

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

[RTID 0648–XB628]

**Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Geophysical Surveys of the Guerrero Gap in the Eastern Tropical Pacific**

**AGENCY:** National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice; proposed incidental harassment authorization; request for comments on proposed authorization and possible Renewal.

**SUMMARY:** NMFS has received a request from the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (L–DEO) for authorization to take marine mammals incidental to geophysical surveys of the Guerrero Gap off the coast of Mexico in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), NMFS is requesting comments on its proposal to issue an incidental harassment authorization (IHA) to incidentally take marine mammals during the specified activities. NMFS is also requesting comments on a possible one-time, one-year renewal that could be issued under certain circumstances and if all requirements are met, as described in Request for Public Comments at the end of this notice. NMFS will consider public comments prior to making any final decision on the issuance of the requested MMPA authorization and agency responses will be summarized in the final notice of our decision.

**DATES:** Comments and information must be received no later than February 11, 2022.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be addressed to Jolie Harrison, Chief, Permits and Conservation Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service submitted via email to [ITP.Fowler@noaa.gov](mailto:ITP.Fowler@noaa.gov).

*Instructions:* NMFS is not responsible for comments sent by any other method, to any other address or individual, or received after the end of the comment period. Comments, including all attachments, must not exceed a 25-megabyte file size. All comments received are a part of the public record and will generally be posted online at [www.fisheries.noaa.gov/permit/incidental-take-authorizations-under-marine-mammal-protection-act](http://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/permit/incidental-take-authorizations-under-marine-mammal-protection-act) without change. All personal identifying information (e.g., name, address)

voluntarily submitted by the commenter may be publicly accessible. Do not submit confidential business information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Amy Fowler, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS, (301) 427–8401. Electronic copies of the application and supporting documents, as well as a list of the references cited in this document, may be obtained online at: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/permit/incidental-take-authorizations-under-marine-mammal-protection-act>. In case of problems accessing these documents, please call the contact listed above.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

The MMPA prohibits the “take” of marine mammals, with certain exceptions. Sections 101(a)(5)(A) and (D) of the MMPA (16 U.S.C. 1361 *et seq.*) direct the Secretary of Commerce (as delegated to NMFS) to allow, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional, taking of small numbers of marine mammals by U.S. citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified geographical region if certain findings are made and either regulations are proposed or, if the taking is limited to harassment, a notice of a proposed incidental harassment authorization is provided to the public for review.

Authorization for incidental takings shall be granted if NMFS finds that the taking will have a negligible impact on the species or stock(s) and will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for taking for subsistence uses (where relevant). Further, NMFS must prescribe the permissible methods of taking and other “means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact” on the affected species or stocks and their habitat, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance, and on the availability of the species or stocks for taking for certain subsistence uses (referred to in shorthand as “mitigation”); and requirements pertaining to the mitigation, monitoring and reporting of the takings are set forth. The definitions of all applicable MMPA statutory terms cited above are included in the relevant sections below.

**National Environmental Policy Act**

To comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*) and NOAA Administrative Order (NAO) 216–6A, NMFS must review our

proposed action (*i.e.*, the issuance of an IHA) with respect to potential impacts on the human environment.

Accordingly, NMFS plans to adopt the National Science Foundation’s (NSF’s) Environmental Assessment (EA), provided our independent evaluation of the document finds that it includes adequate information analyzing the effects on the human environment of issuing the IHA. The NSF’s EA is available at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/permit/incidental-take-authorizations-under-marine-mammal-protection-act>.

We will review all comments submitted in response to this notice prior to concluding our NEPA process or making a final decision on the IHA request.

**Summary of Request**

On August 21, 2021, NMFS received a request from L–DEO for an IHA to take marine mammals incidental to geophysical surveys of the Guerrero Gap off the coast of Mexico in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETP). The application was deemed adequate and complete on December 14, 2021. L–DEO’s request is for take of a small number of 30 species of marine mammals by Level B harassment and, for two of those species, by Level A harassment. Neither L–DEO nor NMFS expects serious injury or mortality to result from this activity and, therefore, an IHA is appropriate.

**Description of Proposed Activity***Overview*

Researchers from L–DEO, University of Texas Institute of Geophysics (UTIG), and Northern Arizona University (NAU), with funding from the NSF, and in collaboration with researchers from the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico or UNAM) and Kyoto University, propose to conduct high-energy seismic surveys from the research vessel (R/V) *Marcus G. Langseth (Langseth)* in and around the Guerrero Gap off western Mexico, in the ETP. The proposed study would use two-dimensional (2–D) seismic surveying to quantify incoming plate hydration and examine the role of fluids on megathrust slip behavior in and around the Guerrero Gap of the Middle America Trench. This is one of the best-known examples in the world of along-strike variations in slip behavior of the plate boundary. L–DEO proposes to conduct two different methods of seismic acquisition, multi-channel seismic (MCS) using a hydrophone streamer and refraction surveys using ocean bottom seismometers (OBSs). The

surveys would use a 36-airgun towed array with a total discharge volume of ~6600 cubic inches (in<sup>3</sup>) as an acoustic source, acquiring return signals using both a towed streamer as well as OBSs. The majority of the proposed 2-D seismic surveys would occur within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of Mexico, including territorial seas, and a small portion would occur in International Waters.

**Dates and Duration**

The proposed research cruise would be expected to last for 48 days, including approximately 20 days of seismic survey operations, 3 days of transit to and from the survey area, 19 days for equipment deployment/recovery, and 6 days of contingency time for poor weather, etc. The R/V *Langseth* would likely leave out of and return to port in Manzanillo, Mexico, during spring 2022. The proposed IHA

would be valid from March 1, 2022 through February 28, 2023.


**Specific Geographic Region**

The proposed surveys would occur within the area of approximately 14–18.5°N and approximately 99–105°W. Representative survey tracklines are shown in Figure 1. Some deviation in actual track lines, including the order of survey operations, could be necessary for reasons such as science drivers, poor data quality, inclement weather, or mechanical issues with the research vessel and/or equipment. The majority of the proposed surveys would occur within the EEZ of Mexico, including territorial seas, and a small portion would occur in International Waters. The surveys would occur in waters up to 5,560 meters (m) deep. Most of the survey effort (94 percent) would occur in deep water (≤1000 m), and 6 percent would occur in intermediate water

(100–1000 m deep); no effort would occur in shallow water (<100 m deep). A total of 3,600 kilometers (km) of transect lines would be surveyed (2,230 km of 2-D MCS reflection data and 1,370 km of OBS refraction data).

Approximately 6 percent of the total survey effort would occur in Mexican territorial waters. Note that the MMPA does not apply in Mexican territorial waters. L-DEO is subject only to Mexican law in conducting that portion of the survey. However, NMFS has calculated the expected level of incidental take in the entire activity area (including Mexican territorial waters) as part of the analysis supporting our determination under the MMPA that the activity will have a negligible impact on the affected species (see Estimated Take and Negligible Impact Analysis and Determination).

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**



**Figure 1. Location of the Proposed Seismic Surveys and OBS Deployments in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean**

## BILLING CODE 3510-22-C

*Detailed Description of Specific Activity*

The procedures to be used for the proposed marine geophysical surveys would be similar to those used during previous surveys by L-DEO that received incidental take authorizations from NMFS (e.g., 85 FR 55645; September 9, 2020, 84 FR 35073; July 22, 2019) and would use conventional seismic methodology. The survey would involve one source vessel, R/V *Langseth*, which would tow a 36-airgun array with a discharge volume of ~6600 in<sup>3</sup> at a depth of 12 m. The array consists of 36 elements, including 20 Bolt 1500LL airguns with volumes of 180 to 360 in<sup>3</sup> and 16 Bolt 1900LLX airguns with volumes of 40 to 120 in<sup>3</sup>. The airgun array configuration is illustrated in Figure 2–11 of NSF and the U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS's) Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS; NSF-USGS, 2011). (The PEIS is available online at: [www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/usgs-nsf-marine-seismic-research/nsf-usgs-final-eis-oeis-with-appendices.pdf](http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/usgs-nsf-marine-seismic-research/nsf-usgs-final-eis-oeis-with-appendices.pdf)).

The proposed surveys consist of eight MCS lines, of which six are coincident OBS refraction lines that are located perpendicular to the margin; these six lines would therefore be acquired twice. Approximately 62 percent of the total survey effort would be MCS surveys, with the remaining 38 percent using OBSs. There could be additional seismic survey operations associated with turns, airgun testing, and repeat coverage of any areas where initial data quality is sub-standard, and 25 percent has been added to the assumed survey line-kms to account for this potential. NMFS considers this a conservative approach to estimating potential acoustic exposures.

The vessel speed during seismic survey operations would be ~4.1 knots (~7.6 km/hour) during MCS reflection surveys and 5 knots (~9.3 km/hour) during OBS refraction surveys. The airguns would fire at a shot interval of 50 m (approximately 24 seconds) during MCS surveys with the hydrophone streamer and at a 400-m (155 seconds) interval during refraction surveys to OBSs. The receiving system would consist of a 15-km long hydrophone streamer and short-period OBSs. As the airgun arrays are towed along the survey lines, the OBSs would receive and store the returning acoustic signals internally for later analysis, and the hydrophone streamer would transfer the data to the on-board processing system.

The seismometers would consist of 33 OBSs, which would be deployed at a total of 124 sites. The instruments

would be deployed by R/V *Langseth* and spaced 10 or 12 km apart. Following refraction shooting of one line, short-period instruments on that line would be recovered, serviced, and redeployed on a subsequent refraction line while MCS data are acquired. The OBSs have a height and diameter of approximately 1 m and an anchor weighing roughly 80 kilograms (kg). OBS sample rate would be set at 200 hertz (Hz). All OBSs would be recovered by the end of the survey.

To retrieve OBSs, an acoustic release transponder (pinger) is used to interrogate the instrument at a frequency of 8–11 kilohertz (kHz), and a response is received at a frequency of 11.5–13 kHz. The burn-wire release assembly is then activated, and the instrument is released to float to the surface from the anchor which is not retrieved. Take of marine mammals is not expected to occur incidental to L-DEO's use of OBSs.

In addition to the operations of the airgun array, a multibeam echosounder (MBES), a sub-bottom profiler (SBP), and an Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler (ADCP) would be operated from R/V *Langseth* continuously during the seismic surveys, but not during transit to and from the survey area. Take of marine mammals is not expected to occur incidental to use of the MBES, SBP, or ADCP as, due to these sources' characteristics (e.g., narrow downward-directed beam), marine mammals would experience no more than one or two brief ping exposures from them, if any exposure were to occur. Accordingly, the use of MBES, SBP, and ADCP are not analyzed further in this document.

Proposed mitigation, monitoring, and reporting measures are described in detail later in this document (please see Proposed Mitigation and Proposed Monitoring and Reporting).

#### **Description of Marine Mammals in the Area of Specified Activities**

Sections 3 and 4 of the application summarize available information regarding status and trends, distribution and habitat preferences, and behavior and life history, of the potentially affected species. Brief discussions of some species and stocks is presented below. For all other species, we refer the reader to the descriptions in L-DEO's IHA application, incorporated here by reference, instead of reprinting the information. Additional information regarding population trends and threats may be found in NMFS's Stock Assessment Reports (SARs; <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-stock-assessments>) and more

general information about these species (e.g., physical and behavioral descriptions) may be found on NMFS's website (<https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/find-species>).

Table 1 lists all species or stocks for which take is expected and proposed to be authorized for this action, and summarizes information related to the population or stock, including regulatory status under the MMPA and Endangered Species Act (ESA) and potential biological removal (PBR), where known. For taxonomy, we follow Committee on Taxonomy (2021). PBR is defined by the MMPA as the maximum number of animals, not including natural mortalities, that may be removed from a marine mammal stock while allowing that stock to reach or maintain its optimum sustainable population (as described in NMFS's SARs). While no serious injury or mortality is anticipated or proposed for authorization here, PBR and annual serious injury and mortality from anthropogenic sources are included here as gross indicators of the status of the species and other threats.

Marine mammal abundance estimates presented in this document represent the total number of individuals that make up a given stock or the total number estimated within a particular study or survey area. NMFS's stock abundance estimates for most species represent the total estimate of individuals within the geographic area, if known, that comprises that stock. For some species, this geographic area may extend beyond U.S. waters. All managed stocks in this region are assessed in NMFS's U.S. Pacific SARs. All values presented in Table 1 are the most recent available at the time of publication and are available in the 2020 SARs (Carretta *et al.*, 2021) and draft 2021 SARs (available online at: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/draft-marine-mammal-stock-assessment-reports>). Where available, abundance and status information is also presented for marine mammals in the Pacific waters of Mexico and/or the greater ETP region. Table 1 denotes the status of species and stocks under the U.S. MMPA and ESA. We note also that the Guadalupe fur seal is classified as "En peligro de extinción" (in danger of extinction) under the Norma Oficial Mexicana NOM-059-SEMARNAT-2010 and all other marine mammal species listed in Table 1, with the exception of Longman's beaked whales and Deraniyagala's beaked whales, are listed as "Sujetas a protección especial" (subject to special protection).

TABLE 1—MARINE MAMMALS THAT COULD OCCUR IN THE SURVEY AREA

Common name	Scientific name	Stock	ESA/MMPA status; strategic (Y/N) <sup>1</sup>	Stock abundance (CV, N <sub>min</sub> , most recent abundance survey) <sup>2</sup>	PBR	Annual M/SI <sup>3</sup>	ETP abundance <sup>4</sup>	Mexico Pacific abundance <sup>5</sup>
<b>Order Cetartiodactyla—Cetacea—Superfamily Mysticeti (baleen whales)</b>								
<b>Family Balaenopteridae (rorquals)</b>								
Humpback Whale	<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i> .	Central N Pacific	-, -, Y	10,103 (0.3, 7,890, 2006).	83	26	2,566	
Minke whale	<i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	115	
Bryde's whale	<i>Balaenoptera edeni</i> .	Eastern Tropical Pacific	-, -, N	Unknown (Unknown, Unknown, N/A).	Undetermined	Unknown	10,411	649
Sei whale	<i>Balaenoptera borealis</i> .	Eastern N Pacific	E, D, Y	519 (0.4, 374, 2014).	0.75	≥0.2	0	
Fin whale	<i>Balaenoptera physalus</i> .	N/A	E, D, Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	574	145
Blue whale	<i>Balaenoptera musculus</i> .	Eastern N Pacific	E, D, Y	1,898 (0.085, 1,767, 2018).	4.1	≥19.4	1,415	773
<b>Superfamily Odontoceti (toothed whales, dolphins, and porpoises)</b>								
<b>Family Physeteridae</b>								
Sperm whale	<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i> .	N/A	E, D, Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	4,145	2810
<b>Family Kogiidae</b>								
Dwarf Sperm Whale.	<i>Kogia sima</i>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>6</sup> 11,200	
<b>Family Ziphiidae (beaked whales)</b>								
Cuvier's Beaked Whale.	<i>Ziphius cavirostris</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>7</sup> 20,000	<sup>8</sup> 68,828
Longman's beaked whale.	<i>Indopacetus pacificus</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,007	
Blainville's beaked whale.	<i>Mesoplodon densirostris</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>9</sup> 25,300	<sup>8</sup> 68,828
Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale.	<i>M. ginkgodens</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>9</sup> 25,300	<sup>8</sup> 68,828
Deraniyagala's beaked whale.	<i>M. hotaula</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>9</sup> 25,300	<sup>8</sup> 68,828
Pygmy beaked whale.	<i>M. peruvianus</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>9</sup> 25,300	<sup>8</sup> 68,828
<b>Family Delphinidae</b>								
Risso's dolphin	<i>Grampus griseus</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	110,457	24,084
Rough-toothed dolphin.	<i>Steno bredanensis</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	107,663	37,511
Common bottlenose dolphin.	<i>Tursiops truncatus</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	335,834	61,536
Pantropical spotted dolphin.	<i>Stenella attenuata</i>	N/A <sup>10</sup>	-, D, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>11</sup> 1,297,091	146,296
Spinner dolphin	<i>Stenella longirostris</i> .	N/A <sup>10</sup>	-, D, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>11</sup> 2,075,871	186,906
Striped dolphin	<i>Stenella coeruleoalba</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	964,362	128,867
Short-beaked common dolphin.	<i>Delphinus delphis</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	3,127,203	283,196
Fraser's dolphin	<i>Lagenodelphis hosei</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>7</sup> 289,300	
Short-finned pilot whale.	<i>Globicephala macrorhynchus</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>12</sup> 589,315	3,348
Killer whale	<i>Orcinus orca</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>7</sup> 8,500	852
False killer whale	<i>Pseudorca crassidens</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>7</sup> 39,800	
Pygmy killer whale	<i>Feresa attenuata</i>	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>7</sup> 38,900	
Melon-headed whale.	<i>Peponocephala electra</i> .	N/A	-, -, N	N/A	N/A	N/A	<sup>7</sup> 45,400	
<b>Order Carnivora—Superfamily Pinnipedia</b>								
<b>Family Otariidae (eared seals and sea lions)</b>								
Guadalupe fur seal	<i>Arctocephalus townsendi</i> .	Mexico	T, D, Y	34,187 (N/A, 31,019, 2013).	1062	≥3.8		

TABLE 1—MARINE MAMMALS THAT COULD OCCUR IN THE SURVEY AREA—Continued

Common name	Scientific name	Stock	ESA/MMPA status; strategic (Y/N) <sup>1</sup>	Stock abundance (CV, N <sub>min</sub> , most recent abundance survey) <sup>2</sup>	PBR	Annual M/SI <sup>3</sup>	ETP abundance <sup>4</sup>	Mexico Pacific abundance <sup>5</sup>
California sea lion	<i>Zalophus californianus</i> .	U.S.	-, -, N .....	257,606 (N/A, 233,515, 2014).	14011 .....	>320	105,000	.....

<sup>1</sup> Endangered Species Act (ESA) status: Endangered (E), Threatened (T)/MMPA status: Depleted (D). A dash (-) indicates that the species is not listed under the ESA or designated as depleted under the MMPA. Under the MMPA, a strategic stock is one for which the level of direct human-caused mortality exceeds PBR or which is determined to be declining and likely to be listed under the ESA within the foreseeable future. Any species or stock listed under the ESA is automatically designated under the MMPA as depleted and as a strategic stock.

<sup>2</sup> NMFS marine mammal stock assessment reports online at: <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/draft-marine-mammal-stock-assessment-reports>. CV is coefficient of variation; N<sub>min</sub> is the minimum estimate of stock abundance. In some cases, CV is not applicable.

<sup>3</sup> These values, found in NMFS's SARs, represent annual levels of human-caused mortality plus serious injury from all sources combined (e.g., commercial fisheries, ship strike). Annual M/SI often cannot be determined precisely and is in some cases presented as a minimum value or range. A CV associated with estimated mortality due to commercial fisheries is presented in some cases.

<sup>4</sup> From NMFS (2015b) unless otherwise noted.

<sup>5</sup> Pacific Mexico excluding the Gulf of California (from Gerrodette and Palacios (1996) unless otherwise noted).

<sup>6</sup> Estimate for ETP is mostly for *K. sima* but may also include some *K. breviceps* (Wade and Gerrodette 1993).

<sup>7</sup> Wade and Gerrodette 1993.

<sup>8</sup> Abundance for all ziphiids.

<sup>9</sup> This estimate for the ETP includes all species of the genus *Mesoplodon*.

<sup>10</sup> Several stocks of these species, while not classified as such in the U.S. SARs, are considered depleted due to historical interactions with tuna fisheries in the area. Please see below for a discussion of these stocks.

<sup>11</sup> Includes abundance of several stocks added together.

<sup>12</sup> Based on surveys in 2000 (Gerrodette and Forcada 2002).

As indicated above, all 30 species (with six managed stocks) in Table 1 temporally and spatially co-occur with the activity to the degree that take is reasonably likely to occur, and we have proposed authorizing it. As the planned survey lines are outside of the U.S. EEZ, they do not directly overlap with the defined ranges for most U.S. managed stocks (Carretta *et al.*, 2021). For some species (e.g., Bryde's whale, Guadalupe fur seal; see Table 1), animals encountered during the surveys could be from a defined stock under the MMPA but most marine mammals in the survey area do not belong to any defined stock. Species that could potentially occur in the proposed research area but are not likely to be encountered due to the rarity of their occurrence (*i.e.*, are considered extralimital or rare visitors to the coastal waters of Mexico in the Eastern Tropical Pacific) are described briefly but omitted from further analysis. These generally include species that do not normally occur in the area but for which there are one or more occurrence records that are considered beyond the normal range of the species. These species include the gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*), Hubbs' beaked whale (*Mesoplodon carlhubbsi*), Stejneger's beaked whale (*M. stejnegeri*), Perrin's beaked whale (*M. perrini*), Baird's beaked whale (*Berardius bairdii*), pygmy sperm whale (*Kogia breviceps*), long-finned pilot whale (*Globicephala melas*), Dall's porpoise (*Phocoenoides dalli*), Pacific white-sided dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus obliquidens*), and northern right whale dolphin (*Lissodelphis borealis*), which all generally occur well north of the

proposed survey area (e.g., north of the Baja peninsula). Five additional pinniped species are known to occur in the ETP but are considered extralimital in the proposed survey area: The Galápagos sea lion (*Zalophus wolfebaeki*), Galápagos fur seal (*Arctocephalus galapagoensis*), South American fur seal (*A. australis*), and the South American sea lion (*Otaria flavescens*), which all occur south of the survey area, and the northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*) which is found north of the survey area.

Prior to 2016, humpback whales were listed under the ESA as an endangered species worldwide. Following a 2015 global status review (Bettridge *et al.*, 2015), NMFS delineated 14 distinct population segments (DPSs) with different listing statuses (81 FR 62259; September 8, 2016) pursuant to the ESA. The DPSs that occur in U.S. waters do not necessarily equate to the existing stocks designated under the MMPA and shown in Table 1. The threatened Mexico DPS and endangered Central America DPS may occur within the proposed survey area. However, due to the expected timing of the proposed survey (spring), most humpbacks from the Mexico DPS will have begun their migration north toward the feeding grounds off of the U.S. west coast and are likely to be outside of the survey area. Humpbacks from the Central America DPS will likely be migrating northward through the survey area at the time of the proposed survey. Therefore, we assume that most humpback whales taken by the proposed survey activities will be from the Central America DPS.

The pantropical spotted dolphin is one of the most abundant cetaceans and

is distributed worldwide in tropical and some subtropical waters, between ~40°N and 40°S (Jefferson *et al.*, 2015). In the ETP, this species ranges from 25° N off the Baja California Peninsula to 17° S, off southern Peru (Perrin and Hohn, 1994). There are two forms of pantropical spotted dolphin (Perrin 2018a): Coastal (*Stenella attenuata graffmani*) and offshore (*S. a. attenuata*), both of which could occur within the proposed survey area. Along the coast of Latin America, the coastal form typically occurs within 20 km from shore (Urbán 2008 in Heckel *et al.*, 2020). There are currently three recognized stocks of spotted dolphins in the ETP: The coastal stock and two offshore stocks—the northeast and the west/south stocks (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Leslie *et al.*, 2019). Much of what is known about the pantropical spotted dolphin in the ETP is related to the historical tuna purse-seine fishery in that area (Perrin and Hohn 1994). There was an overall stock decline of spotted dolphins from 1960–1980 because of the fishery (Allen 1985). In 1979, the population size of spotted dolphins in the ETP was estimated at 2.9–3.3 million (Allen 1985). For 1986–1990, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported an estimate of 2.1 million. Gerrodette and Forcada (2005) noted that the population of offshore northeastern spotted dolphins had not yet recovered from the earlier population declines; possible reasons for the lack of growth were attributed to unreported bycatch, effects of fishing activity on survival and reproduction, and long-term changes in the ecosystem. The abundance estimate for 2006 was ~857,884 northeastern offshore spotted

dolphins, and 439,208 western-southern offshore spotted dolphins; the coastal subspecies was estimated at 278,155 and was less affected by fishing activities (Gerrodette *et al.*, 2008). In 2004, the mortality rate in the tuna fishery was estimated at 0.03 percent (Bayliff 2004). Perrin (2018a) noted that for the last few years, hundreds of spotted dolphins have been taken in the fishery. Currently, there are ~640,000 northeastern offshore spotted dolphins inhabiting the ETP (Perrin 2018a). This stock is still considered depleted and may be slow to recover due to continued chase and encirclement by the tuna fishery, which may in turn affect reproductive rates (Cramer *et al.*, 2008; Kellar *et al.*, 2013). The northeastern offshore and coastal stocks of pantropical spotted dolphins are likely to be encountered during the proposed surveys.

