS modeling approach as appropriate. NMFS, NSF and USGS believe that the models can be accurate on a SEL metric. The models used in the PEIS were reviewed by NMFS' acoustics expert. This individual made recommendations and comments on the acoustic information and components of the document. These comments were reviewed by NSF and USGS and incorporated into the PEIS as appropriate. Modeling portions of the draft PEIS were reviewed by an expert identified by NSF and USGS. The expert, Dr. John Diebold of Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, provided advice and guidance on these portions of the document. Reviews of the modeling portions of the document were conducted by the lead and cooperating agencies and noted acoustic experts throughout the development of the document. Moreover, no further peer review was deemed necessary to support the NEPA analysis.*
These models, and an SEL metric, are not necessary to protect sea life. In 2010, NMFS issued USGS a MMPA authorization that does not use these models or an SEL metric. NMFS explained that "NMFS believes that the planned monitoring program will be sufficient to visually detect, with reasonable certainty, most marine mammals within or entering identified EZs [exclusion zones]. This monitoring, along with the required mitigation measures, will help ensure the authorized taking effects the least practicable adverse impact on the affected species or stocks and-will-have-a-negligible impact-on the affected species or stocks. Until proven technological -advances are made, nighttime mitigation measures during operations include combinations of the use of PSVOs and night vision devices (NVDs)." If NMFS wishes to change its regulation of offshore seismic to an SEL metric, then NMFS should propose this change in the context of its ongoing acoustic criteria proceeding. The USGS has explained: "NMFS is proposing to replace current Level A and B harassment criteria with guidelines based on exposure characteristics that are specific to particular groups of mammal species and to particular sound types (NMFS 2005). Recently, a committee of specialists on noise impact issues has proposed new science-based impact criteria (Southall et al. 2007). Thus, for projects subject to U.S. jurisdiction, changes in procedures may be required in the near future." The referenced NMFS proceeding "(NMFS 2005)" is the proper process for proposing	*The Draft PEIS presents acoustic impact analyses based on both rms SPL and SEL metrics (refer to Section 2.3.2 of the Final PEIS). While both metrics are used to describe potential impacts to marine mammals from acoustic sources, as is current NMFS policy, only the rms SPL metric is used to estimate potential levels of take and to describe mitigation measures. The discussion of the recommendations of the Noise Criteria Group (Southall et al. 2007) is provided in Section 2.3.2.3 of the Final PEIS. It essentially reiterates what was stated in the referenced USGS IHA application. NMFS has not yet proposed changes to the acoustic criteria but potential changes are possible in the future. NOAA is currently developing acoustic guidelines for assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on marine mammal species under its jurisdiction. The guidelines will provide past acoustic criteria, as well as updated procedures for assessing acoustic effects based on recent advances in science. NOAA is working toward numerical criteria where appropriate and possible, while general analytical paradigms will be used in other cases (i.e., for instances where context- or environmental-specific factors reduce or eliminate the relevance of broadly applicable numerical criteria). The guidelines will also include an approach for updating acoustic criteria and policy guidance. The process to finalize the guidelines includes the following steps: (1) NOAA internal review; (2) external peer review; (3) public comment; and (4) finalize and release of guidelines. NOAA is currently still conducting step 1 of this process.*

CENTER FOR REGULATORY EFFECTIVENESS (CRE), WASHINGTON, DC (NOVEMBER 16, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
these dramatic changes. These changes would affect several different agencies *(e.g.,* USGS and the bureau of Ocean Energy Management), and many stakeholders *(e.g.,* scientific researchers, the Navy, oil and gas exploration, shipping, indigenous communities and NGOs). NMFS should be express, direct and transparent if it intends to make these changes.	
In addition, NMFS should comply with all applicable laws, including its Information Quality Act guidelines, if NMFS wants to change its regulation of sound in the oceans.	*NMFS will comply with all applicable laws, including the Information Quality Act for producing its updated acoustic guidelines. These will not be issued as regulations.*
This acoustic modeling scheme has no practical utility because it cannot be used to demonstrate compliance with NMFS' and other agencies' regulation of seismic effects on marine mammals. This regulatory uselessness results from the models' inability to accurately predict rms SPL sound levels, which are the current federal regulatory metric.	*The models in the PEIS are used to estimate marine mammal take estimates at the Level A & B harassment isopleths regulated by NMFS and are presented in SEL and rms SPL metrics. NMFS, NSF and USGS believe that the models can be accurate on a SEL metric. The impact analyses discussed in the PEIS are based on the best available science. The PEIS presents take estimates in both SEL and SPL metrics, allowing for estimates to be predicted based on NMFS' current use of an rms SPL metric for implementing mitigation measures.*
There are other Information Quality Act problems with these models. They are proprietary, and NSF's IQA guidelines state that when "estimates and projections included in NSF information products are not directly reproducible by the public because the underlying data sets used to produce them are either confidential or proprietary ... NSF will apply rigorous robustness checks and document what checks were undertaken." NMFS' IQA guidelines impose a similar requirement of especially rigorous robustness checks. Where are NMFS' and NSF's documentation of their "rigorous robustness checks" on the proprietary models used in the draft PEIS/OEIS? We have found none in the record.	*The PEIS was reviewed by NMFS' acoustics expert. This individual made recommendations and comments on the acoustic information and components of the document. These comments were reviewed by NSF and USGS and incorporated into the PEIS as appropriate. Modeling portions of the draft PEIS were reviewed by an expert identified by NSF and USGS. The expert, Dr. John Diebold of Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, provided advice and guidance on these portions of the document. Reviews of the modeling portions of the document were conducted by the lead and cooperating agencies and noted acoustic experts throughout the development of the document. The comments provided by these individuals are part of the complete Administrative Record for this PEIS.*
NMFS previously had the AIM model peer reviewed. The resulting AIM Peer review report states in part as follows: "The three terms of reference required that the Panel evaluate whether AIM correctly implements the models and data upon which it is based; whether animal movements are adequately simulated; and whether AIM meets the Council for Regulatory Monitoring (CREM) guidelines for model development and evaluation. The Panel agreed that AIM appears to be correctly implemented. However, all panelists had recommendations for further testing to be undertaken. They also agreed that animal movement appears to be appropriately modelled within AIM given the inadequacies of --the available data. With regard to whether AIM satisfies the CREM guidelines there was some diversity of opinion. This is understandable given that the CREM guidelines are not *directly*	*The PEIS was reviewed by NMFS' acoustics expert. This individual made recommendations and comments on the acoustic information and components of the document. These comments were reviewed by NSF and USGS and incorporated into the PEIS as appropriate. Modeling portions of the draft PEIS were reviewed by an expert identified by NSF and USGS. The expert, Dr. John Diebold of Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, provided advice and guidance on these portions of the document. Reviews of the modeling portions of the document were conducted by the lead and cooperating agencies and noted acoustic experts throughout the development of the document.*

