



MAY 3 2012

To All Interested Government Agencies and Public Groups:

Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), an environmental review has been performed on the following action.

TITLE: *Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to a Low-Energy Marine Geophysical Survey in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May, 2012*

LOCATION: South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, within the Exclusive Economic Zone of Chile

SUMMARY: The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) proposes to issue an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) for the take, by Level B harassment only, of marine mammals during a low-energy marine geophysical (seismic) survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean, May, 2012.

NMFS has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) titled *Environmental Assessment on the Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment to a Low-Energy Marine Geophysical Survey in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May, 2012*, and prepared an independent Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). In the EA, NMFS incorporated by reference the National Science Foundation's *National Environmental Policy Act Analysis Pursuant to Executive Order 12114, Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May 2012*. NSF's analysis is based on an *Final Environmental Analysis of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean off Chile, May 2012*, prepared by LGL Ltd., Environmental Research Associates and NMFS's EA also incorporates this document by reference. NMFS has determined that the impact of conducting the seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean, within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of Chile may result, at worst, in a temporary modification in behavior of small numbers of species of marine mammals. No injury, serious injury, or mortality is anticipated to result from this activity, nor is it authorized. NMFS has further determined that this activity will result in a negligible impact on the affected species or stocks.



RESPONSIBLE
OFFICIAL:


Helen M. Golde
Acting Director, Office of Protected Resources
National Marine Fisheries Service
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
1315 East-West Highway, Room 13821
Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-427-8407

The environmental review process including the analysis and determinations made during the IHA application and issuance process has led us to conclude that this action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared. A copy of the FONSI prepared by NMFS, the supporting EA, and NSF document incorporated by NMFS, are enclosed for your information.

Although NOAA is not soliciting comments on this EA/FONSI, we will consider any comments submitted that would assist us in preparing future NEPA documents.

Please submit any written comments to the responsible official named above.

Sincerely,



Patricia A. Montanio
NOAA NEPA Coordinator

Enclosure

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to a Low-Energy Marine Geophysical Survey in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May, 2012

May 2012



AGENCY:

U.S. Department of Commerce,
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
National Marine Fisheries Service,
Office of Protected Resources
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910

**RESPONSIBLE
OFFICIAL:**

Helen M. Golde, Acting Director, Office of Protected Resources

**FOR INFORMATION
CONTACT:**

Office of Protected Resources
National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East West Highway
Silver Spring, MD 20910
301-427-8401

LOCATION:

In the Exclusive Economic Zone of Chile, approximately 50 kilometers off the coast, in the area approximately 34° to 35° South, and 72° to 74° West.

ABSTRACT:

This Environmental Assessment analyzes the environmental impacts of the National Marine Fisheries Service's proposal to issue an Incidental Harassment Authorization to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography for the taking, by Level B harassment, of small numbers of marine mammals, incidental to conducting a marine geophysical (seismic) survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean, May, 2012.

1. CHAPTER 1 – PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

1.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

NMFS has received an application from Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), a part of the University of California San Diego (UCSD), for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) to take marine mammals, by Level B harassment, incidental to conducting a marine geophysical (seismic) survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of Chile, May, 2012. SIO's seismic survey activities, which have the potential to cause marine mammals to be behaviorally disturbed, warrant an incidental take authorization from NMFS under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, as amended (MMPA; 16 U.S.C. 1631 *et seq.*).

The proposed action considered in this Environmental Assessment (EA) is the issuance of an IHA, by NMFS, for the incidental taking, by Level B harassment only, of small numbers of marine mammals, incidental to the conduct of SIO's seismic survey in May, 2012 (which includes a six-week buffer for operational delays), pursuant to section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA.

This EA, titled *Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to a Low-Energy Marine Geophysical Survey in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean May, 2012* (hereinafter, EA), addresses the impacts on the human environment that would result from issuance of this IHA for MMPA Level B takes of marine mammals during the SIO survey under the required monitoring and mitigation measures that would be specified in the authorization.

1.1.1 BACKGROUND

The National Science Foundation (NSF) supports basic scientific research in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, social, and other sciences pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (NSF Act; 42 U.S.C. 1861-75). The NSF considers proposals submitted by organizations and makes contracts and/or other arrangements (i.e., grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) to support research activities.

NSF also invests in research infrastructure, including the Academic Research Fleet (ARF) which allows NSF-funded scientists to conduct marine research in coastal and open waters. These funds support ship operations; shipboard scientific support equipment; oceanographic instrumentation and technical services; and submersible support. The U.S. Navy owns the R/V *Melville*, an 85 m (279 ft) research vessel that SIO, a part of UCSD, operates under a charter agreement with the Office of Naval Research.

In 2011, an NSF-expert panel recommended a collaborative research proposal titled, “*Collaborative Research: Post-seismic response updip of the Chilean megathrust earthquake of February 27, 2010*” (NSF Award # 1130013) for funding and ship time on the *Melville*. As the Federal action agency, the NSF has funded SIO's proposed seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean as a part of the NSF Act.

SIO's seismic survey activities, which have the potential to cause marine mammals to be behaviorally disturbed, warrant an incidental take authorization from NMFS under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA. Accordingly, SIO has submitted a permit application requesting NMFS

to issue an IHA for the take, by Level B harassment only, of small numbers of marine mammals, incidental to conducting a proposed seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean from May 4, 2011 to May 18, 2012. Some minor deviation from these dates is possible, depending upon logistics and weather. Therefore, NMFS proposes to issue an authorization that extends to June 29, 2012.

The NSF action of funding Award #1130013 and NMFS's action of issuing an IHA to SIO that authorizes incidental takes, Level B harassment only, of small numbers of marine mammals, incidental to the conduct of the seismic survey are interrelated actions.

1.1.2 INCORPORATION OF NSF'S ANALYSIS AND REPORT BY REFERENCE

After conducting an independent review of the information and analyses for sufficiency and adequacy, NMFS incorporates by reference the NSF's *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA; 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) Analysis Pursuant To Executive Order (E.O.) 12114 Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May 2012* (NSF, 2012) (hereinafter, the NSF NEPA Analysis) and an associated report prepared by LGL Limited, Environmental Research Associates (LGL) for NSF and SIO, titled *Final Environmental Analysis of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean off Chile, May 2012*, (LGL, 2011), (hereinafter, the NSF/SIO Report) pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.21 and NOAA Administrative Order (NAO) 216-6 § 5.09(d). In summary, the NSF NEPA Analysis and the NSF/SIO Report concluded that with incorporation of the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, the potential impacts of the proposed action to marine mammals, sea turtles, seabirds, fish and invertebrates would be limited to short-term, localized changes in behavior and distribution near the seismic vessel.

1.1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED

The MMPA and Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) prohibit "takes" of marine mammals and of threatened and endangered species, respectively, with only a few specific exceptions. The applicable exceptions in this case are an exemption for incidental take of marine mammals in sections 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA and 7(b)(4) of the ESA.

Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA directs the Secretary of Commerce to authorize, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional, taking of small numbers of marine mammals of a species or population stock, by United States citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified geographical region if certain findings are made and a notice of a proposed authorization is provided to the public for review. Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA also establishes a 45-day time limit for NMFS's review of an application for an IHA followed by a 30-day public notice and comment period on any proposed authorizations for the incidental harassment of small numbers of marine mammals. Within 45 days of the close of the public comment period, NMFS must either issue or deny the IHA.

Purpose: The primary purpose of NMFS issuing an IHA to SIO is to provide an exception to SIO from the take prohibitions under the MMPA for the take of marine mammals, incidental to the conduct of SIO's seismic survey in May, 2012. The purpose of issuing an IHA to SIO is to regulate the incidental take of marine mammals associated with the conduct of the seismic survey in May, 2012.

Need: As noted above this section, the MMPA establishes a general moratorium or prohibition on the take of marine mammals, including take by behavioral harassment. The MMPA establishes a

process by which individuals engaged in specified activities within a specified geographic area may request an IHA. NMFS must authorize the take of small numbers of marine mammals if, among other things, it complies with the process described above this section, makes certain determinations, and requires the implementation of mitigation and monitoring to minimize potential adverse impacts and resulting take. Specifically, NMFS shall grant the IHA if it 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 subsistence uses (where relevant). The IHA must set forth the permissible methods of taking, other means of effecting the least practicable impact on the species or stock and its habitat, and requirements pertaining to the mitigation, monitoring, and reporting of such takings.

SIO has submitted a complete application demonstrating potential eligibility for issuance of an IHA. NMFS now has a corresponding duty to determine whether and how it can fashion an IHA authorizing take by harassment incidental to the activities described in SIO's application. The need for this action is therefore established and framed by the MMPA and NMFS's responsibilities under section 101(a)(5)(D) of that Act, its implementing regulations, and other applicable requirements which will influence its decision making, such as section 7 of the ESA which is discussed in more detail below this section.

The foregoing purpose and need guide NMFS in developing alternatives for consideration, including alternative means of mitigating potential adverse effects.

1.2 NEPA REQUIREMENTS AND SCOPE OF NEPA ANALYSIS

This EA focuses primarily on the environmental effects of authorizing MMPA Level B incidental takes of marine mammals during seismic surveys in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. The MMPA and its implementing regulations governing issuance of an IHA (50 CFR § 216.107) require that upon receipt of a valid and complete application for an IHA, NMFS must publish a notice of preliminary determinations and a proposed IHA in the *Federal Register* (FR). The notice published for the SIO action summarizes the purpose of the requested IHA, includes a statement that NMFS would prepare an EA for the proposed action, and invited interested parties to submit written comments concerning the application and NMFS's preliminary analyses and findings including those relevant to consideration in the EA.

NOAA Administrative Order (NAO) 216-6 established agency procedures for complying with NEPA and the implementing NEPA regulations issued by the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Consistent with the intent of NEPA and the clear direction in NAO 216-6 to involve the public in NEPA decision-making, NMFS structures the decision-making process for issuance of IHAs to provide for public participation in the NEPA process by requesting comments on potential environmental impacts described in the proposed IHA, and, in this case, the NEPA documents prepared by NSF and LGL.

Under the requirements of NAO 216-6, the proposed issuance of authorization for incidental take of marine mammals is an action that is not categorically excluded from NEPA review. In addition, it is not the type of action normally requiring preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Therefore, NMFS has prepared this EA to assist in determining whether the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts related to its issuance of the authorization for incidental take under the MMPA of 20 marine mammal species are likely to result in significant impacts to the human environment, or whether the analysis, contained herein, including documents referenced and incorporated by reference and public comments received, supports the issuance of a Finding of No Significant

Impact (FONSI). Given the limited scope of the decision for which NMFS is responsible (i.e. whether or not to issue the authorization including prescribed means of take, mitigation measures and monitoring requirements) that this EA is intended to inform, the scope of analysis is limited to evaluating and disclosing the impacts to living marine resources and their habitat likely to be affected by the SIO seismic survey. As described more fully below this section, the EA identifies all marine mammals, and species protected under the ESA, that are likely to occur within the action area.

The primary analysis focuses on the impacts to certain marine mammal and sea turtle species likely to result from the proposed SIO seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean in May, 2012; impacts that would result from the alternatives presented; and the consideration of potential cumulative environmental impacts. Impacts to other marine species and habitat located in the action area were considered unlikely, and, thus received less detailed evaluation.

The need for this EA is to provide a NEPA analysis of potential environmental impacts to inform the decision of whether or not to issue the IHA to SIO and to determine whether the SIO proposed action has any potential significant impacts. NMFS has relied on and incorporated the more comprehensive environmental analysis prepared by NSF (LGL, 2012; NSF, 2012) addressing the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the underlying activities associated with the seismic cruise described in the application and its supporting documents.

1.2.1 NEPA Scoping Summary

In order to identify environmental issues and impacts to be addressed in this EA, NMFS undertook several scoping steps.

- NMFS independently evaluated and determined the sufficiency of the scope of the NSF/SIO Report and has incorporated those documents by reference (see Section 1.1.2).
- NMFS also made available the NSF/SIO Report to the public at (<http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications>) concurrently with the release of the *Federal Register* notice requesting comments on the proposed IHA (77 FR 14744, March 13, 2012).

In addition, the NSF also made available the NSF/SIO Report on NSF's website (<http://www.nsf.gov/geo/oce/envcomp/index.jsp>) for a 30-day public comment period.

On March 13, 2012, NMFS published a notice of proposed IHA and preliminary determinations in the *Federal Register* (77 FR 14744). That notice included a detailed description of the proposed action, environmental issues and impacts of relevance, and potential mitigation and monitoring measures to avoid and minimize potential adverse impacts. This EA incorporates and relies on that notice and its analysis by reference to avoid duplication of analysis and unnecessary length. As noted in Section 1.1.3, the *Federal Register* notice of preliminary determinations, supporting analysis, proposed IHA and corresponding public comment period are instrumental in providing the public with information on relevant environmental issues and offering the public a meaningful opportunity to provide comments to NMFS for consideration in both the MMPA and NEPA decision-making processes.

1.2.2 COMMENTS ON NSF'S NEPA ANALYSIS AND REPORT

The Marine Mammal Commission (Commission) provides comments on all proposed IHAs as part of their established role under the MMPA (§ 202 (a)(2), *humane means of taking marine mammals*). No other organizations or private citizens submitted comments on NSF's NEPA Analysis and Report to date. NMFS has evaluated all comments and did not identify any comments: (1) that raised substantial questions as to whether the project may cause significant degradation to any marine mammal species or its habitat; or (2) that established a substantial dispute concerning the survey's size, nature, or effect.

The Commission's comments are briefly summarized here. Generally, the Commission recommended that NMFS:

- require the applicant to take in-situ measurements at the survey location and environmental parameters to verify, refine, and if needed, recalculate exclusion zones and buffer zones estimates for the airgun array and associated number of marine mammal takes;
- use species-specific maximum densities derived by multiplying the best density estimates using a precautionary correction factor, and re-estimate the anticipated number of takes using that precautionary approach;
- prohibit a 15 minute pause following the sighting of a mysticete or large odontocete in the exclusion zone and extend that pause to cover the maximum dive times of the species likely to be encountered prior to ramp-up procedures; and
- work with NSF to analyze the data collected during ramp-up procedures to help determine the effectiveness of those procedures as a mitigation measure for seismic surveys.

NMFS has considered the comments regarding additional monitoring and mitigation measures within the context of the MMPA requirement to effect the least practicable impact to marine mammals and their habitats. NMFS has developed responses to specific comments and will provide those responses in the *Federal Register* notice announcing the issuance of the IHA. NMFS incorporates those comments by reference and thus does not repeat them here. NMFS notes, however, that it fully considered the Commission's comments, particularly those related to mitigation and monitoring in preparing a final IHA and this EA. Based on those comments, NMFS has re-evaluated the mitigation and monitoring proposed for incorporation in the IHA and has determined, based on the best available data, that the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant, are the most feasible and effective monitoring and mitigation measures to achieve the MMPA requirement of effecting the least practicable impact on each marine mammal species or stock.

1.3 APPLICABLE LAWS AND NECESSARY FEDERAL PERMITS

This section summarizes federal, state, and local permits, licenses, approvals, and consultation requirements necessary to implement the proposed action.

1.3.1 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

NEPA compliance is necessary for all "major" Federal actions with the potential to significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Major Federal actions include activities that are fully or partially funded, regulated, conducted, or approved by a Federal agency. NMFS's issuance of an IHA for incidental harassment of marine mammals represents approval and regulation of takes of marine mammals incidental to the applicant's activities and is therefore a major Federal action for

which NEPA review is required. While NEPA does not dictate a substantive outcome for a proposed IHA, it requires consideration of environmental issues in Federal agency planning and decision making, and requires an analysis of alternatives and analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of the NMFS's proposed action to authorize MMPA Level B incidental take. As noted, since this is a major Federal action which is not categorically excluded and does not normally require preparation of an EIS. NMFS has prepared this EA to analyze environmental impacts and to assist in determining whether an EIS is necessary for the action.

1.3.2 ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Section 7 of the ESA requires every Federal agency to insure that any action that it authorizes, funds or carries out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any threatened or endangered species or does not result in the adverse modification or destruction of critical habitat designated for any such species. Section 7 of the ESA also requires an action agency to consult with the appropriate Federal agency (either NMFS or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS]) for Federal actions that "may affect" a listed species or critical habitat. NMFS's issuance of an IHA is a Federal action, authorized by NMFS, directly or indirectly affecting ESA-listed species or designated critical habitat, and is therefore subject to these section 7 consultation requirements. Regulations specify the requirements for these consultations (50 CFR § 402).

NMFS has determined that issuance of the IHA is likely to result in adverse effects to listed marine mammal species and, therefore, in May, 2012 NMFS completed a formal section 7 consultation and prepared a Biological Opinion (BiOp) to consider whether or not the action is likely to jeopardize such species or result in the adverse modification or destruction of critical habitat designated for such species. The BiOp also includes an Incidental Take Statement (ITS) that includes reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs) and terms and conditions to minimize the level of incidental take. Incidental take is exempted from the ESA's prohibition on take as long as it occurs consistent with the ITS and its RPMs and terms and conditions. The mitigation and monitoring measures set forth in the final IHA related to listed marine mammals have been incorporated into the ITS.

1.3.3 MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT

Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA directs the Secretary of Commerce (Secretary) to authorize, upon request, the incidental, but not intentional, taking by harassment of small numbers of marine mammals of a species or population stock, for periods of not more than one year, by United States citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specific geographic region if certain findings are made and a *Federal Register* notice of a proposed authorization is provided to the public for review.

Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA established an expedited process by which citizens of the United States can apply for an authorization to incidentally take small numbers of marine mammals by harassment. Except with respect to certain activities not pertinent here, 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"].

Section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA establishes a 45-day time limit for NMFS's review of an application followed by a 30-day public notice and comment period on any proposed authorizations for the incidental harassment of small numbers of marine mammals. Not later than 45 days after the close of the public comment period, if the Secretary makes the findings set forth in Section 101(a)(5)(D)(i) of the MMPA, the Secretary shall issue the authorization with appropriate conditions to meet the requirements of clause 101(a)(5)(D)(ii) of the MMPA.

NMFS has promulgated regulations to implement the permit provisions of the MMPA (50 CFR Part 216) and has produced Office of Management and Budget (OMB)-approved application instructions (OMB Number 0648-0151) that prescribe the procedures necessary to apply for permits. All applicants must comply with these regulations and application instructions in addition to the provisions of the MMPA. Applications for an IHA must be submitted according to regulations at 50 CFR § 216.104.

1.3.4 EXECUTIVE ORDER 12114 – ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS ABROAD OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS

The requirements for Executive Order (E.O.) 12114, discussed in the NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2011) are incorporated herein, by reference. Briefly, the provisions of E.O. 12114 apply to major Federal actions that occur or have effects outside of U.S. territories (the United States, its territories, and possessions). Accordingly, NMFS is required to be informed of environmental considerations and take those considerations into account when making decisions on major Federal actions which could have environmental impacts anywhere beyond the borders of the United States.

2. CHAPTER 2 – ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

The NEPA implementing regulations (40 CFR § 1502.14) and NAO 216-6 provide guidance on the consideration of alternatives to a Federal proposed action and require rigorous exploration and objective evaluation of all reasonable alternatives. Each alternative must be feasible and reasonable in accordance with the President's CEQ regulations (40 CFR §§ 1500-1508) and the purpose and need of the agency proposed action. This chapter describes the range of potential actions (alternatives) determined reasonable with respect to achieving the stated purpose and need, as well as alternatives eliminated from detailed study and also summarizes the expected outputs and any related mitigation of each alternative.

This EA evaluates the alternatives to ensure that they would fulfill the purpose and need, namely: (1) the issuance of an IHA for the take of marine mammals by Level B (behavioral) harassment, incidental to SIO's conduct of a proposed low-energy marine geophysical survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean from May 4 to 18, 2012; and (2) compliance with the MMPA, which sets forth specific standards (i.e., unmitigable adverse impact and negligible impact) that must be met in order for NMFS to issue an IHA.

In the present case, NMFS has only included for full consideration one action alternative, the proposed action. In the course of reviewing the IHA, NMFS evaluated several options for mitigation and monitoring, including those suggested during the public comment period on the proposed IHA, and determined that the proposed action includes the monitoring and mitigation measures that would most effectively minimize potential adverse environmental impacts.

Under the requirements of the MMPA, if the proposed action will have no more than a negligible impact on the species or stocks; will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses; and sets forth the appropriate level of mitigation and monitoring measures, then NMFS shall issue the IHA.

2.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

SIO's proposed survey will use two dimensional (2D) seismic methodologies to study the seafloor of Maule, Chile to monitor the post-seismic response following a megathrust earthquake which occurred there on February 27, 2010. Study efforts propose to evaluate how the outer accretionary prism, where sediments are accreted onto the non-subducting tectonic plate at the convergent plate boundary, responds to the change in tectonic stress that resulted from slip of the subduction fault during the earthquake. In particular, scientists will monitor for seismic tremor and for low frequency earthquakes as well as for normal earthquakes in the study area and underlying subducting crust and for slow fluid flow out of the seafloor that can be modeled to derive volumetric strain in the underlying sediments. The proposed research activity would complement a NSF-sponsored cruise conducted by SIO to map bathymetry in the area one month after the earthquake and other subsequent international research. The proposed seismic survey will involve one source vessel, the *Melville*, which will deploy a two-airgun array with a total volume of 90 or 210 cubic inches (in³). The airgun array is towed through the water column along the survey lines, introducing sound into the water column. Airguns function by venting high-pressure air into the water, which creates an air bubble that transmits sounds downward through the seafloor (Figure 1) (NSF, 2010). The sound penetrates the seafloor and returns to a receiver called a hydrophone. The reflected data provides information on sub-sea floor sediment layers.




Figure 1. General concept of airgun arrays and hydrophones (NSF, 2010).

2.2 ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Evaluation of the No Action Alternative is required by CEQ NEPA regulations as an environmental baseline against which the impacts of the Proposed Action are compared.

Under the No Action Alternative, NMFS would not issue an IHA to SIO for the taking, by Level B harassment, of small numbers of marine mammals, incidental to conducting a low-energy marine seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean from May 4 to 18, 2012. SIO could not legally conduct the seismic survey. The applicant would not receive an exemption from the MMPA and ESA prohibitions against take.

2.3 ALTERNATIVE 2 – ISSUANCE OF AN IHA WITH MITIGATION (PREFERRED)

The Proposed Action is the Preferred Alternative. Under this alternative, NMFS would issue an IHA (valid from May 4, 2012 to June 29, 2012) to SIO allowing the incidental take, by Level B harassment, of 19 species of marine mammals in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. The project is scheduled to commence on May 4, 2012 and scheduled to end on May 18, 2012, however NMFS is proposing to issue the IHA for a longer period to allow for the possibility of operational delays.

NMFS will incorporate the mitigation and monitoring measures and reporting requirements described in Section II(3) of the NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2012) into the IHA. Accordingly, this NEPA Preferred Alternative (Issuance of an IHA with Mitigation) would satisfy the purpose and need of the NMFS MMPA action—issuance of an IHA, along with required mitigation measures and monitoring, and would enable NSF and SIO to comply with the statutory and regulatory requirements of the MMPA and ESA.

2.3.1 SEISMIC ACQUISITION OPERATIONS

The NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2011) describes the survey protocols in detail and this EA briefly summarizes them here.

The proposed study (e.g., equipment testing, startup, line changes, repeat coverage of any areas, and equipment recovery) will take place in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean in water depths ranging from approximately 1,000 to 5,300 meters (m) (3,280.8 to 17,388.5 feet [ft]). The survey will require

approximately 5 to 11 days of airgun operations to complete and consist of approximately 1,145 kilometers (km) (618.3 nautical miles [nmi]) of transect lines.

The *Melville* will conduct additional seismic operations in the survey area associated with turns, airgun testing, and repeat coverage of any areas where the initial data quality is sub-standard.




FIGURE 2. PROPOSED STUDY AREAS FOR THE SURVEY IN THE SOUTH-EASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN, MAY, 2012. THE PRIMARY TRACKLINES, APPROXIMATELY 569 KM (NMI), WILL BE SURVEYED FIRST. DEPENDING ON WEATHER DATA QUALITY, AND AT SEA CONDITIONS, EFFORTS WILL BE MADE TO SURVEY SECONDARY TRACKLINES, APPROXIMATELY 576 KM (NMI).

2.3.2 MITIGATION AND MONITORING MEASURES

The NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2011) describes the required mitigation and monitoring measures in detail and this EA briefly summarizes them here. To reduce the potential for disturbance from acoustic stimuli associated with the activities, SIO and/or its designees have proposed to implement the following monitoring and mitigation measures for marine mammals: (1) proposed exclusion zones; (2) shutdown procedures; (3) ramp-up procedures; (4) visual monitoring by Protected Species Observers (PSOs); and (5) speed or course alteration.

In the IHA, NMFS would include mandatory requirements for NSF/SIO to use these mitigation measures in order to achieve the MMPA requirement of effecting the least practicable impact on each species or stock of marine mammal.

Proposed Exclusion Zones: NMFS has determined that for acoustic effects, using acoustic thresholds in combination with corresponding exclusion zones (EZs) are an effective way to consistently apply measures to avoid or minimize the impacts of an action. SIO uses the thresholds to establish mitigation shut-down or EZ, (i.e., if an animal is about to enter or enters an area calculated to be ensonified above the level of an established threshold a sound source is shut down).

Shut-Down Procedures: SIO would shut-down the operating airgun(s) if a marine mammal is seen within or approaching the EZ for the airgun array. SIO will not resume airgun activity until the marine mammal(s) has cleared the EZ, or until the Protected Species Observer (PSO) is confident that the animal has left the vicinity of the vessel.

Ramp-Up Procedures: SIO would initiate a ramp-up procedure, beginning with a single airgun in the array then adding the second airgun after five minutes when beginning operations, and after a specified period (approximately 15 minutes) of non-active airgun operations when a shut-down has exceeded that period. SIO has used similar periods during previous SIO surveys.

Speed or Course Alteration: If a marine mammal(s) is detected outside the EZ and, based on its position and the relative motion, is likely to enter the EZ, the vessel's speed and/or direct course could be changed. This would be done if operationally practicable while minimizing the effect on the planned science objectives. The activities and movements of the marine mammal(s) (relative to the seismic vessel) will then be closely monitored to determine whether the animal is approaching the applicable EZ. If the marine mammal(s) appears likely to enter the EZ, further mitigative actions will be taken, i.e., either further course alterations or a shut-down of the airguns. Typically, during seismic airgun operations, the source vessel is unable to change speed or course and one or more alternative mitigation measures will need to be implemented.

Visual Monitoring: During seismic operations in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean, at least three PSOs would be based aboard the *Melville* for the duration of the cruise and would watch for marine mammals near the vessel during daytime airgun operations and during any ramp-ups at night. PSOs would record data to estimate the numbers of marine mammals exposed to various received sound levels and to document reactions or lack thereof. PSOs will also observe during daytime periods when the seismic system is not operating for comparison of sighting rates and behavior with versus without airgun operations. They would also provide information needed to order a shut-down of the seismic source when a marine mammal is within or near the EZ. SIO would use the data to estimate numbers of animals potentially 'taken' by harassment (as defined in the MMPA).

2.3.3 REPORTING

The NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2012) describes the required monitoring and reporting measures in detail and this EA briefly summarizes them here.

SIO will submit a report to NMFS and NSF within 90 days after the end of the cruise. The report will describe the operations that were conducted and sightings of marine mammals near the operations. The report will provide full documentation of methods, results, and interpretation pertaining to all monitoring. The 90-day report will summarize the dates and locations of seismic operations, and all marine mammal sightings (dates, times, locations, activities, associated seismic survey activities). The report will also include estimates of the number and nature of exposures that could result in "takes" of marine mammals by harassment or in other ways.

In the unanticipated event that the specified activity clearly causes the take of a marine mammal in a manner prohibited by the IHA (if issued), such as an injury (Level A harassment), serious injury or mortality (e.g., ship-strike, gear interaction, and/or entanglement), SIO shall immediately cease the specified activities and immediately report the incident to the Chief of the Permits and Conservation Division, Office of Protected Resources, NMFS. SIO may not resume activities until NMFS is able to review the circumstances of the prohibited take.

2.3.4 ESTIMATED TAKE OF MARINE MAMMALS BY INCIDENTAL HARASSMENT

The NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2012) describes the estimated take by incidental harassment in detail and this EA briefly summarizes them here.

Only take by Level B harassment is anticipated to be authorized as a result of the marine seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. Acoustic stimuli (i.e., increased underwater sound) generated during the operation of the seismic airgun array may have the potential to cause marine mammals in the survey area to be exposed to sounds at or greater than 160 dB or cause temporary, short-term changes in behavior. There is no evidence that the planned activities could result in injury, serious injury, or mortality within the specified geographic area for which SIO seeks the IHA. Take by injury, serious injury, or mortality is thus neither anticipated nor authorized. NMFS has determined that the required mitigation and monitoring measures will minimize any potential risk for injury, serious injury, or mortality.

SIO's estimates are based on a consideration of the number of marine mammals that could be disturbed appreciably by operations with the two GI airgun array to be used during approximately 1,810.5 km (977.6 nmi) of survey lines (includes primary and secondary lines and an additional 25% contingency) in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. Density data on the marine mammal species in the survey area were available from five sources: (1) the NMFS Southwest Fishery Science Center (SWFSC) habitat model (Barlow *et al.*, 2009); (2) densities from the surveys conducted during summer and fall 1986 to 1996, as summarized by Ferguson and Barlow (2001); (3) for dusky dolphins, mean densities reported for Area A from aerial surveys in North and Central Patagonia (Shiavini *et al.*, 1999); (4) for Chilean dolphins, the estimated density of Chilean dolphins in Patagonia from Heinrich (2006); and (5) for blue whales, densities reported by Galletti-Vernazzani and Cabrera (2009) from aerial surveys in Patagonia in March, 2007 and April, 2009 that took place south of the survey site. SIO incorporated the models into a web-based Geographic Information System (GIS) developed by Duke University's Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) team in close collaboration with the SWFSC SERDP team (Read *et al.*, 2009). For 11 of the cetacean species in the model, SIO used the GIS to obtain mean densities in the survey area, (i.e., in a rectangle bounded by 4° to 12° South and 75° to 85° West, which was the southeast extent of the model).

The total estimate of the number of individual cetaceans that could be exposed to seismic sounds with received levels greater than or equal to 160 dB re: 1 μ Pa during the survey is 561 (see Table 3 in the NSF/SIO Report). That total includes: 4 blue whales (endangered under the ESA) or 0.03 percent of the regional population; 1 humpback whale (endangered under the ESA) or less than 0.05 percent of the regional population; and 7 sperm whales (endangered under the ESA) or 0.03 percent of the regional population could be exposed during the survey. In addition, 3 beaked whales (1 Cuvier's, 1 Blainville's beaked whales, and 1 unidentified *Mesoplodon* spp.) could be exposed during the survey. Most (96.4 percent) of the cetaceans that could be potentially exposed are delphinids (e.g., rough-toothed, short-beaked common, striped, spinner, bottlenose, Risso's and

dusky dolphins, and long-finned pilot whales are estimated to be the most common species in the area) with maximum estimates ranging from 1 to 201 (depending on species) exposed to levels greater than or equal to 160 dB re:1 μ Pa.