The spinner dolphin is pantropical in distribution, including oceanic tropical and sub-tropical waters between 40° N and 40° S (Jefferson *et al.*, 2015). It is generally considered a pelagic species, but it can also be found in coastal waters (Perrin 2018b). In the ETP, three types of spinner dolphins have been identified and two of those are recognized as subspecies: The eastern spinner dolphin (*Stenella longirostris orientalis*), considered an offshore species, the Central American spinner (*S.l. centroamericana*; also known as the Costa Rican spinner), considered a coastal species occurring from southern Mexico to Costa Rica (Perrin 1990; Dizon *et al.*, 1991), and the 'whitebelly' spinner which is thought to be a hybrid of the eastern spinner and Gray's spinner (*S.l. longirostris*). Gray's spinner dolphin is not expected to occur within the proposed study area. Although there is a great deal of overlap between the ranges of eastern and whitebelly spinner dolphins, the eastern form generally occurs in the northeastern portion of the ETP, whereas the whitebelly spinner occurs in the southern portion of the ETP, ranging farther offshore (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Reilly and Fiedler 1994). Reilly and Fiedler (1994) noted that eastern spinners are associated with waters that have high surface temperatures and chlorophyll and shallow thermoclines, whereas whitebelly spinners are associated with cooler surface temperatures, lower chlorophyll levels, and deeper thermoclines. The eastern spinner dolphins are the most likely to occur in the proposed survey area (see Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Heckel *et al.*, 2020), as this subspecies occurs in the ETP, east of 145° W, between 24° N off the

Baja California Peninsula and 10° S off Peru (Perrin 1990). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported an abundance estimate of 1.7 million, and Gerrodette *et al.* (2005) estimated the abundance at 1.1 million for 2003. Gerrodette and Forcada (2005) noted that the population of eastern spinner dolphins had not yet recovered from the earlier population declines due to the tuna fishery. The population estimate for eastern spinner dolphins in 2003 was 612,662 (Gerrodette *et al.*, 2005). In 2000, the whitebelly dolphin was estimated to number 801,000 in the ETP (Gerrodette *et al.*, 2005). Bayliff (2004) noted a spinner dolphin mortality rate in the tuna fishery of 0.03 percent for 2004. Possible reasons why the population has not recovered include under-reported bycatch, effects of fishing activity on survival and reproduction, and long-term changes in the ecosystem (Gerrodette and Forcada, 2005). The continued chase and encirclement by the tuna fishery may be affecting the reproductive rates of the eastern spinner dolphin (Cramer *et al.*, 2008).

The common dolphin is found in oceanic and nearshore waters of tropical and warm temperate oceans around the world, ranging from ~60° N to ~50° S (Jefferson *et al.*, 2015). There are two subspecies of common dolphins that occur in the eastern Pacific Ocean, the short-beaked form (*Delphinus delphis delphis*) and the long-beaked form (*D. delphis bairdii*). The long-beaked form generally prefers shallower water (Perrin 2018c), typically occurring within 180 km from shore (Jefferson *et al.*, 2015). The short-beaked form occurs along the entire coast of Mexico and has been sighted near the proposed survey area off Nayarit, Michoacán, and Guerrero; the long-beaked form occurs off the Baja California Peninsula and the Gulf of California (Heckel *et al.*, 2020). The southern limit of the long-beaked form appears to be 22° N (Urbán 2008), and no sightings in Mexican waters have been made to the south of that. Thus, only the short-beaked form is expected to occur within the study area.

#### Unusual Mortality Events (UME)

A UME is defined under the MMPA as "a stranding that is unexpected; involves a significant die-off of any marine mammal population; and demands immediate response." For more information on UMEs, please visit: [www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-unusual-mortality-events](http://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-unusual-mortality-events).

Increased strandings of Guadalupe fur seals have occurred along the entire coast of California. Guadalupe fur seal

strandings began in January 2015 and were eight times higher than the historical average. Strandings have continued since 2015 and have remained well above average through 2019. Strandings are seasonal and generally peak in April through June of each year. Strandings in Oregon and Washington became elevated starting in 2019 and have continued to present. Strandings in these two states in 2019 are five times higher than the historical average. As of December 2021, a total of 724 Guadalupe fur seals have stranded and are considered part of the UME (542 in California and 182 in Oregon and Washington). Stranded Guadalupe fur seals are mostly weaned pups and juveniles (1–2 years old). The majority of stranded animals showed signs of malnutrition with secondary bacterial and parasitic infections. For more information, please visit <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/2015-2021-guadalupe-fur-seal-unusual-mortality-event-california>.

#### Marine Mammal Hearing

Hearing is the most important sensory modality for marine mammals underwater, and exposure to anthropogenic sound can have deleterious effects. To appropriately assess the potential effects of exposure to sound, it is necessary to understand the frequency ranges marine mammals are able to hear. Current data indicate that not all marine mammal species have equal hearing capabilities (*e.g.*, Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Wartzok and Ketten, 1999; Au and Hastings, 2008). To reflect this, Southall *et al.* (2007) recommended that marine mammals be divided into functional hearing groups based on directly measured or estimated hearing ranges on the basis of available behavioral response data, audiograms derived using auditory evoked potential techniques, anatomical modeling, and other data. Note that no direct measurements of hearing ability have been successfully completed for mysticetes (*i.e.*, low-frequency cetaceans). Subsequently, NMFS (2018) described generalized hearing ranges for these marine mammal hearing groups. Generalized hearing ranges were chosen based on the approximately 65 decibel (dB) threshold from the normalized composite audiograms, with the exception for lower limits for low-frequency cetaceans where the lower bound was deemed to be biologically implausible and the lower bound from Southall *et al.* (2007) retained. Marine mammal hearing groups and their associated hearing ranges are provided in Table 2.

TABLE 2—MARINE MAMMAL HEARING GROUPS  
[NMFS, 2018]

Hearing group	Generalized hearing range *
Low-frequency (LF) cetaceans (baleen whales) .....	7 Hz to 35 kHz.
Mid-frequency (MF) cetaceans (dolphins, toothed whales, beaked whales, bottlenose whales) .....	150 Hz to 160 kHz.
High-frequency (HF) cetaceans (true porpoises, <i>Kogia</i> , river dolphins, cephalorhynchid, <i>Lagenorhynchus cruciger</i> & <i>L. australis</i> ).	275 Hz to 160 kHz.
Phocid pinnipeds (PW) (underwater) (true seals) .....	50 Hz to 86 kHz.
Otariid pinnipeds (OW) (underwater) (sea lions and fur seals) .....	60 Hz to 39 kHz.

\* Represents the generalized hearing range for the entire group as a composite (i.e., all species within the group), where individual species' hearing ranges are typically not as broad. Generalized hearing range chosen based on ~65 dB threshold from normalized composite audiogram, with the exception for lower limits for LF cetaceans (Southall *et al.* 2007) and PW pinniped (approximation).

The pinniped functional hearing group was modified from Southall *et al.* (2007) on the basis of data indicating that phocid species have consistently demonstrated an extended frequency range of hearing compared to otariids, especially in the higher frequency range (Hemilä *et al.*, 2006; Kastelein *et al.*, 2009; Reichmuth and Holt, 2013).

For more detail concerning these groups and associated frequency ranges, please see NMFS (2018) for a review of available information. 30 marine mammal species (28 cetacean and two pinniped (both otariid) species) have the reasonable potential to co-occur with the proposed survey activities. Please refer to Table 1. Of the cetacean species that may be present, six are classified as low-frequency cetaceans (i.e., all mysticete species), 20 are classified as mid-frequency cetaceans (i.e., all delphinid and ziphiid species and the sperm whale), and two are classified as high-frequency cetaceans (i.e., harbor porpoise and *Kogia* spp.).

**Potential Effects of Specified Activities on Marine Mammals and Their Habitat**

This section includes a summary and discussion of the ways that components of the specified activity may impact marine mammals and their habitat. The Estimated Take section later in this document includes a quantitative analysis of the number of individuals that are expected to be taken by this activity. The Negligible Impact Analysis and Determination section considers the content of this section, the Estimated Take section, and the Proposed Mitigation section, to draw conclusions regarding the likely impacts of these activities on the reproductive success or survivorship of individuals and how those impacts on individuals are likely to impact marine mammal species or stocks.

*Description of Active Acoustic Sound Sources*

This section contains a brief technical background on sound, the

characteristics of certain sound types, and on metrics used in this proposal inasmuch as the information is relevant to the specified activity and to a discussion of the potential effects of the specified activity on marine mammals found later in this document.

Sound travels in waves, the basic components of which are frequency, wavelength, velocity, and amplitude. Frequency is the number of pressure waves that pass by a reference point per unit of time and is measured in hertz (Hz) or cycles per second. Wavelength is the distance between two peaks or corresponding points of a sound wave (length of one cycle). Higher frequency sounds have shorter wavelengths than lower frequency sounds, and typically attenuate (decrease) more rapidly, except in certain cases in shallower water. Amplitude is the height of the sound pressure wave or the “loudness” of a sound and is typically described using the relative unit of the dB. A sound pressure level (SPL) in dB is described as the ratio between a measured pressure and a reference pressure (for underwater sound, this is 1 microPascal (µPa)) and is a logarithmic unit that accounts for large variations in amplitude; therefore, a relatively small change in dB corresponds to large changes in sound pressure. The source level (SL) represents the SPL referenced at a distance of 1 m from the source (referenced to 1 µPa) while the received level is the SPL at the listener’s position (referenced to 1 µPa).

Root mean square (rms) is the quadratic mean sound pressure over the duration of an impulse. Root mean square is calculated by squaring all of the sound amplitudes, averaging the squares, and then taking the square root of the average (Urick, 1983). Root mean square accounts for both positive and negative values; squaring the pressures makes all values positive so that they may be accounted for in the summation of pressure levels (Hastings and Popper, 2005). This measurement is often used

in the context of discussing behavioral effects, in part because behavioral effects, which often result from auditory cues, may be better expressed through averaged units than by peak pressures.

Sound exposure level (SEL; represented as dB re 1 µPa<sup>2</sup> – s) represents the total energy contained within a pulse and considers both intensity and duration of exposure. Peak sound pressure (also referred to as zero-to-peak sound pressure or 0-p) is the maximum instantaneous sound pressure measurable in the water at a specified distance from the source and is represented in the same units as the rms sound pressure. Another common metric is peak-to-peak sound pressure (pk-pk), which is the algebraic difference between the peak positive and peak negative sound pressures. Peak-to-peak pressure is typically approximately 6 dB higher than peak pressure (Southall *et al.*, 2007).

When underwater objects vibrate or activity occurs, sound-pressure waves are created. These waves alternately compress and decompress the water as the sound wave travels. Underwater sound waves radiate in a manner similar to ripples on the surface of a pond and may be either directed in a beam or beams or may radiate in all directions (omnidirectional sources), as is the case for pulses produced by the airgun arrays considered here. The compressions and decompressions associated with sound waves are detected as changes in pressure by aquatic life and man-made sound receptors such as hydrophones.

Even in the absence of sound from the specified activity, the underwater environment is typically loud due to ambient sound. Ambient sound is defined as environmental background sound levels lacking a single source or point (Richardson *et al.*, 1995), and the sound level of a region is defined by the total acoustical energy being generated by known and unknown sources. These sources may include physical (e.g., wind and waves, earthquakes, ice, atmospheric sound), biological (e.g.,

sounds produced by marine mammals, fish, and invertebrates), and anthropogenic (e.g., vessels, dredging, construction) sound. A number of sources contribute to ambient sound, including the following (Richardson *et al.*, 1995):

- *Wind and waves*: The complex interactions between wind and water surface, including processes such as breaking waves and wave-induced bubble oscillations and cavitation, are a main source of naturally occurring ambient sound for frequencies between 200 Hz and 50 kHz (Mitson, 1995). In general, ambient sound levels tend to increase with increasing wind speed and wave height. Surf sound becomes important near shore, with measurements collected at a distance of 8.5 km from shore showing an increase of 10 dB in the 100 to 700 Hz band during heavy surf conditions;

- *Precipitation*: Sound from rain and hail impacting the water surface can become an important component of total sound at frequencies above 500 Hz, and possibly down to 100 Hz during quiet times;

- *Biological*: Marine mammals can contribute significantly to ambient sound levels, as can some fish and snapping shrimp. The frequency band for biological contributions is from approximately 12 Hz to over 100 kHz; and

- *Anthropogenic*: Sources of ambient sound related to human activity include transportation (surface vessels), dredging and construction, oil and gas drilling and production, seismic surveys, sonar, explosions, and ocean acoustic studies. Vessel noise typically dominates the total ambient sound for frequencies between 20 and 300 Hz. In general, the frequencies of anthropogenic sounds are below 1 kHz and, if higher frequency sound levels are created, they attenuate rapidly. Sound from identifiable anthropogenic sources other than the activity of interest (e.g., a passing vessel) is sometimes termed background sound, as opposed to ambient sound.

The sum of the various natural and anthropogenic sound sources at any given location and time—which comprise “ambient” or “background” sound—depends not only on the source levels (as determined by current weather conditions and levels of biological and human activity) but also on the ability of sound to propagate through the environment. In turn, sound propagation is dependent on the spatially and temporally varying properties of the water column and sea floor, and is frequency-dependent. As a result of the dependence on a large

number of varying factors, ambient sound levels can be expected to vary widely over both coarse and fine spatial and temporal scales. Sound levels at a given frequency and location can vary by 10–20 dB from day to day (Richardson *et al.*, 1995). The result is that, depending on the source type and its intensity, sound from a given activity may be a negligible addition to the local environment or could form a distinctive signal that may affect marine mammals. Details of source types are described in the following text.

Sounds are often considered to fall into one of two general types: Pulsed and non-pulsed (defined in the following). The distinction between these two sound types is important because they have differing potential to cause physical effects, particularly with regard to hearing (e.g., Ward, 1997 in Southall *et al.*, 2007). Please see Southall *et al.* (2007) for an in-depth discussion of these concepts.

Pulsed sound sources (e.g., airguns, explosions, gunshots, sonic booms, impact pile driving) produce signals that are brief (typically considered to be less than one second), broadband, atonal transients (ANSI, 1986, 2005; Harris, 1998; NIOSH, 1998; ISO, 2003) and occur either as isolated events or repeated in some succession. Pulsed sounds are all characterized by a relatively rapid rise from ambient pressure to a maximal pressure value followed by a rapid decay period that may include a period of diminishing, oscillating maximal and minimal pressures, and generally have an increased capacity to induce physical injury as compared with sounds that lack these features.

Non-pulsed sounds can be tonal, narrowband, or broadband, brief or prolonged, and may be either continuous or non-continuous (ANSI, 1995; NIOSH, 1998). Some of these non-pulsed sounds can be transient signals of short duration but without the essential properties of pulses (e.g., rapid rise time). Examples of non-pulsed sounds include those produced by vessels, aircraft, machinery operations such as drilling or dredging, vibratory pile driving, and active sonar systems (such as those used by the U.S. Navy). The duration of such sounds, as received at a distance, can be greatly extended in a highly reverberant environment.

Airgun arrays produce pulsed signals with energy in a frequency range from about 10–2,000 Hz, with most energy radiated at frequencies below 200 Hz. The amplitude of the acoustic wave emitted from the source is equal in all directions (i.e., omnidirectional), but

airgun arrays do possess some directionality due to different phase delays between guns in different directions. Airgun arrays are typically tuned to maximize functionality for data acquisition purposes, meaning that sound transmitted in horizontal directions and at higher frequencies is minimized to the extent possible.

#### *Acoustic Effects*

Here, we discuss the effects of active acoustic sources on marine mammals.

*Potential Effects of Underwater Sound*—Please refer to the information given previously (“*Description of Active Acoustic Sound Sources*”) regarding sound, characteristics of sound types, and metrics used in this document. Note that, in the following discussion, we refer in many cases to a review article concerning studies of noise-induced hearing loss conducted from 1996–2015 (i.e., Finneran, 2015). For study-specific citations, please see that work.

Anthropogenic sounds cover a broad range of frequencies and sound levels and can have a range of highly variable impacts on marine life, from none or minor to potentially severe responses, depending on received levels, duration of exposure, behavioral context, and various other factors. The potential effects of underwater sound from active acoustic sources can potentially result in one or more of the following: Temporary or permanent hearing impairment, non-auditory physical or physiological effects, behavioral disturbance, stress, and masking (Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Gordon *et al.*, 2004; Nowacek *et al.*, 2007; Southall *et al.*, 2007; Götz *et al.*, 2009). The degree of effect is intrinsically related to the signal characteristics, received level, distance from the source, and duration of the sound exposure. In general, sudden, high level sounds can cause hearing loss, as can longer exposures to lower level sounds. Temporary or permanent loss of hearing will occur almost exclusively for noise within an animal’s hearing range. We first describe specific manifestations of acoustic effects before providing discussion specific to the use of airgun arrays.

Richardson *et al.* (1995) described zones of increasing intensity of effect that might be expected to occur, in relation to distance from a source and assuming that the signal is within an animal’s hearing range. First is the area within which the acoustic signal would be audible (potentially perceived) to the animal, but not strong enough to elicit any overt behavioral or physiological response. The next zone corresponds with the area where the signal is audible to the animal and of sufficient intensity



to elicit behavioral or physiological responsiveness. Third is a zone within which, for signals of high intensity, the received level is sufficient to potentially cause discomfort or tissue damage to auditory or other systems. Overlaying these zones to a certain extent is the area within which masking (*i.e.*, when a sound interferes with or masks the ability of an animal to detect a signal of interest that is above the absolute hearing threshold) may occur; the masking zone may be highly variable in size.

We describe the more severe effects of certain non-auditory physical or physiological effects only briefly as we do not expect that use of airgun arrays are reasonably likely to result in such effects (see below for further discussion). Potential effects from impulsive sound sources can range in severity from effects such as behavioral disturbance or tactile perception to physical discomfort, slight injury of the internal organs and the auditory system, or mortality (Yelverton *et al.*, 1973). Non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that theoretically might occur in marine mammals exposed to high level underwater sound or as a secondary effect of extreme behavioral reactions (*e.g.*, change in dive profile as a result of an avoidance reaction) caused by exposure to sound include neurological effects, bubble formation, resonance effects, and other types of organ or tissue damage (Cox *et al.*, 2006; Southall *et al.*, 2007; Zimmer and Tyack, 2007; Tal *et al.*, 2015). The survey activities considered here do not involve the use of devices such as explosives or mid-frequency tactical sonar that are associated with these types of effects.

**Threshold Shift**—Marine mammals exposed to high-intensity sound, or to lower-intensity sound for prolonged periods, can experience hearing threshold shift (TS), which is the loss of hearing sensitivity at certain frequency ranges (Finneran, 2015). TS can be permanent (PTS), in which case the loss of hearing sensitivity is not fully recoverable, or temporary (TTS), in which case the animal's hearing threshold would recover over time (Southall *et al.*, 2007). Repeated sound exposure that leads to TTS could cause PTS. In severe cases of PTS, there can be total or partial deafness, while in most cases the animal has an impaired ability to hear sounds in specific frequency ranges (Kryter, 1985).

When PTS occurs, there is physical damage to the sound receptors in the ear (*i.e.*, tissue damage), whereas TTS represents primarily tissue fatigue and is reversible (Southall *et al.*, 2007). In addition, other investigators have

suggested that TTS is within the normal bounds of physiological variability and tolerance and does not represent physical injury (*e.g.*, Ward, 1997). Therefore, NMFS does not consider TTS to constitute auditory injury.

Relationships between TTS and PTS thresholds have not been studied in marine mammals, and there is no PTS data for cetaceans but such relationships are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals. PTS typically occurs at exposure levels at least several dB above (a 40-dB threshold shift approximates PTS onset; *e.g.*, Kryter *et al.*, 1966; Miller, 1974) that inducing mild TTS (a 6-dB threshold shift approximates TTS onset; *e.g.*, Southall *et al.* 2007). Based on data from terrestrial mammals, a precautionary assumption is that the PTS thresholds for impulse sounds (such as airgun pulses as received close to the source) are at least 6 dB higher than the TTS threshold on a peak-pressure basis and PTS cumulative sound exposure level thresholds are 15 to 20 dB higher than TTS cumulative sound exposure level thresholds (Southall *et al.*, 2007). Given the higher level of sound or longer exposure duration necessary to cause PTS as compared with TTS, it is considerably less likely that PTS could occur.

For mid-frequency cetaceans in particular, potential protective mechanisms may help limit onset of TTS or prevent onset of PTS. Such mechanisms include dampening of hearing, auditory adaptation, or behavioral amelioration (*e.g.*, Nachtigall and Supin, 2013; Miller *et al.*, 2012; Finneran *et al.*, 2015; Popov *et al.*, 2016).

TTS is the mildest form of hearing impairment that can occur during exposure to sound (Kryter, 1985). While experiencing TTS, the hearing threshold rises, and a sound must be at a higher level in order to be heard. In terrestrial and marine mammals, TTS can last from minutes or hours to days (in cases of strong TTS). In many cases, hearing sensitivity recovers rapidly after exposure to the sound ends. Few data on sound levels and durations necessary to elicit mild TTS have been obtained for marine mammals.

Marine mammal hearing plays a critical role in communication with conspecifics, and interpretation of environmental cues for purposes such as predator avoidance and prey capture. Depending on the degree (elevation of threshold in dB), duration (*i.e.*, recovery time), and frequency range of TTS, and the context in which it is experienced, TTS can have effects on marine mammals ranging from discountable to

serious. For example, a marine mammal may be able to readily compensate for a brief, relatively small amount of TTS in a non-critical frequency range that occurs during a time where ambient noise is lower and there are not as many competing sounds present.

Alternatively, a larger amount and longer duration of TTS sustained during time when communication is critical for successful mother/calf interactions could have more serious impacts.

Finneran *et al.* (2015) measured hearing thresholds in three captive bottlenose dolphins before and after exposure to ten pulses produced by a seismic airgun in order to study TTS induced after exposure to multiple pulses. Exposures began at relatively low levels and gradually increased over a period of several months, with the highest exposures at peak SPLs from 196 to 210 dB and cumulative (unweighted) SELs from 193–195 dB. No substantial TTS was observed. In addition, behavioral reactions were observed that indicated that animals can learn behaviors that effectively mitigate noise exposures (although exposure patterns must be learned, which is less likely in wild animals than for the captive animals considered in this study). The authors note that the failure to induce more significant auditory effects likely due to the intermittent nature of exposure, the relatively low peak pressure produced by the acoustic source, and the low-frequency energy in airgun pulses as compared with the frequency range of best sensitivity for dolphins and other mid-frequency cetaceans.

Currently, TTS data only exist for four species of cetaceans (bottlenose dolphin, beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*), harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*), and Yangtze finless porpoise (*Neophocaena asiaeorientalis*)) exposed to a limited number of sound sources (*i.e.*, mostly tones and octave-band noise) in laboratory settings (Finneran, 2015). In general, harbor porpoises have a lower TTS onset than other measured cetacean species (Finneran, 2015). Additionally, the existing marine mammal TTS data come from a limited number of individuals within these species. There are no data available on noise-induced hearing loss for mysticetes.