CENTER FOR REGULATORY EFFECTIVENESS (CRE), WASHINGTON, DC (NOVEMBER 16, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
applicable to AIM since it is not an application model (but a. tool for developing such models). One of the requirements of the CREM guidelines is for the "model" to have undergone "adequate" peer review. The panelists were split on this question. NMFS clearly thought that an independent peer review was required and hence they initiated this review. The Panel have now reviewed AIM (in what appears to be the first independent peer review), but it is not for them to judge whether their review was an "adequate peer review". The Panel did agree that the principles of credible science had been addressed during the development of AIM. They agreed that AIM is a useful and credible tool for developing application models. The need for expertise in the use of AIM was noted (e.g., in the choice of transmission loss model); as was the absence of appropriate uncertainty and sensitivity tests in the current applications of AIM. It follows, that the Panel agree that the use of AIM can lead to models which will meet the CREM guidelines. However, such models, at this stage, would need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis (i.e., merely using AIM is not sufficient; it must be used appropriately for the specific application)." In other words, the AIM peer review report requires that NSF peer review the proposed specific applications of AIM and the two JASCO models, and the conjunctive use of these models in each application, in order to determine whether they meet the CREM guidelines. We have not found this peer review in the draft PEIS/OEIS record or anywhere else.	
The draft PEIS/OEIS should be revised to delete any use of the JASCO/MONM/AIM models to determine compliance with a regulation based on an rms SPL metric.	*The acoustic modeling and associated results are provided in both rms SPL and SEL, and the PEIS does provide impact analyses based on the rms SPL metric. NMFS, NSF and USGS believe that the models can be accurate on a SEL metric.*
If NMFS wants to change from an rms SPL metric to a SEL regulatory metric, then NMFS should continue with its 2005 proceeding or institute another proceeding which transparently announces and addresses the scope of such a major regulatory change, and which solicits the participation of all stakeholders in federal regulation of ocean sound.	*The Draft PEIS presents acoustic impact analyses based on both rms SPL and SEL metrics. The discussion of the recommendations of the Noise Criteria Group (i.e., Southall et al. [2007]) is provided in Section 2.3.2.3 of the Draft PEIS. It essentially reiterates what was stated in the referenced USGS IHA application. NMFS has not yet proposed changes to the acoustic criteria but potential changes are possible in the future. NOAA is currently developing acoustic guidelines for assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on marine mammals under its jurisdiction. The guidelines will provide past acoustic criteria, as well as updated procedures for assessing acoustic effects based on recent advances in science. NOAA is working toward numerical criteria where appropriate and possible, while general analytical paradigms will be used in other cases (i.e., for instances where context- or environmental-specific factors reduce or eliminate the relevance of broadly applicable numerical criteria). The guidelines will also*

CENTER FOR REGULATORY EFFECTIVENESS (CRE), WASHINGTON, DC (NOVEMBER 16, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
	include an approach for updating acoustic criteria and policy guidance. It is not intended to be a regulatory change but rather national guidelines. The process to finalize the guidelines includes the following steps: (1) NOAA internal review; (2) external peer review; (3) public comment; and (4) finalize and release of guidelines. NOAA is currently still conducting step 1 of this process.
Each application of any and all acoustic models used by the federal government should be externally peer reviewed to determine their compliance with the CREM guidelines.	*The CREM guidelines are EPA guidelines and are not legally binding or required for other federal agencies. In addition, within the 2009 CREM guidelines, EPA includes a disclaimer stating: "This document provides guidance to those who develop, evaluate, and apply environmental models. It does not impose legally binding requirements; depending on the circumstances, it may not apply to a particular situation." NSF does not require peer review of models and their application is required for NEPA documentation. Further, the IQA peer review requirements are triggered by dissemination of "influential scientific information" which is defined to include scientific information that will have a "clear and substantial impact on important public policies or private sector decisions." Given the nature of the PEIS and acknowledgment that future cruise-specific surveys will be reviewed and analyzed, the PEIS alone will not impact important public polices and thus does not amount to a dissemination of influential scientific information. This reaffirms the conclusion that external review of the models and their application is not necessary. Although NSF came to this conclusion, the PEIS was reviewed by NMFS' acoustics expert. This individual made recommendations and comments on the acoustic information and components of the document. These comments were reviewed by NSF and USGS and were incorporated into the PEIS as appropriate. Modeling portions of the Draft PEIS were reviewed by an expert identified by NSF and USGS. The expert, Dr. John Diebold of Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, provided advice and guidance on these portions of the document. Reviews of the modeling portions of the document were conducted by the participating agencies and noted acoustic experts throughout the development of the document.*
There should be an easily accessible record demonstrating that any and all proprietary acoustic models used by NSF and NMFS meet the requirements of NSF's IQA guidelines.	*The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) allows each agency the discretion of selecting an appropriate peer review method for disseminating "influential" information. As noted in the response above, NSF believes the PEIS alone will not impact important public polices and thus does not amount to a dissemination of influential scientific information and external peer review is therefore not necessary. Although the models used to determine the effects of anthropogenic noise on marine organism were proprietary, the model validation and results were published in peer-reviewed journals and used in reports and EISs of other agencies. Records of peer-reviewed journals that examined the Marine Acoustics Inc. (MAI) Acoustic Integration Model© (AIM) and the JASCO's Marine Operations Noise Model (MONM) can be found in Appendix B of the PEIS. In addition, an independent assessment of AIM was initiated by NMFS in September 2006 and can be accessed at http://www.marineacoustics.com/AIM.htm.*

W. STEVEN HOLBROOK, PROFESSOR OF GEOPHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING ON BEHALF OF THE MARCUS LANGSETH SCIENCE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (MLSOC) (NOVEMBER 18, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
Appended below are comments on the draft PEIS for marine seismic work, submitted on behalf of the Marcus Langseth Science Oversight Committee (MLSOC). MLSOC strongly supports adoption of the draft PEIS. W. Steven Holbrook, MLSOC member Professor of Geophysics, University of Wyoming The R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* is a national facility with unique capabilities to seismically image the solid Earth beneath the oceans. The Marcus Langseth Science Oversight Committee (MLSOC), which oversees the facility on behalf of the Earth science community, endorses the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement drafted by NSF and USGS. The rationale for this support, which is detailed below, stems from our recognition that marine seismic data provide an indispensable means of imaging many Earth processes that directly impact human societies. Numerous key geological processes occur in the solid Earth beneath the oceans: • Many of the world's most threatening geological hazards, such as devastating earthquakes and tsunami, occur beneath the oceans. Eight-five percent of global earthquake energy is released beneath the seas. • Ocean sediments contain the longest and most continuous record of Earth's geological and climate history available. • 80% of the world's population lives at or near the coast, and they influence, and are affected by, marine geological processes. • Most of the world's petroleum resources are hosted in marine sediments. In order to peer beneath the blue ocean, which covers 70% of the planet's surface, research vessels equipped with specialized seismic gear (including, but not limited to, the R/V Langseth) are required. Without these capabilities, Earth scientists would be "blind" to many of the processes that govern Earth's climate, tectonics, environment, and hazards. Moreover, marine seismic imaging undergirds many U.S. and international science initiatives, including: (1) IODP, the Integrated Ocean Drilling Program; (2) GeoPRISMS (the MARGINS successor program); (3) R2K (the RIDGE 2000 initiative); (4) Continental Dynamics; (5) the Ocean Bottom Seismometer Instrument Pool; and (6) IRIS/PASSCAL. Formal adoption of Action Alternative B will streamline planning and permitting important scientific work while retaining stringent guidelines for compliance with all relevant federal environmental statutes.	*Thank you for your comments. No responsive changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comments.*