NMFS does not expect the activity to impact rates of recruitment or survival of the marine mammals since no mortality (which would remove individuals from the population) or injury is anticipated to occur, nor authorized. Only a temporary modification in behavior and/or low-level physiological effects is anticipated to occur over a very short period of time.

2.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED STUDY

NMFS considered the alternative where NMFS issues an IHA without the mitigation measures described in Alternative 2—Issuance of an IHA with Mitigation (the Preferred Alternative). However, this alternative failed to meet the statutory and regulatory requirements of the MMPA for an IHA (e.g., negligible impact, effecting the least practicable impact, and monitoring and reporting of such takings). Accordingly, NMFS did not consider this alternative further.

NMFS also considered an alternative whereby NMFS issues the IHA for another time. This alternative, analyzed in the NSF/SIO Report and the NSF NEPA Analysis, is hereby incorporated by reference (LGL, 2012; NSF, 2012). However, this alternative failed to meet the statutory and regulatory requirements of the MMPA for an IHA as SIO did not submit an application (i.e., under the MMPA NMFS shall issue an IHA upon request) to conduct the seismic survey at an alternate time. The proposed dates for the cruise (May, 2012) are the most suitable dates that would best meet the purpose and need, from a logistical perspective, for NSF, SIO, the *Melville*, and its crew. The potential environmental impacts of this alternative would be very similar or identical to the impacts of the proposed action.

3. CHAPTER 3 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The summary of the physical and biological environment of the study area, as analyzed in the NSF/SIO Report, are hereby incorporated by reference (LGL, 2012). The NSF/SIO Report presents baseline information necessary for consideration of the alternatives and describes the resources that would be affected by the alternatives, as well as environmental components that would affect the alternatives if they were to be implemented. Section 3.1 through 3.3 of this EA briefly summarizes them.

In addition to the marine mammal stocks and species that are the subject of the IHA, an assortment of sea birds, sea turtles, fish, and invertebrates may be found in the action area. Section 3.2.2 – 3.2.5 of this EA briefly summarizes these species. However, potential adverse impacts to these marine species located in the action area were considered unlikely, and, thus received less detailed evaluation than marine mammals.

3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.1.1 OCEANOGRAPHY

The survey area located approximately 55 km (29.7 nmi) west of the coast of Chile, occurs within the Chile-Peru current coastal province (Longhurst, 2007). The integrated chlorophyll concentration and the primary productivity in the area of 10° to 55° South are 16 g Chl m⁻² and 0.74 g C m⁻² d⁻¹ respectively. The Humboldt Current large region (HC) extends about 7,280 km (3,930.9 nmi) along the west coast of South America from northern Peru (3° 24' 34" South, 80° 18' 25" West) to the southern tip of Chile (54° 55' 39" South, 64° 52' 12" West). It has a surface area of 2.5 million km² (728,883.4 nmi²), containing 0.42 percent of the world's seamounts and 24 major estuaries (Miloslavich *et al.*, 2011). The HC is one of the major upwelling systems of the world, with moderate to extremely high primary productivity (150 to 300 gC/m²/year), and highly productive fisheries that account for 16 percent to 20 percent of the global fish captures (Hill *et al.*, 1998). This current system is characterized by cold water that flows toward the equator, with offshore Ekman transport and coastal upwelling of cold, nutrient-rich subsurface water. The current system is complex and marked by coastal currents that can export waters up to 1,000 km (540 nmi) offshore, with subsequent effects on the biological populations of species with planktonic dispersal (Miloslavich *et al.*, 2011).

3.1.2 PROTECTED AREAS

All territorial waters of Chile have been designated a whale sanctuary, which prohibits all whaling activities. Several marine reserves and parks are established along the coast of Chile, and the parks closest to the proposed survey area are described more in the NSF/SIO Report. Francisco Coloane Marine Park is also described although it is located more than 2,000 km (1,079.9 nmi) from the survey area because of its importance to migrating mysticetes and other resident marine mammals. Protected areas include: Juan Fernandez Archipelago National Park, Laguna Torca National Reserve, Isla Chanaral Marine Reserve, Islas Choros-Damas Marine Reserve, Las Cruces Marine and Coastal Protected Area, and Francisco Coloane Marine Park.

3.2 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT

Socioeconomics comprise the basic attributes and resources associated with the human environment, particularly population and economic activity. This section addresses the socioeconomic effects of the proposed action on commercial and recreational fishing, tourism, and subsistence use.

3.2.1 FISHERIES

Commercial Fisheries

The most important fisheries in the southeast Pacific in terms of catch volume is the tuna fishery, with purse seiners of the international fleet operating in the EEZ waters under a license system. The total catch from purse seine fisheries represents more than half of landings, from commercial fisheries from all reported areas in the EEZ of Chile (see Table 5 of the NSF/SIO Report).

The Chilean fisheries products represent 12 percent of the total national exports. The sector involves 200,000 workers direct and indirectly. Pelagic resources (mainly horse mackerel, anchovy, sardine, and hake) contributes over 73% of the total fish export and are heavily exploited. These species are primarily used as the main raw material for fishmeal (FAO, 1999). Longline fisheries for swordfish occur off the coast of Chile as well, but these do not form a major part of Chile's fisheries export.

The artisanal fisheries (small-scale, decentralized operations) in Chile captured 763,000 tonnes in 2004 using small sea-faring vessels (FAO, 2011). In 2004, 14,000 fishing vessels were registered to artisanal fishers which included 8,905 motor boats and 1,219 row boats (FAO, 2011).

Recreational Fisheries

Sport fishing for billfish and tuna are pursued in most Latin American coastal nations. Sport fishing is popular in both freshwater and marine environments in Chile. Species targeted in the marine recreational fisheries include: sole, tuna, and sea bass among others. Salmon are typically fished in estuaries along the central and southern regions in Chile. The recreational fisheries industry is regulated by the National Fishing Service (SERNAPESCA) that provides fishing licenses to local residents and foreign visitors. SIO's seismic operations in the study area are expected to have a negligible contribution to cumulative impacts on the study area when compared to that of commercial and recreational fisheries activities.

Aquaculture

Chilean aquaculture takes place mainly in coastal marine environments and secondarily in freshwater environments (rivers and lakes). Aquaculture activities are concentrated almost entirely in two administrative areas of the country: Regions III-IV (north of the proposed survey area), and Regions X-XI (south of the survey area) which contributed 5 percent and 92 percent of that national harvest in 2003 respectively (FAO, 2011). In 2007, over 800,000 tonnes of aquaculture products were harvested (FAO, 2011). The breakdown of the harvest was: 80 percent fish (primarily salmon and trout), 13 percent shellfish and 7 percent algae (primarily *Gracilaria*). The total area of aquaculture concessions granted in Chile in 2004 reached 19,600 hectares, and the aquaculture industry is growing steadily in Chile (FAO, 2011).

Most aquaculture production occurs in the intensive cultivation of salmonids in suspended system (floating cages) in marine and estuarine environments, and secondarily in freshwater. Most

production units used are circular in design (10 to 15 m [32.8 to 49.2 ft] in diameter) and approximately 15 to 20 m (49.2 to 65.6 ft) in height. These are arranged in trains of up to 10 units. Culture centers can have up to 3 trains of rafts, depending on the concession area. The second largest aquaculture production is focused on semi-intensive cultures of oyster long-lines and to a lesser extent on field crops of other bivalves (mussels and abalone). Of the 14 species grown commercially in aquaculture facilities, only 6 species are native (FAO, 2011).

The *Melville's* streamer may become entangled with fishing gear. SIO will employ avoidance tactics as necessary to prevent conflict. It is not expected that SIO's operations will have a significant impact on commercial or recreational fisheries in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. Nonetheless, SIO will minimize the potential to have a negative impact on the fisheries by avoiding areas where fishing is actively underway. More information about impacts on fisheries in Section IV of the NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2012).

3.2.2 OIL AND GAS ACTIVITIES

In most Latin American countries, hydrocarbons are an asset of the state, and state-owned oil and gas companies are responsible for conducting extraction and development activities. In recent years, however, several countries have introduced regulatory reforms to allow for increased participation of the private sector in oil and gas production activities.

Most of Chile's energy sector is privatized, with Empresa Nacional del Petroleo (ENAP) controlling the oil sector. ENAP is also the sole producer and refiner in the country. Energy policy decisions are the shared responsibility of the National Energy Commission (CNE), the Ministry of Economy and Energy (MME), and the Superintendency of Electricity and Fuels (SEC) (Mbendi, 2011). In 2006, Chile had only 150 million barrels of crude oil reserves. Oil production in Chile is consequently limited, and has been dwindling over the past two decades, from 49,000 barrels per day in 1983 to 15,100 barrels per day in 2006 (production includes crude, natural gas liquids and refinery gain). In contrast, oil consumption in Chile has increased significantly, with Chile consuming an average of 341.72 thousand barrels a day of oil in 200. The country's main source of crude oil imports is Argentina. Other oil import sources include Brazil, Angola, and Nigeria (Mbendi, 2011).

ENAP first started production at its Poseidon project in the CAM 2 A Sur block offshore Tierra del Fuego (south of the survey area) in June, 2003. The Poseidon platform was the first to be installed in the area, 14 km (7.6 nmi) off the northeast coast of Tierra del Fuego in Argentine territorial waters (BNAmericas, 2003).

On April 30, 2008 the Chilean government granted eight blocks (territory portion) for the exploration of oil and natural gas deposits, in Magallanes Region, south of the survey area (see Figure 5 of the NSF/SIO Report). ENAP was one of the forerunning companies in this process. The other blocks granted, and the awarded companies and consortiums were: Tranquilo Block, IPR-Manas; Russfin Block, Apache; Brotula Isla Magdalena and Porvenir Blocks. The awarded companies participate in a 50 percent association with ENAP in the three remaining blocks, el Coiron (Pan American Energy), Caupolicán (Greymouth) and Lenga (Apache). In December 2010, international oil companies were invited to become partners with ENAP in hydrocarbon exploration work in five areas located on Tierra del Fuego island in the 12th Region of Magallanes and Chilean Antarctic. In September 2011, ENAP, and the companies Geopark, YPF and Wintershall, presented Special Petroleum Operations Contract (CEOP) requests to the Ministry of Energy, concerning five exploration blocks in Magallanes Region: Isla Norte, Campanario, Flamenco, San Sebastian and

Marazzi-Lago Mercedes. The Chilean Secretary of State will define the awarding of these CEOPs in 2012 (ENAP, 2011).

3.3 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.3.1 MARINE MAMMALS

Forty-four species of marine mammal, including 32 odontocetes, 8 mysticetes, 4 pinnipeds, and the marine otter are known to occur in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. Of those, 28 species may occur in the proposed survey area (see Table 2 of NSF/SIO's Report). Five of these species are listed as endangered under the ESA, including the humpback (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), sei (*Balaenoptera borealis*), fin (*Balaenoptera physalus*), blue (*Balaenoptera musculus*), and sperm (*Physeter macrocephalus*) whale. Twelve cetacean species, although present in the survey area, are extralimital, or they are typically found in coastal water. Four species of pinnipeds are known to occur in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean: the Juan Fernandez fur seal (*Arctocephalus philippii*), southern sea lion (*Otaria flavescens*), the South American fur seal (*A. australis*) and the southern elephant seal (*Mirounga leonina*). The typical range of southern elephant seals is far south of the survey area, and the southern sea lion is typically found in coastal waters shallower than the depth of the survey area. The Juan Fernandez fur seal and South American fur seals could be encountered at sea, although they are typically found close to the Juan Fernandez archipelago, approximately 700 km (378 nmi) west of the survey area. The marine otter (*Lontra felina*) is a coastal species and does not occur in offshore waters.

Information on the occurrence, distribution, population size, and conservation status for each of the 28 cetacean species and 4 pinniped species that may occur in the proposed area is presented in Table 2 of the NSF/SIO Report. More information about each stock may be found in the respective Stock Assessment Reports, which are available online at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/sars/species.htm>.

3.3.2 MARINE TURTLES

Of the world's several species of sea turtles, four species of sea turtles could occur in the proposed study area during the proposed seismic activities. They include the green (*Chelonia mydas*); leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*); loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*); and olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) sea turtles. At least three species nest north of the survey area in considerable numbers: leatherbacks in Mexico and Costa Rica, green turtles from Mexico and Columbia (mostly in Mexico, nesting in the Galapagos occurs during December to May), and olive ridleys from Mexico to Peru, mostly in southern Mexico and northern Costa Rica. Loggerheads do not nest in the eastern Pacific. The proposed survey is scheduled after the peak nesting periods for leatherbacks (October to March), green turtles (October to November), and olive ridleys (September to December).

More information about each species may be found in Section III of the NSF/SIO Report (LGL, 2012).

3.3.3 FISH

Examples of fish present in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean (SAUP, 2012) include species important to commercial and recreational fisheries such as Inca scad (*Trachurus murphyi*), Peruvian anchoveta (*Engraulis ringens*), Patagonian grenadier (*Macruronus magellanicus*), South American pilchard (*Sardinops sagax*), Normans camote (*Normanichthys crockeri*), South Pacific hake (*Merluccius*

gayi), Araucanian herring (*Clupea bentincki*), Southern hake (*Merluccius australis*), and chub mackerel (*Scomber japonicus*); to name a few.

3.3.4 INVERTEBRATES

Examples of invertebrates present in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean (SAUP, 2012) include mollusks, urchins, shrimp, squids, sharks, rays, and chimaeras.

4. CHAPTER 4 – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

The NSF/SIO Report and NSF's NEPA Analysis, which address potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed marine seismic survey on marine mammals, sea turtles, fish, and invertebrates, and impacts to prey species and marine mammal habitats, are hereby incorporated by reference (LGL, 2012; NSF, 2012). NMFS finds that the NSF/SIO Report and NSF's NEPA Analysis facilitate a meaningful analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of SIO's proposed action on marine mammals and other marine species, including marine turtles, seabirds, fish, and invertebrates.

Under the MMPA, NMFS has evaluated the potential impacts of SIO's action in order to determine whether to authorize incidental take of marine mammals. Under NEPA, NMFS has determined that an EA is appropriate to evaluate the potential significance of environmental impacts to the marine environment resulting from the proposed SIO action that would occur after issuance of this IHA.

4.1 EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action Alternative, NMFS would not issue an IHA to SIO for the taking, by Level B harassment, of small numbers of marine mammals, incidental to conducting a low-energy marine seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean from May 4 to 18, 2012. SIO could not legally conduct the seismic survey. The applicant would not receive an exemption from the MMPA and ESA prohibitions against take. There are no direct or indirect effects on the environment of not issuing the IHA. The incidental take of marine mammals, including those listed as threatened or endangered, resulting from SIO's survey would not be exempted. It is unlikely the applicant would conduct the research in the absence of a permit, because to do so would risk sanctions and enforcement actions under the MMPA and ESA.

4.2 EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE 2 – PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The NSF/SIO Report and NSF's NEPA Analysis, incorporated by reference (LGL, 2012; NSF, 2012), describe, in detail, the potential effects of airgun sounds, multibeam echosounder and sub-bottom profiler signals on marine species, particularly marine mammals and marine turtles of particular concern (see Section IV and Appendices B through D of the NSF/SIO Report). The NSF/SIO Report also includes analyses of effects on sea turtles, fish, and invertebrates.

SIO proposed a number of monitoring and mitigation measures for marine mammals as part of the action evaluated in the NSF/SIO Report and NSF's NEPA Analysis. In analyzing the effects of the preferred alternative, NMFS has included the following monitoring and mitigation measures as part of the preferred alternative:

- (1) proposed exclusion zones;
- (2) power-down procedures;
- (3) shut-down procedures;
- (4) ramp-up procedures;
- (5) visual monitoring by PSOs; and
- (6) speed or course alteration.

Inclusion of these monitoring and mitigation measures will minimize and/or avoid impacts to marine resources. With the above mandatory monitoring and mitigation measures, unavoidable impacts to each species of marine mammal and sea turtle that could be encountered are expected to be limited to short-term, localized changes in behavior (such as brief masking of natural sounds) and short-term changes in animal distribution near the seismic vessel. At most, effects on marine mammals may be interpreted as falling within the MMPA definition of Level B (behavioral) harassment for those species managed by NMFS. Under the proposed action, NMFS expects no long-term or substantial adverse effects on marine mammals, marine turtles, fish, invertebrates, or the populations to which they belong or on their habitats.

NMFS does not anticipate that take by injury (Level A harassment), serious injury, or death will occur and expects that harassment takes should be at the lowest level practicable due to the incorporation of the mitigation measures proposed in the application, NSF/SIO Report and NMFS' notice of proposed IHA (77 FR 14744, March 13, 2012), nor is take by injury, serious injury, or mortality authorized by this IHA.

4.2.1 IMPACTS TO THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Based on a review of the data, NMFS expects no significant direct impacts from the action of issuing an IHA for the incidental take, by Level B harassment, of small numbers of marine mammals to SIO during the conduct of the seismic survey. SIO's survey activities are not expected to disturb the geology nor the water surrounding the survey area.

NMFS does not expect the seismic survey to have any substantial impacts to the protected areas near the proposed action area, nor does NMFS expect the authorization to have a significant effect on the living marine resources that may be important resources in the waters off of Chile.

4.2.2 IMPACTS TO MARINE MAMMALS AND SEA TURTLES

The impacts of the seismic survey on marine mammals and sea turtles are specifically related to acoustic activities, and these are expected to be temporary in nature, negligible, and would not result in substantial impact to marine mammals or to their role in the ecosystem. These temporary acoustic activities would not affect physical habitat features, such as substrates and water quality.

Additionally, the effects from vessel transit and routine operation of one seismic source vessel would not result in substantial damage to ocean and coastal habitats that might constitute marine mammal habitats. The potential for striking marine mammals and sea turtles is a concern with vessel traffic. The probability of a ship strike resulting in an injury or mortality of an animal has been associated with ship speed; it is highly unlikely that the proposed seismic survey would result in a serious injury or mortality to any marine mammal or sea turtle as a result of vessel strike given the *Melville's* slow survey speed (8 to 12 km/hr; 4.3 to 6.5 nmi per hour; 4 to 6 knots [kts]). SIO has not requested authorization for take of marine mammals that might occur incidental to vessel ship strike while transiting to and from the survey site. However, the probability of marine mammal interactions occurring during transit to and from the survey area is unlikely due to the *Melville's* slow cruising speed which is approximately 11.7 nmi per hour (21.7 km/hr; 11.7 kts) which is generally below the speed at which studies have noted reported increases of marine mammal injury or death (Laist, Knowlton, Mead, Collet, & Podesta, 2001).

NMFS anticipates, and would authorize, the incidental, Level B harassment only, in the form of temporary behavioral disturbance, of several species of cetaceans. NMFS does not anticipate that

take by injury (Level A harassment), serious injury, or death would occur and expects that harassment takes should be at the lowest level practicable due to the incorporation of the monitoring and mitigation measures required by the proposed IHA and analyzed in this EA, the NSF/SIO Report and NSF's NEPA Analysis. The Level B harassment is not expected to affect biodiversity or ecosystem function. As with marine mammals, sea turtles may experience temporary hearing threshold shifts and may exhibit relatively minor and short-term behavioral responses.

4.2.3 POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES TO OTHER LIVING MARINE RESOURCES

NMFS's evaluation indicates that any direct or indirect effects of the action would not result in a substantial impact to living marine resources (i.e., any fish, or invertebrate species) or their habitats and would not have any adverse impacts on biodiversity or ecosystem function. Most effects of the proposed action are considered to be short-term, temporary in nature, and negligible, and unlikely to affect normal ecosystem function or predator/prey relationships; therefore, there will not be a substantial impact on marine life biodiversity or on the normal function of the high seas marine environment.

SIO proposes to conduct the proposed open-water low-energy marine geophysical survey for a short period of time in deep-water (approximately 1,000 to 5,300 m in depth). As the *Melville* transits the area while conducting the survey, any displacement of marine fish species by the proposed action would be temporary. Many fish species (i.e., those that do not have swim bladders, have rudimentary swim bladders (such as bottom-dwelling species, including flatfish), or well-developed swim bladders that are not directly connected to the ears) tend to have relatively poor auditory sensitivity and are not likely to be affected by exposure to intense noise. The seismic survey may potentially displace prey items of marine mammals, such as fish. However, prey items would return after the *Melville* and the towed airgun array have transited through the area and the ambient sound has returned to baseline levels.

The overall response of fishes and squids is to exhibit startle responses and undergo vertical and horizontal movements away from the sound source. NMFS expects that the seismic survey would have no more than a temporary and minimal adverse effect on any fish or invertebrate species and no cumulative effects on the environment. Although there is a potential for injury to fish or marine life in close proximity to the seismic airguns, the impacts of the seismic survey on fish and other marine life specifically related to acoustic activities are expected to be temporary in nature, negligible, and would not result in substantial impact to these species or to their role in the ecosystem.

NMFS conducted additional literature reviews for purposes of the MMPA analyses, and applicable information is included here to support this finding. Sperm whales regularly feed on squid and some fishes and may be feeding while in the area during the proposed survey. One study investigating behavioral response of southern calamari squid (*Sepioteuthis australis*) exposed to seismic survey sound reported that the squid exhibited both startle and avoidance responses. It is expected that sperm whales remaining in this area would experience indirect effects from airgun activities through temporary behavioral disruptions and reduced feeding opportunities. Like their prey, sperm whales are expected to move out of the survey area temporarily and return to the area once survey activities are complete and prey species return.

Available data suggest that sound energy from the airguns will diminish dramatically by the time it travels more than 1,000 m (3,280 ft) to the ocean floor. The seismic program in the south-eastern

Pacific Ocean is not expected to significantly impact benthic and invertebrate communities in the study area.

The existing body of information on the impacts of seismic survey sound on marine invertebrates and benthic fauna is very limited. Recent controlled field experiments on adult crustaceans exposed to seismic energy found no pathological impacts to the research animals. The study reported that the seismic survey did not: (1) cause any acute or mid-term mortality of the snow crabs (*Chionoecetes opilio*); (2) alter feeding behavior; or (3) affect embryo survival or post-hatch locomotion of larvae.

4.3 COMPLIANCE WITH NECESSARY LAWS – NECESSARY FEDERAL PERMITS

NMFS has determined that the IHA is consistent with the applicable requirements of the MMPA, ESA, and NMFS's regulations. The applicant has secured or applied for necessary permits from NMFS.

Under section 7 of the ESA, NSF initiated formal consultation with the NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division, on this seismic survey. NMFS's Office of Protected Resources, Permits and Conservation Division, has initiated formal consultation under section 7 of the ESA with NMFS's Office of Protected Resources, Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division, to obtain a Biological Opinion evaluating the effects of issuing the IHA on threatened and endangered marine mammals and, if appropriate authorizing incidental take. In May, 2012, NMFS issued a BiOp and concluded that the action and issuance of the IHA are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of humpback, sei, fin, blue, and sperm whales as well as sea turtles. NSF and SIO must comply with the relevant terms and conditions of the ITS corresponding to NMFS's BiOp issued to NSF, SIO, and NMFS's Office of Protected Resources. SIO must comply with the mitigation and monitoring requirements included in the IHA in order to be exempted under the ITA in the BiOp from the prohibition on take of listed endangered marine mammal species otherwise prohibited by section 9 of the ESA.

4.4 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

The summary of unavoidable adverse impacts to marine mammals, marine turtles, seabirds, fish, invertebrates, or the populations to which they belong or on their habitats occurring in the survey area analyzed in the NSF/SIO Report and NSF's NEPA Analysis are hereby incorporated by reference (LGL, 2012; NSF, 2012).

NMFS does not expect SIO's activities to have adverse consequences on the viability of marine mammals in the study area. Further, NMFS does not expect the marine mammal populations in that area to experience reductions in reproduction, numbers, or distribution that might appreciably reduce their likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild. Numbers of individuals of all species taken by harassment are expected to be small (relative to species or stock abundance), and the low-energy marine seismic survey will have a negligible impact on the affected species or stocks of marine mammals. The MMPA requirement of ensuring the proposed action has no unmitigable adverse impact to subsistence uses does not apply here because of the location of the proposed activity.

4.5 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

The potential cumulative effects to marine mammals, marine turtles, seabirds, fish, invertebrates, or the populations to which they belong or on their habitats occurring in the survey area analyzed in the NSF/SIO Report and NSF's NEPA Analysis are hereby incorporated by reference (LGL, 2012; NSF, 2012).

The impacts of conducting the seismic survey on marine mammals and sea turtles are specifically related to acoustic activities, and these are expected to be temporary in nature, negligible, and would not result in substantial impacts to marine mammals or to their role in the ecosystem. NMFS believes that the survey would not have any adverse cumulative effect on any fish or invertebrate species or their habitats.

NMFS has issued incidental take authorizations for other seismic research surveys (to SIO, L-DEO, U.S. Geological Survey [USGS], and other parties) that may have resulted in the harassment of marine mammals, but the other research surveys are dispersed both geographically (throughout the world) and temporally, are short-term in nature, and all are required to use mitigation and monitoring measures to minimize impacts to marine mammals and other living marine resources in the activity area. There are no other NSF-sponsored seismic surveys scheduled in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean in May, 2012; therefore, NMFS is unaware of any synergistic impacts to marine resources associated with reasonably foreseeable future actions that may be planned or occur within the same region of influence.

5. LIST OF PREPARERS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

Agencies Consulted

No other persons or agencies were consulted in preparation of this EA.

Prepared By

Howard Goldstein

Fisheries Biologist

Permits and Conservation Division

Office of Protected Resources

National Marine Fisheries Service

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

6. REFERENCES

- Barlow, J., Ferguson, M. C., Becker, E. A., Redfern, J. V., Forney, K. A., Vilchis, I. L., . . . Ballance, L. T. (2009). *Predictive Modeling of Cetacean Densities in the Eastern Pacific Ocean*, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-444. La Jolla, CA: National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.
- Ferguson, M.C. and J. Barlow. (2001). Spatial distribution and density of cetaceans in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean based on summer/fall research vessel surveys in 1986-96. Admin. Rep. LJ-01-04, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 61 p.
- Galletti Vernazzani, B. and E. Cabrera. (2009). First aerial surveys to estimate abundance of blue whales off southern Chile, IWC SC/61/SH21.
- Heinrich, S. (2006). Ecology of Chilean dolphins and Peale's dolphins at Islan Chiloe, southern Chile. Ph.D. Thesis, University of St. Andrews.
- Laist, D. W., Knowlton, A. R., Mead, J. G., Collet, A. S., & Podesta, M. (2001). Collisions between ships and whales. *Marine Mammal Science*, 17(1), 35-75.
- LGL Ltd. Environmental Research Associated (2012). Final Environmental Analysis of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Melville* in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean off Chile, May 2012. (pp. 182). King City, Ontario.
- Longhurst, A. R. (2007). *Ecological geography of the sea*. (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Elsevier Inc.
- NSF. (2010). Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement for Marine Seismic Research Funded by the National Science Foundation or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey. Arlington, VA.
- National Science Foundation. (2012). Final National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 Analysis Pursuant To Executive Order 12114. Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Melville* in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May 2012.
- Read, A.J., P.N. Halpin, L.B. Crowder, B.D. Best, and E. Fujioka (eds.). (2009). OBIS-SEAMPA: Mapping marine mammals, birds, and turtles. World Wide Web electronic publication. Accessed on 17 April 2010 at http://seamap.env.duke.edu/prod/serdp/serdp_map.php.
- SAUP. (2012). Sea Around Us Project. Landings by species in high seas - Pacific, southeastern. Retrieved March 21, 2012, from <http://www.seaaroundus.org/eez/152/11.aspx>
- Schiavini, A., S.N. Pedraza, and E.A. Crespo. (1999). Abundance of Dusky dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*) of north and central Patagonia, Argentina, in spring and a comparison with incidental catch in fisheries. *Marine Mammal Science*. 15(3): 828-840.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
Silver Spring, MD 20910

**Finding of No Significant Impact for the National Marine Fisheries Service's
Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to the Scripps Institution of
Oceanography to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to a Low-
Energy Marine Geophysical Survey in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May, 2012**

National Marine Fisheries Service

BACKGROUND

The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) received an application from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), with funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF), for an authorization to take small numbers of marine mammals, by Level B harassment, incidental to its 2012 low-energy marine geophysical (seismic) survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. Pursuant to the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), authorization for incidental takings shall be granted if NMFS finds that the taking will have a negligible impact on the species or stock(s), will not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stock(s) for subsistence uses (where relevant), and if the permissible methods of taking and requirements pertaining to the mitigation, monitoring, and reporting of such takings are set forth.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA, 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*), NMFS has completed an *Environmental Assessment on the Issuance of an Incidental Harassment Authorization to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography to Take Marine Mammals by Harassment Incidental to a Low-Energy Marine Geophysical Survey in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May, 2012* (EA).

This EA incorporates NSF's *National Environmental Policy Act Analysis Pursuant to Executive Order 12114, Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean, May 2012* (NSF, 2012) (hereinafter, the NSF NEPA Analysis) and an associated report prepared by LGL Ltd., Environmental Research Associates (LGL) for NSF titled *Final Environmental Analysis (EA) of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean off Chile, May 2012* (LGL, 2012) (hereinafter NSF/SIO Report) by reference pursuant to 40 CFR 1502.21 and NOAA Administrative Order (NAO) 216-6 § 5.09(d).

NMFS has prepared this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) to evaluate the significance of the impacts of NMFS's action. It is specific to Alternative 2 in the EA, identified as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 2 is entitled "Issuance of an IHA with Required Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Measures." Based on NMFS's review of SIO's proposed activities and measures contained in Alternative 2, NMFS has



determined that no significant impacts to the human environment would occur from implementing the Preferred Alternative.

SIGNIFICANCE REVIEW

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Administrative Order (NAO) 216-6 (May 20, 1999) contains criteria for determining the significance of the impacts of a proposed action. In addition, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 CFR §1508.27 state that the significance of an action should be analyzed both in terms of “context” and “intensity.” Each criterion listed below is relevant to making a finding of no significant impact and has been considered individually, as well as in combination with the others. The significance of this action is analyzed based on the NAO 216-6 criteria and CEQ’s context and intensity criteria. These include:

1) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to cause substantial damage to the ocean and coastal habitats and/or Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) as defined under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA) and identified in fishery management plans?

Response: NMFS does not anticipate that either issuance of the IHA or SIO and NSF’s proposed activity would cause substantial damage to the ocean and coastal habitats. Specifically, these temporary acoustic activities would not affect physical habitat features, such as substrates and water quality. Additionally, the effects from vessel transit and the seismic operations of a single vessel would not result in substantial damage to ocean and coastal habitats that might constitute marine mammal habitats. Commercial fishing, military training exercises, and commercial vessel traffic in the study area generate noise throughout the year. The addition of the noise produced by an airgun array is comparatively minor in terms of total additional acoustic energy and brief, in terms of duration of the proposed effort.