Critical questions remain regarding the rate of TTS growth and recovery after exposure to intermittent noise and the effects of single and multiple pulses. Data at present are also insufficient to construct generalized models for recovery and determine the time necessary to treat subsequent exposures as independent events. More

information is needed on the relationship between auditory evoked potential and behavioral measures of TTS for various stimuli. For summaries of data on TTS in marine mammals or for further discussion of TTS onset thresholds, please see Southall *et al.* (2007, 2019), Finneran and Jenkins (2012), Finneran (2015), and NMFS (2018).

**Behavioral Effects**—Behavioral disturbance may include a variety of effects, including subtle changes in behavior (e.g., minor or brief avoidance of an area or changes in vocalizations), more conspicuous changes in similar behavioral activities, and more sustained and/or potentially severe reactions, such as displacement from or abandonment of high-quality habitat. Behavioral responses to sound are highly variable and context-specific and any reactions depend on numerous intrinsic and extrinsic factors (e.g., species, state of maturity, experience, current activity, reproductive state, auditory sensitivity, time of day), as well as the interplay between factors (e.g., Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Wartzok *et al.*, 2003; Southall *et al.*, 2007, 2019; Weilgart, 2007; Archer *et al.*, 2010). Behavioral reactions can vary not only among individuals but also within an individual, depending on previous experience with a sound source, context, and numerous other factors (Ellison *et al.*, 2012), and can vary depending on characteristics associated with the sound source (e.g., whether it is moving or stationary, number of sources, distance from the source). Please see Appendices B–C of Southall *et al.* (2007) for a review of studies involving marine mammal behavioral responses to sound.

Habituation can occur when an animal's response to a stimulus wanes with repeated exposure, usually in the absence of unpleasant associated events (Wartzok *et al.*, 2003). Animals are most likely to habituate to sounds that are predictable and unvarying. It is important to note that habituation is appropriately considered as a “progressive reduction in response to stimuli that are perceived as neither aversive nor beneficial,” rather than as, more generally, moderation in response to human disturbance (Bejder *et al.*, 2009). The opposite process is sensitization, when an unpleasant experience leads to subsequent responses, often in the form of avoidance, at a lower level of exposure. As noted, behavioral state may affect the type of response. For example, animals that are resting may show greater behavioral change in response to disturbing sound levels than animals

that are highly motivated to remain in an area for feeding (Richardson *et al.*, 1995; NRC, 2003; Wartzok *et al.*, 2003). Controlled experiments with captive marine mammals have showed pronounced behavioral reactions, including avoidance of loud sound sources (Ridgway *et al.*, 1997). Observed responses of wild marine mammals to loud pulsed sound sources (typically seismic airguns or acoustic harassment devices) have been varied but often consist of avoidance behavior or other behavioral changes suggesting discomfort (Morton and Symonds, 2002; see also Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Nowacek *et al.*, 2007). However, many delphinids approach acoustic source vessels with no apparent discomfort or obvious behavioral change (e.g., Barkaszi *et al.*, 2012; Barkaszi and Kelly, 2018).

Available studies show wide variation in response to underwater sound; therefore, it is difficult to predict specifically how any given sound in a particular instance might affect marine mammals perceiving the signal. If a marine mammal does react 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 individuals and populations could be significant (e.g., Lusseau and Bejder, 2007; Weilgart, 2007; NRC, 2005). However, there are broad categories of potential response, which we describe in greater detail here, that include alteration of dive behavior, alteration of foraging behavior, effects to breathing, interference with or alteration of vocalization, avoidance, and flight.

Changes in dive behavior can vary widely, and may consist of increased or decreased dive times and surface intervals as well as changes in the rates of ascent and descent during a dive (e.g., Frankel and Clark, 2000; Ng and Leung, 2003; Nowacek *et al.*, 2004; Goldbogen *et al.*, 2013a, b). Variations in dive behavior may reflect interruptions in biologically significant activities (e.g., foraging) or they may be of little biological significance. The impact of an alteration to dive behavior resulting from an acoustic exposure depends on what the animal is doing at the time of the exposure and the type and magnitude of the response.

Disruption of feeding behavior can be difficult to correlate with anthropogenic sound exposure, so it is usually inferred by observed displacement from known foraging areas, the appearance of

secondary indicators (e.g., bubble nets or sediment plumes), or changes in dive behavior. As for other types of behavioral response, the frequency, duration, and temporal pattern of signal presentation, as well as differences in species sensitivity, are likely contributing factors to differences in response in any given circumstance (e.g., Croll *et al.*, 2001; Nowacek *et al.*; 2004; Madsen *et al.*, 2006; Yazvenko *et al.*, 2007). A determination of whether foraging disruptions incur fitness consequences would require information on or estimates of the energetic requirements of the affected individuals and the relationship between prey availability, foraging effort and success, and the life history stage of the animal.

Of note for one of the species that occur in the survey area, visual tracking, passive acoustic monitoring, and movement recording tags were used to quantify sperm whale behavior prior to, during, and following exposure to airgun arrays at received levels in the range 140–160 dB at distances of 7–13 km, following a phase-in of sound intensity and full array exposures at 1–13 km (Madsen *et al.*, 2006; Miller *et al.*, 2009). Sperm whales did not exhibit horizontal avoidance behavior at the surface. However, foraging behavior may have been affected. The sperm whales exhibited 19 percent less vocal (buzz) rate during full exposure relative to post exposure, and the whale that was approached most closely had an extended resting period and did not resume foraging until the airguns had ceased firing. The remaining whales continued to execute foraging dives throughout exposure; however, swimming movements during foraging dives were 6 percent lower during exposure than control periods (Miller *et al.*, 2009). These data raise concerns that seismic surveys may impact foraging behavior in sperm whales, although more data are required to understand whether the differences were due to exposure or natural variation in sperm whale behavior (Miller *et al.*, 2009).

Variations in respiration naturally vary with different behaviors and alterations to breathing rate as a function of acoustic exposure can be expected to co-occur with other behavioral reactions, such as a flight response or an alteration in diving. However, respiration rates in and of themselves may be representative of annoyance or an acute stress response. Various studies have shown that respiration rates may either be unaffected or could increase, depending on the species and signal characteristics, again highlighting the importance in

understanding species differences in the tolerance of underwater noise when determining the potential for impacts resulting from anthropogenic sound exposure (e.g., Kastelein *et al.*, 2001, 2005, 2006; Gailey *et al.*, 2007, 2016).

Marine mammals vocalize for different purposes and across multiple modes, such as whistling, echolocation click production, calling, and singing. Changes in vocalization behavior in response to anthropogenic noise can occur for any of these modes and may result from a need to compete with an increase in background noise or may reflect increased vigilance or a startle response. For example, in the presence of potentially masking signals, humpback whales and killer whales have been observed to increase the length of their songs or amplitude of calls (Miller *et al.*, 2000; Fristrup *et al.*, 2003; Foote *et al.*, 2004; Holt *et al.*, 2012), while right whales have been observed to shift the frequency content of their calls upward while reducing the rate of calling in areas of increased anthropogenic noise (Parks *et al.*, 2007). In some cases, animals may cease sound production during production of aversive signals (Bowles *et al.*, 1994).

Cerchio *et al.* (2014) used passive acoustic monitoring to document the presence of singing humpback whales off the coast of northern Angola and to opportunistically test for the effect of seismic survey activity on the number of singing whales. Two recording units were deployed between March and December 2008 in the offshore environment; numbers of singers were counted every hour. Generalized Additive Mixed Models were used to assess the effect of survey day (seasonality), hour (diel variation), moon phase, and received levels of noise (measured from a single pulse during each 10 minute sampled period) on singer number. The number of singers significantly decreased with increasing received level of noise, suggesting that humpback whale breeding activity was disrupted to some extent by the survey activity.

Castellote *et al.* (2012) reported acoustic and behavioral changes by fin whales in response to shipping and airgun noise. Acoustic features of fin whale song notes recorded in the Mediterranean Sea and northeast Atlantic Ocean were compared for areas with different shipping noise levels and traffic intensities and during a seismic airgun survey. During the first 72 hours of the survey, a steady decrease in song received levels and bearings to singers indicated that whales moved away from the acoustic source and out of the study area. This displacement persisted for a

time period well beyond the 10-day duration of seismic airgun activity, providing evidence that fin whales may avoid an area for an extended period in the presence of increased noise. The authors hypothesize that fin whale acoustic communication is modified to compensate for increased background noise and that a sensitization process may play a role in the observed temporary displacement.

Seismic pulses at average received levels of 131 dB re 1  $\mu\text{Pa}^2\text{-s}$  caused blue whales to increase call production (Di Iorio and Clark, 2010). In contrast, McDonald *et al.* (1995) tracked a blue whale with seafloor seismometers and reported that it stopped vocalizing and changed its travel direction at a range of 10 km from the acoustic source vessel (estimated received level 143 dB pk-pk). Blackwell *et al.* (2013) found that bowhead whale call rates dropped significantly at onset of airgun use at sites with a median distance of 41–45 km from the survey. Blackwell *et al.* (2015) expanded this analysis to show that whales actually increased calling rates as soon as airgun signals were detectable before ultimately decreasing calling rates at higher received levels (*i.e.*, 10-minute SELcum of ~127 dB). Overall, these results suggest that bowhead whales may adjust their vocal output in an effort to compensate for noise before ceasing vocalization effort and ultimately deflecting from the acoustic source (Blackwell *et al.*, 2013, 2015). These studies demonstrate that even low levels of noise received far from the source can induce changes in vocalization and/or behavior for mysticetes.

Avoidance is the displacement of an individual from an area or migration path as a result of the presence of a sound or other stressors, and is one of the most obvious manifestations of disturbance in marine mammals (Richardson *et al.*, 1995). For example, gray whales are known to change direction—deflecting from customary migratory paths—in order to avoid noise from seismic surveys (Malme *et al.*, 1984). Humpback whales showed avoidance behavior in the presence of an active seismic array during observational studies and controlled exposure experiments in western Australia (McCauley *et al.*, 2000). Avoidance may be short-term, with animals returning to the area once the noise has ceased (e.g., Bowles *et al.*, 1994; Goold, 1996; Stone *et al.*, 2000; Morton and Symonds, 2002; Gailey *et al.*, 2007). Longer-term displacement is possible, however, which may lead to changes in abundance or distribution patterns of the affected species in the

affected region if habituation to the presence of the sound does not occur (e.g., Bejder *et al.*, 2006; Teilmann *et al.*, 2006).

Forney *et al.* (2017) detail the potential effects of noise on marine mammal populations with high site fidelity, including displacement and auditory masking, noting that a lack of observed response does not imply absence of fitness costs and that apparent tolerance of disturbance may have population-level impacts that are less obvious and difficult to document. Forney *et al.* (2017) state that, for these animals, remaining in a disturbed area may reflect a lack of alternatives rather than a lack of effects. The authors discuss several case studies, including western Pacific gray whales, which are a small population of mysticetes believed to be adversely affected by oil and gas development off Sakhalin Island, Russia (Weller *et al.*, 2002; Reeves *et al.*, 2005). Western gray whales display a high degree of interannual site fidelity to the area for foraging purposes, and observations in the area during airgun surveys has shown the potential for harm caused by displacement from such an important area (Weller *et al.*, 2006; Johnson *et al.*, 2007). Forney *et al.* (2017) also discuss beaked whales, noting that anthropogenic effects in areas where they are resident could cause severe biological consequences, in part because displacement may adversely affect foraging rates, reproduction, or health, while an overriding instinct to remain could lead to more severe acute effects.

A flight response is a dramatic change in normal movement to a directed and rapid movement away from the perceived location of a sound source. The flight response differs from other avoidance responses in the intensity of the response (e.g., directed movement, rate of travel). Relatively little information on flight responses of marine mammals to anthropogenic signals exist, although observations of flight responses to the presence of predators have occurred (Connor and Heithaus, 1996). The result of a flight response could range from brief, temporary exertion and displacement from the area where the signal provokes flight to, in extreme cases, marine mammal strandings (Evans and England, 2001). However, it should be noted that response to a perceived predator does not necessarily invoke flight (Ford and Reeves, 2008), and whether individuals are solitary or in groups may influence the response.

Behavioral disturbance can also impact marine mammals in more subtle ways. Increased vigilance may result in

costs related to diversion of focus and attention (*i.e.*, when a response consists of increased vigilance, it may come at the cost of decreased attention to other critical behaviors such as foraging or resting). These effects have generally not been demonstrated for marine mammals, but studies involving fish and terrestrial animals have shown that increased vigilance may substantially reduce feeding rates (*e.g.*, Beauchamp and Livoreil, 1997; Fritz *et al.*, 2002; Purser and Radford, 2011). In addition, chronic disturbance can cause population declines through reduction of fitness (*e.g.*, decline in body condition) and subsequent reduction in reproductive success, survival, or both (*e.g.*, Harrington and Veitch, 1992; Daan *et al.*, 1996; Bradshaw *et al.*, 1998). However, Ridgway *et al.* (2006) reported that increased vigilance in bottlenose dolphins exposed to sound over a five-day period did not cause any sleep deprivation or stress effects.

Many animals perform vital functions, such as feeding, resting, traveling, and socializing, on a diel cycle (24-hour cycle). Disruption of such functions resulting from reactions to stressors such as sound exposure are more likely to be significant if they last more than one diel cycle or recur on subsequent days (Southall *et al.*, 2007). Consequently, a behavioral response lasting less than one day and not recurring on subsequent days is not considered particularly severe unless it could directly affect reproduction or survival (Southall *et al.*, 2007). Note that there is a difference between multi-day substantive behavioral reactions and multi-day anthropogenic activities. For example, just because an activity lasts for multiple days does not necessarily mean that individual animals are either exposed to activity-related stressors for multiple days or, further, exposed in a manner resulting in sustained multi-day substantive behavioral responses.

Stone (2015) reported data from at-sea observations during 1,196 seismic surveys from 1994 to 2010. When large arrays of airguns (considered to be 500 in<sup>3</sup> or more) were firing, lateral displacement, more localized avoidance, or other changes in behavior were evident for most odontocetes. However, significant responses to large arrays were found only for the minke whale and fin whale. Behavioral responses observed included changes in swimming or surfacing behavior, with indications that cetaceans remained near the water surface at these times. Cetaceans were recorded as feeding less often when large arrays were active. Behavioral observations of gray whales during a seismic survey monitored

whale movements and respirations pre-, during, and post-seismic survey (Gailey *et al.*, 2016). Behavioral state and water depth were the best 'natural' predictors of whale movements and respiration and, after considering natural variation, none of the response variables were significantly associated with seismic survey or vessel sounds.

**Stress Responses**—An animal's perception of a threat may be sufficient to trigger stress responses consisting of some combination of behavioral responses, autonomic nervous system responses, neuroendocrine responses, or immune responses (*e.g.*, Seyle, 1950; Moberg, 2000). In many cases, an animal's first and sometimes most economical (in terms of energetic costs) response is behavioral avoidance of the potential stressor. Autonomic nervous system responses to stress typically involve changes in heart rate, blood pressure, and gastrointestinal activity. These responses have a relatively short duration and may or may not have a significant long-term effect on an animal's fitness.

Neuroendocrine stress responses often involve the hypothalamus-pituitary-adrenal system. Virtually all neuroendocrine functions that are affected by stress—including immune competence, reproduction, metabolism, and behavior—are regulated by pituitary hormones. Stress-induced changes in the secretion of pituitary hormones have been implicated in failed reproduction, altered metabolism, reduced immune competence, and behavioral disturbance (*e.g.*, Moberg, 1987; Blecha, 2000). Increases in the circulation of glucocorticoids are also equated with stress (Romano *et al.*, 2004).

The primary distinction between stress (which is adaptive and does not normally place an animal at risk) and "distress" is the cost of the response. During a stress response, an animal uses glycogen stores that can be quickly replenished once the stress is alleviated. In such circumstances, the cost of the stress response would not pose serious fitness consequences. However, when an animal does not have sufficient energy reserves to satisfy the energetic costs of a stress response, energy resources must be diverted from other functions. This state of distress will last until the animal replenishes its energetic reserves sufficiently to restore normal function.

Relationships between these physiological mechanisms, animal behavior, and the costs of stress responses are well-studied through controlled experiments and for both laboratory and free-ranging animals (*e.g.*, Holberton *et al.*, 1996; Hood *et al.*,

1998; Jessop *et al.*, 2003; Krausman *et al.*, 2004; Lankford *et al.*, 2005). Stress responses due to exposure to anthropogenic sounds or other stressors and their effects on marine mammals have also been reviewed (Fair and Becker, 2000; Romano *et al.*, 2002b) and, more rarely, studied in wild populations (*e.g.*, Romano *et al.*, 2002a). For example, Rolland *et al.* (2012) found that noise reduction from reduced ship traffic in the Bay of Fundy was associated with decreased stress in North Atlantic right whales. These and other studies lead to a reasonable expectation that some marine mammals will experience physiological stress responses upon exposure to acoustic stressors and that it is possible that some of these would be classified as "distress." In addition, any animal experiencing TTS would likely also experience stress responses (NRC, 2003).

**Auditory Masking**—Sound can disrupt behavior through masking, or interfering with, an animal's ability to detect, recognize, or discriminate between acoustic signals of interest (*e.g.*, those used for intraspecific communication and social interactions, prey detection, predator avoidance, navigation) (Richardson *et al.*, 1995; Erbe *et al.*, 2016). Masking occurs when the receipt of a sound is interfered with by another coincident sound at similar frequencies and at similar or higher intensity, and may occur whether the sound is natural (*e.g.*, snapping shrimp, wind, waves, precipitation) or anthropogenic (*e.g.*, shipping, sonar, seismic exploration) in origin. The ability of a noise source to mask biologically important sounds depends on the characteristics of both the noise source and the signal of interest (*e.g.*, signal-to-noise ratio, temporal variability, direction), in relation to each other and to an animal's hearing abilities (*e.g.*, sensitivity, frequency range, critical ratios, frequency discrimination, directional discrimination, age or TTS hearing loss), and existing ambient noise and propagation conditions.

Under certain circumstances, marine mammals experiencing significant masking could also be impaired from maximizing their performance fitness in survival and reproduction. Therefore, when the coincident (masking) sound is man-made, it may be considered harassment when disrupting or altering critical behaviors. It is important to distinguish TTS and PTS, which persist after the sound exposure, from masking, which occurs during the sound exposure. Because masking (without resulting in TS) is not associated with

abnormal physiological function, it is not considered a physiological effect, but rather a potential behavioral effect.

The frequency range of the potentially masking sound is important in determining any potential behavioral impacts. For example, low-frequency signals may have less effect on high-frequency echolocation sounds produced by odontocetes but are more likely to affect detection of mysticete communication calls and other potentially important natural sounds such as those produced by surf and some prey species. The masking of communication signals by anthropogenic noise may be considered as a reduction in the communication space of animals (e.g., Clark *et al.*, 2009) and may result in energetic or other costs as animals change their vocalization behavior (e.g., Miller *et al.*, 2000; Foote *et al.*, 2004; Parks *et al.*, 2007; Di Iorio and Clark, 2009; Holt *et al.*, 2009). Masking can be reduced in situations where the signal and noise come from different directions (Richardson *et al.*, 1995), through amplitude modulation of the signal, or through other compensatory behaviors (Houser and Moore, 2014). Masking can be tested directly in captive species (e.g., Erbe, 2008), but in wild populations it must be either modeled or inferred from evidence of masking compensation. There are few studies addressing real-world masking sounds likely to be experienced by marine mammals in the wild (e.g., Branstetter *et al.*, 2013).

Masking affects both senders and receivers of acoustic signals and can potentially have long-term chronic effects on marine mammals at the population level as well as at the individual level. Low-frequency ambient sound levels have increased by as much as 20 dB (more than three times in terms of SPL) in the world's ocean from pre-industrial periods, with most of the increase from distant commercial shipping (Hildebrand, 2009). All anthropogenic sound sources, but especially chronic and lower-frequency signals (e.g., from vessel traffic), contribute to elevated ambient sound levels, thus intensifying masking.

Masking effects of pulsed sounds (even from large arrays of airguns) on marine mammal calls and other natural sounds are expected to be limited, although there are few specific data on this. Because of the intermittent nature and low duty cycle of seismic pulses, animals can emit and receive sounds in the relatively quiet intervals between pulses. However, in exceptional situations, reverberation occurs for much or all of the interval between

pulses (e.g., Simard *et al.* 2005; Clark and Gagnon 2006), which could mask calls. Situations with prolonged strong reverberation are infrequent. However, it is common for reverberation to cause some lesser degree of elevation of the background level between airgun pulses (e.g., Gedamke 2011; Guerra *et al.* 2011, 2016; Klinck *et al.* 2012; Guan *et al.* 2015), and this weaker reverberation presumably reduces the detection range of calls and other natural sounds to some degree. Guerra *et al.* (2016) reported that ambient noise levels between seismic pulses were elevated as a result of reverberation at ranges of 50 km from the seismic source. Based on measurements in deep water of the Southern Ocean, Gedamke (2011) estimated that the slight elevation of background levels during intervals between pulses reduced blue and fin whale communication space by as much as 36–51 percent when a seismic survey was operating 450–2,800 km away. Based on preliminary modeling, Wittekind *et al.* (2016) reported that airgun sounds could reduce the communication range of blue and fin whales 2000 km from the seismic source. Nieukirk *et al.* (2012) and Blackwell *et al.* (2013) noted the potential for masking effects from seismic surveys on large whales.

Some baleen and toothed whales are known to continue calling in the presence of seismic pulses, and their calls usually can be heard between the pulses (e.g., Nieukirk *et al.* 2012; Thode *et al.* 2012; Bröker *et al.* 2013; Sciacca *et al.* 2016). As noted above, Cerchio *et al.* (2014) suggested that the breeding display of humpback whales off Angola could be disrupted by seismic sounds, as singing activity declined with increasing received levels. In addition, some cetaceans are known to change their calling rates, shift their peak frequencies, or otherwise modify their vocal behavior in response to airgun sounds (e.g., Di Iorio and Clark 2010; Castellote *et al.* 2012; Blackwell *et al.* 2013, 2015). The hearing systems of baleen whales are undoubtedly more sensitive to low-frequency sounds than are the ears of the small odontocetes that have been studied directly (e.g., MacGillivray *et al.* 2014). The sounds important to small odontocetes are predominantly at much higher frequencies than are the dominant components of airgun sounds, thus limiting the potential for masking. In general, masking effects of seismic pulses are expected to be minor, given the normally intermittent nature of seismic pulses.

#### Vessel Noise

Vessel noise from the *Langseth* could affect marine animals in the proposed survey areas. Houghton *et al.* (2015) proposed that vessel speed is the most important predictor of received noise levels, and Putland *et al.* (2017) also reported reduced sound levels with decreased vessel speed. Sounds produced by large vessels generally dominate ambient noise at frequencies from 20 to 300 Hz (Richardson *et al.* 1995). However, some energy is also produced at higher frequencies (Hermannsen *et al.* 2014); low levels of high-frequency sound from vessels has been shown to elicit responses in harbor porpoise (Dyndo *et al.* 2015). Increased levels of ship noise have been shown to affect foraging by porpoise (Teilmann *et al.* 2015; Wisniewska *et al.* 2018); Wisniewska *et al.* (2018) suggest that a decrease in foraging success could have long-term fitness consequences.