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE (API), INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GEOPHYSICAL CONTRACTORS (IAGC), NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (NOIA), AND U.S. OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION (USOGA) (NOVEMBER 22, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
Overall Approach and Methodology We commend NSF for undertaking the development of this comprehensive DPEIS. The scientific description of the environment and potential effects to the environment, the overall methodology and acoustic modeling are excellent. The level of scientific detail and analysis for acoustic impacts on marine mammals is exceptional. This DPEIS represents a good synthesis of the best available science presented in an objective and scientifically professional manner. We support the general approach and methodology, such as the use of representative areas and acoustic modeling, utilized in the DPEIS and recommend that other US government agencies consider a similar approach when preparing programmatic environmental impact statements (PEIS) for commercial geophysical surveys. However, we have some concerns which we expand upon in the following points.	*Thank you for your comment. No responsive changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comment.*
Regulatory and Policy As mentioned previously, we strongly support NSF's decision to prepare a PEIS for its planned global marine seismic research operations. In the DPEIS (pages ES-3 and 1-4), the stated purpose is to address cumulative effects and to reduce duplication of effort in preparing environmental documentation. As stated, the PEIS should replace the duplicative EAs which have been used previously to analyze the effects of individual marine seismic research surveys. The comprehensive analysis in the PEIS more than adequately evaluates the potential individual and cumulative effects of proposed marine seismic research cruises. We encourage NSF to use this PEIS as the NEPA document for all upcoming marine seismic operations until additional relevant data is available which might prompt a need for a project specific EA or supplemental environmental assessment. Additional EAs should only be necessary if the proposed action or geographic area is significantly different from what is described in the DPEIS or if significant new scientific information becomes available.	*As future marine seismic cruises are proposed, the appropriate environmental compliance documents will be prepared for all such activities. It is expected that future surveys proposed by NSF or USGS would be covered by or tiered from the current PEIS, depending on the specifics of the proposed research and survey area. Future projects that are not covered by the analysis contained in the PEIS will likely require additional NEPA. However, those NEPA documents will incorporate by reference as much of the analysis from the PEIS as possible in accordance with the CEQ regulations.*
Use of precautionary approach Overall, the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences, Acoustic Impact Criteria, and Acoustic Modeling sections provide well-written descriptions and reviews of the best available science on these topics. However, we are disappointed that in the DPEIS, NSF seems to advocate using a precautionary approach when estimating the numbers of animals exposed to seismic sources and in recommending mitigation measures. Even though the science described in the sections on the environment and potential effects does not indicate that biologically significant effects to marine animal populations have resulted from geophysical operations, the authors repeatedly state that the most conservative values and assumptions were used as input for the acoustic model	*The lead and cooperating agencies agree with the commenters that a conservative approach to modeling has been employed in the draft PEIS. Employing conservative values and assumptions at various stages in the modeling allows for consistency in approach, and for an overall conclusion that the modeling results are conservative. This approach while conservative, allows both the action proponent and regulators confidence that actions will unlikely exceed modeled take estimates. Although the modeling approach may be conservative, results are still viewed to represent potential conditions. This would not preclude the action agency from identifying in future NEPA analyses instances where conservative take estimate results are unlikely to be realized. Underestimating takes has potential for negatively impacting the seismic research community as it could result in the premature termination of a survey and future surveys, since a robust schedule is needed to keep vessels operating efficiently.*

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE (API), INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GEOPHYSICAL CONTRACTORS (IAGC), NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (NOIA), AND U.S. OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION (USOGA) (NOVEMBER 22, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
(e.g. page 2-57, Table 2-10; page 2-62, Figure 2-27; page 2-63, section 2.3.3.3) and in estimating the received exposure level (page 3-141, Section 3.6.5.1). By using the most conservative values and assumptions, the end result is an overestimate of the number of animals exposed. We suggest a more balanced approach, incorporating the best available science and risk assessment, be utilized when determining the inputs for the model and calculating received exposure levels. We are opposed to a government agency adopting the "precautionary principle" as regulation. The US statutory framework is supposed to incorporate a risk-based approach that relies upon the use of sound scientific data and the objective assessment of risk to determine the potential effects from human activity. This is in marked contrast to the precautionary approach, utilized in the EU, which does not require demonstrated adverse impact. NEPA does not require or recommend the use of the precautionary approach in preparing environmental documents. We recommend NSF reconsider using this precautionary approach in its environmental assessment.	*NMFS uses the best available science to make its decisions under the MMPA. NMFS decisions concerning whether or not to issue authorizations for the incidental take of marine mammals under Sections 101(a)(5)(A) and (D) of the MMPA may be made only after the agency sets forth and supports specific determinations, including determinations that the authorization will result in no more than a negligible impact on the affected species or stock, and that mitigation will achieve the least practicable adverse impact on the affected marine mammal species or stock. The authorization must also set forth the permissible methods of taking and requirements for the monitoring and reporting of such taking. The analyses contained in the PEIS will provide useful information for NMFS in evaluating the potential impacts of marine seismic surveys on marine mammals and their habitat and other marine resources. NSF and USGS appropriately rely on NMFS for these determinations, as NMFS is the federal regulatory agency with statutory responsibility for authorizing take under the MMPA and the necessary technical expertise in determining underwater acoustics impacts to marine mammals.*
<u>Noise exposure criteria</u> We applaud NSF for considering the Southall et al. (2007) noise exposure criteria and including estimates of exposure using this criterion in the DPEIS. In our view, Southall et al. (2007) is the best available peer-reviewed scientific paper on noise exposure criteria and associated metrics. Southall et al. provides valuable information to assist in risk assessment of the potential for physical harm to individual animals during seismic operations. The criteria proposed by Southall et al. can and should help inform whether there is a risk of physical harm to animals both during regular operation and soft-start of a source array. The current NMFS guidelines for Level A harassment under the MMPA are based on the root-mean-square (rms) sound pressure metric. "However, there is now scientific evidence that suggests that auditory effects of transient sound on marine mammals are better correlated with the amount of received energy than with the level of strongest pulse" (DPEIS, page 2-47). Therefore, we strongly recommend the use the Southall et al. noise exposure criteria, which uses a sound exposure level (SEL) metric or at least development of a criteria based on SEL and not rms. In addition, we support the recommendation that "allowance should be given to the differential frequency responsiveness of various marine mammal groups" (DPEIS page 2-52) by applying frequency-weighting functions when calculating the effective SELs.	*Given the potential for NMFS to change its acoustic guidelines in the future, the PEIS provides both M-weighted and flat-weighted and rms SPL and SEL metrics in the impact analyses. At present, NMFS still requires the use of the rms SPL metric for estimating acoustic exposures of marine mammals. Should NMFS incorporate a SEL approach for estimating acoustic exposures of marine mammals and use of M-weighting, the PEIS will still be effective.* *NOAA is currently developing acoustic guidelines for assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on marine mammal species under its jurisdiction. The guidelines will provide past acoustic criteria, as well as updated procedures for assessing acoustic effects based on recent advances in science. NOAA is working toward numerical criteria where appropriate and possible, while general analytical paradigms will be used in other cases (i.e., for instances where context- or environmental-specific factors reduce or eliminate the relevance of broadly applicable numerical criteria). The guidelines will also include an approach for updating acoustic criteria and policy guidance. The process to finalize the guidelines includes the following steps: (1) NOAA internal review; (2) external peer review; (3) public comment; and (4) finalize and release of guidelines. NOAA is currently still conducting step 1 of this process. Until such time that these guidelines are finalized, NMFS shall continue to use the rms SPL metric for estimating take and establishing mitigation measures.*