NMFS believes that the proposed seismic survey conducted under the requirements of the IHA would have no more than minimal adverse impacts to fish or invertebrates and their habitats, and would have no potential for population-level impacts to any fish or invertebrate species. These temporary acoustic activities would not affect physical habitat features, such as substrates and water quality. The MSFCMA governs marine fisheries management in waters within the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), and required Federal agencies to consult with NMFS with respect to actions that may adversely impact EFH. The proposed seismic survey would occur in the EEZ off the coast of Chile; there would be no potential impacts to EFH because none is designated within the action area. Because EFH species have been identified and described pursuant to the MSFCMA, NSF has made a determination that this project will not result in adverse impacts to EFH, and therefore NSF is not required to consult with NOAA’s NMFS under Section 305(b)(2) of the MSFCMA as amended by the Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-257). Similarly, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Permits and Conservation Division has determined that the issuance of an IHA for the taking of marine mammals incidental to a marine low-energy seismic survey

in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean will not have an adverse impact on EFH, therefore an EFH consultation is not required.

2) Can the proposed action be expected to have a substantial impact on biodiversity and/or ecosystem function within the affected area (e.g., benthic productivity, predator-prey relationships, etc.)?

Response: The proposed issuance of the IHA to authorize the take of marine mammals by Level B harassment incidental to NSF and SIO's seismic survey would not have a substantial impact on biodiversity or ecosystem function within the affected area. The impacts of the seismic survey action on marine mammals are specifically related to the acoustic activities, and these are expected to be temporary in nature and not result in substantial impact to marine mammals or to their role in the ecosystem. The IHA anticipates, and would authorize, Level B harassment only, in the form of temporary behavioral disturbance, of several species of cetaceans. No injury (Level A harassment), serious injury, or mortality is anticipated or proposed to be authorized, and the Level B harassment is not expected to affect biodiversity or ecosystem function.

The EA analyzed the potential for NSF and SIO's seismic survey activity to affect other ecosystem features and biodiversity components, including sea turtles, fish, invertebrates, and oceanographic features. NMFS's evaluation indicates that any direct, indirect, or cumulative effects of issuance of the IHA or the NSF and SIO action would not result in a substantial impact on biodiversity or ecosystem function. In particular, the potential for effects to these resources are considered here with regard to the potential effects on diversity or functions that may serve as essential components of marine mammal habitats. Most effects are considered to be short-term and unlikely to affect normal ecosystem function or predator/prey relationships; therefore, NMFS believes that there will not be a substantial impact on marine life biodiversity or on the normal function of the nearshore or offshore ecosystems of the Pacific Ocean, and specifically the south-eastern Pacific Ocean.

Although there is a relative lack of knowledge about the potential physical (pathological and physiological) effects of seismic energy on marine fish and invertebrates, the available data suggest that there may be physical impacts on egg, larval, juvenile, and adult stages that are in close proximity to the seismic source. Whereas egg and larval stages are not able to escape such exposures, juveniles and adults most likely would avoid it. In the case of eggs and larvae, it is likely that the numbers adversely affected by such exposure would not significantly change the total number of those succumbing to natural mortality. Limited data regarding physiological impacts on fish and invertebrates indicate that these impacts are short term and are most apparent after exposure at close range. It is possible that zooplankton very close to the source may react to the shock wave caused by airgun operations. The pathological (mortality) zone for fish and invertebrates would be expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source to be used for this survey. Little or no mortality is expected. The proposed seismic program in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean is predicted to have negligible to low physical effects on the various life stages of fish and invertebrates. Though these effects do not require

authorization under an IHA, the effects on these features were considered by NMFS with respect to consideration of effects to marine mammals and their habitats, and NMFS finds that the effects from the survey itself on fish and invertebrates are not anticipated to have a substantial effect on biodiversity and/or ecosystem function within the affected area.

3) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to have a substantial adverse impact on public health or safety?

Response: NMFS does not expect either NMFS's issuance of the proposed IHA or the proposed seismic survey to have a substantial adverse impact on public health or safety. The constant monitoring for marine mammals and other marine life during seismic operations effectively eliminates the possibility of any humans being inadvertently exposed to levels of sound that might have adverse effects. Although the conduct of the seismic survey may carry some risk to the personnel involved (i.e., boat or mechanical accidents during surveys), the applicant and those individuals working with the applicant would be required to be adequately trained or supervised in performance of the underlying activity (i.e., the seismic survey) to minimize such risk to personnel. The survey is not expected to have any adverse impacts on traffic and transportation, as this is only a single working sound source vessel that will be at sea for a relatively short period of time (i.e., approximately 15 days, including approximately 5 to 11 days of airgun operations) over a relatively small geographic area. Also, there is little risk of exposure to hazardous materials or wastes, risk of contracting diseases, or risk of damage from a natural disaster.

4) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to adversely affect endangered or threatened species, their critical habitat, marine mammals, or other non-target species?

Response: The proposed IHA would authorize some Level B harassment (in the form of short-term and localized changes in behavior) of small numbers of marine mammals incidental to the proposed seismic survey. No injury (Level A harassment), serious injury, or mortality is anticipated or authorized. Behavioral effects may include temporary and short-term displacement of cetaceans from within certain ensonified zones, generally within 350 meters (m) or 670 m (2,198.2 feet [ft]), from the source vessel for the two GI airgun array (90 or 210 cubic inch [in³] total volume) at 2 m (6.6 ft) tow depth. The monitoring and mitigation measures required for the activity are designed to minimize the exposure of marine mammals to sound and to minimize conduct of the activity in the vicinity of habitats that might be used by certain cryptic marine mammals (i.e., those that are more difficult to detect).

Taking these measures into account, effects on marine mammals from the preferred alternative are expected to be limited to avoidance of the area around the seismic operations and short-term behavioral changes, falling within the MMPA definition of "Level B harassment." Numbers of individuals of all marine mammal species incidentally taken to the specified activity are expected to be small (relative to species abundance), and the incidental take is anticipated to have a negligible impact on the species or stock.

On December 23, 2011, NSF initiated a formal consultation, under section 7 of the ESA, with the NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division on the proposed seismic survey. On March 7, 2012, NMFS (Permits and Conservation Division) also initiated and engaged in formal consultation with NMFS (Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division) on the issuance of an IHA under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA for this activity. These two consultations were consolidated and addressed in a single Biological Opinion (BiOp) addressing the direct and indirect effects of these interdependent actions. In May, 2012, NMFS finished conducting its section 7 consultation and issued a BiOp, and concluded that the NSF action and issuance of the IHA are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of ESA-listed cetaceans, pinnipeds, and sea turtles and included an Incidental Take Statement incorporating the requirements of the IHA and Terms and Conditions to ensure that there would be no more than minimal impacts to ESA-listed species. Compliance with those Terms and Conditions is likewise a mandatory requirement of the IHA. The BiOp also concluded that designated critical habitat for these species does not occur in the action area and would not be affected by the survey.

5) Are significant social or economic impacts interrelated with natural or physical environmental effects?

Response: No significant social or economic effects are expected to result from issuance of the IHA or the proposed seismic survey. The primary impacts to the natural and physical environment are expected to be acoustic and temporary in nature, and not interrelated with significant social or economic impacts. The planned seismic survey will not result in directed or lethal takes of marine mammals.

Issuance of the IHA would not result in inequitable distributions of environmental burdens or access to environmental goods. NMFS has determined that issuance of the IHA will not adversely affect low-income or minority populations. Finally, there will be no impact of the activity on the availability of the species or stocks of marine mammals for subsistence uses. Therefore, no significant social or economic effects are expected to result from issuance of the IHA or the proposed seismic survey.

6) Are the effects on the quality of the human environment likely to be highly controversial?

Response: The effects of this action on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial. There is no significant controversy about the effects of the seismic survey or the issuance of an IHA on the quality of the human environment.

For several years, NMFS has assessed and authorized incidental take for multiple seismic surveys conducted within the same year and has developed relatively standard mitigation and monitoring measures which the public has vetted during each public comment period for over five years. Moreover, the scope of the action is not unusually large or substantial. The mitigation measures are based on NMFS's past experiences and practices with similar projects and consideration of comments submitted on this action

and other similar actions by the Marine Mammal Commission and members of the public.

NMFS published a proposed IHA in the *Federal Register* on March 13, 2012 (77 FR 14744), which allowed the public to submit comments for up to 30 days from the date of publication of the notice. The NSF requested public comment for the EA and made the draft EA available to the public on the NSF Ocean Sciences Environmental Compliance website (<http://www.nsf.gov/geo/occe/envcomp/index.jsp>). NMFS also made the draft EA available to the public on the NMFS permit website (<http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/permits/incidental.htm#applications>). Based on the analysis in the EA, consideration of public comments submitted on the proposed action in the *Federal Register* notice of a proposed IHA, and NMFS experience in issuing prior IHAs for similar actions, NMFS does not consider the effects of this action on the quality of the human environment to be highly controversial.

The Marine Mammal Commission provided comments on proposed mitigation and monitoring measures. NMFS considered the Marine Mammal Commission comments as a component of the marine mammal impacts analysis required by the MMPA in order to reach a determination that only Level B harassment would occur as a result of the proposed NSF/SIO survey, and in making this FONSI. The specific responses to public comments will be provided in the *Federal Register* notice announcing the issuance of the IHA.

No comments raised substantial questions as to whether the survey would cause significant degradation to any component of the human environment, including marine mammals or sea turtles or their habitat. There is no substantial dispute concerning the survey's size, nature or effect. Therefore, NMFS has concluded that the proposed survey and issuance of the IHA are not likely to be controversial.

7) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in substantial impacts to unique areas, such as historic or cultural resources, park land, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, EFH, or ecologically critical areas?

Response: SIO's proposed low-energy marine seismic survey will take place in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean where no historic and cultural resources, park land, prime farmlands, wetlands, or wild and scenic rivers are present. NMFS does not expect the NSF and SIO survey to have any substantial impacts to unique areas, nor does NMFS expect the authorization to have a significant effect on marine mammals that may be important resources in such areas. Similarly, NMFS does not expect its issuance of the IHA or the proposed SIO survey to have any impacts to EFH as described in the response to question 1 above. Detailed information about the affected environment, marine mammals, other marine life, and all potential adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts related to the proposed action are provided in the EA.

To the extent that marine mammals are important features of these resource areas, the potential temporary behavioral disturbance of marine mammals might result in short-term behavioral effects on cetaceans and pinnipeds within ensonified zones, but no long-term displacement of marine mammals, endangered species, or their prey is expected as a result of the NSF and SIO action or the issuance of an Incidental Take Authorization for marine mammals.

8) Are the effects on the human environment likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks?

Response: The effects of the action on the human environment are not likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. The exact mechanisms of how different sounds may affect certain marine organisms are not fully understood, but there is no substantial dispute about the size, nature, or effect of this particular action. While NMFS's judgments on impact thresholds are based on somewhat limited data, enough is known for NMFS and the regulated entity (here NSF and SIO) to develop precautionary monitoring and mitigation measures to minimize the potential for significant impacts on biological resources and to support the necessary findings. The multiple mitigation and monitoring requirements are designed to ensure the least practicable impact on the affected species or stocks of marine mammals and also to gather additional data to inform future decision-making. NMFS has been authorizing take for similar types of seismic surveys for years, and monitoring reports received pursuant to the requirements of the authorizations have indicated that there were no unanticipated or unauthorized impacts (i.e., nothing exceeding Level B harassment) that occurred as a result of the previously conducted seismic surveys.

9) Is the proposed action related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant impacts?

Response: The NSF and SIO's conduct of the low-energy seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean and NMFS's action of issuing an IHA to SIO that authorizes take of a small number of marine mammals incidental to the conduct of SIO's seismic survey, are interrelated. These actions are not expected to result in cumulatively significant impacts when considered in relation to other separate actions with individually insignificant effects.

The EA analyzes the impacts of the seismic survey in light of other human activities within the study area. In the EA, the NSF concluded and NMFS agrees that although the airgun sounds from the seismic survey have higher source levels than the sounds generated from some other human activities in the area, airgun sounds are pulses and will be carried out for only approximately 5 to 11 days, in contrast to those from other sources that have lower peak pressures but occur continuously over extended periods of time (e.g., vessel noise). Thus, the combination of SIO's operations with existing commercial shipping, commercial fishing, and military training exercises is expected to result in no more than minor and short term impacts from the proposed seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean in terms of overall disturbance effects on marine mammals.

Human activities and foreseeable projects in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean include commercial and recreational vessel traffic, fishing, and oil and gas exploration and production. These activities, when conducted separately or in combination with other activities, can affect marine mammals in the study area. Any cumulative effects caused by the addition of the seismic survey impacts on marine mammals will be extremely limited and will not rise to the level of “significant,” especially considering the timeframe of the proposed activities and the location of the proposed survey area offshore of Chile. For the majority of the proposed trackline, the *Melville* is unlikely to encounter any additional human activities, and thus the degree of cumulative impact will be minimal. Any such effects related to the cumulation of human activities near the start and end of the trackline will have no more than a negligible impact on the marine mammal populations encountered.

NMFS has issued Incidental Take Authorizations for other seismic surveys (to the oil and gas industry, NSF, USGS, and other organizations) that may have resulted in the harassment of marine mammals, but the surveys are dispersed both geographically (throughout the world) and temporally, are short term in nature, and all include required monitoring and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to marine mammals and to minimize other potential adverse environmental impacts in the activity area. There are no other NSF-sponsored seismic surveys scheduled for the south-eastern Pacific Ocean in 2012 and therefore, NMFS is unaware of any synergistic impacts to marine resources associated with reasonably foreseeable future actions that may be planned or occur within the same region of influence. The impacts of SIO’s proposed seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean are expected to be no more than minor and short-term with no potential to contribute to cumulatively significant impacts.

10) Is the proposed action likely to adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources?

Response: The actions proposed by NMFS and NSF/SIO are not likely to adversely affect cultural resources along the coast of Chile, as the seismic survey would occur on the high seas. As described in question 5 above, implementation of mitigation and monitoring measures in the IHA proposed to be issued to SIO ensures that there will not be significant social or economic impacts on the coastal inhabitants of the south-eastern Pacific Ocean. The NSF/SIO proposed action is not likely, directly or indirectly, to adversely affect places or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, or other significant scientific, cultural or historical resources as none are known to exist at the site of the proposed action and because the action is not expected to alter any physical resources.

11) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in the introduction or spread of a non-indigenous species?

Response: The primary concern regarding the introduction or spread of a non-indigenous species from the proposed seismic survey is through ballast water exchange.

The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) is responsible for ensuring that ships are in compliance with all international and U.S. national ballast water requirements to prevent the spread of non-indigenous species; the vessel (*Melville*) involved in this seismic survey will follow all those ballast water requirements.

Therefore, neither NMFS's issuance of the IHA nor NSF and SIO's proposed survey is expected to result in the introduction or spread of non-indigenous species, as all international and national preventive measures would be implemented.

12) Is the proposed action likely to establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration?

Response: The proposed action will not set a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle. To ensure compliance with statutory and regulatory standards, NMFS's actions under section 101(a)(5)(D) of the MMPA must be considered individually and be based on the best available information, which is continuously evolving in the field of underwater sound. Moreover, each action for which an Incidental Take Authorization is sought must be considered in light of the specific circumstances surrounding the action, and mitigation and monitoring may vary depending on those circumstances. As mentioned above, NMFS has issued many authorizations for seismic research surveys. A finding of no significant impact for this action, and for NMFS's issuance of an IHA, may inform the environmental review for future projects but would not establish a precedent or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

13) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment?

Response: NMFS does not expect the proposed action to violate any Federal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment, as NMFS and NSF have fulfilled their section 7 responsibilities under the ESA (see response to question 4 above), and NSF and SIO has complied with the MMPA (by submitting an application for an IHA) for this action. Also, all requirements have been met to prevent the spread of non-indigenous species into the action area (see response to question 11 above).

14) Can the proposed action reasonably be expected to result in cumulative adverse effects that could have a substantial effect on the target species or non-target species?

Response: The NSF and SIO low-energy seismic survey and NMFS's issuance of an IHA are not expected to result in any significant adverse effects on species incidentally taken by harassment, or any cumulative adverse effects that could have a substantial effect. NMFS has issued Incidental Take Authorizations for other seismic research surveys (to oil and gas companies, NSF, and other organizations) that may have resulted in the harassment of marine mammals, but they are dispersed both geographically (throughout the world) and temporally, are short-term in nature, and all use monitoring and mitigation measures to minimize impacts to marine mammals and


other protected species. There will be five other research seismic surveys (by the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory [L-DEO]) that are scheduled for the winter, spring, and summer of 2012 in the northwest Pacific (Shatsky Rise), central Pacific (Line Islands), and northeast Pacific (off of British Columbia, Washington, and Oregon). In spring, summer, and fall of 2011, NSF and USGS sponsored seismic surveys onboard the *Langseth* in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETP), central Gulf of Alaska (GOA), western GOA, Bering Sea, Chukchi Sea, and Line Islands. Two NSF-sponsored seismic surveys onboard the *Langseth* occurred in the Northwest Pacific Ocean area (i.e., Shatsky Rise) in the summer of 2010 and in the eastern tropical Pacific (ETP) off of Costa Rica in April, 2011, and two other NSF-sponsored low-energy seismic surveys took place on the R/V *Thomas G. Thompson* in the western tropical Pacific in the winter of 2011 and on the *Melville* in the ETP in the fall of 2010. L-DEO, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Rice University, and SIO have conducted seismic surveys in the Pacific and Atlantic Ocean in 2008, 2009, and 2010. NMFS does not believe the effects of this action combined with effects from the other surveys to result in cumulative adverse effects.

As described in the EA, anthropogenic activities such as commercial and recreational vessel traffic, fishing, and oil and gas exploration and production could adversely affect marine mammals and sea turtles in the survey area. However, airgun sounds are pulses (i.e., intermittent) and will be carried out for only approximately 5 to 11 days during the program, in contrast to those from other sources that occur continuously over extended periods of time (e.g., vessel noise). NSF and SIO's airgun operations are unlikely to cause any large-scale or prolonged effects. Thus, the seismic survey will add little to activities in the proposed seismic survey area, take of only small numbers of each species by behavioral disturbance are proposed to be authorized, and no injury, serious injury, or mortality is anticipated or proposed to be authorized.

Because of the relatively short time that the project area will be ensonified, NMFS anticipates that the proposed action will not result in cumulative adverse effects that could have a substantial effect on any species, such as cetaceans and pinnipeds in the area (see responses to questions 4 and 9 above). The survey would also not be expected to have a substantial cumulative effect on any sea turtles, fish, or invertebrate species. Although some loss of fish and other marine life might occur as a result of being in close proximity to the seismic airguns, this loss is not expected to be significant. Additionally, adult fish near seismic operations are likely to avoid the immediate vicinity of the source due to hearing the sounds at greater distances, thereby avoiding injury. Due to the relatively short time that seismic operations will be conducted in the area (approximately 15 days, including approximately 5 to 11 days of airgun operations), small sound source, avoidance behavior by marine mammals in the activity area, and implementation of required monitoring and mitigation measures, NMFS does not anticipate that the proposed action will result in cumulative adverse effects that could have a substantial effect on marine mammals or other marine species. Therefore, the proposed action is not expected to contribute to or result in a cumulatively significant impact to marine mammals or other marine resources.

DETERMINATION

In view of the information presented in this document and the analysis contained in NMFS's supporting EA, NMFS determined that the issuance of an IHA for the take, by Level B harassment, of small numbers of marine mammals incidental to NSF and SIO's May, 2012, seismic survey in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment, as described above and in the EA. In addition, all beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action have been addressed to reach the conclusion of no significant impacts. Accordingly, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for this action is not necessary.



Helen M. Golde
Acting Director
Office of Protected Resources
National Marine Fisheries Service

MAY -2 2012

Date

**National Science Foundation
Geosciences Directorate
Division of Ocean Sciences
Arlington, Virginia**

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA) ANALYSIS PURSUANT TO
EXECUTIVE ORDER 12114**

**Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Melville*
in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean,
May 2012**

OCE# 1130013

Principal Investigators/Institution: Dr. Anne Trehu, Oregon State University

Project Title: Collaborative Research: Post-seismic response updip of the Chilean megathrust earthquake of February 27, 2010

This constitutes an environmental analysis prepared by the National Science Foundation (NSF) for a marine seismic survey proposed to be conducted in May 2012 on board the research vessel (R/V) *Melville* in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean off the coast of Chile. A significant portion of this analysis was based on an Environmental Assessment report entitled, "Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Melville* in the Pacific Ocean off Central and South America, October-November 2010", prepared by LGL, Ltd environmental associates, on behalf of the National Science Foundation and Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO). The LGL report, which was prepared for a similar marine geophysical survey off of Central and South America, was updated to reflect the proposed survey objectives and survey site environment off of Maule, Chile, including marine species anticipated to be present and take estimates (Attachment 1). NSF posted the draft environmental analysis on the NSF website for public comment from January 5, 2012 to February 5, 2012 but received no direct public comments during (or after) the open comment period.

After further consideration by the Principal Investigator, it was determined that a smaller source, 90 in³ (two 45 in³ airguns), rather than the larger source, 210 in³ (two 105 in³), might be used to effectively collect the geophysical data. Consequently, the LGL report was updated to reflect the potential for using the smaller source and associated exclusion and safety zones, however take estimates were not reevaluated or adjusted for the lower source level. The appropriate exclusion and safety zones for each source level will be employed for monitoring and mitigation efforts.

The NSF assisted NMFS in responding to questions submitted by the Marine Mammal Commission (MMC) in response to the NMFS Federal Register notice related to the proposed issuance of an IHA for the survey, but no changes were made to the environmental analysis.

The environmental analysis in Attachment 1 was used to inform the Division of Ocean Sciences (OCE) management of potential environmental impacts of the cruise. OCE has reviewed and concurs with the analysis findings. Accordingly, Attachment 1 is incorporated into this analysis by reference as if fully set forth herein.

Project Objectives and Context

The purpose of this project is to study the seafloor off of Maule, Chile to monitor the post-seismic response following a megathrust earthquake which occurred there on February 27, 2010. Study efforts propose to evaluate how the outer accretionary prism, where sediments are accreted onto the non-subducting tectonic plate at the convergent plate boundary, responds to the change in tectonic stress that resulted from slip of the subduction fault during the earthquake. In particular, scientists will monitor for seismic tremor and for low frequency earthquakes as well as for normal earthquakes in the study area and underlying subducting crust and for slow fluid flow out of the seafloor that can be modeled to derive volumetric strain in the underlying sediments. This research activity will complement a NSF sponsored cruise that was conducted by SIO to map bathymetry in the area one month after the earthquake and other subsequent international research activities. This subduction zone setting is typical of numerous locations around the world, and the results of the proposed survey will have broad application. These are settings that generate the world's largest and most destructive earthquakes and tsunamis, and the results of this study will have broad implications for geohazards studies and societal benefit. The project will be a collaborative research effort and would provide support to US scientists, technicians, graduate and undergraduate students, and other support personnel.

Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

The procedures to be used for the survey will be similar to those used during previous seismic surveys and will involve conventional seismic methodology. The proposed survey would take place in May 2012 within the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) of Chile (See Attachment 1, Figure 1). The seismic survey will consist of approximately 1145 km of transect lines in water depths ranging from approximately 1000 meters to 5000 meters. During the survey, a two GI airgun array will be deployed from the R/V *Melville* as an energy source; it will be operated simultaneously, with a maximum discharge volume of 210 in³. A towed hydrophone streamer will receive the returning acoustic signals and transfer the data to the on-board processing system. Additionally, ocean bottom seismometers (OBSs) will be deployed to detect the acoustic signal, process the data, and log it internally until the instrument is retrieved and the data is recovered. OBSs will remain on the seafloor for approximately one year to continue to collect data from the survey area. In addition to the airgun array, a multibeam echosounder (MBES) and a sub-bottom profiler (SBP) will be used continuously throughout the cruise. Seismic operations will be carried out for approximately 11 days. Some minor deviation from proposed cruise dates may be required, depending on logistics, weather conditions, and the need to repeat some lines if data quality were substandard.

One alternative to the proposed action would be to issue an IHA at an alternative time and conduct the survey at that alternative time. Constraints for vessel operations and availability of equipment (including the vessel) and personnel would need to be considered for alternative cruise times. Limitations on scheduling the vessel include the additional research studies planned on the vessel for 2012 and beyond. Other research activities planned within the region also would need to be considered.

Another alternative to conducting the proposed activities would be the "No Action" alternative, i.e. do not issue an IHA and do not conduct the operations. If the planned research were not

conducted, the “No Action” alternative would result in no disturbance to marine mammals attributable to the proposed activities, but geophysical data of considerable scientific value that would increase our understanding of ocean faults and geohazards such as megathrust earthquakes would not be acquired and the project objectives as described above would not be met. The “No Action” alternative would result in a lost opportunity to obtain important scientific data and knowledge relevant to a number of research fields and to society in general. The collaboration, involving investigators, students, and technicians, would be lost along with the collection of new data, interpretation of these data, and introduction of new results into the greater scientific community and applicability of this data to other similar settings. Loss of NSF support often represents a significant negative impact to the academic infrastructure.

Summary of environmental consequences

The potential effects of sounds from airguns on marine species, including mammals and turtles of particular concern, are described in detail in Attachment 1 (pages 39-71 and Appendices A-D) and might include one or more of the following: tolerance, masking of natural sounds, behavioral disturbance, and at least in theory, temporary or permanent hearing impairment, or non-auditory physical or physiological effects. It is unlikely that the project would result in any cases of temporary or especially permanent hearing impairment, or any significant nonauditory physical or physiological effects. Some behavioral disturbance is expected, if animals are in the general area during seismic operations, but this would be localized, short-term, and involve limited numbers of animals.

The proposed activity will include a mitigation program to further minimize potential impacts on marine mammals that may be present during the conduct of the research to a level of insignificance. As detailed in Attachment 1 (pages 7-12; and 54-55) monitoring and mitigation measures will include: minimum of one dedicated observer maintaining a visual watch during all daytime seismic operations; two observers 30 min before and during start ups (and when possible at other times); ramp ups; and shut downs when marine mammals or sea turtles are detected in or about to enter designated exclusion zones. The fact that the airguns, as a result of their design, direct the majority of the energy downward, and less energy laterally, is also an inherent mitigation measure.

With the planned monitoring and mitigation measures, unavoidable impacts to each species of marine mammal and turtle that could be encountered are expected to be limited to short-term, localized changes in behavior and distribution near the seismic vessel. At most, effects on marine mammals may be interpreted as falling within the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) definition of “Level B Harassment” for those species managed by the National Marine Fisheries Service. No long-term or significant effects are expected on individual marine mammals, sea turtles, or the populations to which they belong or on their habitats.

A survey at an alternative time would result in few net benefits. As described in Attachment 1, marine mammals and sea turtles are expected to be found throughout the proposed study area and throughout the time period during which the project may occur. A number of marine mammal species are year-round residents in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean, so altering the timing of the proposed project likely would result in no net benefits for those species. Baleen whales have been observed near the survey site between July-September and migrating baleen

whales might be encountered during the May survey period, as individuals travel north for the austral winter. However, the peak in mysticete sightings during April-June south of the survey area suggests most baleen whales would still be south of the survey area during the proposed survey period.

The “no action” alternative would remove the potential for disturbance to marine mammals or sea turtles attributable to the proposed activities as described. It would however preclude important scientific research from going forward that has distinct potential to address geological processes of concern.

Conclusions

NSF has reviewed and concurs with the conclusions of the analysis (Attachment 1) that implementation of the proposed activity will not have a significant impact on the environment. Consequently, implementation of the proposed activity does not have a significant impact on the environment within the meaning of Executive Order 12114. No further action is required for NSF compliance with Executive Order 12114. On behalf of NSF, I authorize the issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact for the marine seismic survey proposed to be conducted on board the research vessel *Melville* in the south-eastern Pacific Ocean in May 2012.



26 Apr 2012

Bauke (Bob) Houtman
Integrative Programs Section Head
Division of Ocean Sciences

Date

**Final Environmental Analysis of a
Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Melville*
in the South-Eastern Pacific Ocean off Chile,
May 2012**

Prepared for

Scripps Institution of Oceanography

8602 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla, CA. 92037

and

National Science Foundation

Division of Ocean Sciences

4201 Wilson Blvd., Suite 725
Arlington, VA 22230

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	VI
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	VII
I. PURPOSE AND NEED	1
II. ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING PROPOSED ACTION	2
Proposed Action.....	2
(1) Project Objectives and Context	2
(2) Proposed Activities.....	2
(3) Monitoring and Mitigation Measures	7
Alternative Action: Another Time.....	12
No Action Alternative	13
III. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT.....	13
Oceanography	13
Protected Areas	13
(1) Juan Fernandez Archipelago National Park	14
(2) Laguna Torca National Reserve	14
(3) Isla Chañaral Marine Reserve	14
(4) Islas Choros-Damas Marine Reserve	14
(5) Las Cruces Marine and Coastal Protected Area	14
(6) Francisco Coloane Marine Park	15
Marine Mammals	15
(1) Mysticetes.....	18
(2) Odontocetes	22
(3) Pinnipeds	33
Sea Turtles	34
(1) Leatherback Turtle (<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>).....	34
(2) Loggerhead Turtle (<i>Caretta caretta</i>).....	35
(3) Green Turtle (<i>Chelonia mydas</i>).....	36
(4) Olive Ridley Turtle (<i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i>).....	37
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	39
Proposed Action.....	39
(1) Direct Effects on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles and Their Significance	39
(2) Mitigation Measures.....	54
(3) Numbers of Marine Mammals that could be Exposed to Various Received Sound Levels.....	55
<i>Number of Pinnipeds that could be Exposed to ≥ 160 dB.—</i>	59
(4) Conclusions for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles	59
(5) Direct Effects on Fish and Their Significance.....	60

(6) Direct Effects on Invertebrates and Their Significance.....	62
(7) Indirect Effects on Marine Mammals, Sea Turtles, and Their Significance.....	64
(8) Cumulative Effects	64
(9) Unavoidable Impacts	71
(10) Coordination with Other Agencies and Processes.....	71
Alternative Action: Another Time.....	72
No Action Alternative	72
V. LIST OF PREPARERS.....	73
VI. LITERATURE CITED.....	74
Marine Mammals and Acoustics	74
Sea Turtles, Fish, and Other	96
APPENDIX A: REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON MARINE	
MAMMALS.....	105
1. Categories of Noise Effects	105
2. Hearing Abilities of Marine Mammals.....	105
2.1 Toothed Whales (Odontocetes).....	106
2.2 Baleen Whales (Mysticetes).....	106
2.3 Seals and Sea Lions (Pinnipeds)	107
2.4 Manatees and Dugong (Sirenians)	107
2.5 Sea Otter and Polar Bear	108
3. Characteristics of Airgun Sounds	108
4. Masking Effects of Airgun Sounds.....	110
5. Disturbance by Seismic Surveys	111
5.1 Baleen Whales.....	113
5.2 Toothed Whales	119
5.3 Pinnipeds.....	125
5.4 Sirenians, Sea Otter and Polar Bear	126
6. Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects of Seismic Surveys	127
6.1 Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS)	128
6.2 Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)	132
6.3 Strandings and Mortality.....	134
6.4 Non-Auditory Physiological Effects	136
7. Literature Cited.....	136
APPENDIX B:.....	151
REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON SEA TURTLES.....	151
1. Sea Turtle Hearing	151
2. Effects of Airgun Pulses on Behavior and Movement	153
3. Possible Effects of Airgun Sounds on Distribution	156

4. Possible Impacts of Airgun Sounds on Hearing	157
5. Other Physical Effects.....	159
6. Conclusions	159
7. Literature Cited.....	159
APPENDIX C:.....	164
REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON FISHES.....	164
1. Acoustic Capabilities.....	164
2. Potential Effects on Fishes	166
2.1 Marine Fishes	166
2.2 Freshwater Fishes.....	169
2.3 Anadromous Fishes.....	169
3. Indirect Effects on Fisheries.....	170
4. Literature Cited.....	171
APPENDIX D:.....	175
REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON MARINE INVERTEBRATES	175

ABSTRACT

The Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), with research funding from the National Science Foundation (NSF), and in collaboration with Oregon State University, plans to conduct a seismic survey with the R/V *Melville* in the south-eastern Pacific (SEP) Ocean off Chile for ~15 days in May 2012. The seismic survey will occur in water depths ranging from ~1000 m to ~5300 m. This project would be conducted in the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of Chile. On behalf of SIO, the U.S. State Department will seek authorization from the Chilean government for clearance to work in their EEZ.