Ship noise, through masking, can reduce the effective communication distance of a marine mammal if the frequency of the sound source is close to that used by the animal, and if the sound is present for a significant fraction of time (e.g., Richardson *et al.* 1995; Clark *et al.* 2009; Jensen *et al.* 2009; Gervaise *et al.* 2012; Hatch *et al.* 2012; Rice *et al.* 2014; Dunlop 2015; Erbe *et al.* 2015; Jones *et al.* 2017; Putland *et al.* 2017). In addition to the frequency and duration of the masking sound, the strength, temporal pattern, and location of the introduced sound also play a role in the extent of the masking (Branstetter *et al.* 2013, 2016; Finneran and Branstetter 2013; Sills *et al.* 2017). Branstetter *et al.* (2013) reported that time-domain metrics are also important in describing and predicting masking. In order to compensate for increased ambient noise, some cetaceans are known to increase the source levels of their calls in the presence of elevated noise levels from shipping, shift their peak frequencies, or otherwise change their vocal behavior (e.g., Parks *et al.* 2016a,b; Bittencourt *et al.* 2016; Dahlheim and Castellote 2016; Gospić and Picciulin 2016; Gridley *et al.* 2016; Heiler *et al.* 2016; Martins *et al.* 2016; O'Brien *et al.* 2016; Tenessen and Parks 2016). Holt *et al.* (2015) reported that changes in vocal modifications can have increased energetic costs for individual marine mammals. A negative correlation between the presence of some cetacean species and the number of vessels in an area has been demonstrated by several studies (e.g., Campana *et al.* 2015; Culloch *et al.* 2016).

Baleen whales are thought to be more sensitive to sound at these low frequencies than are toothed whales (e.g., MacGillivray *et al.* 2014), possibly causing localized avoidance of the proposed survey area during seismic operations. Reactions of gray and humpback whales to vessels have been studied, and there is limited information available about the reactions of right whales and orcas (e.g., fin, blue, minke, humpback, sei, and Bryde's whales). Reactions of humpback whales to boats are variable, ranging from approach to avoidance (Payne 1978; Salden 1993). Baker *et al.* (1982, 1983) and Baker and Herman (1989) found humpbacks often move away when vessels are within several kilometers. Humpbacks seem less likely to react overtly when actively feeding than when resting or engaged in other activities (Krieger and Wing 1984, 1986). Increased levels of ship noise have been shown to affect foraging by humpback whales (Blair *et al.* 2016). Fin whale sightings in the western Mediterranean were negatively correlated with the number of vessels in the area (Campana *et al.* 2015). Minke whales have shown slight displacement in response to construction-related vessel traffic (Anderwald *et al.* 2013).

Many odontocetes show considerable tolerance of vessel traffic, although they sometimes react at long distances if confined by ice or shallow water, if previously harassed by vessels, or have had little or no recent exposure to ships (Richardson *et al.* 1995). Dolphins of many species tolerate and sometimes approach vessels (e.g., Anderwald *et al.* 2013). Some dolphin species approach moving vessels to ride the bow or stern waves (Williams *et al.* 1992). Pirodda *et al.* (2015) noted that the physical presence of vessels, not just ship noise, disturbed the foraging activity of bottlenose dolphins. Sightings of striped dolphin, Risso's dolphin, sperm whale, and Cuvier's beaked whale in the western Mediterranean were negatively correlated with the number of vessels in the area (Campana *et al.* 2015).

There are few data on the behavioral reactions of beaked whales to vessel noise, though they seem to avoid approaching vessels (e.g., Würsig *et al.* 1998) or dive for an extended period when approached by a vessel (e.g., Kasuya 1986). Based on a single observation, Aguilar Soto *et al.* (2006) suggest foraging efficiency of Cuvier's beaked whales may be reduced by close approach of vessels.

Sounds emitted by the *Langseth* are low frequency and continuous, but would be widely dispersed in both space and time. Vessel traffic associated

with the proposed survey is of low density compared to traffic associated with commercial shipping, industry support vessels, or commercial fishing vessels, and would therefore be expected to represent an insignificant incremental increase in the total amount of anthropogenic sound input to the marine environment, and the effects of vessel noise described above are not expected to occur as a result of this survey. In summary, project vessel sounds would not be at levels expected to cause anything more than possible localized and temporary behavioral changes in marine mammals, and would not be expected to result in significant negative effects on individuals or at the population level. 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 (NSF-USGS 2011).

#### Ship Strike

Vessel collisions with marine mammals, or ship strikes, can result in death or serious injury of the animal. Wounds resulting from ship strike may include massive trauma, hemorrhaging, broken bones, or propeller lacerations (Knowlton and Kraus, 2001). An animal at the surface may be struck directly by a vessel, a surfacing animal may hit the bottom of a vessel, or an animal just below the surface may be cut by a vessel's propeller. Superficial strikes may not kill or result in the death of the animal. These interactions are typically associated with large whales (e.g., fin whales), which are occasionally found draped across the bulbous bow of large commercial ships upon arrival in port. Although smaller cetaceans are more maneuverable in relation to large vessels than are large whales, they may also be susceptible to strike. The severity of injuries typically depends on the size and speed of the vessel, with the probability of death or serious injury increasing as vessel speed increases (Knowlton and Kraus, 2001; Laist *et al.*, 2001; Vanderlaan and Taggart, 2007; Conn and Silber, 2013). Impact forces increase with speed, as does the probability of a strike at a given distance (Silber *et al.*, 2010; Gende *et al.*, 2011).

Pace and Silber (2005) also found that the probability of death or serious injury increased rapidly with increasing vessel speed. Specifically, the predicted probability of serious injury or death resulting from a strike increased from 45 to 75 percent as vessel speed increased from 10 to 14 knots, and exceeded 90 percent at 17 knots. Higher speeds during collisions result in greater force of impact, but higher speeds also appear to increase the chance of severe injuries

or death through increased likelihood of collision by pulling whales toward the vessel (Clyne, 1999; Knowlton *et al.*, 1995). In a separate study, Vanderlaan and Taggart (2007) analyzed the probability of lethal mortality of large whales at a given speed, showing that the greatest rate of change in the probability of a lethal injury to a large whale as a function of vessel speed occurs between 8.6 and 15 knots. The chances of a lethal injury decline from approximately 80 percent at 15 knots to approximately 20 percent at 8.6 knots. At speeds below 11.8 knots, the chances of lethal injury drop below 50 percent, while the probability asymptotically increases toward 100 percent above 15 knots.

The vessel speed during seismic survey operations would be approximately 4.1 knots (7.6 km/h) during MCS reflection surveys and 5 knots (9.3 km/h) during OBS refraction surveys. At this speed, both the possibility of striking a marine mammal and the possibility of a strike resulting in serious injury or mortality are so low as to be discountable. At average transit speed, the probability of serious injury or mortality resulting from a strike is less than 50 percent. However, the likelihood of a strike actually happening is again low. Ship strikes, as analyzed in the studies cited above, generally involve commercial shipping, which is much more common in both space and time than is geophysical survey activity. Commercial shipping vessels are also generally much larger than typical geophysical survey vessels (e.g., up to 360 m long cargo vessels compared to the 71-m R/V *Langseth*). Jensen and Silber (2004) summarized ship strikes of large whales worldwide from 1975–2003 and found that most collisions occurred in the open ocean and involved large vessels (e.g., commercial shipping vessels). No such incidents were reported for geophysical survey vessels during that time period.

It is possible for ship strikes to occur while traveling at slow speeds. For example, a hydrographic survey vessel traveling at low speed (5.5 knots) while conducting mapping surveys off the central California coast struck and killed a blue whale in 2009. The State of California determined that the whale had suddenly and unexpectedly surfaced beneath the hull, with the result that the propeller severed the whale's vertebrae, and that this was an unavoidable event. This strike represents the only such incident in approximately 540,000 hours of similar coastal mapping activity ( $p = 1.9 \times 10^{-6}$ ; 95 percent CI =  $0-5.5 \times 10^{-6}$ ; NMFS, 2013b). In addition, a research vessel

reported a fatal strike in 2011 of a dolphin in the Atlantic, demonstrating that it is possible for strikes involving smaller cetaceans to occur. In that case, the incident report indicated that an animal apparently was struck by the vessel's propeller as it was intentionally swimming near the vessel. While indicative of the type of unusual events that cannot be ruled out, neither of these instances represents a circumstance that would be considered reasonably foreseeable or that would be considered preventable.

Although the likelihood of the vessel striking a marine mammal is low, we require a robust ship strike avoidance protocol (see Proposed Mitigation), which we believe eliminates any foreseeable risk of ship strike during transit. We anticipate that vessel collisions involving a seismic data acquisition vessel towing gear, while not impossible, represent unlikely, unpredictable events for which there are no preventive measures. Given the required mitigation measures, the relatively slow speed of the vessel towing gear, the presence of bridge crew watching for obstacles at all times (including marine mammals), and the presence of marine mammal observers, we believe that the possibility of ship strike is discountable and, further, that were a strike of a large whale to occur, it would be unlikely to result in serious injury or mortality. No incidental take resulting from ship strike is anticipated, and this potential effect of the specified activity will not be discussed further in the following analysis.

**Stranding**—When a living or dead marine mammal swims or floats onto shore and becomes “beached” or incapable of returning to sea, the event is a “stranding” (Geraci *et al.*, 1999; Perrin and Geraci, 2002; Geraci and Lounsbury, 2005; NMFS, 2007). The legal definition for a stranding under the MMPA is that “(A) a marine mammal is dead and is (i) on a beach or shore of the United States; or (ii) in waters under the jurisdiction of the United States (including any navigable waters); or (B) a marine mammal is alive and is (i) on a beach or shore of the United States and is unable to return to the water; (ii) on a beach or shore of the United States and, although able to return to the water, is in need of apparent medical attention; or (iii) in the waters under the jurisdiction of the United States (including any navigable waters), but is unable to return to its natural habitat under its own power or without assistance.”

Marine mammals strand for a variety of reasons, such as infectious agents, biotoxins, starvation, fishery

interaction, ship strike, unusual oceanographic or weather events, sound exposure, or combinations of these stressors sustained concurrently or in series. However, the cause or causes of most strandings are unknown (Geraci *et al.*, 1976; Eaton, 1979; Odell *et al.*, 1980; Best, 1982). Numerous studies suggest that the physiology, behavior, habitat relationships, age, or condition of cetaceans may cause them to strand or might pre-dispose them to strand when exposed to another phenomenon. These suggestions are consistent with the conclusions of numerous other studies that have demonstrated that combinations of dissimilar stressors commonly combine to kill an animal or dramatically reduce its fitness, even though one exposure without the other does not produce the same result (Chroussos, 2000; Creel, 2005; DeVries *et al.*, 2003; Fair and Becker, 2000; Foley *et al.*, 2001; Moberg, 2000; Relyea, 2005a; 2005b; Romero, 2004; Sih *et al.*, 2004).

There is no conclusive evidence that exposure to airgun noise results in behaviorally-mediated forms of injury. Behaviorally-mediated injury (*i.e.*, mass stranding events) has been primarily associated with beaked whales exposed to mid-frequency active (MFA) naval sonar. Tactical sonar and the alerting stimulus used in Nowacek *et al.* (2004) are very different from the noise produced by airguns. One should therefore not expect the same reaction to airgun noise as to these other sources. As explained below, military MFA sonar is very different from airguns, and one should not assume that airguns will cause the same effects as MFA sonar (including strandings).

To understand why Navy MFA sonar affects beaked whales differently than airguns do, it is important to note the distinction between behavioral sensitivity and susceptibility to auditory injury. To understand the potential for auditory injury in a particular marine mammal species in relation to a given acoustic signal, the frequency range the species is able to hear is critical, as well as the species' auditory sensitivity to frequencies within that range. Current data indicate that not all marine mammal species have equal hearing capabilities across all frequencies and, therefore, species are grouped into hearing groups with generalized hearing ranges assigned on the basis of available data (Southall *et al.*, 2007, 2019). Hearing ranges as well as auditory sensitivity/susceptibility to frequencies within those ranges vary across the different groups. For example, in terms of hearing range, the high-frequency cetaceans (*e.g.*, *Kogia spp.*) have a

generalized hearing range of frequencies between 275 Hz and 160 kHz, while mid-frequency cetaceans—such as dolphins and beaked whales—have a generalized hearing range between 150 Hz to 160 kHz. Regarding auditory susceptibility within the hearing range, while mid-frequency cetaceans and high-frequency cetaceans have roughly similar hearing ranges, the high-frequency group is much more susceptible to noise-induced hearing loss during sound exposure, *i.e.*, these species have lower thresholds for these effects than other hearing groups (NMFS, 2018). Referring to a species as behaviorally sensitive to noise simply means that an animal of that species is more likely to respond to lower received levels of sound than an animal of another species that is considered less behaviorally sensitive. So, while dolphin species and beaked whale species—both in the mid-frequency cetacean hearing group—are assumed to (generally) hear the same sounds equally well and be equally susceptible to noise-induced hearing loss (auditory injury), the best available information indicates that a beaked whale is more likely to behaviorally respond to that sound at a lower received level compared to an animal from other mid-frequency cetacean species that are less behaviorally sensitive. This distinction is important because, while beaked whales are more likely to respond behaviorally to sounds than are many other species (even at lower levels), they cannot hear the predominant, lower frequency sounds from seismic airguns as well as sounds that have more energy at frequencies that beaked whales can hear better (such as military MFA sonar).

Navy MFA sonar affects beaked whales differently than airguns do because it produces energy at different frequencies than airguns. Mid-frequency cetacean hearing is generically thought to be best between 8.8 to 110 kHz, *i.e.*, these cutoff values define the range above and below which a species in the group is assumed to have declining auditory sensitivity, until reaching frequencies that cannot be heard (NMFS, 2018). However, beaked whale hearing is likely best within a higher, narrower range (20–80 kHz, with best sensitivity around 40 kHz), based on a few measurements of hearing in stranded beaked whales (Cook *et al.*, 2006; Finneran *et al.*, 2009; Pacini *et al.*, 2011) and several studies of acoustic signals produced by beaked whales (*e.g.*, Frantzis *et al.*, 2002; Johnson *et al.*, 2004, 2006; Zimmer *et al.*, 2005). While precaution requires that the full range of

audibility be considered when assessing risks associated with noise exposure (Southall *et al.*, 2007, 2019), animals typically produce sound at frequencies where they hear best. More recently, Southall *et al.* (2019) suggested that certain species amongst the historical mid-frequency hearing group (beaked whales, sperm whales, and killer whales) are likely more sensitive to lower frequencies within the group's generalized hearing range than are other species within the group and state that the data for beaked whales suggest sensitivity to approximately 5 kHz. However, this information is consistent with the general conclusion that beaked whales (and other mid-frequency cetaceans) are relatively insensitive to the frequencies where most energy of an airgun signal is found. Military MFA sonar is typically considered to operate in the frequency range of approximately 3–14 kHz (D'Amico *et al.*, 2009), *i.e.*, outside the range of likely best hearing for beaked whales but within or close to the lower bounds, whereas most energy in an airgun signal is radiated at much lower frequencies, below 500 Hz (Dragoset, 1990).

It is important to distinguish between energy (loudness, measured in dB) and frequency (pitch, measured in Hz). In considering the potential impacts of mid-frequency components of airgun noise (1–10 kHz, where beaked whales can be expected to hear) on marine mammal hearing, one needs to account for the energy associated with these higher frequencies and determine what energy is truly “significant.” Although there is mid-frequency energy associated with airgun noise (as expected from a broadband source), airgun sound is predominantly below 1 kHz (Breitzke *et al.*, 2008; Tashmukhambetov *et al.*, 2008; Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009). As stated by Richardson *et al.* (1995), “[. . .] most emitted [seismic airgun] energy is at 10–120 Hz, but the pulses contain some energy up to 500–1,000 Hz.” Tolstoy *et al.* (2009) conducted empirical measurements, demonstrating that sound energy levels associated with airguns were at least 20 dB lower at 1 kHz (considered “mid-frequency”) compared to higher energy levels associated with lower frequencies (below 300 Hz) (“all but a small fraction of the total energy being concentrated in the 10–300 Hz range” [Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009]), and at higher frequencies (*e.g.*, 2.6–4 kHz), power might be less than 10 percent of the peak power at 10 Hz (Yoder, 2002). Energy levels measured by Tolstoy *et al.* (2009) were even lower at frequencies above 1 kHz. In addition, as sound propagates away from the

source, it tends to lose higher-frequency components faster than low-frequency components (*i.e.*, low-frequency sounds typically propagate longer distances than high-frequency sounds) (Diebold *et al.*, 2010). Although higher-frequency components of airgun signals have been recorded, it is typically in surface-ducted conditions (*e.g.*, DeRuiter *et al.*, 2006; Madsen *et al.*, 2006) or in shallow water, where there are advantageous propagation conditions for the higher frequency (but low-energy) components of the airgun signal (Hermannsen *et al.*, 2015). This should not be of concern because the likely behavioral reactions of beaked whales that can result in acute physical injury would result from noise exposure at depth (because of the potentially greater consequences of severe behavioral reactions). In summary, the frequency content of airgun signals is such that beaked whales will not be able to hear the signals well (compared to MFA sonar), especially at depth where we expect the consequences of noise exposure could be more severe.

Aside from frequency content, there are other significant differences between MFA sonar signals and the sounds produced by airguns that minimize the risk of severe behavioral reactions that could lead to strandings or deaths at sea, *e.g.*, significantly longer signal duration, horizontal sound direction, typical fast and unpredictable source movement. All of these characteristics of MFA sonar tend towards greater potential to cause severe behavioral or physiological reactions in exposed beaked whales that may contribute to stranding. Although both sources are powerful, MFA sonar contains significantly greater energy in the mid-frequency range, where beaked whales hear better. Short-duration, high energy pulses—such as those produced by airguns—have greater potential to cause damage to auditory structures (though this is unlikely for mid-frequency cetaceans, as explained later in this document), but it is longer duration signals that have been implicated in the vast majority of beaked whale strandings. Faster, less predictable movements in combination with multiple source vessels are more likely to elicit a severe, potentially antipredator response. Of additional interest in assessing the divergent characteristics of MFA sonar and airgun signals and their relative potential to cause stranding events or deaths at sea is the similarity between the MFA sonar signals and stereotyped calls of beaked whales' primary predator: The killer whale (Zimmer and Tyack, 2007). Although generic disturbance stimuli—

as airgun noise may be considered in this case for beaked whales—may also trigger antipredator responses, stronger responses should generally be expected when perceived risk is greater, as when the stimulus is confused for a known predator (Frid and Dill, 2002). In addition, because the source of the perceived predator (*i.e.*, what is actually a MFA sonar signal) will likely be closer to the whales (because attenuation limits the range of detection of mid-frequencies) and moving faster (because it will be on faster-moving vessels), any antipredator response would be more likely to be severe (with greater perceived predation risk, an animal is more likely to disregard the cost of the response; Frid and Dill, 2002). Indeed, when analyzing movements of a beaked whale exposed to playback of killer whale predation calls, Allen *et al.* (2014) found that the whale engaged in a prolonged, directed avoidance response, suggesting a behavioral reaction that could pose a risk factor for stranding. Overall, these significant differences between sound from MFA sonar and the mid-frequency sound component from airguns and the likelihood that MFA sonar signals will be interpreted in error as a predator are critical to understanding the likely risk of behaviorally-mediated injury due to seismic surveys.

The available scientific literature also provides a useful contrast between airgun noise and MFA sonar regarding the likely risk of behaviorally-mediated injury. There is strong evidence for the association of beaked whale stranding events with MFA sonar use, and particularly detailed accounting of several events is available (*e.g.*, a 2000 Bahamas stranding event for which investigators concluded that MFA sonar use was responsible; Evans and England, 2001). D'Amico *et al.* (2009) reviewed 126 beaked whale mass stranding events over the period from 1950 (*i.e.*, from the development of modern MFA sonar systems) through 2004. Of these, there were two events where detailed information was available on both the timing and location of the stranding and the concurrent nearby naval activity, including verification of active MFA sonar usage, with no evidence for an alternative cause of stranding. An additional ten events were at minimum spatially and temporally coincident with naval activity likely to have included MFA sonar use and, despite incomplete knowledge of timing and location of the stranding or the naval activity in some cases, there was no evidence for an alternative cause of



stranding. The U.S. Navy has publicly stated agreement that five such events since 1996 were associated in time and space with MFA sonar use, either by the U.S. Navy alone or in joint training exercises with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The U.S. Navy additionally noted that, as of 2017, a 2014 beaked whale stranding event in Crete coincident with naval exercises was under review and had not yet been determined to be linked to sonar activities (U.S. Navy, 2017). Separately, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea reported in 2005 that, worldwide, there have been about 50 known strandings, consisting mostly of beaked whales, with a potential causal link to MFA sonar (ICES, 2005). In contrast, very few such associations have been made to seismic surveys, despite widespread use of airguns as a geophysical sound source in numerous locations around the world.

A more recent review of possible stranding associations with seismic surveys (Castellote and Llorens, 2016) states plainly that, “[s]peculation concerning possible links between seismic survey noise and cetacean strandings is available for a dozen events but without convincing causal evidence.” The authors’ “exhaustive” search of available information found 10 events worth further investigation via a ranking system representing a rough metric of the relative level of confidence offered by the data for inferences about the possible role of the seismic survey in a given stranding event. Only three of these events involved beaked whales. Whereas D’Amico *et al.* (2009) used a 1–5 ranking system, in which “1” represented the most robust evidence connecting the event to MFA sonar use, Castellote and Llorens (2016) used a 1–6 ranking system, in which “6” represented the most robust evidence connecting the event to the seismic survey. As described above, D’Amico *et al.* (2009) found that two events were ranked “1” and ten events were ranked “2” (*i.e.*, 12 beaked whale stranding events were found to be associated with MFA sonar use). In contrast, Castellote and Llorens (2016) found that none of the three beaked whale stranding events achieved their highest ranks of 5 or 6. Of the 10 total events, none achieved the highest rank of 6. Two events were ranked as 5: One stranding in Peru involving dolphins and porpoises and a 2008 stranding in Madagascar. This latter ranking can only broadly be associated with the survey itself, as opposed to use of seismic airguns. An exhaustive investigation of this stranding event, which did not involve

beaked whales, concluded that use of a high-frequency mapping system (12-kHz multibeam echosounder) was the most plausible and likely initial behavioral trigger of the event, which was likely exacerbated by several site- and situation-specific secondary factors. The review panel found that seismic airguns were used after the initial strandings and animals entering a lagoon system, that airgun use clearly had no role as an initial trigger, and that there was no evidence that airgun use dissuaded animals from leaving (Southall *et al.*, 2013).

However, one of these stranding events, involving two Cuvier’s beaked whales, was contemporaneous with and reasonably associated spatially with a 2002 seismic survey in the Gulf of California conducted by L-DEO, as was the case for the 2007 Gulf of Cadiz seismic survey discussed by Castellote and Llorens (also involving two Cuvier’s beaked whales). However, neither event was considered a “true atypical mass stranding” (according to Frantzis [1998]) as used in the analysis of Castellote and Llorens (2016). While we agree with the authors that this lack of evidence should not be considered conclusive, it is clear that there is very little evidence that seismic surveys should be considered as posing a significant risk of acute harm to beaked whales or other mid-frequency cetaceans. We have considered the potential for the proposed surveys to result in marine mammal stranding and have concluded that, based on the best available information, stranding is not expected to occur.