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE (API), INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GEOPHYSICAL CONTRACTORS (IAGC), NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (NOIA), AND U.S. OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION (USOGA) (NOVEMBER 22, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
Mitigation zones Overall, we agree with the methodology outlined in the DPEIS: identification of representative analysis areas and detailed acoustic modeling for a subset of those areas to define mitigation zones (MZ) and evaluate potential acoustic impacts. However, NSF states that in addition to the acoustic modeling conducted for the 5 representative areas in the DPEIS, "…cruise-specific MZs would need to be modeled to determine the effective MZs for marine mammals and turtles" (pages ES-8 and 2-72). Though it might be possible to perform detailed acoustic modeling and determine a specific MZ for every marine seismic research survey, we caution other government agencies about requiring this for commercial geophysical surveys. The amount of resources (time, personnel, financial) required to model the MZ for every proposed Industry geophysical survey would be prohibitive. An alternative approach would be to define 'generic' MZs, perhaps for shallow and deep water, for marine seismic surveys based on the acoustic modeling performed for the representative areas. Defining a generic MZ based on the representative areas modeled would eliminate the need for redundant modeling for every seismic survey and would still protect marine mammals from physical or auditory harm.	*NSF funds approximately 4-8 seismic surveys per year and USGS conducts approximately 8-12 per year. These surveys are conducted worldwide with little repetition in the same survey area from year-to-year as they are driven by scientific goals and objectives. This is different from the oil and gas industry, which conducts several different types of surveys in the same geographic area. At present, NSF and USGS perform modeling to identify the mitigation zone for each survey and therefore viewed it feasible to continue operating in this manner. Based on information gleaned from recent publications and workshops on the topic of monitoring and mitigation for acoustic sources, incorporating geographically specific data into the mitigation zone modeling enhances the accuracy of determining acoustic propagation and associated regulated mitigation zone. Therefore, NSF and USGS have attempted to incorporate this approach into the monitoring and mitigation program. Based on past surveys and certain conditions, a fixed mitigation zone was identified for the low-energy surveys. In the future should it be determined that a fixed mitigation zone can be employed successfully rather than modeled for high-energy surveys, NSF and USGS can re-evaluate the PEIS. The monitoring and mitigation program outlined in the PEIS was designed for NSF and USGS purposes and may not be feasible or appropriate for other entities.*
Passive Acoustic Monitoring We support NSF's use of passive acoustics as a monitoring tool. However, we question if NSF's proposal to use passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) during "both daytime and nighttime seismic operations as well as when the sources are not active" is feasible and practicable. The PAM operators will need periods of rest and time to repair equipment; it would require several operators to run PAM continuously. Also, there is limited bunk space on seismic vessels and it would be difficult if not impossible to accommodate the number of people that continuous 24/7 PAM operations would require. In addition, the global pool of experienced PAM operators is limited. Though there are limitations to current PAM technology (as described in the DPEIS), there are also limitations to visual observations. PAM offers another tool, in addition to visual observers, to use for monitoring. We support the use of PAM as a monitoring tool during certain conditions, such as to allow soft-starts during low-visibility conditions. PAM is useful under certain conditions and for certain species which have somewhat regular vocalization patterns, such as sperm whales. However, at this time, PAM systems are not able to reliably and accurately determine the location of the vocalizing animal automatically. An experienced operator is needed to optimize detection capability and interpret the data displayed in the user interface to estimate range to a vocalizing animal. A significant amount of research is underway to improve the localization capabilities of PAM systems.	*NSF-USGS agrees with the comments regarding the current state and efficacy of PAM. PAM is viewed as a useful tool in assisting marine mammal observers and will be used as appropriate and as recommended by NMFS as part of the MMPA compliance process. In determining what mitigation and monitoring should be included in an MMPA authorization, NMFS must assess the benefit to the species of implementing the measure, practicability for applicant implementation, and effectiveness of the measure. Whether or not PAM should be used or required in a MMPA authorization will be assessed on a cruise-by-cruise basis and on an applicant-by-applicant basis. NMFS works with each individual applicant to determine the most appropriate mitigation and monitoring requirements. NSF and USGS will continue to monitor the advances made with PAM technology and incorporate any advanced systems when viewed beneficial and feasible, or conversely, should it be proven to not be beneficial in monitoring or mitigating for marine mammals.* *At present PAM is used on the primary seismic vessel, the R/V Langseth. The technical support for 24/7 PAM operations is currently being met aboard the R/V Langseth and therefore was viewed feasible to continue operating in this manner. Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (LDEO), ship operator of the R/V Langseth, subcontracts for PAM and PAM support; LDEO has successfully obtained satisfactory PAM support for past surveys. The PAM program outlined in the PEIS however was designed for NSF and USGS activities and may not be feasible or*