SIO is requesting an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to authorize the incidental, i.e., not intentional, harassment of small numbers of marine mammals should this occur during the seismic survey. The information in this Environmental Analysis (EA) supports the IHA application process and provides information on marine species that are not addressed by the IHA application, notably sea turtles, which are listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA). The EA addresses the requirements of Executive Order 12114, “Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions”. Alternatives addressed in this EA consist of a corresponding program at a different time, along with issuance of an associated IHA; and the no action alternative, with no IHA and no seismic survey.

Numerous species of cetaceans and pinnipeds inhabit the SEP. Several of these species are listed as *endangered* under the ESA, including the humpback, sei, fin, blue, and sperm whales. Other species of special concern that could occur in the study area are the *endangered* leatherback, and South Pacific DPS of loggerhead turtles and *threatened* green, and olive ridley turtles.

Potential impacts of the seismic survey on the environment would be primarily a result of the operation of the GI airguns. A multibeam echosounder and sub-bottom profiler will also be operated. Impacts would be associated with increased underwater noise, which could result in avoidance behavior of marine mammals, sea turtles, and fish, and other forms of disturbance. An integral part of the planned survey is a monitoring and mitigation program designed to minimize impacts of the proposed activities on marine animals present during the proposed research, and to document as much as possible the nature and extent of any effects. Injurious impacts to marine mammals and sea turtles have not been proven to occur near airgun arrays, and also are not likely to be caused by the other types of sound sources to be used. The planned monitoring and mitigation measures would minimize the possibility of such effects.

Protection measures designed to mitigate the potential environmental impacts to marine mammals and turtles will include the following: minimum of one dedicated observer maintaining a visual watch during all daytime seismic operations; two observers 30 min before and during start ups (and when possible at other times); ramp ups; and shut downs when marine mammals or sea turtles are detected in or about to enter designated exclusion zones. SIO and its contractors are committed to apply these measures in order to minimize effects on marine mammals and other environmental impacts.

With the planned monitoring and mitigation measures, unavoidable impacts to each species of marine mammal and turtle that could be encountered are expected to be limited to short-term, localized changes in behavior and distribution near the seismic vessel. At most, effects on marine mammals may be interpreted as falling within the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) definition of “Level B Harassment” for those species managed by NMFS. No long-term or significant effects are expected on individual marine mammals, sea turtles, or the populations to which they belong, or on their habitats.

A significant portion of this report was based on an Environmental Assessment entitled, “Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Melville* in the Pacific Ocean

off Central and South America, October-November 2010”, prepared by LGL, Ltd environmental associates, on behalf of SIO and the National Science Foundation.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

~	approximately
AAPA	American Association of Port Authorities
ABS	American Bureau of Shipping
Amver	Atlantic Merchant Vessel Emergency Reporting
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CPA	Closest Point of Approach
CPUE	Catch per Unit Effort
CV	Coefficient of Variation
DFO	Fisheries and Oceans Canada
E	east
EA	Environmental Assessment
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EOE	Encyclopedia of Earth
EPO	eastern Pacific Ocean
ESA	(U.S.) Endangered Species Act
ETP	eastern tropical Pacific Ocean
EZ	Exclusion Zone
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FM	frequency modulated
GI	Generator-Injector
GIS	Geographic Information System
h	hour
hp	horsepower
ha	hectares
IHA	Incidental Harassment Authorization (under MMPA)
in	inch
IAGC	International Association of Geophysical Contractors
IATTC	Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IWC	International Whaling Commission
kJ	kiloJoule
kt	knot
L-DEO	Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
m	meter
MBES	Multibeam echosounder
min	minute
MMO	Marine Mammal Observer
MMPA	(U.S.) Marine Mammal Protection Act
ms	millisecond
MTTS	Masked Temporary Threshold Shift

n.mi.	nautical mile
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NEPA	(U.S.) National Environmental Policy Act
NMFS	(U.S.) National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration
NRC	(U.S.) National Research Council
NSF	National Science Foundation
NVD	Night Vision Device
ONR	(U.S.) Office of Naval Research
PAM	Passive Acoustic Monitoring
pk	peak
PNNC	Colombia Natural National Parks System
ppt	parts per thousand
psi	pounds per square inch
PTS	Permanent Threshold Shift
rms	root-mean-square
RP	reproductive patch
rpm	rotations per minute
s	second
SBP	sub-bottom profiler
SE	southeast
SEL	sound energy level
SERDP	Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program
SIO	Scripps Institution of Oceanography
SL	source level
SMM	Safety Management Manual
SPL	sound pressure level
SOSUS	Sound Surveillance System
SWFSC	Southwest Fisheries Science Center
TAMU	Texas A&M University
TEU	twenty-foot equivalent unit
TTS	Temporary Threshold Shift
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
U.S.	United States of America
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USN	U.S. Navy
vs.	versus
W	west
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre

I. PURPOSE AND NEED

Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), a part of the University of California, operates the oceanographic research vessel R/V *Melville* under a charter agreement with the U.S. Office of Naval Research (ONR). The title of the vessel is held by the U.S. Navy. SIO, in collaboration with Oregon State University, plans to conduct a seismic survey with the R/V *Melville* in the south-eastern Pacific (SEP) Ocean off Chile for ~15 days in May 2012. The National Science Foundation (NSF) is the agency of the U.S. Government that is providing the funding to support the research to be undertaken on this research cruise. The seismic survey will occur in water depths ranging from ~1000 m to ~5300 m. This project would be conducted in the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of Chile. On behalf of SIO, the U.S. State Department will seek authorization from the Chilean government for clearance to work in their EEZ.

The purpose of this project is to study the seafloor off of Maule, Chile in order to understand how the outer accretionary wedge is responding to a change in stress resulting from the megathrust earthquake of February 27, 2010. In this region, sediments are being transferred from the subducting Juan de Fuca plate to the overriding South American plate, creating an accretionary prism. Several lines of evidence suggest that this region did not slip during the 2010 earthquake, unlike in the Tohoku earthquake of 2011, when slip extended to the trench. The study is designed to evaluate the wide range of seismic and hydrological responses expected as the seafloor adjusts to the change in stress caused by the earthquake. In particular, scientists will monitor for seismic tremor and for low frequency earthquakes as well as for normal earthquakes in the study area and underlying subducting crust and for slow fluid flow out of the seafloor that can be modeled to derive volumetric strain in the underlying sediments. This research activity would complement a NSF sponsored cruise conducted by SIO to map bathymetry in the area one month after the earthquake and other subsequent international research activities.

Numerous species of cetaceans and pinnipeds inhabit the SEP. Several of these species are listed as *endangered* under the ESA, including the humpback, sei, fin, blue, and sperm whales. Other species of special concern that could occur in the study area are the *endangered* leatherback, and South Pacific DPS of loggerhead turtles and *threatened* green, and olive ridley turtles.

The purpose of this Environmental Analysis (EA) is to provide the information needed to assess the potential environmental impacts associated with the use of the GI airguns during the proposed study. The EA was prepared under Executive Order 12114, "Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions". The EA addresses potential impacts of the proposed seismic survey on marine mammals, as well as other species of concern in the study area, notably sea turtles. The EA also provides useful information in support of an application for an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The requested IHA would, if issued, allow the non-intentional, non-injurious "take by harassment" of small numbers of marine mammals during the proposed seismic survey by SIO in the SEP during May 2012.

To be eligible for an IHA, the proposed "taking" (with mitigation measures in place) must not cause serious physical injury or death of marine mammals, must have negligible impacts on the species and stocks, must "take" no more than small numbers of those species or stocks, and must not have an unmitigable adverse impact on the availability of the species or stocks for legitimate subsistence uses.

Protection measures designed to mitigate the potential environmental impacts are also described in this EA as an integral part of the planned activities. With these mitigation measures in place, any impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles are expected to be limited to short-term, localized changes in behavior of small numbers of animals. No long-term or significant effects are expected on individual mammals, turtles, or populations.

A significant portion of this report was based on an Environmental Assessment entitled, “Environmental Assessment of a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V Melville in the Pacific Ocean off Central and South America, October-November 2010”, prepared by LGL, Ltd environmental associates, on behalf of SIO and the National Science Foundation.

II. ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING PROPOSED ACTION

Three alternatives are evaluated: (1) the proposed seismic survey and issuance of an associated IHA, (2) a corresponding seismic survey at an alternative time, along with issuance of an associated IHA, and (3) no action alternative.

Proposed Action

The project objectives and context, activities, and mitigation measures for SIO’s planned seismic survey are described in the following subsections.

(1) Project Objectives and Context

The purpose of this project is to deploy an array of 10 broadband ocean bottom seismometers up-dip of the region of maximum slip during the Maule, Chile, earthquake of Feb. 27, 2010 in order to understand how the outer accretionary prism, where sediments are accreted onto the non-subducting tectonic plate at the convergent plate boundary, responds to the change in tectonic stress that resulted from slip of the subduction fault during the earthquake. Onshore and offshore seismological data suggest that slip during the main event and in the immediate aftershock period stopped ~30 km down-dip of the trench. The lack of a detectable bathymetric change in the outer accretionary complex a month after the earthquake also suggests that the upper part of the megathrust did not slip during the event. Although the downdip edge of the seismogenic zone of megathrust faults has been instrumented in many regions, very few data are available from the updip edge of the seismogenic zone, which is almost always offshore. The close spacing of the planned array on the lower slope in water depths immediately seaward of the patch of greatest slip during the earthquake will allow the PIs to study a wide range of seismic and hydrological responses that should be occurring as the accretionary complex adjusts to the change in stress caused by the earthquake. In particular, the PIs will monitor for seismic tremor and for low frequency earthquakes as well as for normal earthquakes in the prism and underlying subducting crust and for slow fluid flow out of the seafloor that can be modeled to derive volumetric strain in the underlying sediments.

To carry out research goals, ocean bottom seismometers (OBSs) will be deployed and high resolution seismic and bathymetry data will be acquired. Data collected will be used to orient the horizontal components of the OBSs; map subsurface faults and folds that may be accommodating deformation and acting as fluid conduits; estimate heat flow from the seismic signature of gas hydrates; and, provide a framework for instruction of a cohort of participating students. This experiment represents a natural next step in post-earthquake response by the global marine geology and geophysics community.

(2) Proposed Activities

(a) Location of the Activities

The survey will encompass the area ~34°–36°S, ~72–74°W, off the coast of Chile (Fig. 1). Water depths in the survey area range from 1000 m to ~5300 m. The ~5-11 days seismic survey will be conducted in the EEZ of Chile, and is scheduled to occur 4 – 18 May 2012. Some minor deviation from these dates is possible, depending on logistics and weather.

(b) Description of the Activities

The survey will involve one source vessel, the R/V *Melville*. For the seismic component of the research program, the source vessel will deploy a pair of low-energy Sercel Generator-Injector (GI) airguns as an energy source (maximum 210 in³). The receiving system will consist of a 200-800 m towed hydrophone streamer up to 48 channels with 12.5m channel spacing, and broadband OBSs. The energy to the airguns is compressed air supplied by compressors on board the source vessel. As the airguns are towed along the survey lines, the hydrophone streamer will receive the returning acoustic signals and transfer the data to the on-board processing system. The OBSs acquire the signal, process the data, and log it internally until the instrument is retrieved and the data is recovered.

The program will consist of ~1145 km of seismic survey tracklines (Fig. 1). Water depths within the seismic survey areas are ~1000–5300 m. To provide constraints on the fault structure and seismic stratigraphy in the accretionary wedge, high resolution seismic data will be acquired using two GI-guns shot simultaneously. Simultaneously shots from both airguns will provide penetration to basement in the trench and clearly define fault structures and folds in the slope basin sediments that overlie the accretionary complex.

The Primary tracklines, ~569 km, identified in Figure 1 will be surveyed first. Depending on weather, data quality, and at sea conditions, efforts will be made to survey the Secondary tracklines identified in Figure 1, ~576 km. During the survey, OBSs will be deployed and survey profiles will be taken along tracklines that extend from the trench across the accretionary complex to the region of greatest slip. These data will be processed onboard the vessel and will be used to optimize the location of remaining profiles to be collected within the survey site area. There will be additional seismic operations associated with equipment testing, startup, and possible line changes or repeat coverage of any areas where initial data quality is sub-standard. An additional 25% of survey contingency has been added in the calculations in § IV(3) to accommodate these operations. In addition to the GI airguns, a multibeam echosounder (MBES) and a sub-bottom profiler (SBP) will be used throughout the cruise.




FIGURE 1. Proposed study areas for the survey in the SEP, May 2012. The Primary tracklines, ~569km, will be surveyed first. Depending on weather, data quality, and at sea conditions, efforts will be made to survey Secondary tracklines, ~576km.

All planned geophysical and geochemical data acquisition activities will be conducted by SIO with on-board assistance by the scientists who have proposed the study. The Principal Investigator is Dr. Anne Trehu of Oregon State University. The vessel will be self-contained, and the crew will live aboard the vessel for the entire cruise.

(c) Schedule

The R/V *Melville* is expected to depart Bahia de Valparaiso, Chile on 4 May 2012 and return to Bahia de Valparaiso, Chile, on 18 May 2012. Of the ~15 day cruise, ~5 days will be spent collecting seismic data along the Primary tracklines (Figure 1), with potential for an additional ~6 days of seismic data acquisition along the Secondary tracklines (Figure 1), barring weather or instrument related issues. OBS deployments will take place during the survey, and will remain on the seafloor to continue to collect data for approximately one year. Remaining cruise time will be spent transiting to and from port. The exact dates of the activities depend on logistics, weather conditions, and the need to repeat some lines if data quality is substandard.

(d) Source Vessel Specifications

The R/V *Melville* has a length of 85 m, a beam of 14.0 m, and a maximum draft of 5.0 m. The ship is powered by two 1385-hp Propulsion General Electric motors and a 900-hp retracting Azimuthing bow thruster. Operation speeds of ~8-12 km/h (~4-6 kts) and ~15-18.5 km/h (~8-10 kts) will be used during seismic acquisition within the survey areas and between stations, respectively. When not towing seismic survey gear, the R/V *Melville* cruises at 21.7 km/h (11.7 knots) and has a maximum speed of 25.9 km/h (14 knots). It has a normal operating range of ~18,630 km.

The R/V *Melville* will also serve as the platform from which vessel-based protected species observers will watch for marine mammals and sea turtles before and during airgun operations, as described in § II(3), below.

Other details of the R/V *Melville* include the following:

Owner:	U.S. Navy
Operator:	Scripps Institution of Oceanography of the University of California
Flag:	United States of America
Date Built:	1969
Gross Tonnage:	2516
Compressors for Air Guns:	1850 psi
Accommodation Capacity:	23 crew plus 38 scientists

The R/V *Melville* complies with International Maritime Organization (IMO) guidelines and United States Coast Guard (USCG) regulations for Ballast Water Management. The R/V *Melville*'s procedures are documented in the SIO Marine Facility's Safety Management Manual (SMM) in Section 256, "Ballast Water Management Plan." These procedures are in place and approved by the American Bureau of Shipping (ABS), which acts for USCG to approve and verify compliance with approved procedures. These procedures are audited internally annually and externally every 2.5 years. The loading and discharging of ballast water is recorded in the ship's Ballast Water Management Log and in the ship's official log located on the bridge. In short, the R/V *Melville* meets all international and U.S. requirements for handling ballast water and U.S. requirements for reporting carriage and discharge of ballast water in U.S. ports.

(e) Airgun Description

The R/V *Melville* will tow a pair of 45-105-in³ Sercel GI airguns and a streamer containing hydrophones. Seismic pulses will be emitted at intervals of ~8–12 seconds. At speeds of ~8-12 km/h through the water, the ~8–12 s spacing corresponds to a shot interval of ~25 m over the seafloor. The generator chamber of each GI airgun, the one responsible for introducing the sound pulse into the ocean, is either 45 in³ or 105 in³, depending on how it is configured. The injector chamber injects air into the previously-generated bubble to maintain its shape, and does not introduce more sound into the water. The two GI airguns will be towed 8 m apart side by side, 21 m behind the *Melville*, at a depth of 2 m. Depending on configuration, the total effective volume will be 90 in³ or 210 in³. As a precautionary measure, we assume that the larger volume will be used.

As the GI airgun is towed along the survey line, the towed hydrophone array streamer receives the reflected signals and transfers the data to the on-board processing system. The OBSs acquire the signal, process the data, and log it internally until the instrument is retrieved and the data is recovered. Given the relatively short streamer length behind the vessel, the turning rate of the vessel while the gear is deployed is much higher than the limit of five degrees per minute for a seismic vessel towing a streamer of more typical length (>>1 km). Thus, the maneuverability of the vessel is not limited much during operations.

GI Airgun Specifications

Energy Source	Two GI airguns of 45 in ³ -105 in ³ each
Source output (downward)	0-pk is 5.5 bar-m (234.4 dB re 1 µPa·m); pk-pk is 9.8 bar-m (239.8 dB re 1 µPa·m)
Towing depth of energy source	2 m
Air discharge volume	~210 in ³ maximum
Dominant frequency components	0–188 Hz
Gun positions used	Two side by side airguns 8 m apart

Gun volumes at each position (in³) 105, 105

The nominal downward-directed source levels indicated above do not represent actual sound levels that can be measured at any location in the water. Rather, they represent the level that would be found 1 m from a hypothetical point source emitting the same total amount of sound as is emitted by the combined GI airguns. The actual received level at any location in the water near the GI airguns will not exceed the source level of the strongest individual source. In this case, that will be about 234.4 dB re 1 μ Pa-m peak, or 239.8 dB re 1 μ Pa-m peak-to-peak. Actual levels experienced by any organism more than 1 m from either GI airgun will be significantly lower.

A further consideration is that the rms¹ (root mean square) received levels that are used as impact criteria for marine mammals are not directly comparable to the peak (p or 0–p) or peak to peak (p–p) values normally used to characterize source levels of airgun arrays. The measurement units used to describe airgun sources, peak or peak-to-peak decibels, are always higher than the rms decibels referred to in biological literature. A measured received level of 160 dB re 1 μ Pa_{rms} in the far field would typically correspond to ~170 dB re 1 μ Pa_p, and to ~176–178 dB re 1 μ Pa_{p-p}, as measured for the same pulse received at the same location (Greene 1997; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000). The precise difference between rms and peak or peak-to-peak values depends on the frequency content and duration of the pulse, among other factors. However, the rms level is always lower than the peak or peak-to-peak level for an airgun-type source.

Additional discussion of the characteristics of airgun pulses is included in Appendix A (3).

(f) OBS Description and Deployment

Approximately 10 broadband OBSs will be deployed and recovered by the *Melville* during the survey. LDEO OBS08 model broadband OBSs will be used during the cruise. This type of OBS has a height of ~ 122 cm and a width and depth of 76.2×106.7 cm. The anchor is made of two steel cylinders approximately 15 cm in diameter and 46 cm in length. Each cylinder weighs approximately 75 lbs in air. OBSs will remain on the seafloor to continue to collect data for approximately one year. Once an OBS is ready to be retrieved, an acoustic release transponder interrogates the instrument at a frequency of 9–11 kHz, and a response is received at a frequency of 9–13 kHz. The burn-wire release assembly is then activated, and the instrument is released from the anchor to float to the surface.

(g) Multibeam Echosounder and Sub-bottom Profiler Descriptions

Along with the seismic operations, two additional acoustical data acquisition systems will be operated continuously during the cruise except when the R/V *Melville* is on water sampling and coring stations.

Kongsberg EM 122 Multi-beam Echo Sounder.—The Kongsberg EM 122 MBES operates at 10.5–13 (usually 12) kHz and is hull-mounted on the *Melville*. The transmitting beamwidth is 1° fore–aft and 150° athwartship. The maximum source level is 242 dB re 1 μ Pa·m_{rms}. Each “ping” consists of eight (in water >1000 m deep) or four (<1000 m) successive fan-shaped transmissions, each ensonifying a sector that extends 1° fore–aft. Continuous-wave (CW) pulses increase from 2 to 15 ms long in water depths up to 2600 m, and FM chirp pulses up to 100 ms long are used in water >2600 m. The successive transmissions span an overall cross-track angular extent of about 150°, with 2-ms gaps between the pulses for successive sectors.

Knudsen 3260 Sub-bottom Profiler.—The Knudsen Engineering Model 3260 sub-bottom profiler (SBP) is used in conjunction with the MBES to provide data about the sedimentary features that occur

¹ The rms (root mean square) pressure is an average over the pulse duration.

below the sea floor. The SBP is capable of reaching depths of 10,000m. The beam is transmitted as a 27 degree cone, which is directed downward by a 3.5-kHz transducer array mounted in the hull of the R/V *Melville*. The nominal power output is 10 kilowatts or 222 dB re 1 μ Pa-m. The ping duration is up to 64 ms, and the ping interval is 1 s. A common mode of operation is to broadcast five pings at 1-s intervals followed by a 5-s pause. (The 12-kHz section is seldom used in survey mode on R/V *Melville* because of overlap with the operating frequency of the Kongsberg EM 122 MBES.)

(3) Monitoring and Mitigation Measures

Marine mammals and sea turtles are known to occur in the proposed study area. To minimize the likelihood that impacts will occur to the species and stocks, seismic operations will be conducted in accordance with regulations by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA), including obtaining permission for incidental harassment or incidental ‘take’ of marine mammals and other endangered species. The proposed seismic activities will take place in the EEZ of Chile. The U.S. State Department will seek authorization from the government of Chile for clearance to work in their EEZ. All national and international environmental regulations identified through these processes will be met.

The following subsections provide more detailed information about the monitoring and mitigation measures that are an integral part of the planned activities. The procedures described here are based on protocols used during previous SIO seismic research cruises as approved by NMFS, and on best practices recommended in Richardson et al (1995), Pierson et al. (1998), and Weir and Dolman (2007).

(a) Planning Phase

The PIs worked with SIO and NSF to identify potential time periods to carry out the survey taking into consideration key factors such as environmental conditions (i.e., the seasonal presence of marine mammals, sea turtles, and seabirds), weather conditions, equipment, and optimal timing for other proposed seismic surveys using the R/V *Melville*. Most marine mammal species are expected to occur in the area year-round, so altering the timing of the proposed project likely would result in no net benefits for those species. Baleen whales are most common south of the survey area between February and June, whereas odontocetes were most commonly observed between October and November. After considering what energy source level was necessary to achieve the research goals, the PIs determined the use of the 2 GI airgun array with a maximum total volume of 210 in³ would be required, however a lower energy source of 90 in³ may be used. Given the research goals, location of the survey and associated deep water, this energy source level was viewed appropriate. The location of the survey was informed and adjusted based on the latest scientific information on the epicenter of the February 27, 2010 earthquake; survey location is critical for collecting the data for the overall research activity and meeting research objectives.

(b) Visual Monitoring

Vessel-based protected species observers (PSOs) will be based on board the seismic source vessel, and they will watch for marine mammals and turtles near the vessel during seismic operations. PSOs will also watch for marine mammals and turtles near the seismic vessel for at least 30 minutes prior to the start of seismic operations after an extended shutdown. When feasible, PSOs will also make observations during daytime periods when the seismic system is not operating for comparison of animal abundance and behavior. Based on PSO observations, the seismic source will be shut down when marine mammals are observed within or about to enter a designated exclusion zone (EZ) [see section (e) below]. The EZ is a region in which a possibility exists of adverse effects on animal hearing or other physical effects.

PSOs will be appointed by the academic institution conducting the research cruise, with NMFS Office of Protected Resources concurrence. At least one PSO will monitor the EZ during seismic operations. PSOs will normally work in shifts of 4-hour duration or less. The vessel crew will also be instructed to assist in detecting marine mammals and turtles.

Standard equipment for PSOs will be 7 x 50 reticule binoculars and optical range finders. At night, night-vision equipment will be available. The observers will be in wireless communication with ship's officers on the bridge and scientists in the vessel's operations laboratory, so they can advise promptly of the need for avoidance maneuvers or seismic source shut down.

(c) PSO Data and Documentation

PSOs will record data to estimate the numbers of marine mammals and turtles exposed to various received sound levels and to document apparent disturbance reactions or lack thereof. Data will be used to estimate numbers of animals potentially 'taken' by harassment (as defined in the MMPA). They will also provide information needed to order a shutdown of the seismic source when a marine mammal or sea turtle is within or near the EZ.

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

1. Species, group size, age/size/sex categories (if determinable), behavior when first sighted and after initial sighting, heading (if consistent), bearing and distance from seismic vessel, sighting cue, apparent reaction to the seismic source or vessel (e.g., none, avoidance, approach, paralleling, etc.), and behavioral pace.
2. Time, location, heading, speed, activity of the vessel, sea state, visibility, and sun glare.

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

All observations, as well as information regarding seismic source shutdown, will be recorded in a standardized format. Data accuracy will be verified by the PSOs at sea, and preliminary reports will be prepared during the field program and summaries forwarded to the operating institution's shore facility and to NSF weekly or more frequently. PSO observations will provide the following information:

1. The basis for decisions about shutting down the seismic source.
2. Information needed to estimate the number of marine mammals and sea turtles potentially 'taken by harassment'. These data will be reported to NMFS and/or USFWS per terms of MMPA authorizations or regulations.
3. Data on the occurrence, distribution, and activities of marine mammals and turtles in the area where the seismic study is conducted.
4. Data on the behavior and movement patterns of marine mammals and turtles seen at times with and without seismic activity.

(d) Reporting

A report will be submitted to NMFS within 90 days after the end of the cruise. The report will describe the operations that were conducted and sightings of marine mammals and turtles near the operations. The report will be submitted to NMFS, providing full documentation of methods, results, and interpretation pertaining to all monitoring. The 90-day report will summarize the dates and locations of seismic operations, and all marine mammal and turtle sightings (dates, times, locations, activities, associated seismic survey activities). The report will also include estimates of the amount and nature of any potential

“take” of marine mammals and sea turtles by harassment or in other ways. After acceptance by NMFS, the report will be publicly available on the NSF website.

(e) Proposed Exclusion Zones

Received sound levels have been modeled by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University (L-DEO) for a number of airgun configurations, including two 105-in³ GI Guns and two 45-in³ G guns, in relation to distance and direction from the airguns (Fig. 2a and 2b). The models do not allow for bottom interactions, and are most directly applicable to deep water. Based on the modeling, estimates of the maximum distances from the GI airguns where sound levels of 190, 180, and 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ are predicted to be received in deep (>1000-m) water are shown in Table 1.

Empirical data concerning the 190-, 180-, and 160-dB distances were acquired for various airgun arrays based on measurements during the acoustic verification studies conducted by L DEO in the northern Gulf of Mexico in 2003 (6-, 10-, 12-, and 20-airgun arrays, and 2 GI airguns; Tolstoy et al. 2004) and 2007–2008 (36-airgun array; Tolstoy et al. 2009). Results for the 36-airgun array are not relevant for the 2 GI airguns to be used in the proposed survey. The empirical data for the 6-, 10-, 12-, and 20-airgun arrays indicate that, for deep water (>1000 m), the L-DEO model tends to overestimate the received sound levels at a given distance (Tolstoy et al. 2004). Measurements were not made for the 2 GI airgun array in deep water, however, we propose to use the safety radii predicted by L-DEO’s model for the proposed GI airgun operations in deep water, although they are likely conservative given the empirical results for the other arrays.




FIGURE 2a. Modeled received sound levels from two 45-in³ Nucleus G guns, similar to the two GI guns that will be used during the SIO survey. Model results provided by the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University.




FIGURE 2b. Modeled received sound levels from two 105-in³ GI airguns that will be used during the SIO survey in the SEP during May 2012. Model results provided by the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University.

TABLE 1. Distances to which sound levels ≥ 190 , 180, and 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ could be received from the two 105-in³ GI airguns that will be used for the seismic survey in the SEP planned during May 2012. Distances are based on model results provided by L-DEO.

Source and Volume	Tow Depth (m)	Water Depth (m)	Predicted RMS Radii Distances (m)		
			Shut-down EZ for Pinnipeds 190 dB	Shut-down EZ for Cetaceans 180 dB	Level-B Harassment Zone 160 dB
Two Generator Injector (GI) airguns 105 in ³ (210 in ³ total)	2	Deep (>1,000)	20	70	670
Two GI airguns 45 in ³ (90 in ³ total)	2	Deep (>1,000)	10	40	350

Table 1 shows the distances at which three rms sound levels are expected to be received from the GI airguns. The 180- and 190-dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ distances are the safety criteria as specified by NMFS (2000) and are applicable to cetaceans and pinnipeds, respectively. The 180-dB distance will also be used as the exclusion zone for sea turtles, as required by NMFS in most other recent seismic projects (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a; Holst and Beland 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst 2009; Antochiw et al. n.d.). If marine mammals or sea turtles are detected within or about to enter the appropriate exclusion zone, the airguns will be shut down immediately.

Southall et al. (2007) made detailed recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria. SIO will be prepared to revise its procedures for estimating numbers of mammals “taken”, exclusion zones, etc., as may be required by any new guidelines that result. However, currently the procedures are based on best practices noted by Pierson et al. (1998) and Weir and Dolman (2007). As yet, NMFS has not specified a new procedure for determining exclusion zones.

(f) Mitigation During Operations

In addition to marine mammal monitoring, the following mitigation measures will be adopted during the proposed seismic program, provided that doing so will not compromise operational safety requirements. Although power-down procedures are often standard operating practice for seismic surveys, they will not be used here because powering down from two airguns to one airgun would make only a small difference in the 180- or 190-dB radius—probably not enough to allow continued one-airgun operations if a mammal or turtle came within the safety radius for two airguns. Mitigation measures that will be adopted are

1. speed or course alteration;
2. shut-down procedures; and
3. ramp-up procedures.

Speed or course alteration

If a marine mammal or sea turtle is detected outside the exclusion zone and, based on its position and the relative motion, is likely to enter the exclusion zone, the vessel’s speed and/or direct course could

be changed. This would be done if operationally practicable while minimizing the effect on the planned science objectives. The activities and movements of the marine mammal or sea turtle (relative to the seismic vessel) will then be closely monitored to determine whether the animal is approaching the applicable exclusion zone. If the animal appears likely to enter the exclusion zone, further mitigative actions will be taken, i.e., either further course alterations or a shut down of the seismic source. Typically, during seismic operations, the source vessel is unable to change speed or course and one or more alternative mitigation measures (see below) will need to be implemented.