*Entanglement*—Entanglements occur when marine mammals become wrapped around cables, lines, nets, or other objects suspended in the water column. During seismic survey operations, numerous cables, lines, and other objects primarily associated with the airgun array and hydrophone streamers will be towed behind the *Langseth* near the water’s surface. 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 nmi (100,000 km) of previous NSF-funded seismic surveys when observers were aboard (*e.g.*, Smultea and Holst 2003; Haley and Koski 2004; Holst 2004; Smultea *et al.*, 2004; Holst *et al.*, 2005; Haley and Ireland 2006; SIO and NSF 2006; Hauser *et al.*, 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008). Although entanglement with the streamer is theoretically possible, it has not been documented during tens of thousands of miles of

NSF-sponsored seismic cruises or, to our knowledge, during hundreds of thousands of miles of industrial seismic cruises. Entanglement in OBSs and ocean bottom nodes (OBNs) is also not expected to occur. There are a relative few deployed devices, and no interaction between marine mammals and any such device has been recorded during prior NSF surveys using the devices. There are no meaningful entanglement risks posed by the proposed survey, and entanglement risks are not discussed further in this document.

#### *Anticipated Effects on Marine Mammal Habitat*

*Physical Disturbance*—Sources of seafloor disturbance related to geophysical surveys that may impact marine mammal habitat include placement of anchors, nodes, cables, sensors, or other equipment on or in the seafloor for various activities. Equipment deployed on the seafloor has the potential to cause direct physical damage and could affect bottom-associated fish resources.

Placement of OBSs on the seafloor could damage areas of hard bottom where direct contact with the seafloor occurs and could crush epifauna (organisms that live on the seafloor or surface of other organisms). Damage to unknown or unseen hard bottom could occur, but because of the small area covered by most bottom-founded equipment and the patchy distribution of hard bottom habitat, contact with unknown hard bottom is expected to be rare and impacts minor. Seafloor disturbance in areas of soft bottom can cause loss of small patches of epifauna and infauna due to burial or crushing, and bottom-feeding fishes could be temporarily displaced from feeding areas. Overall, any effects of physical damage to habitat are expected to be minor and temporary.

*Effects to Prey*—Marine mammal prey varies by species, season, and location and, for some, is not well documented. Fish react to sounds which are especially strong and/or intermittent low-frequency sounds, and behavioral responses such as flight or avoidance are the most likely effects. However, the reaction of fish to airguns depends on the physiological state of the fish, past exposures, motivation (*e.g.*, feeding, spawning, migration), and other environmental factors. Several studies have demonstrated that airgun sounds might affect the distribution and behavior of some fishes, potentially impacting foraging opportunities or increasing energetic costs (*e.g.*, Fewtrell and McCauley, 2012; Pearson *et al.*,

1992; Skalski *et al.*, 1992; Santulli *et al.*, 1999; Paxton *et al.*, 2017), though the bulk of studies indicate no or slight reaction to noise (*e.g.*, Miller and Cripps, 2013; Dalen and Knutsen, 1987; Pena *et al.*, 2013; Chapman and Hawkins, 1969; Wardle *et al.*, 2001; Sara *et al.*, 2007; Jorgenson and Gyselman, 2009; Blaxter *et al.*, 1981; Cott *et al.*, 2012; Boeger *et al.*, 2006), and that, most commonly, while there are likely to be impacts to fish as a result of noise from nearby airguns, such effects will be temporary. For example, investigators reported significant, short-term declines in commercial fishing catch rate of gadid fishes during and for up to 5 days after seismic survey operations, but the catch rate subsequently returned to normal (Engas *et al.*, 1996; Engas and Lokkeborg, 2002). Other studies have reported similar findings (Hassel *et al.*, 2004). Skalski *et al.* (1992) also found a reduction in catch rates—for rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.) in response to controlled airgun exposure—but suggested that the mechanism underlying the decline was not dispersal but rather decreased responsiveness to baited hooks associated with an alarm behavioral response. A companion study showed that alarm and startle responses were not sustained following the removal of the sound source (Pearson *et al.*, 1992). Therefore, Skalski *et al.* (1992) suggested that the effects on fish abundance may be transitory, primarily occurring during the sound exposure itself. In some cases, effects on catch rates are variable within a study, which may be more broadly representative of temporary displacement of fish in response to airgun noise (*i.e.*, catch rates may increase in some locations and decrease in others) than any long-term damage to the fish themselves (Streever *et al.*, 2016).

SPLs of sufficient strength have been known to cause injury to fish and fish mortality and, in some studies, fish auditory systems have been damaged by airgun noise (McCauley *et al.*, 2003; Popper *et al.*, 2005; Song *et al.*, 2008). However, in most fish species, hair cells in the ear continuously regenerate and loss of auditory function likely is restored when damaged cells are replaced with new cells. Halvorsen *et al.* (2012b) (2012) showed that a TTS of 4–6 dB was recoverable within 24 hours for one species. Impacts would be most severe when the individual fish is close to the source and when the duration of exposure is long—both of which are conditions unlikely to occur for this survey that is necessarily transient in any given location and likely result in brief, infrequent noise exposure to prey

species in any given area. For this survey, the sound source is constantly moving, and most fish would likely avoid the sound source prior to receiving sound of sufficient intensity to cause physiological or anatomical damage. In addition, ramp-up may allow certain fish species the opportunity to move further away from the sound source.

A recent comprehensive review (Carroll *et al.*, 2017) found that results are mixed as to the effects of airgun noise on the prey of marine mammals. While some studies suggest a change in prey distribution and/or a reduction in prey abundance following the use of seismic airguns, others suggest no effects or even positive effects in prey abundance. As one specific example, Paxton *et al.* (2017), which describes findings related to the effects of a 2014 seismic survey on a reef off of North Carolina, showed a 78 percent decrease in observed nighttime abundance for certain species. It is important to note that the evening hours during which the decline in fish habitat use was recorded (via video recording) occurred on the same day that the seismic survey passed, and no subsequent data is presented to support an inference that the response was long-lasting. Additionally, given that the finding is based on video images, the lack of recorded fish presence does not support a conclusion that the fish actually moved away from the site or suffered any serious impairment. In summary, this particular study corroborates prior studies indicating that a startle response or short-term displacement should be expected.

Available data suggest that cephalopods are capable of sensing the particle motion of sounds and detect low frequencies up to 1–1.5 kHz, depending on the species, and so are likely to detect airgun noise (Kaifu *et al.*, 2008; Hu *et al.*, 2009; Mooney *et al.*, 2010; Samson *et al.*, 2014). Auditory injuries (lesions occurring on the statocyst sensory hair cells) have been reported upon controlled exposure to low-frequency sounds, suggesting that cephalopods are particularly sensitive to low-frequency sound (Andre *et al.*, 2011; Sole *et al.*, 2013). Behavioral responses, such as inking and jetting, have also been reported upon exposure to low-frequency sound (McCauley *et al.*, 2000b; Samson *et al.*, 2014). Similar to fish, however, the transient nature of the survey leads to an expectation that effects will be largely limited to behavioral reactions and would occur as a result of brief, infrequent exposures.

With regard to potential impacts on zooplankton, McCauley *et al.* (2017)

found that exposure to airgun noise resulted in significant depletion for more than half the taxa present and that there were two to three times more dead zooplankton after airgun exposure compared with controls for all taxa, within 1 km of the airguns. However, the authors also stated that in order to have significant impacts on r-selected species (*i.e.*, those with high growth rates and that produce many offspring) such as plankton, the spatial or temporal scale of impact must be large in comparison with the ecosystem concerned, and it is possible that the findings reflect avoidance by zooplankton rather than mortality (McCauley *et al.*, 2017). In addition, the results of this study are inconsistent with a large body of research that generally finds limited spatial and temporal impacts to zooplankton as a result of exposure to airgun noise (*e.g.*, Dalen and Knutsen, 1987; Payne, 2004; Stanley *et al.*, 2011). Most prior research on this topic, which has focused on relatively small spatial scales, has showed minimal effects (*e.g.*, Kostyuchenko, 1973; Booman *et al.*, 1996; Sætre and Ona, 1996; Pearson *et al.*, 1994; Bolle *et al.*, 2012).

A modeling exercise was conducted as a follow-up to the McCauley *et al.* (2017) study (as recommended by McCauley *et al.*), in order to assess the potential for impacts on ocean ecosystem dynamics and zooplankton population dynamics (Richardson *et al.*, 2017). Richardson *et al.* (2017) found that for copepods with a short life cycle in a high-energy environment, a full-scale airgun survey would impact copepod abundance up to three days following the end of the survey, suggesting that effects such as those found by McCauley *et al.* (2017) would not be expected to be detectable downstream of the survey areas, either spatially or temporally.

Notably, a more recent study produced results inconsistent with those of McCauley *et al.* (2017). Researchers conducted a field and laboratory study to assess if exposure to airgun noise affects mortality, predator escape response, or gene expression of the copepod *Calanus finmarchicus* (Fields *et al.*, 2019). Immediate mortality of copepods was significantly higher, relative to controls, at distances of 5 m or less from the airguns. Mortality one week after the airgun blast was significantly higher in the copepods placed 10 m from the airgun but was not significantly different from the controls at a distance of 20 m from the airgun. The increase in mortality, relative to controls, did not exceed 30 percent at any distance from the airgun. Moreover,

the authors caution that even this higher mortality in the immediate vicinity of the airguns may be more pronounced than what would be observed in free-swimming animals due to increased flow speed of fluid inside bags containing the experimental animals. There were no sublethal effects on the escape performance or the sensory threshold needed to initiate an escape response at any of the distances from the airgun that were tested. Whereas McCauley *et al.* (2017) reported an SEL of 156 dB at a range of 509–658 m, with zooplankton mortality observed at that range, Fields *et al.* (2019) reported an SEL of 186 dB at a range of 25 m, with no reported mortality at that distance. Regardless, if we assume a worst-case likelihood of severe impacts to zooplankton within approximately 1 km of the acoustic source, the brief time to regeneration of the potentially affected zooplankton populations does not lead us to expect any meaningful follow-on effects to the prey base for marine mammals.

A 2017 review article concluded that, while laboratory results provide scientific evidence for high-intensity and low-frequency sound-induced physical trauma and other negative effects on some fish and invertebrates, the sound exposure scenarios in some cases are not realistic to those encountered by marine organisms during routine seismic survey operations (Carroll *et al.*, 2017). The review finds that there has been no evidence of reduced catch or abundance following seismic activities for invertebrates, and that there is conflicting evidence for fish with catch observed to increase, decrease, or remain the same. Further, where there is evidence for decreased catch rates in response to airgun noise, these findings provide no information about the underlying biological cause of catch rate reduction (Carroll *et al.*, 2017).

In summary, impacts of the specified activity on marine mammal prey species will likely be limited to behavioral responses, the majority of prey species will be capable of moving out of the area during the survey, a rapid return to normal recruitment, distribution, and behavior for prey species is anticipated, and, overall, impacts to prey species will be minor and temporary. Prey species exposed to sound might move away from the sound source, experience TTS, experience masking of biologically relevant sounds, or show no obvious direct effects. Mortality from decompression injuries is possible in close proximity to a sound, but only limited data on mortality in response to airgun noise exposure are available

(Hawkins *et al.*, 2014). The most likely impacts for most prey species in the survey area would be temporary avoidance of the area. The proposed survey would move through an area relatively quickly, limiting exposure to multiple impulsive sounds. In all cases, sound levels would return to ambient once the survey moves out of the area or ends and the noise source is shut down and, when exposure to sound ends, behavioral and/or physiological responses are expected to end relatively quickly (McCauley *et al.*, 2000b). The duration of fish avoidance of a given area after survey effort stops is unknown, but a rapid return to normal recruitment, distribution, and behavior is anticipated. While the potential for disruption of spawning aggregations or schools of important prey species can be meaningful on a local scale, the mobile and temporary nature of this survey and the likelihood of temporary avoidance behavior suggest that impacts would be minor.

**Acoustic Habitat**—Acoustic habitat is the soundscape—which encompasses all of the sound present in a particular location and time, as a whole—when considered from the perspective of the animals experiencing it. Animals produce sound for, or listen for sounds produced by, conspecifics (communication during feeding, mating, and other social activities), other animals (finding prey or avoiding predators), and the physical environment (finding suitable habitats, navigating). Together, sounds made by animals and the geophysical environment (*e.g.*, produced by earthquakes, lightning, wind, rain, waves) make up the natural contributions to the total acoustics of a place. These acoustic conditions, termed acoustic habitat, are one attribute of an animal's total habitat.

Soundscapes are also defined by, and acoustic habitat influenced by, the total contribution of anthropogenic sound. This may include incidental emissions from sources such as vessel traffic, or may be intentionally introduced to the marine environment for data acquisition purposes (as in the use of airgun arrays). Anthropogenic noise varies widely in its frequency content, duration, and loudness and these characteristics greatly influence the potential habitat-mediated effects to marine mammals (please see also the previous discussion on masking under “Acoustic Effects”), which may range from local effects for brief periods of time to chronic effects over large areas and for long durations. Depending on the extent of effects to habitat, animals may alter their communications signals (thereby

potentially expending additional energy) or miss acoustic cues (either conspecific or adventitious). For more detail on these concepts see, *e.g.*, Barber *et al.*, 2010; Pijanowski *et al.*, 2011; Francis and Barber, 2013; Lillis *et al.*, 2014.

Problems arising from a failure to detect cues are more likely to occur when noise stimuli are chronic and overlap with biologically relevant cues used for communication, orientation, and predator/prey detection (Francis and Barber, 2013). Although the signals emitted by seismic airgun arrays are generally low frequency, they would also likely be of short duration and transient in any given area due to the nature of these surveys. As described previously, exploratory surveys such as these cover a large area but would be transient rather than focused in a given location over time and therefore would not be considered chronic in any given location.

Based on the information discussed herein, we conclude that impacts of the specified activity are not likely to have more than short-term adverse effects on any prey habitat or populations of prey species. Further, any impacts to marine mammal habitat are not expected to result in significant or long-term consequences for individual marine mammals, or to contribute to adverse impacts on their populations.

#### Estimated Take

This section provides an estimate of the number of incidental takes proposed for authorization through this IHA, which will inform both NMFS' consideration of “small numbers” and the negligible impact analysis and determination.

Harassment is the only type of take expected to result from these activities. Except with respect to certain activities not pertinent here, section 3(18) of the MMPA defines “harassment” as any act of pursuit, torment, or annoyance, which (i) has the potential to injure a marine mammal or marine mammal stock in the wild (Level A harassment); or (ii) 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 (Level B harassment).

Authorized takes would primarily be by Level B harassment, as use of seismic airguns has the potential to result in disruption of behavioral patterns for individual marine mammals. There is also some potential for auditory injury (Level A harassment) for mysticetes and high frequency cetaceans (*i.e.*,

porpoises, *Kogia* spp.). The proposed mitigation and monitoring measures are expected to minimize the severity of such taking to the extent practicable.

As noted previously, no serious injury or mortality is anticipated or proposed to be authorized for this activity. Below we describe how the take is estimated.

Generally speaking, we estimate take by considering: (1) Acoustic thresholds above which NMFS believes the best available science indicates marine mammals will be behaviorally harassed or incur some degree of permanent hearing impairment; (2) the area or volume of water that will be ensonified above these levels in a day; (3) the density or occurrence of marine mammals within these ensonified areas; and, (4) the number of days of activities. We note that while these basic factors can contribute to a basic calculation to provide an initial prediction of takes, additional information that can qualitatively inform take estimates is also sometimes available (e.g., previous monitoring results or average group size). Below, we describe the factors considered here in more detail and present the proposed take estimate.

*Acoustic Thresholds*

NMFS recommends the use of acoustic thresholds that identify the

received level of underwater sound above which exposed marine mammals would be reasonably expected to be behaviorally harassed (equated to Level B harassment) or to incur PTS of some degree (equated to Level A harassment).

*Level B Harassment for non-explosive sources*—Though significantly driven by received level, the onset of behavioral disturbance from anthropogenic noise exposure is also informed to varying degrees by other factors related to the source (e.g., frequency, predictability, duty cycle), the environment (e.g., bathymetry), and the receiving animals (hearing, motivation, experience, demography, behavioral context) and can be difficult to predict (Southall *et al.*, 2007, Ellison *et al.*, 2012). Based on what the available science indicates and the practical need to use a threshold based on a factor that is both predictable and measurable for most activities, NMFS uses a generalized acoustic threshold based on received level to estimate the onset of behavioral harassment. NMFS predicts that marine mammals are likely to be behaviorally harassed in a manner we consider Level B harassment when exposed to underwater anthropogenic noise above received levels of 120 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa (rms) for continuous (e.g., vibratory pile-driving, drilling) and above 160 dB re 1

$\mu$ Pa (rms) for non-explosive impulsive (e.g., seismic airguns) or intermittent (e.g., scientific sonar) sources. L-DEO’s proposed activity includes the use of impulsive seismic sources. Therefore, the 160 dB re 1  $\mu$ Pa (rms) threshold is applicable for analysis of Level B harassment.

*Level A harassment for non-explosive sources*—NMFS’ Technical Guidance for Assessing the Effects of Anthropogenic Sound on Marine Mammal Hearing (Version 2.0) (Technical Guidance, 2018) identifies dual criteria to assess auditory injury (Level A harassment) to five different marine mammal groups (based on hearing sensitivity) as a result of exposure to noise from two different types of sources (impulsive or non-impulsive). L-DEO’s proposed seismic survey includes the use of impulsive (seismic airguns) sources.

These thresholds are provided in the table below. The references, analysis, and methodology used in the development of the thresholds are described in NMFS 2018 Technical Guidance, which may be accessed at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-acoustic-technical-guidance>.

TABLE 3—THRESHOLDS IDENTIFYING THE ONSET OF PERMANENT THRESHOLD SHIFT

Hearing group	PTS onset acoustic thresholds* (received level)	
	Impulsive	Non-impulsive
Low-Frequency (LF) Cetaceans .....	Cell 1: $L_{pk,flat}$ : 219 dB; $L_{E,LF,24h}$ : 183 dB .....	Cell 2: $L_{E,LF,24h}$ : 199 dB.
Mid-Frequency (MF) Cetaceans .....	Cell 3: $L_{pk,flat}$ : 230 dB; $L_{E,MF,24h}$ : 185 dB .....	Cell 4: $L_{E,MF,24h}$ : 198 dB.
High-Frequency (HF) Cetaceans .....	Cell 5: $L_{pk,flat}$ : 202 dB; $L_{E,HF,24h}$ : 155 dB .....	Cell 6: $L_{E,HF,24h}$ : 173 dB.
Phocid Pinnipeds (PW) (Underwater) .....	Cell 7: $L_{pk,flat}$ : 218 dB; $L_{E,PW,24h}$ : 185 dB .....	Cell 8: $L_{E,PW,24h}$ : 201 dB.
Otariid Pinnipeds (OW) (Underwater) .....	Cell 9: $L_{pk,flat}$ : 232 dB; $L_{E,OW,24h}$ : 203 dB .....	Cell 10: $L_{E,OW,24h}$ : 219 dB.

\* Dual metric acoustic thresholds for impulsive sounds: Use whichever results in the largest isopleth for calculating PTS onset. If a non-impulsive sound has the potential of exceeding the peak sound pressure level thresholds associated with impulsive sounds, these thresholds should also be considered.

**Note:** Peak sound pressure ( $L_{pk}$ ) has a reference value of 1  $\mu$ Pa, and cumulative sound exposure level ( $L_E$ ) has a reference value of 1  $\mu$ Pa<sup>2</sup>s. In this Table, thresholds are abbreviated to reflect American National Standards Institute standards (ANSI 2013). However, peak sound pressure is defined by ANSI as incorporating frequency weighting, which is not the intent for this Technical Guidance. Hence, the subscript “flat” is being included to indicate peak sound pressure should be flat weighted or unweighted within the generalized hearing range. The subscript associated with cumulative sound exposure level thresholds indicates the designated marine mammal auditory weighting function (LF, MF, and HF cetaceans, and PW and OW pinnipeds) and that the recommended accumulation period is 24 hours. The cumulative sound exposure level thresholds could be exceeded in a multitude of ways (i.e., varying exposure levels and durations, duty cycle). When possible, it is valuable for action proponents to indicate the conditions under which these acoustic thresholds will be exceeded.

*Ensonified Area*

Here, we describe operational and environmental parameters of the activity that will feed into identifying the area ensonified above the acoustic thresholds, which include source levels and transmission loss coefficient.

The proposed 2-D survey would acquire data using the 36-airgun array with a total discharge of 6,600 in<sup>3</sup> at a maximum tow depth of 12 m. L-DEO

model results are used to determine the 160-dBrms radius for the 36-airgun array in deep water (>1,000 m) down to a maximum water depth of 2,000 m. Received sound levels were predicted by L-DEO’s model (Diebold *et al.*, 2010) which uses ray tracing for the direct wave traveling from the array to the receiver and its associated source ghost (reflection at the air-water interface in the vicinity of the array), in a constant-velocity half-space (infinite

homogeneous ocean layer, unbounded by a seafloor). In addition, propagation measurements of pulses from the 36-airgun array at a tow depth of 6 m have been reported in deep water (approximately 1,600 m), intermediate water depth on the slope (approximately 600–1,100 m), and shallow water (approximately 50 m) in the Gulf of Mexico in 2007–2008 (Tolstoy *et al.* 2009; Diebold *et al.* 2010).

For deep and intermediate-water cases, the field measurements cannot be used readily to derive Level A and Level B harassment isopleths, as at those sites the calibration hydrophone was located at a roughly constant depth of 350–500 m, which may not intersect all the SPL isopleths at their widest point from the sea surface down to the maximum relevant water depth for marine mammals of ~2,000 m. At short ranges, where the direct arrivals dominate and the effects of seafloor interactions are minimal, the data recorded at the deep and slope sites are suitable for comparison with modeled levels at the depth of the calibration hydrophone. At longer ranges, the comparison with the model—constructed from the maximum SPL through the entire water column at varying distances from the airgun array—is the most relevant.

In deep and intermediate-water depths, comparisons at short ranges

between sound levels for direct arrivals recorded by the calibration hydrophone and model results for the same array tow depth are in good agreement (Fig. 12 and 14 in Appendix H of NSF–USGS, 2011). Consequently, isopleths falling within this domain can be predicted reliably by the L–DEO model, although they may be imperfectly sampled by measurements recorded at a single depth. At greater distances, the calibration data show that seafloor-reflected and sub-seafloor-refracted arrivals dominate, whereas the direct arrivals become weak and/or incoherent. Aside from local topography effects, the region around the critical distance is where the observed levels rise closest to the model curve. However, the observed sound levels are found to fall almost entirely below the model curve. Thus, analysis of the Gulf of Mexico calibration measurements demonstrates that although simple, the

L–DEO model is a robust tool for conservatively estimating isopleths.

For deep water (>1,000 m), L–DEO used the deep-water radii obtained from model results down to a maximum water depth of 2,000 m. The radii for intermediate water depths (100–1,000 m) were derived from the deep-water ones by applying a correction factor (multiplication) of 1.5, such that observed levels at very near offsets fall below the corrected mitigation curve (See Fig. 16 in Appendix H of NSF–USGS, 2011).

L–DEO’s modeling methodology is described in greater detail in their IHA application. The estimated distances to the Level B harassment isopleths for the array are shown in Table 4. Please note that no survey effort will occur in waters <100 m deep. The estimated isopleth distance specific to shallow water depths are provided for reference only.

TABLE 4—PREDICTED RADIAL DISTANCES TO ISOPLETHS CORRESPONDING TO LEVEL B HARASSMENT THRESHOLD

Source and volume	Tow depth (m)	Water depth (m)	Level B harassment zone (m)
36 airgun array; 6,600 in <sup>3</sup> .....	12	>1,000 100–1,000 <sup>3</sup> <100	<sup>1</sup> 6,733 <sup>2</sup> 10,100 <sup>4</sup> 25,494

<sup>1</sup> Distance based on L–DEO model results.

<sup>2</sup> Distance is based on L–DEO model results with a 1.5 × correction factor between deep and intermediate water depths.

<sup>3</sup> No survey effort will occur in waters <100 m deep.

<sup>4</sup> Distance is based on empirically derived measurements in the Gulf of Mexico (GoM) with scaling applied to account for differences in tow depth.