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE (API), INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GEOPHYSICAL CONTRACTORS (IAGC), NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (NOIA), AND U.S. OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION (USOGA) (NOVEMBER 22, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
We recommend that basic training criteria, such as that specified by many countries for PSVOs, be developed and required for PAM operators. In addition, minimum requirements for PAM equipment should also be considered. A period of confidence in the current PAM capabilities, understanding of limitations, and experienced operator capacity-building is needed before government agencies consider requiring PAM as a mandatory monitoring tool during seismic operations.	*appropriate for other entities and their associated activities.* *Regarding the comment to require basic training criteria for PAM operators, NMFS is currently in the process of developing national standards for PSVOs, which include information about requirements for PAM operators.* *No responsive changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comments regarding PAM.*
Ramp-up procedures We agree with NSF's use of a ramp-up procedure as an operational mitigation measure but recommend an alternative description of the procedure. In the DPEIS (pages ES-12 and 2-69), the recommended ramp-up procedure is described as follows, "Airguns would be added in a sequence such that the source level of the array would increase in steps not exceeding 6 dB per 5-min period. A 36-airgun array would take approximately 30 min to achieve full operation via ramp-up." The procedure described above is prescriptive and may not be possible to achieve for all seismic source array configurations. Therefore, we recommend that the following guidance for ramp-up, as described in the 2007 MMS Notice to Lessees and Operators (NTL), be used in the DPEIS instead: "Initiate ramp-up procedures by firing a single airgun. The preferred airgun to begin with should be the smallest airgun, in terms of energy output (dB) and volume (in3). Continue ramp-up by gradually activating additional airguns over a period of at least 20 minutes, but no longer than 40 minutes, until the desired operating level of the airgun array is obtained."	*The PEIS describes the airgun sources and configurations used by NSF or USGS and therefore prescribe a ramp-up procedure logical for those sources. The text has been revised to account for the ramp-up of low-energy sources (e.g., 2 GI guns) (see Section 2.4.1.1 of the Final PEIS). The ramp-up procedure outlined in the PEIS was designed for NSF and USGS energy sources and activities and is based on the requirements specified by NMFS in previous IHAs for these agency activities. These procedures may not be feasible or appropriate for other entities and their associated activities. In determining what mitigation and monitoring should be included in an MMPA authorization, NMFS must assess the benefit to the species of implementing the measure, practicability for applicant implementation, and effectiveness of the measure. NMFS works with each individual applicant to determine the most appropriate mitigation and monitoring requirements and procedures for implementing them. Refer to Sections 1.4 and 1.8.3 of the Final PEIS for a more detailed discussion of the MMPA and associated IHA requirements.*
Protected Species Visual Observers We support the use of Protected Species Visual Observers (PSVOs) to visually monitor the MZ. However, it is not the role of PSVOs to determine if an observed marine animal's change in behavior is biologically significant or to estimate the numbers of marine mammals potentially 'taken' by harassment as defined by MMPA (page 2-66). The primary responsibility of the PSVOs onboard the seismic vessel is to visually monitor the MZ and record their observations. Also, while we recognize that additional data on the distribution and abundance of marine life is needed, this type of data collection is not the primary responsibility of PSVOs and it should not detract from their primarily responsibility of visually monitoring the MZ. We recommend NSF clarify the roles and responsibilities of PSVOs in the DPEIS.	*The roles and responsibilities of PSVOs as well as the data collection and documentation requirements are defined by NMFS and are based on the required procedures identified in previous marine seismic research survey IHAs funded by NSF or conducted by USGS. Section 2.4.1.1, PSVO Data and Documentation, of the Final EIS/OEIS has been revised to provide clarification on the roles and responsibilities of the PSVOs.*

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE (API), INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GEOPHYSICAL CONTRACTORS (IAGC), NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (NOIA), AND U.S. OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION (USOGA) (NOVEMBER 22, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
Seismic Sources We applaud NSF for including language in the DPEIS which describes why the values for source levels provided in Table 2-3 are not actually realized in the water column, "Because the actual source would be a distributed sound source (typically 2, 4, 18, or 36 airguns) rather than a single point source, the highest sound levels listed in Table 2-3 apply only to downward propagating signals. Because of the directional nature of the sound from large airgun arrays, the effective source level for sound propagating in near-horizontal directions would be substantially lower than that for downward propagation" (page 2-23 Table 2-3; page 2-29). The source levels in Table 2-3 are the back-calculated, modeled sound pressure values and are not actually realized at any point in the water column. Numbers of this sort are regularly quoted but they require explanation in order for the reader to have a clear understanding of the numbers. In virtually all cases they are derived from modeling and are an over-estimate of the true source sound level (sound output from a seismic source array at 1 meter distance from the array). This is an extremely significant point and we suggest NSF add the following text or similar and a graphic to further expand upon this important point: "It is difficult to measure the actual sound pressure level close to a full source array that is being activated, due to the physical environment surrounding an active seismic array. Therefore assumptions are made that enable the response of a given source array to be modeled. The 'far field' assumption suggests that at some distance away from a source array, which is much greater than the dimensions of the source array, the peak energy pulses from the various individual source elements ('near field' signature) arrive at the same time and add together constructively to form the 'far field' response of the source. This response is corrected or back-projected to one meter from the source array to produce the 'far field' signature of the source at one meter, which is a standard modeled measure of a source array output. It is well known that the peak energy pulses from individual source elements no longer align at locations close to the seismic source array (in the 'near field') as a seismic source array is a 'distributed', rather than a 'point' source. Therefore, the emitted sound pressure level close to the source array is lower than that calculated using the 'far field' calculation."	*Suggested text has been added to the end of Section 2.2.3 of the Final PEIS. Additional discussion of source levels and far/near field signatures can be found in Appendix B, Acoustic Modeling Report, Sections 4.1, 5.1, and 8.3.*
Effectiveness of previous mitigation measures Scientific evaluation of the effectiveness of mitigation measures is needed. We are pleased to read that NSF is developing a paper describing the effectiveness and limitations of the mitigation measures used during its previous marine seismic research cruises. We look forward to the publication of the final report. According to the	*Thank you for your comments. LGL is still preparing the data for future publication regarding the effectiveness of current mitigation and monitoring procedures, however since no specific journal or date for publication has yet been identified by LGL, the reference in the document has been changed to "LGL unpublished data." No further responsive changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comment.*

AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE (API), INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GEOPHYSICAL CONTRACTORS (IAGC), NATIONAL OCEAN INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION (NOIA), AND U.S. OIL AND GAS ASSOCIATION (USOGA) (NOVEMBER 22, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
summary of the preliminary results from the Holst et al. paper, "…monitoring and mitigation measures have been effective in reducing the potential exposure of marine mammals and sea turtles to high-level seismic sounds and, presumably, of biologically significant effects (Holst et al. in prep.). Various monitoring and mitigation methods and measures can be combined to complement one another" (page 2-71). This is a significant finding. The information in this section of the DPEIS should be highlighted as it demonstrates that current mitigation and monitoring measures during marine seismic research surveys have been effective and therefore, additional precautionary mitigation measures are not necessary.	