Shut-down procedures

If a marine mammal or turtle is detected outside the exclusion zone but is likely to enter the exclusion zone, and if the vessel's speed and/or course cannot be changed to avoid having the animal enter the exclusion zone, the GI airguns will be shut down before the animal is within the exclusion zone. Likewise, if a mammal or turtle is already within the safety zone when first detected, the seismic source will be shut down immediately.

Following a shut down, seismic activity will not resume until the marine mammal or turtle has cleared the exclusion zone. The animal will be considered to have cleared the exclusion zone if it

- is visually observed to have left the exclusion zone, or
- has not been seen within the zone for 15 min in the case of small odontocetes, (pinnipeds) or sea turtles, or
- has not been seen within the zone for 30 min in the case of mysticetes and large odontocetes, including sperm, pygmy sperm, dwarf sperm, and beaked whales.

Ramp-up procedures

A ramp-up procedure will be followed when the GI airguns begin operating after a specified period without GI airgun operations. It is proposed that, for the present cruise, this period would be ~15 min. Ramp up will begin with a single GI airgun (105 in³). The second GI airgun (105 in³) will be added after 5 min. During ramp up, the PSOs will monitor the exclusion zone, and if marine mammals or turtles are sighted, a shut down will be implemented as though both GI airguns were operational.

If the complete exclusion zone has not been visible for at least 30 min prior to the start of operations in either daylight or nighttime, ramp up will not commence. If one GI airgun has operated, ramp up to full power will be permissible at night or in poor visibility, on the assumption that marine mammals and turtles will be alerted to the approaching seismic vessel by the sounds from the single GI airgun and could move away if they choose. A ramp up from a shut down may occur at night, but only where the safety radius is small enough to be visible. Ramp up of the GI airguns will not be initiated if a sea turtle or marine mammal is sighted within or near the applicable exclusion zones during day or night.

Alternative Action: Another Time

An alternative to issuing the IHA for the period requested and to conducting the project then, is to issue the IHA for another time and to conduct the project at that alternative time. The proposed time for the cruise in May 2012 is the most suitable time logistically for the *Melville* and the participating scientists. If the IHA is issued for another period, it could result in significant delay and disruption not only of this cruise, but of additional studies that are planned by SIO for 2012 and beyond. An evaluation of the effects of this alternative action is given in § IV.

No Action Alternative

An alternative to conducting the proposed activities is the “No Action” alternative, i.e., do not issue an IHA and do not conduct the research operations. If the research is not conducted, the “No Action” alternative would result in no disturbance to marine mammals due to the proposed activities.

The purpose of this project is to assess the post-seismic response following a megathrust earthquake which occurred in Maule, Chile on February 27, 2010. Data collected will help researchers improve our understanding of megathrust earthquakes which can have devastating impacts to populations living close to an event. Advances in our understandings of the Maule earthquake will also improve our understanding of other subduction zone areas, such as the Cascadia region off the west coast of the United States. Under the “No Action” alternative, this valuable scientific information would not become available.

The “No Action” alternative could also, in some circumstances, result in significant delay of other geophysical studies that are planned by SIO for 2012 and beyond, depending on the timing of the decision. Not conducting this cruise (no action) would result in less data and support for the academic institutions involved. Data collection is an essential first step for a much greater effort to analyze and report information for the significant topics indicated. The ~15 days of field effort provides material for years of analyses involving multiple professors, students, and technicians. The lost opportunity to collect valuable scientific information is compounded by lost opportunities for support of research infrastructure, training, and professional career growth.

III. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Oceanography

The proposed survey area, located ~55 km west of the coast of Chile, occurs within the Chile-Peru current coastal province (Longhurst 2007). The integrated chlorophyll concentration and the primary productivity in the area of 10°S–55°S are 16 g Chl m⁻² and 0.74 g C m⁻² d⁻¹ respectively.

The Humboldt Current Large region (HC) extends about 7,280 km along the west coast of South America from northern Peru (3°24'34"S, 80°18'25"W) to the southern tip of Chile (54°55'39"S, 64°52'12"W). It has a surface area of 2.5 million square kilometers, containing 0.42% of the world's seamounts and 24 major estuaries (Miloslavich et al. 2011). The HC is one of the major upwelling systems of the world, with moderate to extremely high primary productivity (150–300 gC/m²/yr, and highly productive fisheries that account for 16%–20% of the global fish captures (Hill et al 1998). This current system is characterized by cold water that flows toward the equator, with offshore Ekman transport and coastal upwelling of cold, nutrient-rich subsurface water. The current system is complex and marked by coastal currents that can export waters up to 1,000 km offshore, with subsequent effects on the biological populations of species with planktonic dispersal (Miloslavich et al. 2011).

Protected Areas

All the territorial waters of Chile have been designated a whale sanctuary, which prohibits all whaling activities. Several marine reserves and parks are established along the coast of Chile, and the parks closest to the proposed survey area are described below. Francisco Coloane Marine Park is also described although it is located more than 2000 km from the survey area because of its importance to migrating mysticetes and other resident marine mammals.

(1) Juan Fernandez Archipelago National Park

Juan Fernandez Archipelago National Park located at 33.67°S, 79.78°W is approximately 690 km west of the survey area. It encompasses an area of 95.7 km² and was created in 1935, and later declared a Biosphere Reserve by UNESCO in 1977. It is still under consideration for inclusion in the UNESCO World Heritage List (UNESCO 2011). The National Park includes the whole Archipelago with the islands of Robinson Crusoe, Alexander Selkirk, Santa Clara and all the islets in the area. Ecotourism on land and sea occur within the park, as well as artisanal fishing, trade and municipal services. Offshore fishing also occurs and the park does not include the surrounding waters. Popular tourist activities include hiking, camping, diving and wildlife viewing. Tourism activities and hotel accommodation is concentrated on Robinson Crusoe Island, which is also serviced by commuter flights. The park is an insular ecosystem, characterized by 131 endemic plant species, and 213 native plant species. The Juan Fernandez Archipelago is volcanic in origin, with steep, rugged mountain ranges with deep ravines. All of its tree species only exist in the Archipelago, and are completely endemic. Endemic fauna includes the Juan Fernandez Firecrown (*Sephanoides fernandensis*) the only insular endemic hummingbird, the Juan Fernandez Tit-Tyrant (*Anairetes fernandezianus*) and the Juan Fernandez Fur Seal (*Arctocephalus philippi*) (UNESCO 2011). The proposed seismic surveys will occur well outside of the protected areas of Juan Fernandez National Park.

(2) Laguna Torca National Reserve

Laguna Torca National Reserve located at 34.8°S, 72°W is approximately 94 km east of the survey area. It is a small reserve, extending 6.04 hectares with two well defined areas. The Torca Lagoon area is habitat for 106 species of birds and the Llico forest area which are managed to prevent problems with dune advancement. The waters adjacent to this reserve are not part of a marine protected area.

(3) Isla Chañaral Marine Reserve

Isla Chañaral Marine Reserve located at 29°S, 71.5°W is approximately 611 km north of the survey area. This marine protected area is approximately 4.25 km² and is in the southern part of the larger Pingüino de Humboldt National Reserve. The marine reserve extends one nautical mile around the island of Chañaral and was created to promote the conservation of the marine habitat and the protection of several species of marine mammals, such as bottlenose dolphins, sea lions and marine otters. Conservation activities within the reserve also include the restoration of commercial species found near the reserves, such as mollusks, sea urchins and algae. Activities in the reserve include ecotourism, diving and photography but there are no accommodations on Chañaral de Aceituno Island.

(4) Islas Choros-Damas Marine Reserve

Islas Choros-Damas Marine Reserve located at 29.2°S, 71.5°W is approximately 588 km north of the survey area. This marine protected area is approximately 25 km² and is located in the northern section of the Pingüino de Humboldt National Reserve. The marine reserve extends to waters one nautical mile around the islands. Damas Island is the only part of the reserve with camping and picnic facilities and is only accessible through local boat charter services.

(5) Las Cruces Marine and Coastal Protected Area

Las Cruces Marine and Coastal Protected area, located at 33.5°S, 71.6°W, is a small protected area established in 2005. It is approximately 234 km north east of the survey area. It encompasses an area of 0.145 km² and is a complete no-take zone.

(6) Francisco Coloane Marine Park

Francisco Coloane Marine Park is the largest marine and coastal protected area in Chile. It is located at 53.62°S, 72.34°W, near Punta Arenas, is about 672 km², around Carlos III Island. The park is a popular whale watching destination and is an important cetacean feeding ground for migrating mysticetes such as humpback whales. Whale watching tours on zodiacs, kayaks, larger vessels and helicopters are common between November and May, with the peak period between January and April. Tours to observe smaller cetaceans such as Peale's dolphin, Commerson's dolphin, and Chilean dolphins are also conducted in the inland channels and fjords.

Marine Mammals

Forty-four species of marine mammals, including 32 odontocetes, 8 mysticetes, 4 pinnipeds, and the marine otter are known to occur in the SEP. Of those, 28 cetacean species may occur in the proposed survey area in the SEP (Table 2). Five of the 28 cetacean species are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) as **Endangered**: the sperm, humpback, blue, fin, and sei whales. Twelve cetacean species, although present in the wider SEP, likely would not be found in the proposed seismic survey area because their ranges in the survey area are extralimital, or they are typically found in coastal water. Southern right whales (*Eubalaena australis*) are listed as endangered, and the IUCN lists the Chile-Peru subpopulation as critically endangered (Reilly 2008). Sightings are seen on rare occasions off the coasts of Peru and Chile (Aguayo et al. 1992, Santillan et al. 2004) although females with calves have been observed between June and October. Given the size of this population, estimated at 50 individuals, in Chile and Peru (IWC 2007, IWC 2007b) and the rarity of the species in the survey area, it is unlikely that individuals from this subpopulation will be encountered. Pygmy right whales (*Caperea marginata*) are rarely seen at sea, but are known from stranding records off Chile (Cabrera et al. 2005). Little is known about Arnoux's beaked whales (*Berardius arnuxii*) as they are rarely seen, but typically they are found between the Antarctic continent and 34°S. The northernmost limit of their range overlaps with the survey area, but no records of their occurrence exist within the survey area. The spade toothed beaked whales (*Mesoplodon traversii*) and Shepherd's beaked whales (*Tasmacetus shepherdi*) are uncommon species, but individuals have been described from stranding records in the Juan Fernandez Archipelago in Chile (Reyes et al. 1996) approximately 700 km west of the survey site. Ginkgo toothed beaked whales, (*Mesoplodon ginkgodons*), pygmy beaked whales (*Mesoplodon pervianus*), and long beaked common dolphins (*Delphinus capensis*) are likely extralimital with distributions mostly north of the survey area. Commerson's dolphins (*Cephalorhynchus commersonii*), hourglass dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus cruciger*) and southern bottlenose whales (*Hyperoodon planifrons*) are also extralimital in the survey area, but have a northernmost extent that is south of the survey area.

Four species of pinnipeds are known to occur in the SEP: the Juan Fernandez fur seal (*Arctocephalus philippii*), southern sea lion (*Otaria flavescens*), the South American fur seal (*A. australis*) and the southern elephant seal (*Mirounga leonina*). The typical range of southern elephant seals is far south of the survey area, and the southern sea lion is typically found in coastal waters shallower than the depth of the survey area. The Juan Fernandez fur seal and South American fur seals could be encountered at sea, although they are typically found close to the Juan Fernandez archipelago, approximately 700 km west of the survey area. The marine otter (*Lontra felina*) is a coastal species and does not occur in offshore waters.

The SEP is a biologically productive area that supports a variety of cetacean species. Several studies of marine mammal distribution and abundance have been conducted off the southern coast of

Chile, but survey effort occurs primarily between 36° and 52°S in Chile. Boat based cetacean surveys conducted between 2000 and 2001 in the channels and fjords of northern Patagonia in southern Chile determined that baleen whales were most abundant during late summer and autumn (February – June), and odontocetes were most common in the spring (October – November) (Viddi et al. 2010). Abundance estimates for blue whales from aerial (Galletti-Vernazzani and Cabrera 2009) and boat based surveys (Williams et al. 2009; Findlay et al. 1998) exist for various regions along the Chilean coast, but estimates for other species are lacking. Survey effort that overlaps with the study site is poor, and therefore if abundance estimates for the survey area were unavailable, we include abundance information from the Eastern Tropical Pacific for species that are also found north of the survey site. Information on the distribution of cetaceans inhabiting the ETP has been summarized in several studies (e.g., Polacheck 1987; Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Gerrodette et al. 2008). However, some species abundance in the proposed seismic survey area could be quite different from that of the ETP, depending on local oceanographic variabilities. In addition, procedures used during the various surveys that are cited have differed somewhat, and those differences could affect the results. For example, Ferguson and Barlow (2001) calculated cetacean densities in the ETP based on summer/fall research surveys in 1986–1996. Their densities are corrected for both changes in detectability of species with distance from the survey track line [$f(0)$], and for perception and availability bias [$g(0)$]. Gerrodette et al. (2008) calculated dolphin abundance in the ETP based on summer/fall research surveys in 1986–1990, 1998–2000, 2003, and 2006. Their estimates are corrected for $f(0)$ but not $g(0)$.

Information on the occurrence, distribution, population size, and conservation status for each of the 28 cetacean species and 4 pinniped species that may occur in the proposed project area is presented in Table 2. The status of these species is based on the U.S. ESA, the IUCN Red List and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).

TABLE 2. The habitat, regional abundance, and conservation status of marine mammals that could occur in or near the proposed seismic survey area in the SEP.

Species	Occurrence in survey area during Apr-May	Habitat	Abundance in the SEP ¹	ESA ²	IUCN	CITES
Mysticetes						
Humpback whale	Uncommon	Mainly nearshore waters and banks	SE Pacific 2900 ³	EN	LC	I
Common minke whale	Uncommon	Coastal	338,000 ⁴	NL	LC	I
Bryde's whale	Uncommon	Pelagic and coastal	130,008	NL	DD	I
Sei whale	Very rare	Mostly pelagic	11,000 ⁵	EN	EN	I
Fin whale	Very rare	Slope, mostly pelagic	15178 ⁶	EN	EN	I
Blue whale	Uncommon	Pelagic and coastal	1415 ⁷	EN	EN	I
Odontocetes						
Sperm whale	Common	Usually deep pelagic, steep topography	26,053 ⁸	EN	VU	I
Pygmy sperm whale	Rare	Deep waters off shelf	150,000 ⁹	NL	DD	II
Dwarf sperm whale	Very rare	Deep waters off shelf	150,000 ⁹	NL	DD	II
Cuvier's beaked whale	Uncommon	Slope and pelagic	20,000 ¹⁰	NL	LC	II
Blainville's beaked whale	Uncommon	Pelagic	25300 ¹¹	NL	DD	II
Rough-toothed dolphin	Common	Mainly pelagic	107,633	NL	LC	II
Bottlenose dolphin	Very Common	Coastal, shelf, pelagic	335,834	NL	LC	II
Spinner dolphin	Very Common	Coastal and pelagic	1,797,716	NL	DD	II
Striped dolphin	Common	Off continental shelf	964,362	NL	LC	II
Short-beaked common dolphin	Common	Shelf, pelagic, high relief	3,127,203	NL	LC	II
Risso's dolphin	Common	Shelf, slope, seamounts	110,457	NL	LC	II
False killer whale	Uncommon	Pelagic	398,009	NL	DD	II
Killer whale	Uncommon	Widely distributed	8500 ¹²	NL	DD	II
Long finned pilot whale	Common	Shelf, pelagic	200,000 ¹³	NL	DD	II
Peale's dolphin	Uncommon	Coastal, shelf	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Dusky dolphin	Common	Shelf, slope	7,252 ¹⁴	NL	DD	II
Southern right whale dolphin	Rare	Pelagic	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Burmeister's porpoise	Rare	Coastal	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Gray's beaked whale	Uncommon	Slope, pelagic	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Hector's beaked whale	Rare	Slope, pelagic	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Strap toothed whale	Rare	Slope, pelagic	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Chilean dolphin	Rare	Coastal, shelf	< 10,000 ¹⁵	NL	NT	II
Pinnipeds						
S. American fur seal	Rare	Coastal, shelf	30,000 ¹⁶	NL	LC	II
Juan Fernandez fur seal	Rare	Coastal, shelf	12,000 ¹⁷	NL	NT	II
S. American sea lion	Very rare	Coastal, shelf	150,000 ¹⁸	NL	LC	II
Southern elephant seal	Very rare	Coastal, Pelagic	650,000 ¹⁹	NL	LC	II

N.A. Not available or not assessed. IUCN: DD = Data deficient, LC = Least Concern, NT = Near Threatened, VU = Vulnerable, EN = Endangered

¹ Abundance from Gerrodette et al. (2008) unless otherwise stated.

² U.S. Endangered Species Act: EN = Endangered, T = Threatened, NL = Not listed

³ Southeast Pacific; Félix et al. (2005)

- ⁴ Estimated from Antarctic and common Minke whales in S Pacific (Reily 2011)
- ⁵ Based on 2007 projection for southern hemisphere (IWC 1996)
- ⁶ Based on 2007 projection for southern hemisphere (Reilly 2011)
- ⁷ ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993)* excluded nursing area south of study area estimated at ~ 267 animals
- ⁸ Eastern temperate North Pacific (Whitehead 2002)
- ⁹ This abundance estimate is for both *K. sima* and *K. breviceps* in ETP (Ferguson and Barlow 2001)
- ¹⁰ ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993)
- ¹¹ This estimate includes all species of the genus *Mesoplodon* in the ETP (Ferguson and Barlow 2001)
- ¹² ETP (Ford 2002)
- ¹³ Southern hemisphere population (Waring et al. 1997)
- ¹⁴ Patagonian coast population (Dans et al. 1997)
- ¹⁵ SEP (Reeves et al. 2008)
- ¹⁶ Chile (Arias Shreiber and Rivas 1998)
- ¹⁷ Juan Fernandez Archipelago population (Auriolles and Trillmich 2008)
- ¹⁸ Peru and Chile (Campagna 2008a).
- ¹⁹ Southern hemisphere (Capagna 2009)

(1) Mysticetes

Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)

The humpback whale is listed as **Endangered** under the U.S. ESA and **Least concern** on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). The worldwide population of humpback whales is divided into various northern and southern ocean populations (Mackintosh 1965). Geographical overlap of these populations has been documented only off Central America (Acevedo and Smultea 1995; Rasmussen et al. 2004, 2007). The humpback whale is one of the most abundant cetaceans off the Pacific coast of Costa Rica during the winter breeding season of northern hemisphere humpbacks, and off the coasts of Ecuador, Columbia, and Panama during the winter breeding period for southern hemisphere humpbacks (e.g., Rasmussen et al. 2004; May-Collado et al. 2005, Félix and Haase 2005). The estimate of abundance for the southeast Pacific stock is ~2900 (Félix et al. 2005)

Humpback whales occur worldwide, migrating from tropical breeding areas to polar or sub-polar feeding areas (Jefferson et al. 2008). Although the humpback whale is considered mainly a coastal species, it often traverses deep pelagic areas while migrating (Clapham and Mattila 1990; Norris et al. 1999; Calambokidis et al. 2001). Some males occur in waters >3000 m deep and up to 57 km from the coast in the Caribbean (Swartz et al. 2003).

Humpback whales are often sighted singly or in groups of two or three, but while on breeding and feeding grounds they may occur in groups of >20 (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983; Jefferson et al. 2008). Based on NMFS vessel-based surveys in the ETP in July–December 2006, Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 1.5 (n = 11). The diving behavior of humpback whales is related to time of year and whale activity (Clapham and Mead 1999). In summer feeding areas, humpbacks typically forage in the upper 120 m of the water column, with a maximum recorded dive depth of 500 m (Dolphin 1987; Dietz et al. 2002). On winter breeding grounds, humpback dives have been recorded at depths >100 m (Baird et al. 2000).

Rasmussen et al. (2007) reported 207 humpback whale sightings off Central America during surveys in the austral winters of 2001–2004. Based on eight years (1996–2003) of survey effort off Costa Rica from January to March and three years (2001–2003) off Panama, Rasmussen et al. (2004) reported 177 sightings. Humpback whales were also observed off the coasts of Columbia, Ecuador and Peru, and occasionally in offshore waters >200 km from the coast (Félix and Haase 2005) with a peak in sightings in July. Off the coast of Chile, Humpback whales are known to occur south of the survey area. During

opportunistic surveys in 2000-2011 Viddi et al. (2010) made 6 sightings of humpback whales in Patagonia during the austral autumn (between April and June). Group size ranged from 1 to 5 individuals (average 2.8) (Viddi et al. 2010). Migrating humpback whales may occur in the offshore seismic survey areas between April-May, as individuals travel towards their winter breeding grounds farther north.

Minke Whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*)

The minke whale inhabits all oceans of the world from the high latitudes to near the equator (Jefferson et al. 2008). The common minke whale in the Southern Hemisphere is commonly referred to as the “diminutive” or “dwarf” minke whale (Arnold et al. 1987; Best 1985) and has been considered an undescribed subspecies (Rice 1998). In the Southern Hemisphere common minke whales have been reported for western South Atlantic waters off Brazil (DaRocha and Braga 1982; Zerbini et al. 1996; 1997) and Chilean Patagonia (Acevedo et al. 2006), western South Pacific waters off New Zealand (Baker 1983), central and northern Great Barrier Reef in Australia (Arnold et al. 1987; Arnold 1997), and western Indian Ocean waters off Durban in South Africa (Best 1985). Acevedo et al. (2006) suggested that the population of common minke whales off Brazil may be distributed much farther south in April, some into the Chilean Patagonia Channels, and they postulated that common minke whales from Brazil and Patagonia belong to the same population. However, Pastene et al. (2009) suggest that multiple populations of Minke whales may exist in the southern hemisphere with different populations in the western south Atlantic and western south Pacific oceans.

Minke whales are relatively solitary, but may occur in aggregations of up to 100 when food resources are concentrated (Jefferson et al. 2008). Based on SWFSC vessel surveys from 1991 to 2005, Barlow and Forney (2007) reported mean group sizes of 1.6 (n = 4) off southern California. The mean group size for Minke whales in Patagonia is 1.4 (n=5) (Viddi et al 2010). Little is known about the diving behavior of minke whales, but they are not known to make prolonged deep dives (Leatherwood and Reeves 1983).

The general distribution of minke whales includes the offshore waters of the study area (e.g., Reeves et al. 2002). However, minke whales are likely to be rare in the survey area. Viddi et al. (2010) reported five sightings of Minke whales during a survey in 2000 – 2001 with group sizes ranging from 1 to 3 animals. The highest sighting rates for Minke whales in Patagonia occurred south of the survey site, between April and June (Viddi et al. 2010).

Bryde’s Whale (*Balaenoptera edeni/ brydei*)

Bryde’s whale occurs in tropical and subtropical waters, generally between 40°N and 40°S (Jefferson et al. 2008). It is common throughout the ETP, with a concentration near the equator east of 110°W, decreasing west of 140°W (Lee 1993; Wade and Gerrodette 1993). They occur off the coasts of Peru and Ecuador but not during July to September (Valdivia *et al.* 1981). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) estimated Bryde’s whale population size in the ETP at 13,000, based on data collected during 1986–1990. The International Whaling Commission (IWC) recognizes a cross-equatorial or Peruvian stock of Bryde’s whale (Donovan 1991).

Bryde’s whales are known to occur in both shallow coastal and deeper offshore waters (Jefferson et al. 2008). It does not undertake long migrations, although there is a general pattern of movement toward the equator in winter and toward higher latitudes in summer (Kato 2002; Miyashita *et al.* 1995). Bryde’s whales are usually solitary or in pairs, although groups of 10–20 are known from feeding grounds (Jefferson et al. 2008). Romero et al. (2001) reported that 78% of all sightings off Venezuela were of

single animals. Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported a mean group size of 1.7 ($n = 109$) for the ETP. The durations of Bryde's whale dives are 1–20 min (Cummings 1985).

Two Bryde's whales were observed north of the survey area during winter surveys between 1993 and 1995 (Aguayo et al. 1998) and they have been sighted off the coast of Chile in an upwelling area between 35°–37°S (Gallardo *et al.* 1983). Bryde's whales are not expected to be common during the May survey period.

Sei Whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*)

The sei whale is listed as *Endangered* under the U.S. ESA and on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). Sei whale current status is generally uncertain (Horwood 1987) and the global population size is unknown but thought to be small. The sei whale has a nearly cosmopolitan distribution, with a marked preference for temperate oceanic waters, and is rarely seen in coastal waters (Gambell 1985a). In the open ocean, sei whales generally migrate from temperate zones occupied in winter to higher latitudes in the summer, where most feeding takes place (Gambell 1985a). Sei whales appear to prefer regions of steep bathymetric relief such as the continental shelf break, seamounts, and canyons (Kenney and Winn 1987; Gregr and Trites 2001). On feeding grounds, they associate with oceanic frontal systems (Horwood 1987) such as the cold eastern currents in the North Pacific (Perry et al. 1999).

Sei whales are frequently seen in groups of 2–5 (Leatherwood et al. 1988; Jefferson et al. 2008), although larger groups sometimes form on feeding grounds (Gambell 1985a). Based on NMFS vessel surveys in the ETP during July–December 2006, Jackson et al. (2008) reported mean group sizes for tentative sei whale sightings (may have been Bryde's whales, see above) of 1.3 ($n = 21$). Sei whales generally do not dive deeply, and dive durations are 15 min or longer (Gambell 1985a).

Sei whales may have been sighted during surveys in the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993; Kinzey et al. 1999, 2000, 2001); however, it is difficult to distinguish sei whales from Bryde's whales at sea. Because sei whales generally have a more northerly and temperate distribution (Leatherwood et al. 1988), Wade and Gerrodette (1993) classified any tentative sei whale observations in the ETP as Bryde's whale sightings.

Sei whales are likely to be rare in the survey area during the proposed survey period. Rasmussen et al. (2004) did not report sei whales in eight years of surveys off Costa Rica or Panama, and no sei whales were sighted south of the survey area in the fjords of northern Patagonia between 2000 and 2001 (Viddi et al. 2010). Aguayo et al. (1998) made three sightings of sei whales in September in the offshore waters of northern and central Chile during surveys between 1993 and 1995, and there is a record of a sei whale ship-strike in 2009. The 2009 incident involved a cruise ship departing from Puerto Montt in southern Chile that struck a baleen whale which was later identified as a sei whale (Brownell et al. 2009). Sei whales are more common north or south of the survey area and are unlikely to be encountered during the survey.

Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*)

The fin whale is listed as *Endangered* under the U.S. ESA and on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). Based on 2001 and 2005 surveys, the California/Oregon/Washington Stock of fin whales was estimated at 2636 (Caretta et al. 2010). Fin whales are widely distributed in all the world's oceans in coastal, shelf, and oceanic waters, but typically occur in temperate and polar regions (Gambell 1985b; Perry et al. 1999; Gregr and Trites 2001; Jefferson et al. 2008). The North Pacific population summers from the Chukchi Sea to California, and

winters from California southward (Gambell 1985b). Fin whales from the Southern Hemisphere are usually distributed south of 50°S in the austral summer (Gambell 1985b). The Chile–Peruvian stock of the Southern Hemisphere fin whale population winters west of northern Chile and Peru from 110°W to 60°W (Gambell 1985b).

The species appears to have complex seasonal movements, and is likely a seasonal migrant: mating and calving occurs in temperate waters during winter, followed by migration to northern latitudes to feed during the summer (Mackintosh 1966; Gambell 1985b; Jefferson et al. 2008). However, some evidence suggests that there is a resident population of fin whales in the Gulf of California (Tershy et al. 1993). Thus, some individuals or populations may not undertake the typical long-distance migrations that characterize this species. Sergeant (1977) suggested that fin whales tend to follow steep slope contours, either because they detect them readily or because biological productivity is high along steep contours because of tidal mixing and perhaps current mixing.

Fin whales are typically observed alone or in pairs, but also in groups of up to seven or more, with the largest aggregations occurring on feeding grounds (Jefferson et al. 2008). Based on NMFS vessel-based surveys in the ETP in July–December 2006, Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 1.2 ($n = 8$); all sightings were near Baja California. Croll et al. (2001) reported a mean dive depth and time of 98 m and 6.3 min for foraging fin whales, and a mean dive depth and time of 59 m and 4.2 min for non-foraging individuals. Dive depths of >150 m coinciding with the diel migration of krill were reported by Panigada et al. (1999).

Fin whales are considered rare in the proposed survey area during the proposed survey period. No fin whales were sighted in surveys off Patagonia between April – June (Viddi et al. 2010), but ten fin whale sightings were made north of the survey area during winter surveys (June – September) between 1993 and 1995 (Aguayo et al. 1998). Fin whales from the Southern Hemisphere population are likely to be south of the survey area during the proposed May survey period.

Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*)

The blue whale is listed as **Endangered** under the U.S. ESA and on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). The world-wide population has been estimated at 15,000, with 10,000 in the Southern Hemisphere (Gambell 1976). Two recognised subspecies of blue whales occur in the Southern Hemisphere: Antarctic (or true) blue whales (*Balaenoptera musculus intermedia*) and pygmy blue whales (*B. m. brevicauda*). During the austral summer, nearly all Antarctic blue whales are in the Southern Ocean south of 55°S, while pygmy blue whales are in more northerly waters, primarily in the Indian Ocean and around Australia and New Zealand (Ichihara, 1966; Kato et al., 1995; Branch et al., 2007; Branch et al., 2009). Blue whales also occur off Chile, Peru and Ecuador, but it is not yet clear whether these blue whales are Antarctic blue whales or pygmy blue whales (Van Waerebeek et al., 1997). The blue whale population estimated off coastal Chile between 18° and 38° S is ~267 (Williams et al. 2009), but this likely underestimates the South Pacific population because it excludes the newly discovered feeding and nursing ground in the Chiloe-Corcovado region in southern Chile (Williams et al. 2009; Huckle-Gaete et al., 2003; Huckle-Gaete et al., 2005; Galletti Vernazzani et al., 2006).

The blue whale is widely distributed throughout most of the world's oceans, occurring in coastal, shelf, and pelagic waters (Jefferson et al. 2008), and are most often found in cool, productive waters where upwelling occurs (Reilly and Thayer 1990). Generally, blue whales are seasonal migrants between high latitudes in the summer, where they feed, and low latitudes in winter, where they mate and give birth

(Lockyer and Brown 1981). Little is known about the movements and wintering grounds of the stocks (Mizroch et al. 1984). Some individuals may stay in low or high latitudes throughout the year (Reilly and Thayer 1990; Watkins et al. 2000).