Predicted distances to Level A harassment isopleths, which vary based on marine mammal hearing groups, were calculated based on modeling performed by L–DEO using the NUCLEUS source modeling software program and the NMFS User Spreadsheet, described below. The acoustic thresholds for impulsive sounds (e.g., airguns) contained in the Technical Guidance were presented as dual metric acoustic thresholds using both SEL<sub>cum</sub> and peak sound pressure metrics (NMFS 2018). As dual metrics, NMFS considers onset of PTS (Level A harassment) to have occurred when either one of the two metrics is exceeded (i.e., metric resulting in the largest isopleth). The SEL<sub>cum</sub> metric considers both level and duration of exposure, as well as auditory weighting functions by marine mammal hearing group. In recognition of the fact that the requirement to calculate Level A harassment ensnified areas could be more technically challenging to predict due to the duration component and the use of weighting functions in the new

SEL<sub>cum</sub> thresholds, NMFS developed an optional User Spreadsheet that includes tools to help predict a simple isopleth that can be used in conjunction with marine mammal density or occurrence to facilitate the estimation of take numbers.

The values for SEL<sub>cum</sub> and peak SPL for the Langseth airgun arrays were derived from calculating the modified far-field signature. The far-field signature is often used as a theoretical representation of the source level. To compute the far-field signature, the source level is estimated at a large distance below the array (e.g., 9 km), and this level is back projected mathematically to a notional distance of 1 m from the array’s geometrical center. However, when the source is an array of multiple airguns separated in space, the source level from the theoretical far-field signature is not necessarily the best measurement of the source level that is physically achieved at the source (Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009). Near the source (at short ranges, distances <1 km), the pulses of sound pressure from each

individual airgun in the source array do not stack constructively, as they do for the theoretical far-field signature. The pulses from the different airguns spread out in time such that the source levels observed or modeled are the result of the summation of pulses from a few airguns, not the full array (Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009). At larger distances, away from the source array center, sound pressure of all the airguns in the array stack coherently, but not within one time sample, resulting in smaller source levels (a few dB) than the source level derived from the far-field signature. Because the far-field signature does not take into account the large array effect near the source and is calculated as a point source, the modified far-field signature is a more appropriate measure of the sound source level for distributed sound sources, such as airgun arrays. L–DEO used the acoustic modeling methodology as used for estimating Level B harassment distances with a small grid step of 1 m in both the inline and depth directions. The propagation modeling takes into account all airgun

interactions at short distances from the source, including interactions between subarrays, which are modeled using the NUCLEUS software to estimate the notional signature and MATLAB software to calculate the pressure signal at each mesh point of a grid.

In order to more realistically incorporate the Technical Guidance’s weighting functions over the seismic array’s full acoustic band, unweighted spectrum data for the Langseth’s airgun array (modeled in 1 Hz bands) was used to make adjustments (dB) to the unweighted spectrum levels, by frequency, according to the weighting functions for each relevant marine mammal hearing group. These adjusted/weighted spectrum levels were then converted to pressures (μPa) in order to integrate them over the entire broadband spectrum, resulting in broadband weighted source levels by hearing group that could be directly incorporated within the User

Spreadsheet (*i.e.*, to override the Spreadsheet’s more simple weighting factor adjustment). Using the User Spreadsheet’s “safe distance” methodology for mobile sources (described by Sivle *et al.*, 2014) with the hearing group-specific weighted source levels, and inputs assuming spherical spreading propagation and information specific to the planned survey (*i.e.*, the 2.2 m/s source velocity and (worst-case) 50-m shot interval, equivalent to a repetition rate of 23.1 seconds), potential radial distances to auditory injury zones were then calculated for SEL<sub>cum</sub> thresholds.

Inputs to the User Spreadsheets in the form of estimated source levels are shown in Appendix A of L-DEO’s application. User Spreadsheets used by L-DEO to estimate distances to Level A harassment isopleths for the airgun arrays are also provided in Appendix A of the application. Outputs from the User Spreadsheets in the form of

estimated distances to Level A harassment isopleths for the survey are shown in Table 5. As described above, NMFS considers onset of PTS (Level A harassment) to have occurred when either one of the dual metrics (SEL<sub>cum</sub> and Peak SPL<sub>flat</sub>) is exceeded (*i.e.*, metric resulting in the largest isopleth). L-DEO proposes to conduct two different methods of seismic acquisition, MCS using a hydrophone streamer (approximately 62 percent of the total survey effort) and refraction surveys using OBSs (approximately 38 percent of the total survey effort). The airguns would fire at a shot interval of 50 m (repetition rate of 23 seconds) during MCS surveys and at a 400-m interval (repetition rate of 155 seconds) during refraction surveys to OBSs. The distances presented in Table 5 were calculated using the MCS survey inputs as using the 50-m shot interval provides more conservative distances than the 400-m shot interval.

TABLE 5—MODELED RADIAL DISTANCES (m) TO ISOPLETHS CORRESPONDING TO LEVEL A HARASSMENT THRESHOLDS

Source (volume)	Threshold	Level A harassment zone (m)			
		LF cetaceans	MF cetaceans	HF cetaceans	Otariids
36-airgun array (6,600 in <sup>3</sup> ) .....	SEL <sub>cum</sub> .....	320.2	0	1.0	0
	Peak .....	8.9	13.9	268.3	10.6

Note that because of some of the assumptions included in the methods used (*e.g.*, stationary receiver with no vertical or horizontal movement in response to the acoustic source), isopleths produced may be overestimates to some degree, which will ultimately result in some degree of overestimation of Level A harassment. However, these tools offer the best way to predict appropriate isopleths when more sophisticated modeling methods are not available, and NMFS continues to develop ways to quantitatively refine these tools and will qualitatively address the output where appropriate. For mobile sources, such as the proposed seismic survey, the User Spreadsheet predicts the closest distance at which a stationary animal would not incur PTS if the sound source traveled by the animal in a straight line at a constant speed.

Auditory injury is unlikely to occur for mid-frequency cetaceans and otariid pinnipeds, given very small modeled zones of injury for those species (all estimated zones less than 15 m for mid-frequency cetaceans and otariid pinnipeds), in context of distributed source dynamics. The source level of the array is a theoretical definition

assuming a point source and measurement in the far-field of the source (MacGillivray, 2006). As described by Caldwell and Dragoset (2000), an array is not a point source, but one that spans a small area. In the far-field, individual elements in arrays will effectively work as one source because individual pressure peaks will have coalesced into one relatively broad pulse. The array can then be considered a “point source.” For distances within the near-field, *i.e.*, approximately 2–3 times the array dimensions, pressure peaks from individual elements do not arrive simultaneously because the observation point is not equidistant from each element. The effect is destructive interference of the outputs of each element, so that peak pressures in the near-field will be significantly lower than the output of the largest individual element. Here, the relevant peak isopleth distances would in all cases be expected to be within the near-field of the array where the definition of source level breaks down. Therefore, actual locations within this distance of the array center where the sound level exceeds the relevant peak SPL thresholds would not necessarily exist. In general, Caldwell and Dragoset (2000)

suggest that the near-field for airgun arrays is considered to extend out to approximately 250 m.

In order to provide quantitative support for this theoretical argument, we calculated expected maximum distances at which the near-field would transition to the far-field (Table 5). For a specific array one can estimate the distance at which the near-field transitions to the far-field by:

$$D = \frac{L^2}{4\lambda}$$

with the condition that  $D \gg \lambda$ , and where  $D$  is the distance,  $L$  is the longest dimension of the array, and  $\lambda$  is the wavelength of the signal (Lurton, 2002).

Given that  $\lambda$  can be defined by:

$$\lambda = \frac{v}{f}$$

where  $f$  is the frequency of the sound signal and  $v$  is the speed of the sound in the medium of interest, one can rewrite the equation for  $D$  as:

$$D = \frac{fL^2}{4v}$$

and calculate  $D$  directly given a particular frequency and known speed

of sound (here assumed to be 1,500 meters per second in water, although this varies with environmental conditions).

To determine the closest distance to the arrays at which the source level predictions in Table 5 are valid (*i.e.*, maximum extent of the near-field), we calculated *D* based on an assumed frequency of 1 kHz. A frequency of 1 kHz is commonly used in near-field/far-field calculations for airgun arrays (Zykov and Carr, 2014; MacGillivray, 2006; NSF and USGS, 2011), and based on representative airgun spectrum data and field measurements of an airgun array used on the *Langseth*, nearly all (greater than 95 percent) of the energy from airgun arrays is below 1 kHz (Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009). Thus, using 1 kHz as the upper cut-off for calculating the maximum extent of the near-field should reasonably represent the near-field extent in field conditions.

If the largest distance to the peak sound pressure level threshold was equal to or less than the longest dimension of the array (*i.e.*, under the array), or within the near-field, then received levels that meet or exceed the threshold in most cases are not expected to occur. This is because within the near-field and within the dimensions of the array, the source levels specified in Appendix A of L-DEO's application are overestimated and not applicable. In fact, until one reaches a distance of approximately three or four times the near-field distance the average intensity of sound at any given distance from the array is still less than that based on calculations that assume a directional point source (Lurton, 2002). The 6,600-in<sup>3</sup> airgun array planned for use during the proposed survey has an approximate diagonal of 28.8 m, resulting in a near-field distance of 138.7 m at 1 kHz (NSF and USGS, 2011). Field measurements of this array indicate that the source behaves like multiple discrete sources, rather than a directional point source, beginning at approximately 400 m (deep site) to 1 km (shallow site) from the center of the array (Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009), distances that are actually greater than four times the calculated 140-m near-field distance. Within these distances, the recorded received levels were always lower than would be predicted based on calculations that assume a

directional point source, and increasingly so as one moves closer towards the array (Tolstoy *et al.*, 2009). Given this, relying on the calculated distance (138.7 m) as the distance at which we expect to be in the near-field is a conservative approach since even beyond this distance the acoustic modeling still overestimates the actual received level. Within the near-field, in order to explicitly evaluate the likelihood of exceeding any particular acoustic threshold, one would need to consider the exact position of the animal, its relationship to individual array elements, and how the individual acoustic sources propagate and their acoustic fields interact. Given that within the near-field and dimensions of the array source levels would be below those assumed here, we believe exceedance of the peak pressure threshold would only be possible under highly unlikely circumstances.

In consideration of the received sound levels in the near-field as described above, we expect the potential for Level A harassment of mid-frequency cetaceans, otariid pinnipeds, and phocid pinnipeds to be de minimis, even before the likely moderating effects of aversion and/or other compensatory behaviors (*e.g.*, Nachtigall *et al.*, 2018) are considered. We do not believe that Level A harassment is a likely outcome for any mid-frequency cetacean, otariid pinniped, or phocid pinniped and do not propose to authorize any Level A harassment for these species.

#### *Marine Mammal Occurrence*

In this section we provide the information about the presence, density, or group dynamics of marine mammals that will inform the take calculations.

L-DEO used habitat-based stratified marine mammal densities for summer for the ETP when available (Barlow *et al.*, 2009), and densities for the ETP from NMFS (2015b) for all other species (Table 6). Barlow *et al.* (2009) used data from 16 NMFS Southwest Fisheries Science Center (SWFSC) ship-based cetacean and ecosystem assessment surveys between 1986 and 2006 to develop habitat models to predict density for 15 cetacean species in the ETP. Model predictions were then used in standard line-transect formulae to estimate density for each transect

segment for each survey year. Predicted densities for each year were smoothed with geospatial methods to obtain a continuous grid of density estimates for the surveyed area in the ETP. These annual grids were then averaged to obtain a composite grid that represents our best estimates of cetacean density over the past 20 years in the ETP. The models developed by Barlow *et al.* (2009) have been incorporated into a web-based GIS software system developed by Duke University's Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program. The habitat-based density models consist of 100 km × 100 km grid cells. Densities in the grid cells that overlapped the survey area were averaged for each of the three water depth categories (shallow, intermediate, deep).

The NMFS SWFSC also developed density estimates for species in the ETP that may be affected by their own fisheries research activities (NMFS 2015b). These estimates were derived from abundance estimates using ship-based surveys of marine mammals in the ETP, as reported by Gerrodette *et al.* (2008). While the SWFSC developed volumetric density estimates (animals/km<sup>3</sup>) to account for typical dive depth of each species (0–200 m and >200 m), L-DEO used the area density (animals/km<sup>2</sup>) to represent expected density across all water depth strata.

For the sei whale, for which NMFS (2015b) reported a density of zero, L-DEO used the spring density for Baja from U.S. Navy (2017b). No regional density estimates are available for Guadalupe fur seals in the ETP; therefore, NMFS (2015b) used the density of Guadalupe fur seals in the California Current Ecosystem (CCE) as a proxy. However, as the survey area is south of the typical range of Guadalupe fur seals (Ortiz *et al.*, 2019), the density from the CCE is likely an overestimate. In the survey area, Guadalupe fur seals are extremely unlikely to occur in waters over the continental shelf under 2,000 m (T. Norris, pers. comm.). NMFS has therefore assumed that the density of Guadalupe fur seals in water depths under 2,000 m is zero animals per square km, and have retained the CCE density estimate for waters over 2,000 m deep (Table 6).

TABLE 6—ESTIMATED DENSITIES OF MARINE MAMMALS IN THE PROPOSED SURVEY AREA

Species	Density (#/km <sup>2</sup> ) in survey area		
	Shallow water (<100 m)	Intermediate water (100–1,000 m)	Deep water (>1,000 m)
Humpback whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00013	<sup>1</sup> 0.00013	<sup>1</sup> 0.00013
Minke whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00001	<sup>1</sup> 0.00001	<sup>1</sup> 0.00001
Bryde's whale	<sup>2</sup> 0.000486	<sup>2</sup> 0.000489	<sup>2</sup> 0.000451
Fin whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00003	<sup>1</sup> 0.00003	<sup>1</sup> 0.00003
Sei whale	<sup>3</sup> 0.00005	<sup>3</sup> 0.00005	<sup>3</sup> 0.00005
Blue whale	<sup>2</sup> 0.00010	<sup>2</sup> 0.00009	<sup>2</sup> 0.00008
Sperm whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00019	<sup>1</sup> 0.00019	<sup>1</sup> 0.00019
Cuvier's beaked whale	<sup>2</sup> 0.00105	<sup>2</sup> 0.00106	<sup>2</sup> 0.00107
Longman's beaked whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00004	<sup>1</sup> 0.00004	<sup>1</sup> 0.00004
Mesoplodon spp <sup>4</sup>	<sup>2</sup> 0.00032	<sup>2</sup> 0.00033	<sup>2</sup> 0.00036
Risso's dolphin	<sup>1</sup> 0.00517	<sup>1</sup> 0.00517	<sup>1</sup> 0.00517
Rough-toothed dolphin	<sup>2</sup> 0.00880	<sup>2</sup> 0.00891	<sup>2</sup> 0.00945
Common bottlenose dolphin	<sup>2</sup> 0.04809	<sup>2</sup> 0.04502	<sup>2</sup> 0.03557
Pantropical spotted dolphin	<sup>1</sup> 0.12263	<sup>1</sup> 0.12263	<sup>1</sup> 0.12263
Spinner dolphin (whitebelly)	<sup>2</sup> 0.00148	<sup>2</sup> 0.00155	<sup>2</sup> 0.00193
Spinner dolphin (eastern)	<sup>2</sup> 0.13182	<sup>2</sup> 0.12989	<sup>2</sup> 0.12791
Striped dolphin	<sup>2</sup> 0.02800	<sup>2</sup> 0.02890	<sup>2</sup> 0.03516
Short-beaked common dolphin	<sup>2</sup> 0.04934	<sup>2</sup> 0.04881	<sup>2</sup> 0.04435
Fraser's dolphin	<sup>1</sup> 0.01355	<sup>1</sup> 0.01355	<sup>1</sup> 0.01355
Short-finned pilot whale <sup>5</sup>	<sup>2</sup> 0.00346	<sup>2</sup> 0.00344	<sup>2</sup> 0.00382
Killer whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.0004	<sup>1</sup> 0.0004	<sup>1</sup> 0.0004
False killer whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00186	<sup>1</sup> 0.00186	<sup>1</sup> 0.00186
Pygmy killer whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00183	<sup>1</sup> 0.00183	<sup>1</sup> 0.00183
Melon-headed whale	<sup>1</sup> 0.00213	<sup>1</sup> 0.00213	<sup>1</sup> 0.00213
<i>Kogia</i> spp	<sup>1</sup> 0.00053	<sup>1</sup> 0.00053	<sup>1</sup> 0.00053
Guadalupe fur seal	0	<sup>6</sup> 0.00741	<sup>1</sup> 0.00741
California sea lion	<sup>1</sup> 0.16262	<sup>1</sup> 0.16262	<sup>7</sup> 0

<sup>1</sup> Density in greater ETP (NMFS 2015b).

<sup>2</sup> Density in proposed survey area (Barlow *et al.*, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> Density for Baja (U.S. Navy 2017b).

<sup>4</sup> Density for Mesoplodon species guild (Blainville's beaked whale, Ginkgo-toothed beaked whale, Deraniyagala's beaked whale, and pygmy beaked whale).

<sup>5</sup> Density for *Globicephala* species guild.

<sup>6</sup> Density is assumed to be zero in waters <2,000 m.

<sup>7</sup> Density is assumed to be zero in deep water (>1,000 m).

*Take Calculation and Estimation*

Here we describe how the information provided above is brought together to produce a quantitative take estimate.

In order to estimate the number of marine mammals predicted to be exposed to sound levels that would result in Level A or Level B harassment, radial distances from the airgun array to predicted isopleths corresponding to the Level A harassment and Level B harassment thresholds are calculated, as described above. Those radial distances are then used to calculate the area(s) around the airgun array predicted to be ensonified to sound levels that exceed the Level A and Level B harassment thresholds. L-DEO identified specific seismic survey trackline(s) that could be surveyed on one day of research; in this case, a representative 182-km MCS line and a 222-km long OBS line were chosen. The distances to the 160-dB Level B harassment threshold and PTS (Level A harassment) thresholds (based on L-DEO model results) were used to draw a buffer around every transect line in GIS to determine the daily ensonified

area in each depth category. The ensonified areas were then multiplied by the number of survey days (7 days for OBS survey effort; 13 days for MCS survey effort) increased by 25 percent. As noted previously, L-DEO has added 25 percent in the form of operational days, which is equivalent to adding 25 percent to the proposed line kilometers to be surveyed. This accounts for the possibility that additional operational days are required, but likely results in an overestimate of actual exposures. For additional details regarding calculations of ensonified area, please see Appendix D of L-DEO's application. L-DEO's estimated incidents of exposure above Level A and Level B harassment criteria are presented in Table 7.

As previously noted, NMFS does not have authority under the MMPA within the territorial seas of foreign nations (from 0–12 nmi (22.2 km) from shore), as the MMPA does not apply in those waters, and therefore does not authorize incidental take that may occur as a result of activities occurring within territorial waters. However, NMFS has

still calculated the estimated level of incidental take in the entire activity area (including Mexican territorial waters) as part of the analysis supporting our determination under the MMPA that the activity will have a negligible impact on the affected species. The total estimated take in U.S. and Mexican waters is presented in Table 8 (see Negligible Impact Analysis and Determination).

L-DEO generally assumed that their estimates of marine mammal exposures above harassment thresholds to equate to take and requested authorization of those takes. Those estimates in turn form the basis for our proposed take authorization numbers. For the species for which NMFS does not expect there to be a reasonable potential for take by Level A harassment to occur, *i.e.*, mid-frequency cetaceans and all pinnipeds, we have added L-DEO's estimated exposures above Level A harassment thresholds (and requests for take by Level A harassment) to their estimated exposures above the Level B harassment threshold to produce a total number of incidents of take by Level B harassment



that is proposed for authorization. Estimated exposures and proposed take numbers for authorization are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7—ESTIMATED AND PROPOSED TAKE BY LEVEL A AND LEVEL B HARASSMENT, AND PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION

Species	Estimated takes by Level B harassment	Estimated takes by Level A harassment	Proposed takes by Level B harassment	Proposed takes by Level A harassment	Total proposed take	Regional population size	Percent of population
Humpback whale .....	8	0	8	0	8	<sup>a</sup> 2,566	0.31
Minke whale .....	1	0	<sup>b</sup> 2	0	<sup>b</sup> 2	115	1.74
Bryde's whale .....	27	1	27	1	28	<sup>a</sup> 649	4.31
Fin whale .....	2	0	2	0	2	<sup>a</sup> 145	1.38
Sei whale .....	3	0	3	0	3	<sup>c</sup> 29,600	0.01
Blue whale .....	5	0	5	0	5	773	0.65
Sperm whale .....	12	0	12	0	12	2,810	0.43
Cuvier's beaked whale	69	0	69	0	69	<sup>c</sup> 20,000	0.35
Longman's beaked whale .....	3	0	3	0	3	<sup>c</sup> 1,007	0.30
Mesoplodon spp .....	23	0	23	0	23	<sup>c</sup> 25,300	0.09
Risso's dolphin .....	327	1	328	0	328	<sup>a</sup> 24,084	1.36
Rough-toothed dolphin	596	1	597	0	597	<sup>a</sup> 37,511	1.59
Common bottlenose dolphin .....	2,268	6	2274	0	2274	<sup>a</sup> 61,536	3.70
Pantropical spotted dolphin .....	7,973	15	7988	0	7988	<sup>a</sup> 146,296	5.46
Spinner dolphin (whitebelly) .....	121	0	121	0	121	<sup>a</sup> 186,906	0.06
Spinner dolphin (eastern) .....	8,173	16	8,189	0	8189	<sup>a</sup> 186,906	4.38
Striped dolphin .....	2,209	3	2212	0	2212	<sup>a</sup> 128,867	1.72
Short-beaked common dolphin .....	2,812	6	2818	0	2818	<sup>a</sup> 283,196	1.00
Fraser's dolphin .....	856	2	858	0	858	<sup>c</sup> 289,300	0.30
Short-finned pilot whale	244	0	244	0	244	<sup>a</sup> 3,348	7.29
Killer whale .....	25	0	25	0	25	<sup>a</sup> 852	2.93
False killer whale .....	118	0	118	0	118	<sup>c</sup> 39,600	0.30
Pygmy killer whale .....	116	0	116	0	116	<sup>c</sup> 38,900	0.30
Melon-headed whale ....	135	0	135	0	135	<sup>c</sup> 45,400	0.30
<i>Kogia</i> spp .....	33	1	33	1	34	<sup>c,d</sup> 11,200	0.30
Guadalupe fur seal .....	415	1	416	0	416	<sup>c</sup> 34,187	1.22
California sea lion .....	349	16	365	0	365	<sup>c</sup> 105,000	0.35

<sup>a</sup> Estimated population in Pacific waters of Mexico (Gerrodette and Palacios (1996)).

<sup>b</sup> Proposed take increased to maximum group size.

<sup>c</sup> Population in ETP or wider Pacific (NMFS 2015b).

<sup>d</sup> Population of *Kogia* species guild.

**Proposed Mitigation**

In order to issue an IHA under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA, NMFS must set forth the permissible methods of taking pursuant to the activity, and other means of effecting the least practicable impact on the species or stock and its habitat, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance, and on the availability of the species or stock for taking for certain subsistence uses (latter not applicable for this action). NMFS regulations require applicants for incidental take authorizations to include information about the availability and feasibility (economic and technological) of equipment, methods, and manner of conducting the activity or other means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact upon the affected species or stocks and their habitat (50 CFR 216.104(a)(11)).