M. LYLE, PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF OCEANOGRAPHY, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE STATION, TX	
Comment	*NSF Response*
I am a Principal Investigator responsible for seismic reflection data acquisition funded by the National Science Foundation (3 expeditions since 2000). I strongly support this programmatic EIS, because individual environmental impact statements for each cruise have proven costly and are for the most part redundant efforts. In addition, they make it difficult to schedule seismic reflection operations and add to uncertainty about what parts of a scientific program can be carried out. Finally, rules for conducting the seismic reflection surveys have changed with each survey in what seems to be an arbitrary fashion. In terms of mitigation alternatives, I strongly recommend that Alternative B--generic mitigation measures for low-energy acoustic sources-- be chosen as the best mitigation option. Alternative B provides for customizing mitigation measures when environmental factors require it to minimize affecting marine mammals, yet minimizes red tape when standard operations are envisioned.	*Thank you for your comments. No responsive changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comments.*

STATE OF HAWAII, OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS, HONOLULU, HI (NOVEMBER 17, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) is in receipt of your October 1, 2010 request for comments on the above-referenced project. OHA understands that the project entails a series of marine seismic surveys funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) or conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). As lead agency, NSF prepared the subject draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (hereinafter Draft PElS) to cover the research activities of academic and U.S. government scientists who will perform scientific research to better understand the structure and stratigraphy of the crust and overlying sediment of the ocean floor. The Draft PElS does not examine the impacts of a specific research activity; rather, it analyzes the impacts of future marine seismic research on thirteen exemplary analysis areas. The surveys will primarily involve the use of high-energy sources of sound, in addition to mapping, dredging, drilling, and coring research. Based on the documentation provided, OHA does not have comments on the Draft PElS. In the event a seismic survey is planned around Hawai 'i, the impacts associated with said survey would likely be most similar to those of the Marianas Qualitative Analysis Area, as both are volcanic archipelagos within the Pacific Trade Wind Longhurst Biome. Should a seismic survey be planned around Hawai'i, OHA requests that we be directly notified prior to its commencement.	*Thank you for your comments. Per OHA request, the action agencies will contact OHA should a seismic survey be planned around Hawai'i prior to its commencement. No responsive changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comment.*

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION, BETHESDA, MD (NOVEMBER 24, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
Programmatic Approach and Site-Specific Analyses Federal agencies are required to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act before they make final decisions about proposed federal actions that could impact the human environment. The National Science Foundation has identified proposed marine seismic research that it will fund or that the U.S. Geological Survey will conduct as federal actions requiring such environmental review. In the past, the Foundation has prepared environmental assessments to analyze the environmental impact of individual cruises or surveys and posted the assessments on the Foundation's website for public review and comment. The Marine Mammal Commission concurs with the Foundation and the Survey that a programmatic analysis such as the one under consideration here may help streamline environmental reviews needed for marine seismic research. However, a programmatic approach also has its limitations. The Foundation and the Survey state that they cannot anticipate fully the actual types of research activities that they will fund or conduct during the next several years and therefore have limited their programmatic analyses to "exemplary areas" based on past activities. Although a focus on such areas may be useful for the purpose of completing a programmatic analysis, such a focus does not provide assurance that all area-specific considerations are adequately described in the analysis. In addition, other factors such as season, protected resources at risk, environmental conditions, and the precise nature of future studies may not be adequately described using a programmatic approach based on exemplary areas. The Foundation's *Federal Register* notice acknowledges such limitations and states that subsequent project- and cruise-specific analyses will be needed to evaluate specific research projects. The Marine Mammal Commission concurs with this assessment and recommends that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey be prepared to conduct supplemental environmental analyses under the National Environmental Policy Act once the details pertaining to specific proposed seismic studies become available. The Marine Mammal Commission requests that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey provide the Commission with copies of these supplemental environmental analyses as they are made available for public review and comment.	*We appreciate that the MMC is in agreement with the approach identified in paragraph 1, pg 1-5 of the Draft PEIS, that in accordance with NEPA and other regulatory requirements (e.g., ESA, MMPA), NSF and USGS will conduct supplemental environmental analyses as appropriate and as specific details for proposed cruises are identified. NSF and the USGS will make copies of these supplemental or tiered environmental documents available to the public for review and comment. No responsive changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comment.*
Action Alternatives Past environmental assessments have generally discussed only two alternatives; the No Action Alternative (i.e., research is not conducted) and the Preferred Alternative (a single statement of proposed mitigation measures for a specific research program). This narrow range of alternatives is contrary to guidance provided by the Council on Environmental Quality in regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act. This guidance states that environmental documents "should present the environmental impacts of the proposal and the alternatives in comparative form, thus sharply defining the issues and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the	*In order to respond as effectively as possible to this comment, NSF, USGS, and NMFS contacted MMC to obtain further clarification regarding this comment.* *We appreciate the MMC's comments with regard to the action alternatives presented in the Draft PEIS. The Draft PEIS provides a description of the various types of vessels and technology that would be utilized during proposed marine seismic surveys conducted by USGS or funded by NSF (Chapter 2), their utility for various purposes and in various locations, and their characteristics (Sections 2.1 and 2.2). Section 2.6 also provides a description of alternative technologies that were considered for*