Blue whales are typically found singly or in groups of two or three (Yochem and Leatherwood 1985; Jefferson et al. 2008). They commonly form scattered aggregations on feeding grounds (Jefferson et al. 2008) and apparent single whales are likely part of a large, dispersed group (Wade and Friedrichsen 1979). Based on NMFS vessel surveys in the ETP in July–December 2006, Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 1.9 ($n = 57$). Four satellite-radio-tagged blue whales in the northeast Pacific Ocean spent 94% of their time underwater, 72% of dives were <1 min long, and “true” dives (>1 min) were 4.2–7.2 min long. Shallow (<16-m) dives were most common (75%), and the average depth of deep (>16-m) dives was 105 m (Lagerquist et al. 2000). Croll et al. (2001) reported mean dive depths and times of 140 m and 7.8 min for foraging blue whales, and 68 m and 4.9 min for non-foraging individuals. Dives of up to 300 m were recorded for tagged blue whales (Calambokidis et al. 2003).

Reilly and Thayer (1990) also suggested that the whales seen along the equator are likely part of the southeast Pacific population, which occupies the coastal shelf of South America and the Antarctic (Mackintosh 1966). However, the whales could also be resident in the area, exploiting food resources in the Costa Rica Dome (CRD) and near the South American coastline (Mate et al. 1999; Palacios 1999). Based on call similarities, Stafford et al. (1999b) linked the whales near the CRD to the population that feeds off California at the same time of year. A recent satellite-tag study confirmed that some blue whales off California migrate south in the fall to an area west of the CRD at 9°N; the area is considered an important winter feeding area for blue whales (Bailey et al. 2009).

Nine blue whales were sighted within the survey area in a boat-based survey between December 1997 and January 1998 (Williams et al. 2009), although higher sighting rates were reported 390 km north (26.5°S to 31°S) (Williams et al. 2009) and 900 km south of the survey area between January and April (Hucke-Gaete et al., 2003). Blue whales may be encountered in the survey area during the May survey period.

(2) Odontocetes

Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*)

The sperm whale is listed as **Endangered** under the U.S. ESA and as **Vulnerable** on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). Using the Whitehead (2002) estimate of the worldwide sperm whale population, the NMFS sperm whale recovery plan estimates the southern hemisphere population between 150,000–225,000. The population of sperm whales for the ETP is estimated at 26,053 (Whitehead 2002).

Sperm whales range between the northern and southern edges of the polar pack ice, although they are most abundant in tropical and temperate waters >1000 m deep over the continental shelf edge and slope, and in pelagic waters (e.g., Rice 1989; Gregr and Trites 2001; Waring et al. 2001). Adult females and juveniles generally occur year-round in tropical and subtropical waters, whereas males often move to higher latitudes outside the breeding season to forage (Best 1979; Watkins and Moore 1982; Arnborn and Whitehead 1989; Whitehead and Waters 1990). Sperm whales often associate with areas of high secondary productivity and steep underwater topography, such as volcanic islands (Jacquet and Whitehead 1996). Adult males may occur in water depths <100 m and as shallow as 40 m (Whitehead et al. 1992; Scott and Sadove 1997). Females almost always occur in water depths >1000 m (Whitehead 2002).

Sperm whales undertake some of the deepest-known dives for the longest durations among cetaceans. They can dive as deep as ~2 km and possibly deeper on rare occasions, for periods of over 1 h; however, most of their foraging occurs at depths of ~300–800 m for 30–45 min (Whitehead 2003). A recent study of tagged male sperm whales off Norway found that foraging dives extended to highly variable maximum depths, ranging from 14 to 1860 m and with median 175 m (Teloni et al. 2008). During a foraging dive, sperm whales typically travel ~3 km horizontally and 0.5 km vertically (Whitehead 2003). At the Galápagos Islands, sperm whales typically forage at depths of ~400 m (Papastavrou et al. 1989; Whitehead 1989; Smith and Whitehead 2000). Whales typically dove for ~40 min and then spent 10 min at the surface (Papastavrou et al. 1989).

Sperm whales occur singly (older males) or in groups, with mean group sizes of 20–30 but as many as 50 (Whitehead 2003; Jefferson et al. 2008). May-Collado et al. (2005) reported a mean group size of 9.9 whales off Costa Rica. Based on NMFS vessel surveys in the ETP in 2006, Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 6.1 ($n = 24$). Jackson et al. (2008) recorded two sperm whale sightings during surveys in July–December 2006: one ~100 km off the coast of Ecuador and one in deep, offshore waters of the coast of central Peru. Whitehead and Rendell (2004) identified 739 immature and female sperm whales off northern Chile ($19^{\circ} - 23^{\circ}\text{S}$) in 2000 from photographs, suggesting a higher sighting rate north of the survey site. Several sightings of sperm whales exist within the survey area, and includes one sperm whale stranding reported off Chile in 2009, one sighting during an aerial survey between $36^{\circ} - 44^{\circ}\text{S}$ in 2009 (Centro de Conservación Cetácea) and 13 sightings in northern and central Chile during winter surveys between 1993 and 1995 (Aguayo et al. 1998).

Dwarf and Pygmy Sperm Whale (*Kogia sima* and *K. breviceps*)

Pygmy sperm whales (*Kogia breviceps*) and dwarf sperm whales (*Kogia sima*) are distributed widely throughout tropical and temperate seas, but their precise distributions are unknown because much of what we know of the species comes from strandings (McAlpine 2002). They are difficult to sight at sea, because of their dive behavior and perhaps because of their avoidance reactions to ships and behavior changes in relation to survey aircraft (Würsig et al. 1998). The two species are often difficult to distinguish from one another when sighted (McAlpine 2002). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) estimated that the population of dwarf sperm whales in the ETP was 11,200.

Both *Kogia* species are sighted primarily along the continental shelf edge and slope and over deeper waters off the shelf (Hansen et al. 1994; Davis et al. 1998; Jefferson et al. 2008). Several studies have suggested that pygmy sperm whales live mostly beyond the continental shelf edge, whereas dwarf sperm whales tend to occur closer to shore, often over the continental shelf (Rice 1998; Wang et al. 2002; MacLeod et al. 2004). Barros et al. (1998), on the other hand, suggested that dwarf sperm whales might be more pelagic and dive deeper than pygmy sperm whales. Another suggestion is that the pygmy sperm whale is more temperate, and the dwarf sperm whale more tropical, based at least partially on live sightings at sea from a large database from the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). This idea is also supported by the distribution of strandings in South American waters (Muñoz-Hincapié et al. 1998).

Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales are usually found singly or in groups of less than six (Jefferson et al. 2008). Based on NMFS vessel-based surveys in the ETP, Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 1.6 ($n = 31$) for dwarf sperm whales. In the Gulf of California, median dive and surface times for dwarf or unidentified *Kogia* sp. were 8.6 min and 1.2 min, and dives of up to 25 min and surface times up to 3 min were common (J. Barlow, pers. comm. in Willis and Baird 1998). However, dive times of up to 45 min have also been recorded in *K. sima* (Willis and Baird 1998). Little is known about dive depths of *Kogia* spp. A satellite-tagged pygmy sperm whale released off Florida made longer dives (> 8 min and

up to ~18 min) at night and on overcast days, and shorter dives (usually 2–5 min) on clear days, probably because of the distribution of their prey, vertically-migrating squid (Scott et al. 2001).

Both *Kogia* species have distributions that include the proposed survey area, although dwarf sperm whales are likely to be very rare and pygmy sperm whales are likely to be rare. Rodríguez-Fonseca (2001) reported the presence of *Kogia* sp. off Costa Rica, but only the dwarf sperm whale has been positively identified as occurring in that area (Ferguson and Barlow 2001; Jackson et al. 2008; May-Collado et al. 2005). Similarly, the dwarf sperm whale was the only confirmed *Kogia* species off Costa Rica based on sightings compiled from 1979 to 2001 by May-Collado et al. (2005). Most of the 34 groups of *Kogia* sp. occurred in offshore waters, with frequent sightings ~90–100 km southwest of the Osa Peninsula. Records of pygmy sperm whales along the Chilean coast exist (Huckstadt 2005; Sanino and Yanez 1997), but there are no confirmed sightings of dwarf sperm whales off Chile.

Cuvier's Beaked Whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*)

Cuvier's beaked whale is probably the most widespread of the beaked whales, although it is not found in high-latitude polar waters (Heyning 1989). There are an estimated 20,000 Cuvier's beaked whales in the ETP (Wade and Gerrodette 1993).

Cuvier's beaked whale is found in deep water, but it appears to prefer steep continental slope waters (Jefferson et al. 2008), and is most common in water depths >1000 m (Heyning 1989). Ferguson et al. (2006a) reported that in the ETP, the mean water depth where Cuvier's beaked whales were sighted was ~3.4 km. It is most commonly seen in groups of 2–7 but also up to 15, with a reported mean group size of 2.3 (MacLeod and D'Amico 2006; Jefferson et al. 2008). In the ETP, group sizes range from one to seven animals (Heyning 1989); Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported a mean group size of 2.2 (n = 91) and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 1.8 (n = 16). Cuvier's beaked whales make long (30–60 min), deep dives with reported maximum depths of 1267 m (Johnson et al. 2004) and 1450 m (Baird et al. 2006).

One Cuvier's beaked whale was observed south of the survey site in Patagonia (Viddi et al. 2010) and was consistent with the observations of beaked whales occurring primarily in offshore deep waters (May-Collado et al. 2005). Cuvier's beaked whales are likely to be uncommon in the survey area.

Mesoplodont Beaked Whales (*Mesoplodon* spp.)

Mesoplodont beaked whales (*Mesoplodon* spp.) are difficult to distinguish in the field, and confirmed at-sea sightings are rare (Mead 1989; Caretta et al. 2010; Jefferson et al. 2008). Until better methods are developed for distinguishing the different *Mesoplodon* species from one another, the management unit is defined to include all *Mesoplodon* populations (Caretta et al. 2010). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) estimated a population size of Mesoplodont beaked whales at 25,300 for the ETP. No population estimates are available for the SEP.

Mesoplodonts are distributed primarily in deep waters (>2000 m) and along continental slopes at depths 200–2000 m, and are rarely found in continental shelf waters (Pitman 2002). Most mesoplodonts identified to species are known from strandings involving single individuals (Jefferson et al. 2008), thus it is not possible to identify spatial or seasonal patterns in their distribution (Caretta et al. 2010). Dive depths of most of these species are undocumented.

Mean group sizes are unknown for many of the *Mesoplodon* spp. For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported a mean group size of 3.0 (n = 128) and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 2.4 (n = 30) during July–December surveys in 2006.

MacLeod and Mitchell (2006) identified the ETP as a key area for beaked whales, but little is known about beaked whale distributions in the SEP. Four species are known to occur in or near the survey area: Gray's, Hector's, strap toothed and Blainville's beaked whales.

Blainville's Beaked Whale (M. densirostris)

Blainville's beaked whale is the most widely distributed *Mesoplodon* species (Mead 1989), although it is generally limited to pelagic tropical and warmer temperate waters (Jefferson et al. 2008). Occasional occurrences in cooler, higher-latitude waters are presumably related to warm-water incursions (Reeves et al. 2002). Long-term habitat studies in the northern Bahamas found that Blainville's beaked whales preferred continental slope waters 200–1000 m deep characterized by intermediate depth gradients (MacLeod and Zuur 2005), where they spent most of their time along a canyon wall in waters <800 m deep (Claridge 2003; MacLeod et al. 2004; MacLeod and Zuur 2005). Studies elsewhere indicate that Blainville's beaked whales most frequently occurred in waters 300–1400 m deep (Society Islands, Gannier 2000) and 100–500 m deep (Canary Islands, Ritter and Brederlau 1999). This species may also occur in coastal areas, particularly where deep water gullies come close to shore (Jefferson et al. 2008).

The most commonly observed group size for this species is 1–2 individuals, with a maximum of 9 off Hawaii (Baird et al. 2004; Jefferson et al. 2008). MacLeod and D'Amico (2006) reported a mean group size of 3.5 (n = 31), and Ritter and Brederlau (1999) reported a mean group size of 3.4. The maximum known dive depth of tagged Blainville's beaked whales is 1408 m off Hawaii (Baird et al. 2006).

In the ETP, Blainville's beaked whales have been sighted in offshore as well as nearshore areas of Central and South America (Pitman et al. 1987; Pitman and Lynn 2001). Off Costa Rica, May-Collado et al. (2005) reported one sighting of three Blainville's beaked whales in deep offshore waters based on compiled sightings from 1979 to 2001.

Gray's Beaked Whale (M. grayi)

Gray's beaked whale is primarily found in the southern Hemisphere in cool temperate water, where it occurs in deep water beyond the continental shelf (Taylor et al. 2008). It is assumed to have a circum-Antarctic distribution (Mead 1989, MacLeod et al. 2006). Most records are from south of 30°S (Taylor et al. 2008). There are many sighting records from Antarctic and sub-Antarctic waters, and in summer months they appear near the Antarctic Peninsula and along the shores of the continent (sometimes in the sea ice). Most of the stranding records are from New Zealand, southern Australia, South Africa, Argentina, Chile, and Peru. The area between the south island of New Zealand and the Chatham Islands has been suggested to be a "hot spot" for sightings of this species (Dalebout et al. 2004).

Hector's Beaked Whale (M. grayi)

Hector's beaked whale is also considered a Southern Hemisphere cool temperate species (Mead 1989). The records of this species occur mostly from strandings in southern South America, South Africa, southern Australia, and New Zealand (Taylor et al. 2008). The single confirmed live sighting record is from southwestern Australia (Gales et al. 2002). It has been speculated that the species has a continuous distribution in the Atlantic and Indian oceans at least from South America to New Zealand. Although there are no current records from the central and eastern Pacific Ocean, the range may prove to be circumpolar. This species is probably rare in the survey area.

Strap-toothed Whale (M. layardii)

Strap-toothed beaked whales are the largest Mesoplodonts, with recorded lengths of 6.2 m (Pitman 2009). This species likely has a continuous distribution in the cold temperate and sub-Antarctic waters of the Southern Hemisphere, mostly between 35°S and 60°S (Taylor et al. 2008). This suggests that they are primarily distributed south of the proposed survey area. There have been strandings in South Africa,

Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, the Kerguelen Islands, Heard Island, Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, and the Falkland Islands (MacLeod *et al.* 2006). The seasonality of strandings suggests that this species may migrate. Like all beaked whales, they occur mostly in deep waters beyond the edge of the continental shelf. There is some evidence of sexual segregation in their distribution.

Rough-toothed Dolphin (*Steno bredanensis*)

The rough-toothed dolphin is distributed worldwide in tropical, subtropical, and warm temperate waters (Miyazaki and Perrin 1994). It rarely ranges north of 40°N or south of 35°S (Jefferson 2002). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) estimated rough-toothed dolphin abundance in the ETP at 145,900 based on data collected during 1986–1990. For 2006, the abundance estimate was 107,633 (Gerrodette *et al.* 2008).

Rough-toothed dolphins are generally seen in deep water and in shallower waters around islands. They are typically found in groups of 10–20 animals, but groups of up to 300 have been seen (Jefferson 2002). They are deep divers and can dive for up to 15 min (Reeves *et al.* 2002).

In the ETP, sightings of rough-toothed dolphins have been reported by Perrin and Walker (1975), Pitman and Ballance (1992), Wade and Gerrodette (1993), Kinzey *et al.* (1999, 2000, 2001), Ferguson and Barlow (2001), Jackson *et al.* (2008), and May-Collado *et al.* (2005). The mean group size is 15.46 (Ferguson *et al.* 2006b).

Rough-toothed dolphins are common in the proposed survey area, but are more frequently sighted north of the survey area in the ETP (May-Collado *et al.*, 2005; Rasmussen *et al.*, 2004; Jackson *et al.*, 2008) in both shallow and deep waters. No rough-toothed dolphins were detected during L-DEO seismic surveys off Costa Rica or Nicaragua in February–March 2008 (Holst *et al.* 2005b; Holst and Smultea 2008) or during winter offshore surveys in northern and central Chile (Aguayo *et al.* 1998).

Bottlenose Dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)

The bottlenose dolphin occurs throughout the world's tropical, subtropical, and temperate waters, most commonly in coastal and continental shelf waters (Jefferson *et al.* 2008). Gerrodette *et al.* (2008) estimated the abundance of bottlenose dolphins in the ETP at 335,834 for 2006.

There are two distinct bottlenose dolphin types: a shallow water type mainly found in coastal waters and a deepwater type mainly found in oceanic waters (Duffield *et al.* 1983; Hoelzel *et al.* 1998; Walker *et al.* 1999). The nearshore dolphins usually inhabit shallow waters along the continental shelf and upper slope, at depths <200 m (Davis *et al.* 1998). Klatsky *et al.* (2007) reported that offshore dolphins show a preference for water <2186 m deep. Bottlenose dolphins are reported to regularly dive to depths >450 m for periods of >5 min, and even down to depths of 600–700 m for up to 12 min (Klatsky *et al.* 2007). Bottlenose dolphins usually occur in groups of 2–20, although groups of >100 are occasionally seen in offshore areas (Shane *et al.* 1986; Jefferson *et al.* 2008). Off Costa Rica, May-Collado *et al.* (2005) reported a mean group size of 21.5 individuals based on sightings from 1979–2001. For the ETP, Ferguson *et al.* (2006b) reported a mean group size of 24.1 and Jackson *et al.* (2008) reported a mean group size of 24.2 (n = 149). Bottlenose dolphins in Chile appear to form larger groups in regions close to the proposed survey area and south of it. From two bottlenose dolphin sightings in southern Chile, Zamorano-Abramson (2010) reported a mean group size of 100 animals in the inshore waters of the Aisen Region 43°–45°S, Viddi *et al.* (2010) reported a mean group size of 34.1 animals (n = 8) in Patagonia, southern Chile, and Aguayo *et al.* (1998) reported a mean group size of 71.8 animals (n = 6) in northern and central Chile.

In the ETP, bottlenose dolphins tend to be more abundant close to the coasts and islands (Scott and

Chivers 1990); they also seem to occur more inshore than other dolphin species (Wade and Gerrodette 1993). Polacheck (1987) reported that the highest encounter rates for bottlenose dolphins in the ETP tended to be in nearshore areas. Bottlenose dolphins are very common in the proposed survey area, but may be encountered more often close to the coast.

Spinner Dolphin (*Stenella longirostris*)

The spinner dolphin is distributed in oceanic and coastal waters and is associated with warm tropical surface water (Au and Perryman 1985; Reilly 1990; Reilly and Fiedler 1994). The total population of spinner dolphins in the ETP in 1979 was estimated at 0.8–0.9 million (Allen 1985). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported an abundance estimate of 1.7 million for spinner dolphins in the ETP based on data collected during 1986–1990. Gerrodette et al. (2008) estimated the abundance for spinner dolphins in the ETP for 2006 at 1,797,716.

In the ETP, three types of spinner dolphins have been identified and two of those are recognized as subspecies: the eastern spinner dolphin, *S. l. orientalis*, considered an offshore species, the Central American spinner, *S. l. centroamericana* (also known as the Costa Rican spinner), considered a coastal species in 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*). 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).

Spinner dolphins in the ETP tend to occur in large groups compared to most other cetaceans. Ferguson et al. (2006b) reported mean group sizes of 108.8, 82.5, and 147.7 for eastern, whitebelly, and unidentified spinner dolphins, respectively, and Gerrodette and Forcada (2005) reported a mean group size of 112 for the eastern stock. Off Costa Rica, May-Collado et al. (2005) reported a mean group size of 97 based on sightings compiled from 1979–2001. Spinner dolphins usually dive to 600 m or deeper to feed (Perrin and Gilpatrick 1994).

Rasmussen et al. (2004) reported only one sighting of spinner dolphins in eight years of surveys from 1996 to 2003 off Costa Rica and from 2001 to 2003 off Panama. May-Collado et al. (2005) reported spinner dolphins primarily in oceanic waters off Costa Rica during 1979–2001, with small numbers in coastal waters. One sighting of a group of 50 spinner dolphins was reported by the UK Navy near the proposed survey area in 1997 (iOBIS 2011), but no spinner dolphins were observed during winter surveys between 1993 and 1995 (Aguayo et al. 1998). The whitebelly is expected to be very common in the proposed survey area.

Striped Dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*)

The striped dolphin has a cosmopolitan distribution in tropical to warm temperate waters from ~50°N to 40°S (Perrin et al. 1994a; Jefferson et al. 2008). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) estimated that the population in the ETP numbered 1.9 million based on data collected during 1986–1990. The population has declined; Gerrodette et al. (2008) estimated the abundance of striped dolphins in the ETP at 964,362 for 2006.

The striped dolphin’s preferred habitat seems to be cool, deep, oceanic waters (Davis et al. 1998) along the edge and seaward of the continental shelf, particularly convergence zones and upwelling areas (Au and Perryman 1985). Striped dolphin group sizes are typically several dozen to 500 animals, although groups of thousands sometimes form (Jefferson et al. 2008). For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) reported a mean

group size of 61, and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 51.8 ($n = 137$). Off Costa Rica, Mayo-Collado et al. (2005) reported a mean group size of 48.9. Striped dolphins are believed to be capable of diving to depths of 200–700 m based on stomach content analyses (Archer and Perrin 1999).

Multiple sightings of striped dolphins were recorded in offshore waters off Ecuador and northern Peru, and to the southwest of the Galápagos Islands (Jackson et al. 2008). Mayo-Collado et al. (2005) reported this species nearly exclusively from oceanic waters. The occurrence of this species is known primarily in the ETP, north of the proposed survey area, but it may be common in the offshore survey area.

Short-beaked Common Dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*)

Common dolphins are found in tropical and temperate oceans around the world (Evans 1994). There are two species of common dolphin, the more coastal long-beaked dolphin (*Delphinus capensis*) and the more offshore short-beaked dolphin (*D. delphis*). The short-beaked common dolphin is more widely distributed compared to the long-beaked common dolphin (Heyning and Perrin 1994). Only the short-beaked common dolphin is expected to occur in the SEP. Three stocks of *D. delphis* are recognized in the ETP: northern, central, and southern (Perrin et al. 1985; Perryman and Lynn 1993). Individuals present in the proposed study area would likely be from the central and southern stocks.

Gerrodette et al. (2005) reported an abundance estimate for short-beaked common dolphins of 1.1 million for 2003. However, abundance estimates of common dolphins have fluctuated from <1 million to >3 million from 1986 to 2000 (Gerrodette and Forcada 2002). The abundance estimate for 2006 was 3,127,203 (Gerrodette et al. 2008).

The common dolphin's distribution is associated with prominent underwater topography, such as sea mounts (Evans 1994). Short-beaked common dolphins are widely distributed from the coast to at least 550 km from shore (Carretta et al. 2010). In the ETP, common dolphin distribution is associated with cool, upwelling areas along the equator and off Baja California, Central America, and Peru (Au and Perryman 1985; Reilly 1990; Reilly and Fiedler 1994). Reilly (1990) reported no seasonal changes in common dolphin distribution, although Reilly and Fiedler (1994) observed interannual changes in distribution that were likely attributable to El Niño events. Most dives of a radio-tagged common dolphin off southern California were to depths 9–50 m, and maximum depth was ~200 m (Evans 1994).

Common dolphins travel in group of ~10 to >10,000 (Jefferson et al. 2008). For the ETP, Ferguson et al. (2006b) reported a mean group size of 230, and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 217 ($n = 123$). The mean group size reported between Valparaiso (just east of the survey site) and Easter Island, Chile was 210.1 ($n=8$) (Aguayo et al. 1998).

Short beaked common dolphins are very common north of the study area, and although the survey area is in the southern-most extent of their range, they are also expected to be common in the proposed study area.

Risso's Dolphin (*Grampus griseus*)

Risso's dolphin is primarily a tropical and mid-temperate species distributed worldwide between 60°N and 60°S, where surface water temperatures are ~10°C (Kruse et al. 1999). Gerrodette et al. (2008) reported an abundance estimate of 110,457 Risso's dolphins for the ETP.

Risso's dolphins usually occur over steeper sections of the upper continental slope in waters 400–1000 m deep (Baumgartner 1997; Davis et al. 1998), and are known to frequent seamounts and escarpments (Kruse et al. 1999; Baird et al. 2002a). Risso's dolphins occur individually or in small- to moderate-sized groups, normally ranging in numbers from 10 to 100 but up to as many as 4000 (Jefferson et al. 2008).

May-Collado et al. (2005) reported a mean group size of 11.6 off Costa Rica. For the ETP, Ferguson et al. (2006b) reported a mean group size of 18.64, and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 18.5 ($n = 48$). Risso's dolphin can remain underwater up to 30 min (Kruse et al. 1999).

Risso's dolphins are common north of the proposed survey area; based on the SWFSC surveys. Eight Risso's dolphins were reported during July–December ETP surveys in 2006 (Jackson et al. 2008). Six of these sightings were reported off the coasts of Costa Rica and Panama, at various depths, and two were reported in offshore waters between Ecuador and the Galápagos Islands. Seventeen sightings of Risso's dolphins were recorded from historical sources along the Chilean coast between 33° and 40°S (iOIBS 2011 from Argentina RON), making it one of the most common species in the survey area.

False Killer Whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*)

The false killer whales is widely distributed, though not abundant anywhere (Jefferson et al. 2008). It is found in all tropical and warmer temperate oceans, especially in deep offshore waters (Odell and McClune 1999). Wade and Gerrodette (1993) estimated their abundance in the ETP at 39,800 based on data collected during 1986–1990.

False killer whales have been sighted in the ETP, where they chase or attack *Stenella* and *Delphinus* dolphins during tuna fishing operations (Perryman and Foster 1980). They travel in groups of 20–100 (Baird 2002b), although groups of several hundred are sometimes observed. For the ETP, Wade and Gerrodette (1993) and Ferguson et al. (2006b) reported a mean group size of 11, and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 11.8 ($n = 16$). Off Costa Rica, May-Collado et al. (2005) reported a mean group size of 36.2, and Martínez-Fernandez et al. (2005) reported a mean group size of 13.2. Smaller numbers of false killer whales have been reported south of the survey area, with mean group sizes of 5 animals ($n = 2$) reported in Patagonia during 2000 – 2001 surveys (Viddi et al. 2010). False killer whales are usually seen far offshore, although sightings have been reported for both shallow (<200 m) and deep (>2000 m) waters (Wade and Gerrodette 1983).

Aguayo et al. (1998) sighted one false killer whale during winter surveys in 1993–1995 between Valparaiso, east of the survey site, and Easter Island, northwest of the survey site. Sightings occur more often north of the survey area. Off Costa Rica, May-Collado et al. (2005) reported nine sightings of 253 animals in 1979–2000. Martínez-Fernandez et al. (2005) observed four groups off Costa Rica during monthly strip-transect surveys during December 2004–June 2005. Rasmussen et al. (2004) reported eight sightings of false killer whales in eight years of surveys (1996–2003) off Costa Rica and in 2001–2003 off Panama. During L-DEO seismic surveys off Costa Rica and Nicaragua, one sighting was made of 12 false killer whales (off the coast of Nicaragua in waters <2000 m deep) in November–December 2004 (Holst et al. 2005b), but none were observed in February–March 2008 (Holst and Smultea 2008). False killer whales are uncommon in the proposed survey area.

Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*)

The killer whale is cosmopolitan and globally abundant; it has been observed in all oceans of the world (Ford 2002). Killer whales are segregated socially, genetically, and ecologically into three distinct groups: resident, transient, and offshore animals. Offshore whales do not appear to mix with the other types of killer whales (Black et al. 1997; Dahlheim and Heyning 1999). The abundance of killer whales in the ETP was estimated at 8500 (Ford 2002).

Groups sizes of killer whales are 1–75, though offshore transient groups generally contain <10 (Dahlheim et al. 1982; Jefferson et al. 2008). Off Costa Rica, May-Collado et al. (2005) reported that the

mean group size was the smallest among the delphinids seen, at 3.5. For the ETP, Ferguson et al. (2006b) reported a mean group size of 5.5, and Jackson et al. (2008) reported a mean group size of 8.1 ($n = 15$). Viddi et al. (2010) reported mean group sizes of 5 animals ($n=2$) in Patagonia, south of the survey area. The maximum depth to which seven tagged free-ranging killer whales dove off British Columbia was 228 m, but only an average of 2.4 % of their time was spent below 30 m in depth (Baird et al. 2003).

Killer whales are found throughout the ETP (Pitman and Ballance 1992; Wade and Gerrodette 1993), but are most densely distributed near the coast from 35°N to 5°S (Dahlheim et al. 1982). Dahlheim et al. (1982) reported the occurrence of a cluster of sightings at two offshore locations in the ETP. One location was bounded by 7–14°N and 127–139°W, and the other was within a band between the equator and 5°N and from the Galápagos Islands to 115°W; both well north of the proposed study area.

Jackson et al. (2008) reported four sighting of killer whales north of the study area during July–December surveys in 2006; one sighting was in Panama and the other three sightings were in the offshore waters of central Peru, to the southwest of the Galápagos Islands. Off Costa Rica, May-Collado et al. (2005) reported seven sightings of 25 animals in offshore oceanic waters in 1979–2000. Rasmussen et al. (2004) reported three sightings in eight years of surveys (1996–2003) off Costa Rica and in 2001–2003 off Panama. A group of 20–22 was seen preying on a blue whale calf in the Costa Rica Dome in 2003, ~230 km west of Nicaragua (Gilpatrick et al. 2005).

Aguayo et al. (1998) made 3 sightings of killer whales between Valparaíso and the Easter Islands, in north and central Chile with a mean group size of 2.7 animals. All sightings of killer whales have occurred at least 100 km north or south of the proposed survey area, and killer whales are likely uncommon in the proposed survey area.

Long-finned Pilot Whale (*Globicephala melas*)

Long-finned pilot whales occur in temperate and subpolar zones (Olson and Reilly 2002). They are found in oceanic waters and some coastal waters of the North Atlantic Ocean, including the Mediterranean Sea and North Sea. In the North Atlantic, the species occurs in deep offshore waters, including those inside the western Mediterranean Sea, North Sea, and Gulf of St. Lawrence (Abend and Smith 1999). The circum-Antarctic subpopulation in the Southern Hemisphere occur as far south as the Antarctic Convergence, sometimes to 68°S, and this subpopulation is likely isolated from the population of pilot whales in the Northern Hemisphere (Bernard and Reilly 1999).

There are estimated to be about 200,000 long-finned pilot whales in the summer south of the Antarctic Convergence in the Southern Hemisphere, and approximately 31,000 ($CV = 0.27$) in the western North Atlantic (Waring *et al.* 2006), but some of these are short-finned pilot whales. The typical temperature range for the species is 0 - 25°C (Martin 1994).

Aguayo et al. (1998) made three sightings of long-finned pilot whales between Valparaíso and 76°W, just off the Chilean coast during a 3-year survey period. Individuals were sighted mainly near the edge of the continental shelf. Tracking studies of long finned pilot whales around the Faroe islands showed a preference for waters over the borders of the continental shelf (Bloch *et al.* 2003). The mean group size reported off coastal Chile was 4 animals (Aguayo et al. 1998). An additional 26 sightings were made of long finned pilot whales between 33° and 40° S off the coast of Chile (iOBIS 2011 from Argentina RON). Long-finned pilot whales are likely common in the proposed survey area.