In evaluating how mitigation may or may not be appropriate to ensure the least practicable adverse impact on species or stocks and their habitat, as well as subsistence uses where applicable, we carefully consider two primary factors:

(1) The manner in which, and the degree to which, the successful implementation of the measure(s) is expected to reduce impacts to marine mammals, marine mammal species or stocks, and their habitat. This considers the nature of the potential adverse impact being mitigated (likelihood, scope, range). It further considers the likelihood that the measure will be effective if implemented (probability of accomplishing the mitigating result if implemented as planned) and the likelihood of effective implementation (probability implemented as planned); and

(2) The practicability of the measures for applicant implementation, which may consider such things as cost, impact on operations, and, in the case of a military readiness activity, personnel safety, practicality of implementation, and impact on the effectiveness of the military readiness activity.

In order to satisfy the MMPA's least practicable adverse impact standard, NMFS has evaluated a suite of basic mitigation protocols for seismic surveys that are required regardless of the status of a stock. Additional or enhanced protections may be required for species whose stocks are in particularly poor health and/or are subject to some significant additional stressor that lessens that stock's ability to weather the effects of the specified activities without worsening its status. We reviewed seismic mitigation protocols required or recommended elsewhere

(*e.g.*, HESS, 1999; DOC, 2013; IBAMA, 2018; Kyhn *et al.*, 2011; JNCC, 2017; DEWHA, 2008; BOEM, 2016; DFO, 2008; GHFS, 2015; MMOA, 2016; Nowacek *et al.*, 2013; Nowacek and Southall, 2016), recommendations received during public comment periods for previous actions, and the available scientific literature. We also considered recommendations given in a number of review articles (*e.g.*, Weir and Dolman, 2007; Compton *et al.*, 2008; Parsons *et al.*, 2009; Wright and Cosentino, 2015; Stone, 2015b). This exhaustive review and consideration of public comments regarding previous, similar activities has led to development of the protocols included here.

#### *Vessel-Based Visual Mitigation Monitoring*

Visual monitoring requires the use of trained observers (herein referred to as visual protected species observers (PSOs)) to scan the ocean surface for the presence of marine mammals. The area to be scanned visually includes primarily the exclusion zone (EZ), within which observation of certain marine mammals requires shutdown of the acoustic source, but also a buffer zone and, to the extent possible depending on conditions, the surrounding waters. The buffer zone means an area beyond the EZ to be monitored for the presence of marine mammals that may enter the EZ. During pre-start clearance monitoring (*i.e.*, before ramp-up begins), the buffer zone also acts as an extension of the EZ in that observations of marine mammals within the buffer zone would also prevent airgun operations from beginning (*i.e.*, ramp-up). The buffer zone encompasses the area at and below the sea surface from the edge of the 0–500 m EZ, out to a radius of 1,000 m from the edges of the airgun array (500–1,000 m). This 1,000-m zone (EZ plus buffer) represents the pre-start clearance zone. Visual monitoring of the EZ and adjacent waters is intended to establish and, when visual conditions allow, maintain zones around the sound source that are clear of marine mammals, thereby reducing or eliminating the potential for injury and minimizing the potential for more severe behavioral reactions for animals occurring closer to the vessel. Visual monitoring of the buffer zone is intended to (1) provide additional protection to marine mammals that may be in the vicinity of the vessel during pre-start clearance, and (2) during airgun use, aid in establishing and maintaining the EZ by alerting the visual observer and crew of marine mammals that are outside of, but may approach and enter, the EZ.

L-DEO must use dedicated, trained, NMFS-approved PSOs. The PSOs must have no tasks other than to conduct observational effort, record observational data, and communicate with and instruct relevant vessel crew with regard to the presence of marine mammals and mitigation requirements. PSO resumes shall be provided to NMFS for approval.

At least one of the visual and two of the acoustic PSOs (discussed below) aboard the vessel must have a minimum of 90 days at-sea experience working in those roles, respectively, with no more than 18 months elapsed since the conclusion of the at-sea experience. One visual PSO with such experience shall be designated as the lead for the entire protected species observation team. The lead PSO shall serve as primary point of contact for the vessel operator and ensure all PSO requirements per the IHA are met. To the maximum extent practicable, the experienced PSOs should be scheduled to be on duty with those PSOs with appropriate training but who have not yet gained relevant experience.

During survey operations (*e.g.*, any day on which use of the acoustic source is planned to occur, and whenever the acoustic source is in the water, whether activated or not), a minimum of two visual PSOs must be on duty and conducting visual observations at all times during daylight hours (*i.e.*, from 30 minutes prior to sunrise through 30 minutes following sunset). Visual monitoring of the pre-start clearance zone must begin no less than 30 minutes prior to ramp-up, and monitoring must continue until one hour after use of the acoustic source ceases or until 30 minutes past sunset. Visual PSOs shall coordinate to ensure 360° visual coverage around the vessel from the most appropriate observation posts, and shall conduct visual observations using binoculars and the naked eye while free from distractions and in a consistent, systematic, and diligent manner.

PSOs shall establish and monitor the exclusion and buffer zones. These zones shall be based upon the radial distance from the edges of the acoustic source (rather than being based on the center of the array or around the vessel itself). During use of the acoustic source (*i.e.*, anytime airguns are active, including ramp-up), detections of marine mammals within the buffer zone (but outside the EZ) shall be communicated to the operator to prepare for the potential shutdown of the acoustic source. Visual PSOs will immediately communicate all observations to the on duty acoustic PSO(s), including any determination by the PSO regarding

species identification, distance, and bearing and the degree of confidence in the determination. Any observations of marine mammals by crew members shall be relayed to the PSO team. During good conditions (*e.g.*, daylight hours; Beaufort sea state (BSS) 3 or less), visual PSOs shall conduct observations when the acoustic source is not operating for comparison of sighting rates and behavior with and without use of the acoustic source and between acquisition periods, to the maximum extent practicable.

Visual PSOs may be on watch for a maximum of 4 consecutive hours followed by a break of at least one hour between watches and may conduct a maximum of 12 hours of observation per 24-hour period. Combined observational duties (visual and acoustic but not at same time) may not exceed 12 hours per 24-hour period for any individual PSO.

#### *Passive Acoustic Monitoring*

Acoustic monitoring means the use of trained personnel (sometimes referred to as passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) operators, herein referred to as acoustic PSOs) to operate PAM equipment to acoustically detect the presence of marine mammals. Acoustic monitoring involves acoustically detecting marine mammals regardless of distance from the source, as localization of animals may not always be possible. Acoustic monitoring is intended to further support visual monitoring (during daylight hours) in maintaining an EZ around the sound source that is clear of marine mammals. In cases where visual monitoring is not effective (*e.g.*, due to weather, nighttime), acoustic monitoring may be used to allow certain activities to occur, as further detailed below.

PAM would take place in addition to the visual monitoring program. Visual monitoring typically is not effective during periods of poor visibility or at night, and even with good visibility, is unable to detect marine mammals when they are below the surface or beyond visual range. Acoustic monitoring can be used in addition to visual observations to improve detection, identification, and localization of cetaceans. The acoustic monitoring would serve to alert visual PSOs (if on duty) when vocalizing cetaceans are detected. It is only useful when marine mammals vocalize, but it can be effective either by day or by night, and does not depend on good visibility. It would be monitored in real time so that the visual observers can be advised when cetaceans are detected.

The R/V *Langseth* will use a towed PAM system, which must be monitored

by at a minimum one on duty acoustic PSO beginning at least 30 minutes prior to ramp-up and at all times during use of the acoustic source. Acoustic PSOs may be on watch for a maximum of 4 consecutive hours followed by a break of at least one hour between watches and may conduct a maximum of 12 hours of observation per 24-hour period. Combined observational duties (acoustic and visual but not at same time) may not exceed 12 hours per 24-hour period for any individual PSO.

Survey activity may continue for 30 minutes when the PAM system malfunctions or is damaged, while the PAM operator diagnoses the issue. If the diagnosis indicates that the PAM system must be repaired to solve the problem, operations may continue for an additional 5 hours without acoustic monitoring during daylight hours only under the following conditions:

- Sea state is less than or equal to BSS 4;
- No marine mammals (excluding delphinids) detected solely by PAM in the applicable EZ in the previous 2 hours;
- NMFS is notified via email as soon as practicable with the time and location in which operations began occurring without an active PAM system; and
- Operations with an active acoustic source, but without an operating PAM system, do not exceed a cumulative total of 5 hours in any 24-hour period.

#### *Establishment of Exclusion and Pre-Start Clearance Zones*

An EZ is a defined area within which occurrence of a marine mammal triggers mitigation action intended to reduce the potential for certain outcomes, *e.g.*, auditory injury, disruption of critical behaviors. The PSOs would establish a minimum EZ with a 500-m radius. The 500-m EZ would be based on radial distance from the edge of the airgun array (rather than being based on the center of the array or around the vessel itself). With certain exceptions (described below), if a marine mammal appears within or enters this zone, the acoustic source would be shut down.

The pre-start clearance zone is defined as the area that must be clear of marine mammals prior to beginning ramp-up of the acoustic source, and includes the EZ plus the buffer zone. Detections of marine mammals within the pre-start clearance zone would prevent airgun operations from beginning (*i.e.*, ramp-up).

The 500-m EZ is intended to be precautionary in the sense that it would be expected to contain sound exceeding the injury criteria for all cetacean

hearing groups, (based on the dual criteria of SEL<sub>cum</sub> and peak SPL), while also providing a consistent, reasonably observable zone within which PSOs would typically be able to conduct effective observational effort. Additionally, a 500-m EZ is expected to minimize the likelihood that marine mammals will be exposed to levels likely to result in more severe behavioral responses. Although significantly greater distances may be observed from an elevated platform under good conditions, we believe that 500 m is likely regularly attainable for PSOs using the naked eye during typical conditions. The pre-start clearance zone simply represents the addition of a buffer to the EZ, doubling the EZ size during pre-clearance.

An extended EZ of 1,500 m must be enforced for all beaked whales and *Kogia* species. No buffer of this extended EZ is required.

#### *Pre-Start Clearance and Ramp-Up*

Ramp-up (sometimes referred to as “soft start”) means the gradual and systematic increase of emitted sound levels from an airgun array. Ramp-up begins by first activating a single airgun of the smallest volume, followed by doubling the number of active elements in stages until the full complement of an array’s airguns are active. Each stage should be approximately the same duration, and the total duration should not be less than approximately 20 minutes. The intent of pre-start clearance observation (30 minutes) is to ensure no protected species are observed within the pre-clearance zone (or extended EZ, for beaked whales and *Kogia* spp.) prior to the beginning of ramp-up. During pre-start clearance period is the only time observations of marine mammals in the buffer zone would prevent operations (*i.e.*, the beginning of ramp-up). The intent of ramp-up is to warn marine mammals of pending seismic survey operations and to allow sufficient time for those animals to leave the immediate vicinity. A ramp-up procedure, involving a step-wise increase in the number of airguns firing and total array volume until all operational airguns are activated and the full volume is achieved, is required at all times as part of the activation of the acoustic source. All operators must adhere to the following pre-start clearance and ramp-up requirements:

- The operator must notify a designated PSO of the planned start of ramp-up as agreed upon with the lead PSO; the notification time should not be less than 60 minutes prior to the planned ramp-up in order to allow the PSOs time to monitor the pre-start

clearance zone (and extended EZ) for 30 minutes prior to the initiation of ramp-up (pre-start clearance);

- Ramp-ups shall be scheduled so as to minimize the time spent with the source activated prior to reaching the designated run-in;
- One of the PSOs conducting pre-start clearance observations must be notified again immediately prior to initiating ramp-up procedures and the operator must receive confirmation from the PSO to proceed;
- Ramp-up may not be initiated if any marine mammal is within the applicable exclusion or buffer zone. If a marine mammal is observed within the pre-start clearance zone (or extended EZ, for beaked whales and *Kogia* species) during the 30 minute pre-start clearance period, ramp-up may not begin until the animal(s) has been observed exiting the zones or until an additional time period has elapsed with no further sightings (15 minutes for small odontocetes and pinnipeds, and 30 minutes for all mysticetes and all other odontocetes, including sperm whales, beaked whales, and large delphinids, such as killer whales);
- Ramp-up shall begin by activating a single airgun of the smallest volume in the array and shall continue in stages by doubling the number of active elements at the commencement of each stage, with each stage of approximately the same duration. Duration shall not be less than 20 minutes. The operator must provide information to the PSO documenting that appropriate procedures were followed;
- PSOs must monitor the pre-start clearance zone (and extended EZ) during ramp-up, and ramp-up must cease and the source must be shut down upon detection of a marine mammal within the applicable zone. Once ramp-up has begun, detections of marine mammals within the buffer zone do not require shutdown, but such observation shall be communicated to the operator to prepare for the potential shutdown;
- Ramp-up may occur at times of poor visibility, including nighttime, if appropriate acoustic monitoring has occurred with no detections in the 30 minutes prior to beginning ramp-up. Acoustic source activation may only occur at times of poor visibility where operational planning cannot reasonably avoid such circumstances;
- If the acoustic source is shut down for brief periods (*i.e.*, less than 30 minutes) for reasons other than that described for shutdown (*e.g.*, mechanical difficulty), it may be activated again without ramp-up if PSOs have maintained constant visual and/or acoustic observation and no visual or

acoustic detections of marine mammals have occurred within the applicable EZ. For any longer shutdown, pre-start clearance observation and ramp-up are required. For any shutdown at night or in periods of poor visibility (e.g., BSS 4 or greater), ramp-up is required, but if the shutdown period was brief and constant observation was maintained, pre-start clearance watch of 30 minutes is not required; and

- Testing of the acoustic source involving all elements requires ramp-up. Testing limited to individual source elements or strings does not require ramp-up but does require pre-start clearance of 30 min.

#### Shutdown

The shutdown of an airgun array requires the immediate de-activation of all individual airgun elements of the array. Any PSO on duty will have the authority to delay the start of survey operations or to call for shutdown of the acoustic source if a marine mammal is detected within the applicable EZ. The operator must also establish and maintain clear lines of communication directly between PSOs on duty and crew controlling the acoustic source to ensure that shutdown commands are conveyed swiftly while allowing PSOs to maintain watch. When both visual and acoustic PSOs are on duty, all detections will be immediately communicated to the remainder of the on-duty PSO team for potential verification of visual observations by the acoustic PSO or of acoustic detections by visual PSOs. When the airgun array is active (i.e., anytime one or more airguns is active, including during ramp-up) and (1) a marine mammal appears within or enters the applicable EZ and/or (2) a marine mammal (other than delphinids, see below) is detected acoustically and localized within the applicable EZ, the acoustic source will be shut down. When shutdown is called for by a PSO, the acoustic source will be immediately deactivated and any dispute resolved only following deactivation. Additionally, shutdown will occur whenever PAM alone (without visual sighting), confirms presence of marine mammal(s) in the EZ. If the acoustic PSO cannot confirm presence within the EZ, visual PSOs will be notified but shutdown is not required.

Following a shutdown, airgun activity would not resume until the marine mammal has cleared the EZ. The animal would be considered to have cleared the EZ if it is visually observed to have departed the EZ (i.e., animal is not required to fully exit the buffer zone where applicable), or it has not been

seen within the EZ for 15 minutes for small odontocetes and pinnipeds, or 30 minutes for all mysticetes and all other odontocetes, including sperm whales, beaked whales, *Kogia* species, and large delphinids, such as killer whales.

The shutdown requirement is waived for small dolphins if an individual is detected within the EZ. As defined here, the small dolphin group is intended to encompass those members of the Family Delphinidae most likely to voluntarily approach the source vessel for purposes of interacting with the vessel and/or airgun array (e.g., bow riding). This exception to the shutdown requirement applies solely to specific genera of small dolphins (*Delphinus*, *Lagenodelphis*, *Lissodelphis*, *Stenella*, *Steno*, and *Tursiops*).

We include this small dolphin exception because shutdown requirements for small dolphins under all circumstances represent practicability concerns without likely commensurate benefits for the animals in question. Small dolphins are generally the most commonly observed marine mammals in the specific geographic region and would typically be the only marine mammals likely to intentionally approach the vessel. As described above, auditory injury is extremely unlikely to occur for mid-frequency cetaceans (e.g., delphinids), as this group is relatively insensitive to sound produced at the predominant frequencies in an airgun pulse while also having a relatively high threshold for the onset of auditory injury (i.e., permanent threshold shift).

A large body of anecdotal evidence indicates that small dolphins commonly approach vessels and/or towed arrays during active sound production for purposes of bow riding, with no apparent effect observed in those delphinoids (e.g., Barkaszi *et al.*, 2012, Barkaszi and Kelly, 2018). The potential for increased shutdowns resulting from such a measure would require the *Langseth* to revisit the missed track line to reacquire data, resulting in an overall increase in the total sound energy input to the marine environment and an increase in the total duration over which the survey is active in a given area. Although other mid-frequency hearing specialists (e.g., large delphinids) are no more likely to incur auditory injury than are small dolphins, they are much less likely to approach vessels. Therefore, retaining a shutdown requirement for large delphinids would not have similar impacts in terms of either practicability for the applicant or corollary increase in sound energy output and time on the water. We do anticipate some benefit for a shutdown

requirement for large delphinids in that it simplifies somewhat the total range of decision-making for PSOs and may preclude any potential for physiological effects other than to the auditory system as well as some more severe behavioral reactions for any such animals in close proximity to the *Langseth*.

Visual PSOs shall use best professional judgment in making the decision to call for a shutdown if there is uncertainty regarding identification (i.e., whether the observed marine mammal(s) belongs to one of the delphinid genera for which shutdown is waived or one of the species with a larger EZ).

L-DEO must implement shutdown if a marine mammal species for which take was not authorized, or a species for which authorization was granted but the takes have been met, approaches the Level A or Level B harassment zones. L-DEO must also implement shutdown if any large whale (defined as a sperm whale or any mysticete species) with a calf (defined as an animal less than two-thirds the body size of an adult observed to be in close association with an adult) and/or an aggregation of six or more large whales are observed at any distance.

#### Vessel Strike Avoidance

Vessel operators and crews must maintain a vigilant watch for all protected species and slow down, stop their vessel, or alter course, as appropriate and regardless of vessel size, to avoid striking any marine mammal. A visual observer aboard the vessel must monitor a vessel strike avoidance zone around the vessel (distances stated below). Visual observers monitoring the vessel strike avoidance zone may be third-party observers (i.e., PSOs) or crew members, but crew members responsible for these duties must be provided sufficient training to (1) distinguish marine mammals from other phenomena and (2) broadly to identify a marine mammal as a whale or other marine mammal.

Vessel speeds must be reduced to 10 knots or less when mother/calf pairs, pods, or large assemblages of cetaceans are observed near a vessel.

All vessels must maintain a minimum separation distance of 100 m from sperm whales and all other baleen whales.

All vessels must, to the maximum extent practicable, attempt to maintain a minimum separation distance of 50 m from all other marine mammals, with an understanding that at times this may not be possible (e.g., for animals that approach the vessel).

When marine mammals are sighted while a vessel is underway, the vessel shall take action as necessary to avoid violating the relevant separation distance (e.g., attempt to remain parallel to the animal's course, avoid excessive speed or abrupt changes in direction until the animal has left the area). If marine mammals are sighted within the relevant separation distance, the vessel must reduce speed and shift the engine to neutral, not engaging the engines until animals are clear of the area. This does not apply to any vessel towing gear or any vessel that is navigationally constrained.

These requirements do not apply in any case where compliance would create an imminent and serious threat to a person or vessel or to the extent that a vessel is restricted in its ability to maneuver and, because of the restriction, cannot comply.

We have carefully evaluated the suite of mitigation measures described here and considered a range of other measures in the context of ensuring that we prescribe the means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact on the affected marine mammal species and stocks and their habitat. Based on our evaluation of the proposed measures, as well as other measures considered by NMFS described above, NMFS has preliminarily determined that the mitigation measures provide the means of effecting the least practicable impact on the affected species or stocks and their habitat, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance.

#### *Mitigation Measures in Mexican Waters*

As stated previously, NMFS cannot authorize the incidental take of marine mammals in the territorial seas of foreign nations, as the MMPA does not apply in those waters. L-DEO is required to adhere to the mitigation measures described above while operating within the Mexican EEZ and International Waters. The requirements do not apply within Mexican territorial waters. Mexico may prescribe mitigation measures that would apply to survey operations within the Mexican EEZ and territorial waters but NMFS is currently unaware of any specific potential requirements. While operating within the Mexican EEZ but outside Mexican territorial waters, if mitigation requirements prescribed by NMFS differ from the requirements established under Mexican law, L-DEO would adhere to the most protective measure. For operations in Mexican territorial waters, L-DEO would implement measures required under Mexican law (if any). If information regarding measures

required under Mexican law becomes available prior to NMFS' final decision on this request for IHA, NMFS will consider it as appropriate in making its negligible impact determination.

#### **Proposed Monitoring and Reporting**

In order to issue an IHA for an activity, section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA states that NMFS must set forth requirements pertaining to the monitoring and reporting of such taking. The MMPA implementing regulations at 50 CFR 216.104(a)(13) indicate that requests for authorizations must include the suggested means of accomplishing the necessary monitoring and reporting that will result in increased knowledge of the species and of the level of taking or impacts on populations of marine mammals that are expected to be present in the proposed action area. Effective reporting is critical both to compliance as well as ensuring that the most value is obtained from the required monitoring.

Monitoring and reporting requirements prescribed by NMFS should contribute to improved understanding of one or more of the following:

- Occurrence of marine mammal species or stocks in the area in which take is anticipated (e.g., presence, abundance, distribution, density);
- Nature, scope, or context of likely marine mammal exposure to potential stressors/impacts (individual or cumulative, acute or chronic), through better understanding of: (1) Action or environment (e.g., source characterization, propagation, ambient noise); (2) affected species (e.g., life history, dive patterns); (3) co-occurrence of marine mammal species with the action; or (4) biological or behavioral context of exposure (e.g., age, calving or feeding areas);
- Individual marine mammal responses (behavioral or physiological) to acoustic stressors (acute, chronic, or cumulative), other stressors, or cumulative impacts from multiple stressors;
- How anticipated responses to stressors impact either: (1) Long-term fitness and survival of individual marine mammals; or (2) populations, species, or stocks;
- Effects on marine mammal habitat (e.g., marine mammal prey species, acoustic habitat, or other important physical components of marine mammal habitat); and
- Mitigation and monitoring effectiveness.

#### *Vessel-Based Visual Monitoring*

As described above, PSO observations would take place during daytime airgun operations. During seismic survey operations, at least five visual PSOs would be based aboard the *Langseth*. Two visual PSOs would be on duty at all time during daytime hours. Monitoring shall be conducted in accordance with the following requirements:

- The operator shall provide PSOs with bigeye binoculars (e.g., 25 x 150; 2.7 view angle; individual ocular focus; height control) of appropriate quality (i.e., Fujinon or equivalent) solely for PSO use. These shall be pedestal-mounted on the deck at the most appropriate vantage point that provides for optimal sea surface observation, PSO safety, and safe operation of the vessel; and
- The operator will work with the selected third-party observer provider to ensure PSOs have all equipment (including backup equipment) needed to adequately perform necessary tasks, including accurate determination of distance and bearing to observed marine mammals.