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION, BETHESDA, MD (NOVEMBER 24, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
decisionmaker and the public." The draft programmatic environmental impact statement identifies two action alternatives. Alternative A would require cruise-specific mitigation measures for all energy sources, whereas Alternative B (the preferred alternative) would require cruise-specific mitigation measures except for low-energy acoustic sources, which would require only generic mitigation measures. The Commission does not consider these proposed alternatives to be sufficient to define sharply the issues and provide a clear basis for choice among alternatives. Indeed, both of these alternatives would be carried out in identical fashion for all but low-energy sources. Undoubtedly, the programmatic analysis will be limited because the specifics of future seismic studies are not known. However, in developing the analysis, the Foundation and the Survey should be able to provide a full description of the various types of technology that are involved, their utility for various purposes and in various locations, their characteristics (in addition the amount of energy involved), and the types and severities of the risks involved. By including such information in the analysis the agencies will inform the public and decision-makers regarding the various technologies and research approaches that are available and the tradeoffs in terms of information gained versus risks presented. In addition, the agencies should be able to provide a full description of the kinds of mitigation measures that might be used, and their utility and shortcomings under different circumstances. Also, the Commission understands that the Foundation helps researchers design their proposed actions in ways that minimize effects on marine mammal populations. The Commission gratefully acknowledges such efforts, and believes that the guidance given to researchers should be described in the programmatic analysis and may provide a basis for additional alternatives to be considered. The alternatives in the programmatic analysis will determine whether and to what extent it provides an adequate foundation from which to tier future project-specific analyses. To that end, the Marine Mammal Commission recommends that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey redefine the alternatives considered in the programmatic analysis to encompass the broad technological, monitoring, and mitigation issues that pertain to all marine seismic research and provide a clear basis for choosing among options by decision-makers and the public. Doing so should then allow the agencies to focus their attention on specific matters when particular studies are analyzed.	*conducting marine seismic surveys but were dismissed from further consideration as they currently do not meet the scientific objectives of the proposed surveys.* *A full description of the kinds of mitigation measures, based on past and ongoing marine seismic surveys, is provided in Section 2.4.1.1.* *A description of pre-cruise planning procedures is presented in Section 2.4.1.1. The action agencies respond to specific research requests and, therefore, it is often not appropriate to add additional action alternatives. Nevertheless, the agencies will attempt to better characterize pre-cruise planning efforts which shape surveys in future site-specific NEPA documentation.* *Given that the technologies for potential future surveys and monitoring and mitigation are in fact well defined in the PEIS (See Section 2.6), the action agencies feel that the alternatives presented in the PEIS are appropriate. The action agencies feel that the approach to alternatives proposed by MMC do not effectively take into consideration the comprehensive descriptions in the PEIS of technologies, the pre-cruise planning mitigation, and other monitoring and mitigation activities, which make the MMC's proposed approach for alternatives less applicable. The PEIS, by design, is broad and comprehensive in approach. It has identified and discussed all known effective mitigation measures, including various technologies even though they have not been presented as separate action alternatives. This approach is appropriate to the decision being made and the scope and level of analysis necessary to inform that decision. Though the range of action alternatives is limited to the two fully evaluated, the PEIS in no way forecloses or limits the development and evaluation of a broader range of alternatives structured around different mitigation approaches in tiered project-level NEPA documents prepared for specific cruises. The PEIS presents data and analyses to foster development of such alternatives. Therefore the action agencies feel that alternatives presented in the Draft PEIS and carried forward to the Final PEIS establish a range of reasonable alternatives effective at informing both the public and agency decision makers within NSF and USGS on the environmental issues, impacts and trade-offs associated with the programmatic decision at hand.. NSF, therefore, has not included additional action alternatives in the PEIS in response to this comment.*
Site- and Species-Specific Mitigation and Monitoring Measures The National Marine Fisheries Service has indicated that cruise-specific analyses of impacts will be required for the issuance of incidental take authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and/or incidental take statements under the Endangered Species Act. These authorizations likely will have cruise-specific mitigation and monitoring requirements based on potential impacts on the marine mammal species	*As MMC encourages, NSF and USGS will continue to incorporate appropriate, survey-specific mitigation and monitoring based on survey-specific factors such as species present in the survey area, oceanographic features, and any unique survey activities. NSF and USGS will also work in conjunction with NMFS to develop survey-specific monitoring and mitigation measures and will comply with subsequent authorizations and recommendations made through the MMPA and ESA processes. No responsive*

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION, BETHESDA, MD (NOVEMBER 24, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
expected to be in the study area. The Marine Mammal Commission agrees with the need for such specificity and recommends that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey require for each proposed project specific mitigation and monitoring requirements tailored to such things as the species present in the research area, their natural history and status (e.g., endangered, threatened), pertinent oceanographic and bathymetric features, and the proposed operations.	*changes have been made to the PEIS based on your comment.*
Guidance for Applicants The draft programmatic environmental impact statement indicates that the design of any specific survey requires consideration of the trade-off among the range and resolution of different sound sources, the timing of the survey and seasonal sea conditions, research vessel transit times, and the availability of properly outfitted vessels. Whether and to what extent researchers consider potential impacts on marine mammals and other protected species is not clear. If staff from the Foundation and/or Survey spend considerable time and effort helping researchers redesign their studies to minimize impacts on marine mammals, then it may be useful for the agencies to provide guidelines for research that scientists could incorporate into their original research design and planning efforts. For that reason, the Marine Mammal Commission recommends that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey develop guidelines for cruise research design and planning that would minimize the potential impacts of seismic research on marine mammals and other protected species. The Commission would be pleased to assist in developing such guidelines.	*Pre-cruise planning for applicants is an important and vital part of the marine seismic survey process (see Section 2.4.1.1.) NSF currently has a guidance document for scientists interested in marine seismic research and is available on the NSF website at: http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/pubs/Seismic_Reflection_Permitting_Procedures.pdf. Although the focus of this document is on seismic surveys conducted in foreign waters, many of its underlining principles, such as those related to pre-cruise planning, are relevant to all seismic surveys, and therefore the document serves more for the science community than the document's noted titled purpose. This information has been added to Section 2.4.1.1 of the Final PEIS. NSF accepts the MMC's offer to provide assistance with improving existing pre-cruise planning procedures and will consider suggestions to incorporate into seismic survey guidelines. In addition to written guidance, outreach and education regarding optimizing survey design, considering potential environmental consequences, and best practices is conducted through presentations at scientific meetings, conferences, and workshops; University-National Oceanographic Laboratory System (UNOLS) meetings and oversight committees; and, pre-cruise planning meetings held by the vessel operators.*
Collection of Information by Protected Species Observers The Foundation and the Survey propose to deploy protected species observers aboard seismic survey vessels, whether the research is funded by the Foundation or conducted by the Survey. The agencies would consult with the Office of Protected Resources at the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding the observers' qualifications. The National Marine Fisheries Service has developed standards for the selection and training of fisheries observers, and it has made preliminary recommendations to improve protected species observer programs generally, including recommendations for program management, data reporting, training and eligibility, standards of conduct and conflict of interest, and safety. Those recommendations have not yet been implemented in the training of observers for seismic studies and the qualifications and training of observers on seismic vessels varies considerably. The lack of uniform standards undermines the quality (e.g., accuracy, reliability) of information available to assess the impact of seismic activities on marine mammals. To address this concern, the Marine Mammal Commission recommends that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey work with their observers, observer service providers, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Fish and stakeholders to establish and implement standards for	*As MMC has noted, NSF and USGS currently use PSVOs on seismic surveys and are typically required as part of the associated governing IHA issued by the NMFS. While it is outside the agency mission and staff expertise of NSF and USGS to develop a PSVO Standards and Training Program, the action agencies are willing to comply with the PSVO requirements established by NMFS and/or USFWS, the regulating agencies for these activities. NMFS is currently in the process of developing national standards for PSVOs, including PSVOs on research seismic vessels. Once these national standards are finalized, NSF and USGS will ensure that the PSVOs placed on their marine seismic research surveys will meet the required standards. Per requirements established in the survey IHAs, data collected by PSVOs are compiled and analyzed and submitted to NMFS in a report within 90 days of survey completion. Reports currently, and will continue to, estimate potential effects on marine mammals and provide information regarding the effectiveness of monitoring and mitigation measures. Data collected by PSVOs are viewed by the action agencies as public information and any further analysis of them is allowable, and encouraged, at user's expense. A discussion of PSVOs is provided in Section 2.4.1.1 of the Final PEIS.*