Peale's Dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus australis*)

Peale's dolphins occupy two major habitats: open, wave-washed coasts over shallow continental shelves to the north; and deep, protected bays and channels to the south and west. It is typically associated with rocky coasts and riptides at the openings to fjords in the channels. Peale's dolphins show a high degree of association with kelp beds (*Macrocystis pyrifera*), especially in the channel regions (Viddi and Lescrauwaet 2005). Although Peale's dolphins have been observed in waters at least 300 m deep, they appear to prefer shallower coastal waters (Brownell et al. 1999). Over much of its range Peale's dolphin is sympatric with the dusky dolphin although they differ slightly in their habitat use. These two species are often difficult to differentiate at sea (Goodall et al. 1997; de Haro and Iniguez 1997). Peale's dolphins are known to associate with other cetacean species, especially Commerson's dolphins. Calves have been reported from spring through autumn.

Throughout the northern part of their range, Peale's dolphins inhabit waters of the wide continental shelf off Argentina and the narrower shelf off Chile. Aguayo et al (1998) did not observe any Peale's dolphins off coastal Chile near the study site during winter surveys between 1993 and 1995. Zamorano-Abramson et al (2010) observed a mean group size of 6 Peale's dolphins (n=55) during summer surveys (February-March 2009) in Patagonia south of the survey site, and Viddi et al (2010) observed a mean group size of 4.3 animals (n = 42) during surveys in southern Chile in 2000-2001. Peale's dolphins were observed most frequently during surveys in southern Chile during spring and winter (Viddi et al. 2010) although no other studies suggest a seasonal migration for this species. Although this species has a distribution that extends north of the study area, only one record of a sighting exists north of the proposed survey area (iOBIS 2011 from Argentinian RON). Peale's dolphins are unlikely to be encountered in the survey area during May.

Dusky Dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*)

This coastal species is usually found over the continental shelf and slope (Jefferson *et al.* 1993; Aguayo *et al.* 1998). The distribution of dusky dolphins along the west coast of South Africa and both coasts of South America is associated with the continental shelves and cool waters of the Benguela, Humboldt and Falkland Currents. Around New Zealand, these dolphins are associated mainly with various cold water currents (Brownell and Cipriano 1999). Van Waerebeek et al. (1995) suggested that dusky dolphins may be limited to water shallower than 200 m. Off Argentina, dusky dolphins have been sighted from the coast to almost 200 nautical miles offshore (Crespo et al. 1997). They appear to prefer water with sea surface temperatures between 10°C and 18°C (Brownell and Cipriano 1999). Inshore to offshore shifts in abundance have been noted for Argentina and New Zealand, and individuals are known to move over deep waters in some areas, but always along continental slopes.

There are few abundance estimates available for any significant portion of the range (Brownell and Cipriano 1999). The total number of dusky dolphins in one area off the Patagonian coast was estimated to be close to 7,252 individuals (Dans et al. 1997). Individuals from some subpopulations are typically reported as bycatch, such as in fishing-related mortalities in Peru (Van Waerebeek 1994; Van Waerebeek et al. 1997), and midwater trawling in Patagonia (Dans et al. 1997).

There is a gap in the distribution of dusky dolphins in South America, spanning about 1,000 km along the Chilean coast. Animals off Patagonia tend to be smaller than those off northern Chile and Peru, suggesting that the subpopulations in western and eastern South America are separate (Hammond et al. 2008). Aguayo et al. (1998) made only one dusky dolphin sighting of 2 individuals during surveys in 1993-1995 north of the survey site (33°N), and an additional eight records of dusky dolphins exist south

of the survey site, off the coast of Chile (iOBIS 2011 from Argentinean RON). Shiavini et al. (1999) found that 95% of dusky dolphin groups encountered consisted of 10 animals or less in the north and central Patagonia waters, off Argentina indicating smaller group sizes around Chile and Argentina. Dusky dolphins may be common in the survey site, although they are unlikely to be encountered in the deep offshore waters of the proposed survey area.

Southern Right Whale Dolphin (*Lissodelphis peronii*)

Southern right whale dolphins are observed most often in cool, deep, offshore waters with temperatures ranging from 1-20°C. They are only occasionally seen nearshore, generally where deep water approaches the coast (Jefferson *et al.* 1994; Rose and Payne 1991). There are no estimates of abundance for the southern right whale dolphin, and virtually nothing is known of the subpopulation structure or status of the species. Preliminary boat surveys and the rapid accumulation of stranding and fishery interaction records in northern Chile suggest that the southern right whale dolphin may be one of the most common cetaceans in that region (Jefferson *et al.* 1994; Van Waerebeek *et al.*, 1991). Aguayo *et al.* (1998) reported one sighting of *L. peronii* between Valparaiso and 76°W, i.e. just off the Chilean coast during a survey in September 1994, consisting of five individuals.

The distribution of southern right whale dolphins is poorly known, though it appears to be circumpolar and fairly common throughout its range (Jefferson *et al.* 1994, Lipsky 2002). Southern right whale dolphins are found only in cool temperate to subantarctic waters of the Southern Hemisphere, mostly between about 30°S and 65°S. The southern limit appears generally to be bounded by the Antarctic Convergence. The range extends furthest north along the west coast of continents, due to the cold counter clockwise currents of the Southern Hemisphere. The northernmost record is at 12°S, off northern Peru (Hammond *et al.* 2008). Southern right whale dolphins are not unlikely to be encountered during the proposed survey.

Burmeister's porpoise (*Phocoena spinipinnis*)

Very little is known about this species. Most sightings are of less than six individuals, but aggregations of up to 70 have been reported (Goodall *et al.* 1995a; 1995b). This species is difficult to observe because it is inconspicuous at the surface. There appears to be a protracted summer birth peak with most births in Peru apparently occurring in late summer to fall (Reyes *et al.* 1995). Burmeister's porpoise have not been sighted within the survey area, and are primarily found south of the survey area, between 44 °S to 46°S. Zamorano-Ambramson *et al.* (2010) sighted 8 groups of Burmeister's porpoise over a six-day period in February 2009 in Patagonia, south of the survey site. Group size ranged from 2 to 7 animals. Aguayo *et al.* (1998) made no sightings of this species between Valparaiso and Easter Island during winter surveys in 1993 – 1995.

Burmeister's porpoise are essentially a coastal species, which sometimes frequents inshore bays, channels, and the fjords of Tierra del Fuego. It is also occasionally observed inside the kelp line. Individuals are typically found shoreward of the 60 m isobath, but occasionally animals are recorded in deeper water up to 1,000 m (Brownell and Clapham 1999). There have also been records from offshore waters 50 km from the coast of Argentina, however it is unlikely what this species will be encountered in the survey area during the proposed survey period.

Chilean dolphin (*Cephalorhynchus eutropia*)

This dolphin is endemic along the Chilean coast (and possibly in southern Argentina), from about 30°S to Cape Horn, at the southern tip of South America. It is found in shallow coastal waters, and sometimes enters estuaries and rivers. It occurs in the channels and fjords of southern Chile, and to a lesser extent along the west coast of Tierra del Fuego, such as in the Strait of Magellan. Its distribution appears to be continuous, although there may be areas of local abundance, such as Golfo de Arauco, the coast off Valdivia and the eastern side of Isla de Grande Chiloé (Goodall *et al.* 1988).

Sightings of Chilean dolphins are restricted to cold shallow coastal waters where they feed on shallow-water fish (Goodall 1994). According to Goodall (1994) it inhabits two distinct areas: the channels from Cape Horn to Isla Grande de Chiloé and open coasts, bays and river mouths north of Isla Chiloé. Its habitat preference includes areas with rapid tidal flow, tide rips, and shallow waters over banks at the entrance to fjords. Chilean dolphins represented 16% of the cetacean sightings, captures, and strandings in an 8-year study between Coquimbo (30°S) and Tome (36.5°S), but most sightings occurred on an opportunistic basis (Goodall, 1994). Perez-Alvarez *et al.* (2007) saw Chilean dolphins in 83% of the surveys north of the Maule River (36 °N), in a zone more influenced by the estuarine system, but no sightings were made in central Chile during offshore surveys (Aguayo *et al.* 1998).

Most sightings have been near shore and therefore the Chilean dolphin is considered a coastal species. Their movements appear limited, with most dolphins resident in only a small area. Individuals identified from natural markings on their dorsal fins have been shown to concentrate their activities in specific bays and channels (Heinrich, 2006). Groups tend to be small (between 1 and 15), but relatively large aggregations (20-50) have been reported (Goodall 1994; Viddi *et al.* 2010). Although mixed groups of Chilean and Peale's dolphins have been observed, a clear pattern of spatial and temporal partitioning of coastal habitat by the two species was documented during a six-year study at Isla Grande de Chiloé (Heinrich 2006). Chilean dolphins are rare in the offshore survey area.

(3) Pinnipeds

Four species of pinnipeds are known to occur within the SEP: the South American sea lion (*Otaria flavescens*), Juan Fernandez fur seal (*Arctocephalus philippii*), South American fur seal (*A. australis*) and southern elephant seal (*Mirounga leonina*). Of the four species, three have the potential to occur within the survey area, although any occurrence is likely to be rare as they are mainly coastal species.

South American sea lions and South American fur seals are distributed along the coast of South America. The northernmost breeding colony of South American sea lions occurs on the Peruvian coast (Vaz-Ferreira 1981), but vagrant individuals have been seen along the coast of Colombia (Capella *et al.* 2002) and as far north as Panama (Méndez and Rodriguez 1984). South American sea lions are considered non-migratory, although some may wander long distances away from rookeries during the non-breeding season. Most rookeries are continuously occupied by at least some animals. Campagna *et al.* (2001) used satellite tracking to examine the foraging behaviour of lactating females and pre-breeding males in the southwest Atlantic Ocean. Although mean foraging trips covered an average of 206 km in the case of females and 591 km in the case of males, tagged animals remained on the continental shelf and never ventured in waters deeper than 150 m. South American fur seals have a discontinuous distribution off the coast of Chile, with no records of occurrence between 28-43°S (Campagna 2008), however a few sightings have been made of animals 600 km offshore and in the Juan Fernandez islands, west of the proposed survey area. However, as the survey area is mainly well offshore and these two species are most

common in the coastal habitat, sightings in the study area are not expected, although rare encounters could occur.

The Juan Fernandez fur seal is only found ashore regularly in the Juan Fernandez Archipelago in the eastern South Pacific, west of mainland Chile. The Archipelago includes the Juan Fernandez Island group, and the San Felix Islands, approximately 600 km to the north. They have a seasonal presence in the rookeries with a peak occurring during the breeding period between November-January. Vagrant Juan Fernandez fur seals have been found on the west coast of South America from southern Peru to southern Chile (Auriolles and Trillmich 2008). Juan Fernandez fur seal females travel long distances to forage. Based on geolocating time-depth recorders, the mean distance travelled away from the breeding colony is 653 km, and all tagged females traveled at least 550 km to forage (Auriolles and Trillmich 2008). Most trips were southwest and west of the Juan Fernandez Islands, far offshore to deep oceanic areas. Given the distance of the survey site from the Juan Fernandez Archipelago and the tendency for foraging animals to travel away from coastal Chile, no Juan Fernandez fur seals are expected to be encountered in the survey area.

Southern elephant seals have a nearly circumpolar distribution in the southern Hemisphere. A breeding population occurs at Península Valdes on the Argentinian coast of South America that is thought to be a distinct population from the South Georgia population (Campagna et al. 2008). Historically, southern elephant seals have also been recorded in the Juan Fernandez archipelago (Bourne et al. 1992). Individuals are known to travel long distances and an individual tagged in Tierra del Fuego in southern Chile was recorded to travel 18,000 miles in 11 months (Wildlife Conservation Society 2011). Although southern elephant seals are known to undertake long migrations, and spend 9-10 months at sea, their typical range is in the higher latitudes south of the survey site. Southern elephant seals are rare in the proposed survey area and are not expected to be encountered.

Sea Turtles

Of the world's seven species of sea turtles, four could be found in the proposed study area: the leatherback, loggerhead, green, and olive ridley turtles. Mostly foraging or migrating individuals would be encountered. At least three species nest north of the survey area in considerable numbers: leatherbacks in Mexico and Costa Rica, green turtles from Mexico to Colombia, mostly in Mexico (nesting in the Galapagos occurs during December–May), and olive ridleys from Mexico to Peru, mostly in southern Mexico and northern Costa Rica. Loggerheads do not nest in the eastern Pacific. The proposed survey is scheduled after the peak nesting periods for leatherbacks (October–March), green turtles (October–November), and olive ridleys (September–December).

(1) Leatherback Turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*)

The leatherback turtle is listed as *Endangered* under the U.S. ESA and *Critically Endangered* on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). The world leatherback turtle population is estimated at 35,860 females (Spotila 2004).

The leatherback is the largest and most widely distributed sea turtle, ranging far from its tropical and subtropical breeding grounds. It has the most extensive range of any adult, 71°N to 47°S (Eckert 1995; NMFS and USFWS 1998a). Leatherbacks are highly pelagic and approach coastal waters only during the reproductive season (EuroTurtle 2006a). This species is one of the deepest divers in the ocean, with dives deeper than 4000 m (Spotila 2004). The leatherback dives continually and spends short periods of time on the surface between dives (Eckert et al. 1986; Southwood et al. 1998). Off St. Croix, 6 inter-nesting females dove to a

mean depth of 61.6 m for an average of 9.9 min/dive, and post-dive surfacing intervals averaged 4.9 min (Eckert et al. 1989). During shallow-water diving in the South China Sea, typical dive durations averaged 6.9–14.5 min, with a maximum of 42 min (Eckert et al. 1996). Off central California, leatherbacks dove to 20–30 m with a maximum of 92 m, corresponding to the vertical distribution of their prey, and mean dive and surface durations were 2.9 and 2.2 min, respectively (Harvey et al. 2006). During migrations or long distance movements, leatherbacks maximize swimming efficiency by traveling within 5 m of the surface (Eckert 2002).

Hatchling leatherbacks are pelagic, but nothing is known about their distribution for the first four years (Musick and Limpus 1997). Post-nesting adult leatherbacks appear to migrate along bathymetric contours from 200 to 3500 m (Morreale et al. 1994). Leatherbacks are highly migratory, feeding in convergence zones and upwelling areas in the open ocean, along continental margins, and in archipelagic waters (Morreale et al. 1994; Eckert 1995). There is evidence that leatherbacks are associated with oceanic front systems, such as shelf breaks and the edges of oceanic gyre systems where their prey is concentrated (Lutcavage 1996).

Eastern Pacific nesting stocks have declined to near extinction (Donoso and Dutton 2010; Dutton et al., 2007; Sarti et al., 1996, 2007; Spotila et al., 2000). Tag returns, genetic analysis and satellite telemetry data suggest that leatherbacks in the waters of the southeastern Pacific off the coast of South America belong primarily to the severely depleted eastern Pacific nesting stock (Eckert, 1997; Shillinger et al., 2008). In the Pacific Ocean, leatherbacks nest along the west coast of Mexico and in Central America, particularly in Costa Rica, from October to March (Spotila 2004). Females may lay up to nine clutches in a season (although six is more common), and the incubation period is 58–65 days. In Costa Rica, leatherbacks nest at Playa Naranjo in Santa Rosa National Park, the second-most important nesting beach on the Pacific coast (Yañez et al. 2010), Rio Oro on the Osa Peninsula, and at various beaches in Las Baulas National Park, which includes Playa Langosta and Playa Grande and contains the largest colony of leatherbacks in the Pacific (Spotila 2004). The number of leatherback turtles nesting in Las Baulas National Park declined steadily during the 1990s, from ~1500 females during the 1988–89 nesting season, to ~800 in 1990–91 and 1991–92, 193 in 1993–94 (Williams et al. 1996) and 117 in 1998–99 (Spotila 2000 in NMFS 2002). Spotila (2004) reported that between 59 and 435 leatherbacks nest at Las Baulas each year depending on the El Niño–La Niña cycle.

Telemetry studies suggest that post-nesting females from eastern Pacific populations in Mexico and Central America migrate southward to equatorial and Southern Hemisphere waters (Dutton et al. 2006). Female leatherbacks tagged at Playa Grande migrated southward along a well-defined corridor from Costa Rica past the Galapagos, and then dispersed south of 10°S (Shillinger et al. 2010). Among longline fisheries in the ETP, leatherbacks were the most frequent bycatch only in the Chilean swordfish fishery, which had the lowest bycatch rate of longline fisheries from Chile to Baja California. Among gillnet fisheries, leatherbacks were virtually the only species in the bycatch of the Chilean gillnet swordfish fishery, and were included with other species in the bycatch of driftnets targeting sharks and rays off Peru (Kelez et al. 2010). Leatherbacks recovered from Chilean fishing vessels are from populations nesting both in the eastern and western Pacific Ocean (Donoso et al. 2000). Leatherbacks were the most common turtle species recorded from the swordfish longline fisheries between 24°S and 38°S, and Chandler (1991) reported that they are the most common sea turtle species in central Chile. Leatherback turtles are the most likely sea turtle to be encountered in the survey site.

(2) Loggerhead Turtle (*Caretta caretta*)

The loggerhead turtle is listed as **Threatened** under the U.S. ESA throughout its range and the South Pacific DPS of loggerheads are listed as **Endangered**. They are also listed as **Endangered** on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011), and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-

WCMC 2011). The global population of loggerhead turtles is estimated at 43,320–44,560 nesting females (Spotila 2004).

The loggerhead is a widely distributed species, occurring in coastal tropical and subtropical waters around the world. On average, loggerheads turtles spend over 90% of their time underwater (Byles 1988; Renaud and Carpenter 1994). In the North Pacific Ocean, two loggerheads tagged with satellite-linked depth recorders spent about 40% of their time in the top meter and virtually all their time shallower than 100 m; 70% of the dives were no deeper than 5 m (Polovina et al. 2003). Off Japan, virtually all the dives of two loggerheads between nesting were shallower than 30 m (Sakamoto et al. 1993). Routine dives can last 4–172 min (Byles 1988; Sakamoto et al. 1990; Renaud and Carpenter 1994). Small juvenile loggerheads live at or near the surface; for the 6–12 years spent at sea as juveniles, they spend 75% of their time in the top 5 m of water (Spotila 2004). Juveniles spend more time on the surface in deep, offshore areas than in shallow, nearshore waters (Lutcavage and Lutz 1997).

Nesting in the Pacific Ocean basin is restricted to the western region, primarily Japan and Australia (NMFS and USFWS 1998b). The nesting season is typically from May to August. The size structure of loggerheads in coastal and nearshore waters of the eastern and western Pacific Ocean suggest that hatching loggerheads in the Pacific Ocean have a pelagic stage similar to that in the Atlantic (NMFS 2002), where they spend the first 2–6 years of their lives at sea. Telemetry studies, mark-recapture data, demographics, diet analysis, and oceanographic patterns suggest that North Pacific loggerhead turtles, mostly born in southern Japan, are transported as hatchlings and juveniles to the North Pacific by the Kuroshio Current, then spend the next 2–6 years moving from west to east, feeding along convergence and frontal zones. They arrive at the U.S. west coast as juveniles, and feed along the Baha California coast on pelagic red crabs, which are extremely abundant there in spring and early summer. When mature, they migrate back to natal beaches in Japan and remain in the western Pacific, migrating annually between nesting beaches and feeding grounds in the South and East China Seas (Nichols et al. 2000; Nichols 2005; Parker et al. 2005). Recently, adult loggerheads and mating behavior have been reported in the waters of the Pacific coast of Baha California Sur (Rossi et al. 2010).

In the eastern Pacific, the loggerhead's distribution ranges from Alaska to Chile (NMFS and USFWS 1998b). Sightings are typically confined to the summer months in the eastern Pacific, peaking in July–September off southern California and southwestern Baja California (Stinson 1984; NMFS and USFWS 1998b). Loggerheads are rare in Chilean waters (Donoso et al. 2000), but are relatively common in the waters off southern Peru (Alfaro-Shigueto et al. 2004). Juvenile loggerheads, tagged with satellite transmitters and released after being captured incidentally by artisanal longline fishing vessels from central or southern Peru all moved offshore beyond the continental shelf, and most remained within 100 km of the coast of Peru, suggesting that loggerheads are year-round residents there (Mangel et al. 2010). In Chile, loggerheads were most common in the offshore longline bycatch during March, with the majority of individuals classified as juveniles (Donoso and Dutton 2010). Although loggerheads might be found in the survey area, they are not likely to be encountered during the May survey period.

(3) Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*)

The green turtle is listed as **Threatened** under the ESA throughout its Pacific range, except for the **Endangered** population nesting on the Pacific coast of Mexico. It is listed as **Endangered** on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011) and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). The worldwide green turtle population is estimated at ~110,000–150,000 nesting females per year (NMFS and USFWS 2007). The worldwide population has declined 50–70% since 1900 (Spotila 2004).

The green turtle is widely distributed in tropical and subtropical waters near continental coasts and around islands. Green turtles typically migrate along coastal routes from rookeries to feeding grounds, although some populations conduct trans-oceanic migrations (e.g., Ascension Island–Brazil; Carr 1975). Females typically show nest-site fidelity, and nest repeatedly in the same spot, or at least on the same beach from which they hatched. Hatchlings are epipelagic (surface dwelling in the open sea) for ~1–3 years. Subsequently, they live in bays and along protected shorelines, and feed during the day on seagrass and algae (Bjorndal 1982). Juvenile and sub-adult green turtles may travel thousands of kilometers before they return to breeding and nesting grounds (Carr et al. 1978). Juveniles have been observed by research vessels operating thousands of miles from land in the southeastern Pacific Ocean (NMFS and USFWS 1998c).

Green turtles typically make dives shallower than 30 m (Hochscheid et al. 1999; Hays et al. 2000), although they have been observed diving to 73–110 m in the eastern Pacific Ocean (Berkson 1967). The maximum dive time recorded for a juvenile green turtle off Hawaii was 66 min, and routine dive times were 9–23 min (Brill et al. 1995). During a breeding migration in the Hawaiian Islands, three adult green turtles made shallow (1–4 m) and short (1–18 min) dives during the day and deeper (mean maximum of 35–55 m) and longer (35–44 min) dives at night (Rice and Balazs 2010).

In the eastern Pacific, green turtles nest at several locations on the Mexican mainland, Central America, and off the coast of Colombia and Ecuador. The primary nesting grounds are located in Michoacán, Mexico, with an estimated 1395 nesting females per year, and the Galápagos Islands, Ecuador, with an estimated 1650 nesting females per year (NMFS and USFWS 2007). Nesting occurs in Michoacán between August and January, with a peak in October–November, and on the Galápagos Islands between December and May with a peak in February–March (Alvarado and Figueroa 1995; Green and Ortiz-Crespo 1995). Nesting at the four main nesting beaches in the Galápagos—Quinta Play and Bahía Barahona (Isabela Island), Las Salinas (Baltras Island), and Las Bachas (Santa Cruz Island)—has been stable or slightly increasing since the late 1970s (NMFS and USFWS 2007). Green turtles nesting at those beaches during 2002–2007 showed a high degree of nesting beach fidelity, as to green turtles from other populations (Zárate et al 2010b). In Central America, small numbers of green turtles nest at major nesting sites of other species, primarily olive ridleys, in Nicaragua (Ocean Resources Foundation 1998) and in Costa Rica (NMFS and USFWS 1998c). Green turtles also nest in very small numbers in El Salvador (Hasbún and Vásquez 1999).

In the eastern Pacific, the species has been documented as far north as southern Alaska and as far south as Desolation Island, Chile (NMFS and USFWS 1998c). Based on tag-recovery information, the feeding grounds of the Mexican breeding population are restricted to Mexico and Central America, whereas the Galapagos breeding population forages from Costa Rica south to Peru (NMFS and USFWS 1998c). Five green turtles were identified in the longline bycatch off the coast of Chile between 2001 and 2005 (Donoso and Dutton 2010). The occurrence of green turtles ~500 km offshore (at 34 °S) indicates that they could be found in the survey area, although they are typically found along the coastline (Chandler 1991).

(4) Olive Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*)

The olive ridley is the most abundant sea turtle in the world, but olive ridley populations on the Pacific coast of Mexico are listed as **Endangered** under the U.S. ESA; all other populations are listed as **Threatened**. The olive ridley is categorized as **Vulnerable** on the 2011 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2011) and is listed in CITES Appendix I (UNEP-WCMC 2011). The worldwide population of olive ridley turtles is estimated at ~2 million nesting females (Spotila 2004). Worldwide, olive ridleys are in serious decline (Spotila 2004).

The olive ridley has a large range in tropical and subtropical regions in the Pacific, Indian, and south Atlantic oceans, and is generally found between 40°N and 40°S. Most olive ridley turtles lead a primarily pelagic existence. The Pacific Ocean population migrates throughout the Pacific Ocean, from nesting grounds in Mexico and Central America to the North Pacific Ocean (NMFS 2002). The post-nesting migration routes of olive ridleys tracked via satellite from Costa Rica traversed thousands of kilometers of deep oceanic waters ranging from Mexico to Peru, and more than 3000 kilometers out into the central Pacific Ocean (Plotkin et al. 1994a).

Olive ridleys can dive and feed at considerable depths (80–300 m), although ~90% of their time is spent at depths <100 m (Eckert et al. 1986; Polovina et al. 2003). In the ETP, at least 25% of their total dive time is spent in the permanent thermocline, located at 20–100 m (Parker et al. 2003). Olive ridleys spend considerable time at the surface basking, presumably in an effort to speed their metabolism and digestion after a deep dive (Spotila 2004). In the open ocean of the eastern Pacific Ocean, olive ridley turtles are often seen near flotsam, possibly feeding on associated fish and invertebrates (Pitman 1992). In the North Pacific Ocean, two olive ridleys tagged with satellite-linked depth recorders spent about 20% of their time in the top meter and about 10% of their time deeper than 100 m; 70% of the dives were no deeper than 5 m (Polovina et al. 2003).

Females and males begin to aggregate near their nesting beaches two months before the nesting season, and most mating likely occurs near the nesting beaches (NMFS 2002). However, Pitman (1990) observed olive ridleys mating at sea, as far as 1850 km from the nearest mainland, during every month of the year except March and December. There was a sharp peak in offshore mating activity during August and September, corresponding with peak breeding activity in mainland populations. Turtles observed during NMFS/SWFC dolphin surveys during July–December 1998 and 1999 were captured; 50 of 324 were involved in mating (Kopitsky et al. 2002).

In the eastern Pacific, the largest nesting concentrations occur in southern Mexico and northern Costa Rica, with stragglers nesting as far north as southern Baja California (Fritts et al. 1982) and as far south as Peru (Brown and Brown 1982; Kelez et al. 2009). Most olive ridleys nest synchronously in huge colonies called “arribadas”, with several thousand females nesting at the same time; others nest alone, out of sequence with the arribada (Kalb and Owens 1994). The arribadas usually last from three to seven nights (Aprill 1994). Most females lay two clutches of eggs with an inter-nesting period of 1–2 months (Plotkin et al. 1994b). Incubation usually takes from 50 to 60 days (NMFS and USFWS 1998d). Radio-tracking studies showed that females that nested in arribadas remain within 5 km of the beach most of the time during the inter-nesting period (Kalb and Owens 1994). Olive ridleys nest throughout the year in the eastern Pacific with peak months, including major arribadas, occurring from September through December (NMFS and USFWS 1998d). There is no known nesting on the U.S. west coast.

Outside of the breeding season, the turtles disperse, but little is known of their behavior. Neither males nor females migrate to one specific foraging area, but exhibit a nomadic movement pattern and occupy a series of feeding areas in oceanic waters (Plotkin et al. 1994a,b). Aggregations of turtles², sometimes >100 individuals, have been observed as far offshore as 120°W, ~3000 km from shore (Arenas and Hall 1991), however movements of turtles tagged in Central America were highly dissociated from each other, indicating that olive ridleys are “nomadic epipelagic foragers that prey on patchily distributed food” (Morreale et al. 2007:220).

In the ETP, olive ridleys range from the U.S. to central Chile, but are most common off Mexico and Central America; in Peru, they can be found along the entire coast but are most common in the north

² Of sea turtles observed at sea, 75% were olive ridleys.

(Kelez et al. 2009). Among longline fisheries in the ETP, olive ridleys were the most frequent bycatch off northern Peru, Ecuador, and Central America; bycatch rates there were higher than those further south, and no olive ridleys were reported from longline fisheries between 2001 and 2005 (Donoso and Dutton 2010). Among gillnet fisheries, olive ridleys were rare in the bycatch of the Chilean swordfish gillnet fishery, and were included with other species in the bycatch of driftnets targeting sharks and rays off Peru (Kelez et al. 2010). Olive ridleys are considered rare in the survey area, and Chandler (1991) suggests that only an extreme extension of migrants occur in Chile. Olive ridley's are not expected to be encountered in the survey area.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Proposed Action

(1) Direct Effects on Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles and Their Significance

The material in this section includes a summary of the anticipated effects (or lack thereof) on marine mammals and sea turtles of the airgun system to be used by SIO. A more detailed review of airgun effects on marine mammals appears in Appendix A. That Appendix is similar to corresponding parts of previous EAs and associated IHA applications concerning other SIO and L-DEO seismic surveys since 2003, but was updated by LGL in 2009. Appendix B contains a general review of the effects of seismic pulses on sea turtles. This section also includes a discussion of the potential impacts of operations by SIO's multi-beam echosounder (MBES) and sub-bottom profiler (SBP).

Finally, this section includes estimates of the numbers of marine mammals that could be affected by the proposed activity during the seismic survey scheduled to occur during May 2012. A description of the rationale for SIO's estimates of the numbers of exposures to various received sound levels that could occur during the planned seismic program is also provided.

(a) Summary of Potential Effects of Airgun Sounds

The effects of sounds from airguns could include one or more of the following: tolerance, masking of natural sounds, behavioral disturbance, and at least in theory, temporary or permanent hearing impairment, or non-auditory physical or physiological effects (Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Southall et al. 2007). Permanent hearing impairment, in the unlikely event that it occurred, would constitute injury, but temporary threshold shift (TTS) is not an injury (Southall et al. 2007). Although the possibility cannot be entirely excluded, it is unlikely that the project would result in any cases of temporary or especially permanent hearing impairment, or any significant non-auditory physical or physiological effects. Some behavioral disturbance is expected, but this would be localized and short-term.

Tolerance.—Numerous studies have shown that pulsed sounds from airguns are often readily detectable in the water at distances of many kilometers. For a summary of the characteristics of airgun pulses, see Appendix A (3). Several studies have shown that marine mammals at distances more than a few kilometers from operating seismic vessels often show no apparent response—see Appendix A (5). That is often true even in cases when the pulsed sounds must be readily audible to the animals based on measured received levels and the hearing sensitivity of that mammal group. Although various baleen whales, toothed whales, and (less frequently) pinnipeds have been shown to react behaviorally to airgun pulses under some conditions, at other times mammals of all three types have shown no overt reactions. In general, pinnipeds usually seem to be more tolerant of exposure to airgun pulses than are cetaceans,

with the relative responsiveness of baleen and toothed whales being variable. During active seismic surveys, sea turtles typically do not show overt reactions to airgun pulses.

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 very 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. 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 seismic pulses (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986; McDonald et al. 1995; Greene et al. 1999a,b; Nieukirk et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b, 2006; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). However, Clark and Gagnon (2006) reported that fin whales in the northeast Pacific Ocean went silent for an extended period starting soon after the onset of a seismic survey in the area. Similarly, there has been one report that sperm whales ceased calling when exposed to pulses from a very distant seismic ship (Bowles et al. 1994). However, more recent studies found that sperm whales continued calling in the presence of seismic pulses (Madsen et al. 2002; Tyack et al. 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2006; Jochens et al. 2008). Dolphins and porpoises commonly are heard calling while airguns are operating (e.g., Gordon et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b; Potter et al. 2007). 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. Masking effects on marine mammals are discussed further in Appendix A (4). We are not aware of any information concerning masking of hearing in sea turtles.