PSOs must have the following requirements and qualifications:

- PSOs shall be independent, dedicated, trained visual and acoustic PSOs and must be employed by a third-party observer provider;
- PSOs shall have no tasks other than to conduct observational effort (visual or acoustic), collect data, and communicate with and instruct relevant vessel crew with regard to the presence of protected species and mitigation requirements (including brief alerts regarding maritime hazards);
- PSOs shall have successfully completed an approved PSO training course appropriate for their designated task (visual or acoustic). Acoustic PSOs are required to complete specialized training for operating PAM systems and are encouraged to have familiarity with the vessel with which they will be working;
- PSOs can act as acoustic or visual observers (but not at the same time) as long as they demonstrate that their training and experience are sufficient to perform the task at hand;
- NMFS must review and approve PSO resumes accompanied by a relevant training course information packet that includes the name and qualifications (i.e., experience, training completed, or educational background) of the instructor(s), the course outline or syllabus, and course reference material as well as a document stating successful completion of the course;

- PSOs must successfully complete relevant training, including completion of all required coursework and passing (80 percent or greater) a written and/or oral examination developed for the training program;
- PSOs must have successfully attained a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university with a major in one of the natural sciences, a minimum of 30 semester hours or equivalent in the biological sciences, and at least one undergraduate course in math or statistics; and
- The educational requirements may be waived if the PSO has acquired the relevant skills through alternate experience. Requests for such a waiver shall be submitted to NMFS and must include written justification. Requests shall be granted or denied (with justification) by NMFS within 1 week of receipt of submitted information. Alternate experience that may be considered includes, but is not limited to (1) secondary education and/or experience comparable to PSO duties; (2) previous work experience conducting academic, commercial, or government-sponsored protected species surveys; or (3) previous work experience as a PSO; the PSO should demonstrate good standing and consistently good performance of PSO duties.

For data collection purposes, PSOs shall use standardized data collection forms, whether hard copy or electronic. PSOs shall record detailed information about any implementation of mitigation requirements, including the distance of animals to the acoustic source and description of specific actions that ensued, the behavior of the animal(s), any observed changes in behavior before and after implementation of mitigation, and if shutdown was implemented, the length of time before any subsequent ramp-up of the acoustic source. If required mitigation was not implemented, PSOs should record a description of the circumstances. At a minimum, the following information must be recorded:

- Vessel names (source vessel and other vessels associated with survey) and call signs;
- PSO names and affiliations;
- Dates of departures and returns to port with port name;
- Date and participants of PSO briefings;
- Dates and times (Greenwich Mean Time) of survey effort and times corresponding with PSO effort;
- Vessel location (latitude/longitude) when survey effort began and ended and vessel location at beginning and end of visual PSO duty shifts;

- Vessel heading and speed at beginning and end of visual PSO duty shifts and upon any line change;
- Environmental conditions while on visual survey (at beginning and end of PSO shift and whenever conditions changed significantly), including BSS and any other relevant weather conditions including cloud cover, fog, sun glare, and overall visibility to the horizon;
- Factors that may have contributed to impaired observations during each PSO shift change or as needed as environmental conditions changed (*e.g.*, vessel traffic, equipment malfunctions); and
- Survey activity information, such as acoustic source power output while in operation, number and volume of airguns operating in the array, tow depth of the array, and any other notes of significance (*i.e.*, pre-start clearance, ramp-up, shutdown, testing, shooting, ramp-up completion, end of operations, streamers, etc.).

The following information should be recorded upon visual observation of any protected species:

- Watch status (sighting made by PSO on/off effort, opportunistic, crew, alternate vessel/platform);
- PSO who sighted the animal;
- Time of sighting;
- Vessel location at time of sighting;
- Water depth;
- Direction of vessel's travel (compass direction);
- Direction of animal's travel relative to the vessel;
- Pace of the animal;
- Estimated distance to the animal and its heading relative to vessel at initial sighting;
- Identification of the animal (*e.g.*, genus/species, lowest possible taxonomic level, or unidentified) and the composition of the group if there is a mix of species;
- Estimated number of animals (high/low/best);
- Estimated number of animals by cohort (adults, yearlings, juveniles, calves, group composition, etc.);
- Description (as many distinguishing features as possible of each individual seen, including length, shape, color, pattern, scars or markings, shape and size of dorsal fin, shape of head, and blow characteristics);
- Detailed behavior observations (*e.g.*, number of blows/breaths, number of surfaces, breaching, spyhopping, diving, feeding, traveling; as explicit and detailed as possible; note any observed changes in behavior);
- Animal's closest point of approach (CPA) and/or closest distance from any element of the acoustic source;

- Platform activity at time of sighting (*e.g.*, deploying, recovering, testing, shooting, data acquisition, other); and
- Description of any actions implemented in response to the sighting (*e.g.*, delays, shutdown, ramp-up) and time and location of the action.

If a marine mammal is detected while using the PAM system, the following information should be recorded:

- An acoustic encounter identification number, and whether the detection was linked with a visual sighting;
- Date and time when first and last heard;
- Types and nature of sounds heard (*e.g.*, clicks, whistles, creaks, burst pulses, continuous, sporadic, strength of signal); and
- Any additional information recorded such as water depth of the hydrophone array, bearing of the animal to the vessel (if determinable), species or taxonomic group (if determinable), spectrogram screenshot, and any other notable information.

#### Reporting

A report would be submitted to NMFS within 90 days after the end of the cruise. The report would summarize the dates and locations of seismic survey operations, and all marine mammal sightings (dates, times, locations, activities, associated seismic survey activities), and provide full documentation of methods, results, and interpretation pertaining to all monitoring.

The draft report shall also include geo-referenced time-stamped vessel tracklines for all time periods during which airguns were operating. Tracklines should include points recording any change in airgun status (*e.g.*, when the airguns began operating, when they were turned off, or when they changed from full array to single gun or vice versa). GIS files shall be provided in ESRI shapefile format and include the UTC date and time, latitude in decimal degrees, and longitude in decimal degrees. All coordinates shall be referenced to the WGS84 geographic coordinate system. In addition to the report, all raw observational data shall be made available to NMFS. The report must summarize the data collected as described above and in the IHA. A final report must be submitted within 30 days following resolution of any comments on the draft report.

#### Reporting Injured or Dead Marine Mammals

*Discovery of injured or dead marine mammals*—In the event that personnel involved in survey activities covered by

the authorization discover an injured or dead marine mammal, the L-DEO shall report the incident to the Office of Protected Resources (OPR), NMFS and to the NMFS West Coast Regional Stranding Coordinator as soon as feasible. The report must include the following information:

- Time, date, and location (latitude/longitude) of the first discovery (and updated location information if known and applicable);
- Species identification (if known) or description of the animal(s) involved;
- Condition of the animal(s) (including carcass condition if the animal is dead);
- Observed behaviors of the animal(s), if alive;
- If available, photographs or video footage of the animal(s); and
- General circumstances under which the animal was discovered.

**Vessel strike**—In the event of a ship strike of a marine mammal by any vessel involved in the activities covered by the authorization, L-DEO shall report the incident to OPR, NMFS and to the NMFS West Coast Regional Stranding Coordinator as soon as feasible. The report must include the following information:

- Time, date, and location (latitude/longitude) of the incident;
- Vessel's speed during and leading up to the incident;
- Vessel's course/heading and what operations were being conducted (if applicable);
- Status of all sound sources in use;
- Description of avoidance measures/requirements that were in place at the time of the strike and what additional measure were taken, if any, to avoid strike;
- Environmental conditions (*e.g.*, wind speed and direction, Beaufort sea state, cloud cover, visibility) immediately preceding the strike;
- Species identification (if known) or description of the animal(s) involved;
- Estimated size and length of the animal that was struck;
- Description of the behavior of the animal immediately preceding and following the strike;
- If available, description of the presence and behavior of any other marine mammals present immediately preceding the strike;
- Estimated fate of the animal (*e.g.*, dead, injured but alive, injured and moving, blood or tissue observed in the water, status unknown, disappeared); and
- To the extent practicable, photographs or video footage of the animal(s).

#### *Actions To Minimize Additional Harm to Live-Stranded (or Milling) Marine Mammals*

In the event of a live stranding (or near-shore atypical milling) event within 50 km of the survey operations, where the NMFS stranding network is engaged in herding or other interventions to return animals to the water, the Director of OPR, NMFS (or designee) will advise L-DEO of the need to implement shutdown for all active acoustic sources operating within 50 km of the stranding. Procedures related to shutdowns for live stranding or milling marine mammals include the following:

- If at any time, the marine mammal(s) die or are euthanized, or if herding/intervention efforts are stopped, the Director of OPR, NMFS (or designee) will advise L-DEO that the shutdown around the animals' location is no longer needed.
- Otherwise, shutdown procedures will remain in effect until the Director of OPR, NMFS (or designee) determines and advises L-DEO that all live animals involved have left the area (either of their own volition or following an intervention).
- If further observations of the marine mammals indicate the potential for re-stranding, additional coordination with L-DEO will be required to determine what measures are necessary to minimize that likelihood (*e.g.*, extending the shutdown or moving operations farther away) and to implement those measures as appropriate.

**Additional Information Requests**—If NMFS determines that the circumstances of any marine mammal stranding found in the vicinity of the activity suggest investigation of the association with survey activities is warranted, and an investigation into the stranding is being pursued, NMFS will submit a written request to L-DEO indicating that the following initial available information must be provided as soon as possible, but no later than 7 business days after the request for information:

- Status of all sound source use in the 48 hours preceding the estimated time of stranding and within 50 km of the discovery/notification of the stranding by NMFS; and
- If available, description of the behavior of any marine mammal(s) observed preceding (*i.e.*, within 48 hours and 50 km) and immediately after the discovery of the stranding.

In the event that the investigation is still inconclusive, the investigation of the association of the survey activities is still warranted, and the investigation is

still being pursued, NMFS may provide additional information requests, in writing, regarding the nature and location of survey operations prior to the time period above.

#### **Negligible Impact Analysis and Determination**

NMFS has defined negligible impact as an impact resulting from the specified activity that cannot be reasonably expected to, and is not reasonably likely to, adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival (50 CFR 216.103). A negligible impact finding is based on the lack of likely adverse effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival (*i.e.*, population-level effects). An estimate of the number of takes alone is not enough information on which to base an impact determination. In addition to considering estimates of the number of marine mammals that might be "taken" through harassment, NMFS considers other factors, such as the likely nature of any responses (*e.g.*, intensity, duration), the context of any responses (*e.g.*, critical reproductive time or location, migration), as well as effects on habitat, and the likely effectiveness of the mitigation. We also assess the number, intensity, and context of estimated takes by evaluating this information relative to population status. Consistent with the 1989 preamble for NMFS's implementing regulations (54 FR 40338; September 29, 1989), the impacts from other past and ongoing anthropogenic activities are incorporated into this analysis via their impacts on the environmental baseline (*e.g.*, as reflected in the regulatory status of the species, population size and growth rate where known, ongoing sources of human-caused mortality, or ambient noise levels).

To avoid repetition, our analysis applies to all species listed in Table 1, given that NMFS expects the anticipated effects of the planned geophysical survey to be similar in nature. Where there are meaningful differences between species or stocks, or groups of species, in anticipated individual responses to activities, impact of expected take on the population due to differences in population status, or impacts on habitat, NMFS has identified species-specific factors to inform the analysis.

As described above, we propose to authorize only the takes estimated to occur outside of Mexican territorial waters (Table 7); however, for the purposes of our negligible impact analysis and determination, we consider the total number of takes that are

anticipated to occur as a result of the entire survey (including the portion of the survey that would occur within the Mexican territorial waters (approximately 6 percent of the survey) (Table 8).

TABLE 8—TOTAL ESTIMATED TAKE INCLUDING MEXICAN TERRITORIAL WATERS

Species	Level B harassment (excluding Mexican territorial waters)	Level A harassment (excluding Mexican territorial waters)	Level B harassment (Mexican territorial waters)	Level A harassment (Mexican territorial waters)	Total Level B harassment	Total Level A harassment
Humpback whale	8	0	1	0	9	0
Minke whale	2	0	0	0	2	0
Bryde's whale	27	1	2	0	29	1
Fin whale	2	0	0	0	2	0
Sei whale	3	0	0	0	3	0
Blue whale	5	0	0	0	5	0
Sperm whale	12	0	1	0	13	0
Cuvier's beaked whale	69	0	69	0	138	0
Longman's beaked whale	3	0	0	0	3	0
Mesoplodon spp	23	0	1	0	24	0
Risso's dolphin	328	0	22	0	350	0
Rough-toothed dolphin	597	0	38	0	635	0
Common bottlenose dolphin	2,274	0	196	0	2,470	0
Pantropical spotted dolphin	7,988	0	519	0	8,507	0
Spinner dolphin (whitebelly)	121	0	7	0	128	0
Spinner dolphin (eastern)	8,189	0	557	0	8,746	0
Striped dolphin	2,212	0	122	0	2,334	0
Short-beaked common dolphin	2,818	0	209	0	3,027	0
Fraser's dolphin	858	0	58	0	916	0
Short-finned pilot whale	244	0	15	0	259	0
Killer whale	25	0	2	0	27	0
False killer whale	118	0	8	0	126	0
Pygmy killer whale	116	0	8	0	124	0
Melon-headed whale	135	0	9	0	144	0
<i>Kogia</i> spp	33	1	2	0	35	1
Guadalupe fur seal	416	0	1	0	417	0
California sea lion	365	0	693	0	1,058	0

NMFS does not anticipate that serious injury or mortality would occur as a result of L-DEO's planned survey, even in the absence of mitigation, and none are proposed for authorization. Non-auditory physical effects, stranding, and vessel strike are also not expected to occur.

We are proposing to authorize a limited number of instances of Level A harassment of two species (Bryde's whale and dwarf sperm whales, which are members of the low- and high-frequency cetacean hearing groups, respectively) in the form of PTS, and Level B harassment only of the remaining marine mammal species. We believe that any PTS incurred in marine mammals as a result of the planned activity would be in the form of only a small degree of PTS, not total deafness, because of the constant movement of both the R/V *Langseth* and of the marine mammals in the project areas, as well as the fact that the vessel is not expected to remain in any one area in which individual marine mammals would be expected to concentrate for an extended period of time. Additionally, L-DEO would shut down the airgun array if marine mammals approach within 500

m (with the exception of specific genera of dolphins, see Proposed Mitigation), further reducing the expected duration and intensity of sound, and therefore the likelihood of marine mammals incurring PTS. Since the duration of exposure to loud sounds will be relatively short it would be unlikely to affect the fitness of any individuals. Also, as described above, we expect that marine mammals would likely move away from a sound source that represents an aversive stimulus, especially at levels that would be expected to result in PTS, given sufficient notice of the R/V *Langseth's* approach due to the vessel's relatively low speed when conducting seismic surveys. Accordingly, we expect that the majority of takes would be in the form of short-term Level B behavioral harassment in the form of temporary avoidance of the area or decreased foraging (if such activity were occurring), reactions that are considered to be of low severity and with no lasting biological consequences (e.g., Southall *et al.*, 2007, Ellison *et al.*, 2012).

Marine mammal habitat may be impacted by elevated sound levels, but these impacts would be temporary. Prey

species are mobile and are broadly distributed throughout the project areas; therefore, marine mammals that may be temporarily displaced during survey activities are expected to be able to resume foraging once they have moved away from areas with disturbing levels of underwater noise. Because of the relatively short duration (up to 24 days) and temporary nature of the disturbance, the availability of similar habitat and resources in the surrounding area, the impacts to marine mammals and the food sources that they utilize are not expected to cause significant or long-term consequences for individual marine mammals or their populations.

Yazvenko *et al.* (2007) reported no apparent changes in the frequency of feeding activity in Western gray whales exposed to airgun sounds in their feeding grounds near Sakhalin Island. Goldbogen *et al.* (2013) found blue whales feeding on highly concentrated prey in shallow depths were less likely to respond and cease foraging than whales feeding on deep, dispersed prey when exposed to simulated sonar sources, suggesting that the benefits of feeding for humpbacks foraging on high-density prey may outweigh perceived



harm from the acoustic stimulus, such as the seismic survey (Southall *et al.*, 2016). Additionally, L-DEO will shut down the airgun array upon observation of an aggregation of six or more large whales, which would reduce impacts to cooperatively foraging animals. For all habitats, no physical impacts to habitat are anticipated from seismic activities. While SPLs of sufficient strength have been known to cause injury to fish and fish and invertebrate mortality, in feeding habitats, the most likely impact to prey species from survey activities would be temporary avoidance of the affected area and any injury or mortality of prey species would be localized around the survey and not of a degree that would adversely impact marine mammal foraging. The duration of fish avoidance of a given area after survey effort stops is unknown, but a rapid return to normal recruitment, distribution and behavior is expected. Given the short operational seismic time near or traversing specific habitat areas, as well as the ability of cetaceans and prey species to move away from acoustic sources, NMFS expects that there would be, at worst, minimal impacts to animals and habitat within these areas. The proposed survey tracklines do not overlap with any designated critical habitat for ESA-listed species or areas of known importance for any species.

#### *Negligible Impact Conclusions*

The proposed survey would be of short duration (up to 25 days of seismic operations), and the acoustic “footprint” of the proposed survey would be small relative to the ranges of the marine mammals that would potentially be affected. Sound levels would increase in the marine environment in a relatively small area surrounding the vessel compared to the range of the marine mammals within the proposed survey area. Short term exposures to survey operations are not likely to significantly disrupt marine mammal behavior, and the potential for longer-term avoidance of important areas is limited.

The proposed mitigation measures are expected to reduce the number of takes by Level A harassment (in the form of PTS) by allowing for detection of marine mammals in the vicinity of the vessel by visual and acoustic observers. The proposed mitigation measures are also expected to minimize the severity of any potential behavioral disturbance (Level B harassment) via shutdowns of the airgun array. Based on previous monitoring reports for substantially similar activities that have been previously authorized by NMFS (available at [https://www.fisheries.](https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/incidental-take-authorizations-research-and-other-activities)

[noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/incidental-take-authorizations-research-and-other-activities](https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/incidental-take-authorizations-research-and-other-activities)), we expect that the proposed mitigation will be effective in preventing, at least to some extent, potential PTS in marine mammals that may otherwise occur in the absence of the proposed mitigation (although all authorized PTS has been accounted for in this analysis).

NMFS concludes that exposures to marine mammal species and stocks due to L-DEO’s proposed seismic survey activities would result in only short-term (temporary and short in duration) effects to individuals exposed, over relatively small areas of the affected animals’ ranges. Animals may temporarily avoid the immediate area, but are not expected to permanently abandon the area. Major shifts in habitat use, distribution, or foraging success are not expected. NMFS does not anticipate the proposed take estimates to impact annual rates of recruitment or survival.

In summary and as described above, the following factors primarily support our preliminary determination that the impacts resulting from this activity are not expected to adversely affect the species or stock through effects on annual rates of recruitment or survival:

- No serious injury or mortality is anticipated or proposed to be authorized, even absent mitigation;
- The proposed activity is temporary and of relatively short duration (up to 25 days);
- The anticipated impacts of the proposed activity on marine mammals would primarily be temporary behavioral changes due to avoidance of the area around the survey vessel;
- The number of instances of potential PTS that may occur are expected to be very small in number. Instances of potential PTS that are incurred in marine mammals are expected to be of a low level, due to constant movement of the vessel and of the marine mammals in the area, and the nature of the survey design (not concentrated in areas of high marine mammal concentration);
- The availability of alternate areas of similar habitat value for marine mammals to temporarily vacate the survey area during the proposed survey to avoid exposure to sounds from the activity;

- The potential adverse effects on fish or invertebrate species that serve as prey species for marine mammals from the proposed survey would be temporary and spatially limited, and impacts to marine mammal foraging would be minimal; and

- The proposed mitigation measures, including visual and acoustic monitoring and shutdowns are expected to minimize potential impacts to marine mammals (both amount and severity).

Based on the analysis contained herein of the likely effects of the specified activity on marine mammals and their habitat, and taking into consideration the implementation of the proposed mitigation and monitoring measures, NMFS preliminarily finds that the total marine mammal take from the proposed activity will have a negligible impact on all affected marine mammal species or stocks.

#### **Small Numbers**

As noted above, only small numbers of incidental take may be authorized under sections 101(a)(5)(A) and (D) of the MMPA for specified activities other than military readiness activities. The MMPA does not define small numbers and so, in practice, where estimated numbers are available, NMFS compares the number of individuals taken to the most appropriate estimation of abundance of the relevant species or stock in our determination of whether an authorization is limited to small numbers of marine mammals. When the predicted number of individuals to be taken is fewer than one third of the species or stock abundance, the take is considered to be of small numbers. Additionally, other qualitative factors may be considered in the analysis, such as the temporal or spatial scale of the activities.

The amount of take NMFS proposes to authorize is below one third of the estimated population abundance of all species (Gerrodette and Palacios 1996; NMFS 2015b). In fact, take of individuals is less than 8 percent of the abundance of any affected population.

Based on the analysis contained herein of the proposed activity (including the proposed mitigation and monitoring measures) and the anticipated take of marine mammals, NMFS preliminarily finds that small numbers of marine mammals will be taken relative to the population size of the affected species or stocks.

#### **Unmitigable Adverse Impact Analysis and Determination**

There are no relevant subsistence uses of the affected marine mammal stocks or species implicated by this action. Therefore, NMFS has determined that the total taking of affected species or stocks would not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of such species or stocks for taking for subsistence purposes.

### Endangered Species Act

Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA: 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) requires that each Federal agency insure that any action it authorizes, funds, or carries out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat. To ensure ESA compliance for the issuance of IHAs, NMFS consults internally whenever we propose to authorize take for endangered or threatened species.

NMFS is proposing to authorize take of blue whales, fin whales, sei whales, sperm whales, Mexico DPS humpback whales, Central America DPS humpback whales, and Guadalupe fur seals, which are listed under the ESA. The NMFS OPR Permits and Conservation Division has requested initiation of Section 7 consultation with the NMFS OPR ESA Interagency Cooperation Division for the issuance of this IHA. NMFS will conclude the ESA consultation prior to reaching a determination regarding the proposed issuance of the authorization.

### Proposed Authorization

As a result of these preliminary determinations, NMFS proposes to issue an IHA to L-DEO for conducting marine geophysical surveys in the ETP, beginning in spring 2022, provided the previously mentioned mitigation, monitoring, and reporting requirements are incorporated. A draft of the

proposed IHA can be found at <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/permit/incidental-take-authorizations-under-marine-mammal-protection-act>.

### Request for Public Comments

We request comment on our analyses, the proposed authorization, and any other aspect of this notice of proposed IHA for the proposed geophysical surveys. We also request at this time comment on the potential Renewal of this proposed IHA as described in the paragraph below. Please include with your comments any supporting data or literature citations to help inform decisions on the request for this IHA or a subsequent Renewal IHA.

On a case-by-case basis, NMFS may issue a one-time, one-year Renewal IHA following notice to the public providing an additional 15 days for public comments when (1) up to another year of identical or nearly identical activities as described in the Description of Proposed Activities section of this notice is planned or (2) the activities as described in the Description of Proposed Activities section of this notice would not be completed by the time the IHA expires and a Renewal would allow for completion of the activities beyond that described in the *Dates and Duration* section of this notice, provided all of the following conditions are met:

(1) A request for renewal is received no later than 60 days prior to the needed Renewal IHA effective date (recognizing that the Renewal IHA expiration date

cannot extend beyond one year from expiration of the initial IHA);

(2) The request for renewal must include the following:

- An explanation that the activities to be conducted under the requested Renewal IHA are identical to the activities analyzed under the initial IHA, are a subset of the activities, or include changes so minor (*e.g.*, reduction in pile size) that the changes do not affect the previous analyses, mitigation and monitoring requirements, or take estimates (with the exception of reducing the type or amount of take); and

- A preliminary monitoring report showing the results of the required monitoring to date and an explanation showing that the monitoring results do not indicate impacts of a scale or nature not previously analyzed or authorized.

(3) Upon review of the request for Renewal, the status of the affected species or stocks, and any other pertinent information, NMFS determines that there are no more than minor changes in the activities, the mitigation and monitoring measures will remain the same and appropriate, and the findings in the initial IHA remain valid.

Dated: January 7, 2022.

**Catherine Marzin,**

*Acting Director, Office of Protected Resources,  
National Marine Fisheries Service.*

[FR Doc. 2022-00455 Filed 1-7-22; 4:15 pm]

**BILLING CODE 3510-22-P**