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION, BETHESDA, MD (NOVEMBER 24, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
protected species observers to improve the quality and usefulness of information collected during marine seismic surveys. In addition, the Commission recommends that the Foundation and Survey establish requirements for analysis of data collected by the observers to ensure that those data are used both to estimate potential effects on marine mammals and to inform the continuing development of mitigation and monitoring measures.	*Future NSF survey PSVO reports will be available on the NSF website at: http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp. Future USGS survey PSVO reports will be available on a yet to be determined USGS website. The 90-day reports submitted to NMFS are also made available on the NMFS Office of Protected Resources website at: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications.*
Visual Mitigation and Monitoring Measures The Foundation's analysis of impact on marine mammals is based, in part, on the presumed efficacy of the proposed visual mitigation and monitoring measures. The effectiveness of visual monitoring is limited and varies considerably depending on conditions, as has been determined from extensive data and experience in the field of marine mammal assessment. For example, visual monitoring typically is not effective at night or during periods of bad weather and, even with good visibility, observers are unable to detect marine mammals when they are below the surface or beyond visual range. Determining the efficacy of mitigation and monitoring measures may require not only collecting opportunistic data but also designing and conducting studies to test specific hypotheses regarding the utility of visual observations and to evaluate responses of the various species encountered. Because the efficacy of visual observation can vary markedly depending on circumstances, the Marine Mammal Commission recommends that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey provide additional justification for their preliminary determination that the mitigation and monitoring measures that depend on visual observations would be sufficient to detect, with a high level of confidence, all marine mammals within or entering identified mitigation zones. At a minimum, such justification should describe (1) detection probability as a function of distance from the vessel and (2) changes in detection probability under various sea state and weather conditions. If such information is not available, the Foundation and the Survey should undertake the studies needed to verify that the proposed mitigation and monitoring measures are likely to detect all or nearly all marine mammals in or near mitigation zones and, if necessary, to develop alternative means of detecting marine mammals in or near those zones. The Commission would be pleased to continue discussions with the Foundation and the Survey regarding the design of such experiments to promote a better understanding of the utility and shortcomings of visual observations for monitoring and mitigation purposes.	*The Agencies believe that the described visual monitoring program, which is consistent with current practices, will be sufficient to visually detect, with reasonable certainty, most marine mammals within or entering identified mitigation zones (MZ). At present, NMFS views the combination of visual and passive acoustic monitoring as the most effective mitigation techniques available for detecting marine mammals within or entering the exclusion zone. The action agencies are receptive to incorporating proven technologies and techniques to enhance the monitoring and mitigation program. In this vein, NSF, in collaboration with other federal agencies have offered a funding opportunity through the National Oceanographic Partnership Program to improve the technologies and existing capabilities to detect, classify and locate marine mammals in survey areas during seismic operations. Results from this funding opportunity may push the boundaries of current technologies and methodologies for monitoring exclusion zones. Until proven technological advances or enhancements are made for visual observation practices, the action agencies will continue to provide the current visual observation services during surveys. In cooperation with NMFS, LDEO, ship operator for the primary seismic vessel R/V Langseth, will conduct efficacy experiments of night vision devices during a future R/V Langseth cruise. In addition, in response to a recommendation from NMFS, LDEO is evaluating the use of handheld thermal imaging cameras to supplement nighttime mitigation practices. These devices were successfully utilized by another federal agency while conducting nighttime seismic operations. Section 2.4.1.1 of the Final PEIS has been revised to address the concerns regarding the effectiveness of current marine mammal monitoring methods.*
Analysis of Cumulative Impacts The Council on Environmental Quality's regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy Act require that an analysis of cumulative impacts include not only the impacts of the proposed action, but also the "incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions" (40	*The cumulative impacts analysis in the Draft PEIS examined potential impacts at a programmatic level. Consistent with MMC recommendations, NSF and USGS will be prepared to conduct additional cumulative impact analyses for future specific seismic studies in the context of all other factors in the pertinent human environment within a proposed study area as appropriate. Section 4.1 of the Final PEIS has been revised to address your comments.*

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION, BETHESDA, MD (NOVEMBER 24, 2010)	
Comment	*NSF Response*
CFR § 1508.7). Therefore, the Foundation and the Survey must not limit their analysis of cumulative effects only to the expected impact of research funded by the Foundation or conducted by the Survey. Contrary to the Council's regulations, that appears to be exactly what the Foundation and Survey have done in the draft impact statement. The statement lists other activities, such as oil and gas exploration and production, recreation, tourism and commercial vessel traffic, military exercises and operations, fishing operations, hunting and/or incidental mortality, and pollution, but provides few details regarding the impact of these activities on marine mammals. It also does not mention other potentially important natural and human-related impacts, such as disease, natural toxins, predation, weather and climatic influences, or ingestion of debris. More importantly, the impact statement provides little analysis or discussion of how the proposed action, together with the total effects of all of these factors, might affect marine mammals. Instead, the draft impact statement mentions only the impacts of proposed marine seismic research funded by the Foundation or conducted by the Survey when it concludes there would not be any significant cumulative impacts to marine resources. Furthermore, the Foundation justifies this conclusion simply by stating that pre-cruise planning and coordination with other ongoing and planned activities, as well as mitigation and monitoring during proposed seismic operations, would minimize cumulative impacts to an insignificant level. The Commission does not agree that such a blanket statement can be made without a reasoned analysis to support it. First, it is not possible to do a cumulative effects analysis that encompasses all future seismic projects. Such an analysis must take into account not only the effects of a specific project, but also the effects of all other human impacts in the area and at the time of the proposed study. Because the Foundation and the Survey have recognized already that they cannot predict exactly where and when they will fund or conduct such studies, the Commission does not see how the agencies can describe in advance the other factors that must be considered in a cumulative effects analysis. Second, the added effects of a specific project cannot be dismissed based simply on an expectation or promise of future remedies. To do so would be contrary to the whole purpose of an environmental impact statement. To address this shortcoming, the Marine Mammal Commission recommends that the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey provide, to the extent possible, a comprehensive analysis of the cumulative impacts expected from seismic surveys themselves, but then be prepared to conduct additional cumulative impact analyses for future specific seismic studies in the context of all the other factors in the pertinent human environment; that is, the human environment where seismic studies have been proposed.	