Disturbance Reactions.—Disturbance includes a variety of effects, including subtle to conspicuous changes in behavior, movement, and displacement. Based on NMFS (2001, p. 9293), NRC (2005), and Southall et al. (2007), we assume that simple exposure to sound, or brief reactions that do not disrupt behavioral patterns in a potentially significant manner, do not constitute harassment or “taking”. By potentially significant, we mean “in a manner that might have deleterious effects to the well-being of individual marine mammals or their populations”.

Reactions to sound, if any, depend on species, state of maturity, experience, current activity, reproductive state, time of day, and many other factors (Richardson et al. 1995; Wartzok et al. 2004; Southall et al. 2007; Weilgart 2007). If a marine mammal 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). Given the many uncertainties in predicting the quantity and types of impacts of noise on marine mammals, it is common practice to estimate how many mammals would be present within a particular distance of industrial activities and/or exposed to a particular level of industrial sound. In most cases, this approach likely overestimates the numbers of marine mammals that would be affected in some biologically-important manner.

The sound criteria used to estimate how many marine mammals might be disturbed to some biologically-important degree by a seismic program are based primarily on behavioral observations of a few species. Detailed studies have been done on humpback, gray, bowhead, and sperm whales. Less detailed data are available for some other species of baleen whales, small toothed whales, and sea otters, but for many species there are no data on responses to marine seismic surveys.

Baleen Whales

Baleen whales generally tend to avoid operating airguns, but avoidance radii are quite variable. Whales are often reported to show no overt reactions to pulses from large arrays of airguns at distances beyond a few kilometers, even though the airgun pulses remain well above ambient noise levels out to much longer distances. However, as reviewed in Appendix A (5), baleen whales exposed to strong noise pulses from airguns often react by deviating from their normal migration route and/or interrupting their feeding and moving away. In the cases of migrating gray and bowhead whales, the observed changes in behavior appeared to be of little or no biological consequence to the animals. They simply avoided the sound source by displacing their migration route to varying degrees, but within the natural boundaries of the migration corridors.

Studies of gray, bowhead, and humpback whales have shown that seismic pulses with received levels of 160–170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ seem to cause obvious avoidance behavior in a substantial fraction of the animals exposed (Richardson et al. 1995). In many areas, seismic pulses from large arrays of airguns diminish to those levels at distances ranging from 4 to 15 km from the source. A substantial proportion of the baleen whales within those distances may show avoidance or other strong behavioral reactions to the airgun array. Subtle behavioral changes sometimes become evident at somewhat lower received levels, and studies summarized in Appendix A (5) have shown that some species of baleen whales, notably bowhead and humpback whales, at times show strong avoidance at received levels lower than 160–170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$.

Responses of *humpback whales* to seismic surveys have been studied during migration, on summer feeding grounds, and on Angolan winter breeding grounds; there has also been discussion of effects on the Brazilian wintering grounds. McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a) studied the responses of humpback whales off Western Australia to a full-scale seismic survey with a 16-airgun, 2678-in³ array, and to a single 20-in³ airgun with source level 227 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}\cdot\text{m}_{\text{p-p}}$. McCauley et al. (1998) documented that avoidance reactions began at 5–8 km from the array, and that those reactions kept most pods ~3–4 km from the operating seismic boat. McCauley et al. (2000a) noted localized displacement during migration of 4–5 km by traveling pods and 7–12 km by more sensitive resting pods of cow-calf pairs. Avoidance distances with respect to the single airgun were smaller but consistent with the results from the full array in terms of the received sound levels. The mean received level for initial avoidance of an approaching airgun was 140 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ for humpback pods containing females, and at the mean closest point of approach (CPA) distance the received level was 143 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. The initial avoidance response generally occurred at distances of 5–8 km from the airgun array and 2 km from the single airgun. However, some individual humpback whales, especially males, approached within distances of 100–400 m, where the maximum received level was 179 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$.

Humpback whales on their summer feeding grounds in SE Alaska did not exhibit persistent avoidance when exposed to seismic pulses from a 1.64-L (100-in³) airgun (Malme et al. 1985). Some humpbacks seemed “startled” at received levels of 150–169 dB re 1 μPa . Malme et al. (1985) concluded that there was no clear evidence of avoidance, despite the possibility of subtle effects, at received levels up to 172 re 1 μPa on an approximate rms basis.

It has been suggested that South Atlantic humpback whales wintering off Brazil may be displaced or even strand upon exposure to seismic surveys (Engel et al. 2004). The evidence for this was circumstantial and subject to alternative explanations (IAGC 2004). Also, the evidence was not consistent with subsequent results from the same area of Brazil (Parente et al. 2006), or with direct studies of humpbacks exposed to seismic surveys in other areas and seasons. After allowance for data from subsequent years, there was “no observable direct correlation” between strandings and seismic surveys (IWC 2007:236).

There are no data on reactions of *right whales* to seismic surveys, but results from the closely-related *bowhead whale* show that their responsiveness can be quite variable depending on their activity (migrating vs. feeding). Bowhead whales migrating west across the Alaskan Beaufort Sea in autumn, in particular, are unusually responsive, with substantial avoidance occurring out to distances of 20–30 km from a medium-sized airgun source at received sound levels of around 120–130 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ [Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999; see Appendix A (5)]. However, more recent research on bowhead whales (Miller et al. 2005; Harris et al. 2007) corroborates earlier evidence that, during the summer feeding season, bowheads are not as sensitive to seismic sources. Nonetheless, subtle but statistically significant changes in surfacing–respiration–dive cycles were evident upon analysis (Richardson et al. 1986). In summer, bowheads typically begin to show avoidance reactions at received levels of about 152–178 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ (Richardson et al. 1986, 1995; Ljungblad et al. 1988; Miller et al. 2005).

Reactions of migrating and feeding (but not wintering) *gray whales* to seismic surveys have been studied. Malme et al. (1986, 1988) studied the responses of feeding eastern Pacific gray whales to pulses from a single 100-in³ airgun off St. Lawrence Island in the northern Bering Sea. They estimated, based on small sample sizes, that 50% of feeding gray whales stopped feeding at an average received pressure level of 173 dB re 1 μPa on an (approximate) rms basis, and that 10% of feeding whales interrupted feeding at received levels of 163 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. Those findings were generally consistent with the results of experiments conducted on larger numbers of gray whales that were migrating along the California coast (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985), and western Pacific gray whales feeding off Sakhalin Island, Russia (Würsig et al. 1999; Gailey et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2007; Yazvenko et al. 2007a,b), along with data on gray whales off B.C., Canada (Bain and Williams 2006).

Various species of *Balaenoptera* (blue, sei, fin, and minke whales) have occasionally been seen in areas ensonified by airgun pulses (Stone 2003; MacLean and Haley 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006), and calls from blue and fin whales have been localized in areas with airgun operations (e.g., McDonald et al. 1995; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). Sightings by observers on seismic vessels off the United Kingdom from 1997 to 2000 suggest that, during times of good sightability, sighting rates for mysticetes (mainly fin and sei whales) were similar when large arrays of airguns were shooting vs. silent (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). However, these whales tended to exhibit localized avoidance, remaining significantly further (on average) from the airgun array during seismic operations compared with non-seismic periods (Stone and Tasker 2006). In a study off Nova Scotia, Moulton and Miller (2005) found little difference in sighting rates (after accounting for water depth) and initial sighting distances of balaenopterid whales when airguns were operating vs. silent. However, there were indications that these whales were more likely to be moving away when seen during airgun operations. Similarly, ship-based monitoring studies of blue, fin, sei and minke whales offshore of Newfoundland (Orphan Basin and Laurentian Sub-basin) found no more than small differences in sighting rates and swim directions during seismic vs. non-seismic periods (Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a,b).

Data on short-term reactions by cetaceans to impulsive noises are not necessarily indicative of long-term or biologically significant effects. It is not known whether impulsive sounds affect reproductive rate or distribution and habitat use in subsequent days or years. However, gray whales have continued to migrate annually along the west coast of North America with substantial increases in the population over recent years, despite intermittent seismic exploration (and much ship traffic) in that area for decades (Appendix A in Malme et al. 1984; Richardson et al. 1995; Angliss and Allen 2009). The western Pacific gray whale population did not seem affected by a seismic survey in its feeding ground during a previous year (Johnson et al. 2007). Similarly, bowhead whales have continued to travel to the

eastern Beaufort Sea each summer, and their numbers have increased notably, despite seismic exploration in their summer and autumn range for many years (Richardson et al. 1987; Angliss and Allen 2009).

Toothed Whales

Little systematic information is available about reactions of toothed whales to noise pulses. Few studies similar to the more extensive baleen whale/seismic pulse work summarized above and (in more detail) in Appendix A have been reported for toothed whales. However, there are recent systematic studies on sperm whales (e.g., Gordon et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). There is an increasing amount of information about responses of various odontocetes to seismic surveys based on monitoring studies (e.g., Stone 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Moulton and Miller 2005; Bain and Williams 2006; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Potter et al. 2007; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; Weir 2008; Barkaszi et al. 2009; Richardson et al. 2009).

Seismic operators and marine mammal observers on seismic vessels regularly see dolphins and other small toothed whales near operating airgun arrays, but in general there is a tendency for most delphinids to show some avoidance of operating seismic vessels (e.g., Goold 1996a,b,c; Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; Stone 2003; Moulton and Miller 2005; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008; Richardson et al. 2009; see also Barkaszi et al. 2009). Some dolphins seem to be attracted to the seismic vessel and floats, and some ride the bow wave of the seismic vessel even when large arrays of airguns are firing (e.g., Moulton and Miller 2005). Nonetheless, small toothed whales more often tend to head away, or to maintain a somewhat greater distance from the vessel, when a large array of airguns is operating than when it is silent (e.g., Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008). In most cases the avoidance radii for delphinids appear to be small, on the order of 1 km less, and some individuals show no apparent avoidance. The beluga is a species that (at least at times) shows long-distance avoidance of seismic vessels. Aerial surveys conducted in the southeastern Beaufort Sea during summer found that sighting rates of beluga whales were significantly lower at distances 10–20 km compared with 20–30 km from an operating airgun array, and observers on seismic boats in that area rarely see belugas (Miller et al. 2005; Harris et al. 2007).

Captive bottlenose dolphins and beluga whales exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to strong pulsed sounds similar in duration to those typically used in seismic surveys (Finneran et al. 2000, 2002, 2005). However, the animals tolerated high received levels of sound before exhibiting aversive behaviors.

Results for porpoises depend on species. The limited available data suggest that harbor porpoises show stronger avoidance of seismic operations than do Dall's porpoises (Stone 2003; MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006). Dall's porpoises seem relatively tolerant of airgun operations (MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006), although they too have been observed to avoid large arrays of operating airguns (Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; Bain and Williams 2006). This apparent difference in responsiveness of these two porpoise species is consistent with their relative responsiveness to boat traffic and some other acoustic sources (Richardson et al. 1995; Southall et al. 2007).

Most studies of sperm whales exposed to airgun sounds indicate that the sperm whale shows considerable tolerance of airgun pulses (e.g., Stone 2003; Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008). In most cases the whales do not show strong avoidance, and they continue to call (see Appendix A for review). However, controlled exposure experiments in the Gulf of Mexico indicate that foraging behavior was altered upon exposure to airgun sound (Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009; Tyack 2009).

There are almost no specific data on the behavioral reactions of beaked whales to seismic surveys. However, some northern bottlenose whales remained in the general area and continued to produce high-frequency clicks when exposed to sound pulses from distant seismic surveys (Gosselin and Lawson 2004; Laurinolli and Cochrane 2005; Simard et al. 2005). Most beaked whales tend to avoid approaching vessels of other types (e.g., Würsig et al. 1998). They may also dive for an extended period when approached by a vessel (e.g., Kasuya 1986), although it is uncertain how much longer such dives may be as compared to dives by undisturbed beaked whales, which also are often quite long (Baird et al. 2006; Tyack et al. 2006). In any event, it is likely that most beaked whales would also show strong avoidance of an approaching seismic vessel, although this has not been documented explicitly.

There are increasing indications that some beaked whales tend to strand when naval exercises involving mid-frequency sonar operation are ongoing nearby (e.g., Simmonds and Lopez-Jurado 1991; Frantzis 1998; NOAA and USN 2001; Jepson et al. 2003; Hildebrand 2005; Barlow and Gisiner 2006; see also the “Strandings and Mortality” subsection, later). These strandings are apparently at least in part a disturbance response, although auditory or other injuries or other physiological effects may also be involved. Whether beaked whales would ever react similarly to seismic surveys is unknown (see “Strandings and Mortality”, below). Seismic survey sounds are quite different from those of the sonars in operation during the above-cited incidents.

Odontocete reactions to large arrays of airguns are variable and, at least for delphinids and Dall’s porpoises, seem to be confined to a smaller radius than has been observed for the more responsive of the mysticetes, belugas, and harbor porpoises (Appendix A). A ≥ 170 dB re 1 μ Pa disturbance criterion (rather than ≥ 160 dB) is considered appropriate for delphinids (and pinnipeds), which tend to be less responsive than the more responsive cetaceans.

Pinnipeds

Pinnipeds are not likely to show a strong avoidance reaction to the airgun array. Visual monitoring from seismic vessels has shown only slight (if any) avoidance of airguns by pinnipeds, and only slight (if any) changes in behavior—see Appendix A (5). In the Beaufort Sea, some ringed seals avoided an area of 100 m to (at most) a few hundred meters around seismic vessels, but many seals remained within 100–200 m of the trackline as the operating airgun array passed by (e.g., Harris et al. 2001; Moulton and Lawson 2002; Miller et al. 2005). Ringed seal sightings averaged somewhat farther away from the seismic vessel when the airguns were operating than when they were not, but the difference was small (Moulton and Lawson 2002). Similarly, in Puget Sound, sighting distances for harbor seals and California sea lions tended to be larger when airguns were operating (Calambokidis and Osmeck 1998). Previous telemetry work suggests that avoidance and other behavioral reactions may be stronger than evident to date from visual studies (Thompson et al. 1998). Even if reactions of any pinnipeds that might be encountered in the present study area are as strong as those evident in the telemetry study, reactions are expected to be confined to relatively small distances and durations, with no long-term effects on pinniped individuals or populations. As for delphinids, a ≥ 170 dB disturbance criterion is considered appropriate for pinnipeds, which tend to be less responsive than many cetaceans.

Sea Turtles

The limited available data indicate that sea turtles will hear airgun sounds and sometimes exhibit localized avoidance (see Appendix B). Based on available data, it is likely that sea turtles will exhibit behavioral changes and/or avoidance within an area of unknown size near a seismic vessel (e.g., Holst et al. 2005a, 2006; Holst and Smultea 2008). Observed responses of sea turtles to airguns are reviewed in Appendix B. To the extent that there are any impacts on sea turtles, seismic operations in or near areas where turtles concentrate are likely to have the greatest impact. There are no specific data that demon-

strate the consequences to sea turtles if seismic operations with large or small arrays of airguns occur in important areas at biologically important times of year.

Additional details on the behavioral reactions (or the lack thereof) by all types of marine mammals to seismic vessels can be found in Appendix A (5). Corresponding details for sea turtles can be found in Appendix B.

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.—Temporary or permanent hearing impairment is a possibility when marine mammals are exposed to very strong sounds. TTS has been demonstrated and studied in certain captive odontocetes and pinnipeds exposed to strong sounds (reviewed in Southall et al. 2007). However, there has been no specific documentation of TTS let alone permanent hearing damage, i.e., permanent threshold shift (PTS), in free-ranging marine mammals exposed to sequences of airgun pulses during realistic field conditions. Current NMFS policy regarding exposure of marine mammals to high-level sounds is that cetaceans and pinnipeds should not be exposed to impulsive sounds with received levels ≥ 180 dB and 190 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$, respectively (NMFS 2000). Those criteria have been used in establishing the exclusion (=shut-down) zones planned for the proposed seismic survey. However, those criteria were established before there was any information about minimum received levels of sounds necessary to cause auditory impairment in marine mammals. As discussed in Appendix A (6) and summarized here,

- the 180-dB criterion for cetaceans is probably quite precautionary, i.e., lower than necessary to avoid temporary auditory impairment let alone permanent auditory injury, at least for delphinids.
- TTS is not injury and does not constitute “Level A harassment” in U.S. MMPA terminology.
- the minimum sound level necessary to cause permanent hearing impairment (“Level A harassment”) is higher, by a variable and generally unknown amount, than the level that induces barely-detectable TTS.
- the level associated with the onset of TTS is often considered to be a level below which there is no danger of permanent damage. The actual PTS threshold is likely to be well above the level causing onset of TTS (Southall et al. 2007).

Recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria for marine mammals, frequency-weighting procedures, and related matters were published in 2007 (Southall et al. 2007). Those recommendations have not, as of now, been formally adopted by NMFS for use in regulatory processes and during mitigation programs associated with seismic surveys. However, some aspects of the recommendations have been taken into account in certain environmental impact statements and small-take authorizations. NMFS has indicated that it may issue new noise exposure criteria for marine mammals that account for the now-available scientific data on TTS, the expected offset between the TTS and PTS thresholds, differences in the acoustic frequencies to which different marine mammal groups are sensitive (e.g., M-weighting or generalized frequency weightings for various groups of marine mammals, allowing for their functional bandwidths), and other relevant factors. Preliminary information about possible changes in the regulatory and mitigation requirements, and about the possible structure of new criteria, was given by Wieting (2004) and NMFS (2005).

Several aspects of the planned monitoring and mitigation measures for this project are designed to detect marine mammals occurring near the airgun array, and to avoid exposing them to sound pulses that might, at least in theory, cause hearing impairment (see § II, “Monitoring and Mitigation Measures”). In addition, many cetaceans and (to a limited degree) sea turtles show some avoidance of the area where received levels of airgun sound are high enough such that hearing impairment could potentially occur. In

those cases, the avoidance responses of the animals themselves will reduce or (most likely) avoid any possibility of hearing impairment.

Non-auditory physical effects may also occur in marine mammals exposed to strong underwater pulsed sound. Possible types of non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that might (in theory) occur in mammals close to a strong sound source include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, and other types of organ or tissue damage. It is possible that some marine mammal species (i.e., beaked whales) may be especially susceptible to injury and/or stranding when exposed to strong transient sounds. However, as discussed below, there is no definitive evidence that any of these effects occur even for marine mammals in close proximity to large arrays of airguns. It is unlikely that any effects of these types would occur during the present project given the brief duration of exposure of any given mammal and the planned monitoring and mitigation measures (see below). The following subsections discuss in somewhat more detail the possibilities of TTS, PTS, and non-auditory physical effects.

Temporary Threshold Shift

TTS is the mildest form of hearing impairment that can occur during exposure to a strong sound (Kryter 1985). While experiencing TTS, the hearing threshold rises and a sound must be stronger in order to be heard. At least in terrestrial mammals, TTS can last from minutes or hours to (in cases of strong TTS) days. For sound exposures at or somewhat above the TTS threshold, hearing sensitivity in both terrestrial and marine mammals recovers rapidly after exposure to the noise ends. Few data on sound levels and durations necessary to elicit mild TTS have been obtained for marine mammals, and none of the published data concern TTS elicited by exposure to multiple pulses of sound. Available data on TTS in marine mammals are summarized in Southall et al. (2007).

For toothed whales exposed to single short pulses, the TTS threshold appears to be, to a first approximation, a function of the energy content of the pulse (Finneran et al. 2002, 2005). Given the available data, the received energy level of a single seismic pulse (with no frequency weighting) might need to be ~ 186 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (i.e., 186 dB SEL or ~ 196 – 201 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$) in order to produce brief, mild TTS³. Exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each have received levels near 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ might result in cumulative exposure of ~ 186 dB SEL and thus slight TTS in a small odontocete assuming the TTS threshold is (to a first approximation) a function of the total received pulse energy; however, this ‘equal-energy’ concept is an oversimplification. The distances from the *Melville’s* airguns at which the received energy level (per pulse, flat-weighted) would be expected to be ≥ 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ are estimated in Table 1. Levels ≥ 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ are expected to be restricted to radii no more than 20 m (Table 1). For an odontocete closer to the surface, the maximum radius with ≥ 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ would be smaller.

The above TTS information for odontocetes is derived from studies on the bottlenose dolphin and beluga. For the one harbor porpoise tested, the received level of airgun sound that elicited onset of TTS was lower (Lucke et al. 2009). If these results from a single animal are representative, it is inappropriate to assume that onset of TTS occurs at similar received levels in all odontocetes (*cf.* Southall et al. 2007). Some cetaceans apparently can incur TTS at considerably lower sound exposures than are necessary to elicit TTS in the beluga or bottlenose dolphin.

³ If the low frequency components of the watergun sound used in the experiments of Finneran et al. (2002) are downweighted as recommended by Miller et al. (2005) and Southall et al. (2007) using their M_{mf} -weighting curve, the effective exposure level for onset of mild TTS was 183 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (Southall et al. 2007).

For baleen whales, there are no data, direct or indirect, on levels or properties of sound that are required to induce TTS. The frequencies to which baleen whales are most sensitive are assumed to be lower than those to which odontocetes are most sensitive, and natural background noise levels at those low frequencies tend to be higher. As a result, auditory thresholds of baleen whales within their frequency band of best hearing are believed to be higher (less sensitive) than are those of odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). From this, it is suspected that received levels causing TTS onset may also be higher in baleen whales (Southall et al. 2007). In any event, no cases of TTS are expected given the strong likelihood that baleen whales would avoid the approaching airguns (or vessel) before being exposed to levels high enough for TTS to occur, as well as the mitigation measures that are planned.

In pinnipeds, TTS thresholds associated with exposure to brief pulses (single or multiple) of underwater sound have not been measured. Initial evidence from more prolonged (non-pulse) exposures suggested that some pinnipeds (harbor seals in particular) incur TTS at somewhat lower received levels than do small odontocetes exposed for similar durations (Kastak et al. 1999, 2005; Ketten et al. 2001). The TTS threshold for pulsed sounds has been indirectly estimated as being an SEL of ~ 171 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (Southall et al. 2007), which would be equivalent to a single pulse with received level ~ 181 – 186 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$, or a series of pulses for which the highest rms values are a few dB lower. Corresponding values for California sea lions and northern elephant seals are likely to be higher (Kastak et al. 2005).

NMFS (1995, 2000) concluded that cetaceans and pinnipeds should not be exposed to pulsed underwater noise at received levels exceeding, respectively, 180 and 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. Those sound levels are *not* considered to be the level above which TTS might occur. Rather, they were the received levels above which, in the view of a panel of bioacoustics specialists convened by NMFS before TTS measurements for marine mammals started to become available, one could not be certain that there would be no injurious effects, auditory or otherwise, to marine mammals. As summarized above and in Southall et al. (2007), data that are now available imply that TTS is unlikely to occur in most odontocetes (and probably mysticetes as well) unless they are exposed to a sequence of several airgun pulses stronger than 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. For the harbor seal and any species with similarly low TTS thresholds, TTS may occur upon exposure to one or more airgun pulses whose received level equals the NMFS “do not exceed” value of 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. That criterion corresponds to a single-pulse SEL of 175–180 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ in typical conditions, whereas TTS is suspected to be possible (in harbor seals) with a cumulative SEL of ~ 171 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$.

Permanent Threshold Shift

When PTS occurs, there is physical damage to the sound receptors in the ear. In severe cases, there can be total or partial deafness, whereas in other cases, the animal has an impaired ability to hear sounds in specific frequency ranges (Kryter 1985).

There is no specific evidence that exposure to pulses of airgun sound can cause PTS in any marine mammal, even with large arrays of airguns. However, given the possibility that mammals close to an airgun array might incur at least mild TTS, there has been further speculation about the possibility that some individuals occurring very close to airguns might incur PTS (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995, p. 372ff; Gedamke et al. 2008). Single or occasional occurrences of mild TTS are not indicative of permanent auditory damage, but repeated or (in some cases) single exposures to a level well above that causing TTS onset might elicit PTS.

Relationships between TTS and PTS thresholds have not been studied in marine mammals, but are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals. PTS might occur at a received sound level at least several decibels above that inducing mild TTS if the animal were exposed to strong sound pulses with rapid rise time—see Appendix A (6). Based on data from terrestrial mammals, a pre-

cautionary assumption is that the PTS threshold for impulse sounds (such as airgun pulses as received close to the source) is *at least* 6 dB higher than the TTS threshold on a peak-pressure basis, and probably >6 dB (Southall et al. 2007). On an SEL basis, Southall et al. (2007:441-4) estimated that received levels would need to exceed the TTS threshold by at least 15 dB for there to be risk of PTS. Thus, for cetaceans they estimate that the PTS threshold might be an M-weighted SEL (for the sequence of received pulses) of ~198 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (15 dB higher than the M_{mf} -weighted TTS threshold, in a beluga, for a wateregun impulse), where the SEL value is cumulated over the sequence of pulses. Additional assumptions had to be made to derive a corresponding estimate for pinnipeds, as the only available data on TTS-thresholds in pinnipeds pertain to non-impulse sound. Southall et al. (2007) estimate that the PTS threshold could be a cumulative M_{pw} -weighted SEL of ~186 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ in the harbor seal exposed to impulse sound. The PTS threshold for the California sea lion and northern elephant seal the PTS threshold would probably be higher, given the higher TTS thresholds in those species.

Southall et al. (2007) also note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean or pinniped received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 230 or 218 dB re 1 μPa (peak), respectively. Thus, PTS might be expected upon exposure of cetaceans to either SEL ≥ 198 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ or peak pressure ≥ 230 dB re 1 μPa . Corresponding proposed dual criteria for pinnipeds (at least harbor seals) are ≥ 186 dB SEL and ≥ 218 dB peak pressure (Southall et al. 2007). These estimates are all first approximations, given the limited underlying data, assumptions, species differences, and evidence that the “equal energy” model is not be entirely correct. A peak pressure of 230 dB re 1 μPa (3.2 bar \cdot m, 0-pk) would only be found within less than a meter from a GI gun, which has a peak pressure of 224.6 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$. A peak pressure of 218 dB re 1 μPa could be received somewhat farther away; to estimate that specific distance, one would need to apply a model that accurately calculates peak pressures in the near-field around an array of airguns.

Given the higher level of sound necessary to cause PTS as compared with TTS, it is considerably less likely that PTS would occur. Baleen whales generally avoid the immediate area around operating seismic vessels, as do some other marine mammals and sea turtles. The planned monitoring and mitigation measures, including visual monitoring, ramp ups, and shut downs of the airguns when mammals are seen within or approaching the “exclusion zones”, will further reduce the probability of exposure of marine mammals to sounds strong enough to induce PTS.

Strandings and Mortality

Marine mammals close to underwater detonations of high explosives can be killed or severely injured, and the auditory organs are especially susceptible to injury (Ketten et al. 1993; Ketten 1995). However, explosives are no longer used for marine waters for commercial seismic surveys or (with rare exceptions) for seismic research; they have been replaced entirely by airguns or related non-explosive pulse generators. Airgun pulses are less energetic and have slower rise times, and there is no specific evidence that they can cause serious injury, death, or stranding even in the case of large airgun arrays. However, the association of strandings of beaked whales with naval exercises and, in one case, an L-DEO seismic survey (Malakoff 2002; Cox et al. 2006), has raised the possibility that beaked whales exposed to strong “pulsed” sounds may be especially susceptible to injury and/or behavioral reactions that can lead to stranding (e.g., Hildebrand 2005; Southall et al. 2007). Appendix A (6) provides additional details.

Specific sound-related processes that lead to strandings and mortality are not well documented, but may include (1) swimming in avoidance of a sound into shallow water; (2) a change in behavior (such as a change in diving behavior) that might contribute to tissue damage, gas bubble formation, hypoxia, cardiac arrhythmia, hypertensive hemorrhage or other forms of trauma; (3) a physiological change such as a vestibular response leading to a behavioral change or stress-induced hemorrhagic diathesis, leading in

turn to tissue damage; and (4) tissue damage directly from sound exposure, such as through acoustically mediated bubble formation and growth or acoustic resonance of tissues. Some of these mechanisms are unlikely to apply in the case of impulse sounds. However, there are increasing indications that gas-bubble disease (analogous to “the bends”), induced in supersaturated tissue by a behavioral response to acoustic exposure, could be a pathologic mechanism for the strandings and mortality of some deep-diving cetaceans exposed to sonar. The evidence for this remains circumstantial and associated with exposure to naval mid-frequency sonar, not seismic surveys (Cox et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007).

Seismic pulses and mid-frequency sonar signals are quite different, and some mechanisms by which sonar sounds have been hypothesized to affect beaked whales are unlikely to apply to airgun pulses. Sounds produced by airgun arrays are broadband impulses with most of the energy below 1 kHz. Typical military mid-frequency sonars emit non-impulse sounds at frequencies of 2–10 kHz, generally with a relatively narrow bandwidth at any one time. A further difference between seismic surveys and naval exercises is that naval exercises can involve sound sources on more than one vessel. Thus, it is not appropriate to assume that there is a direct connection between the effects of military sonar and seismic surveys on marine mammals. However, evidence that sonar signals can, in special circumstances, lead (at least indirectly) to physical damage and mortality (e.g., Balcomb and Claridge 2001; NOAA and USN 2001; Jepson et al. 2003; Fernández et al. 2004, 2005; Hildebrand 2005; Cox et al. 2006) suggests that caution is warranted when dealing with exposure of marine mammals to any high-intensity “pulsed” sound.

There is no conclusive evidence of cetacean strandings or deaths at sea as a result of exposure to seismic surveys, but a few cases of strandings in the general area where a seismic survey was ongoing have led to speculation concerning a possible link between seismic surveys and strandings. Suggestions that there was a link between seismic surveys and strandings of humpback whales in Brazil (Engel et al. 2004) were not well founded (IAGC 2004; IWC 2007). In September 2002, there was a stranding of two Cuvier’s beaked whales in the Gulf of California, Mexico, when the L-DEO vessel R/V *Maurice Ewing* was operating a 20-airgun, 8490-in³ airgun array in the general area. The link between the stranding and the seismic surveys was inconclusive and not based on any physical evidence (Hogarth 2002; Yoder 2002). Nonetheless, the Gulf of California incident plus the beaked whale strandings near naval exercises involving use of mid-frequency sonar suggests a need for caution in conducting seismic surveys in areas occupied by beaked whales until more is known about effects of seismic surveys on those species (Hildebrand 2005). No injuries of beaked whales are anticipated during the proposed study because of (1) the high likelihood that any beaked whales nearby would avoid the approaching vessel before being exposed to high sound levels, (2) the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures, and (3) differences between the sound sources operated by SIO and those involved in the naval exercises associated with strandings.

Non-auditory Physiological Effects

Non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that theoretically might occur in marine mammals exposed to strong underwater sound include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, resonance, and other types of organ or tissue damage (Cox et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007). Studies examining such effects are limited. However, resonance effects (Gentry 2002) and direct noise-induced bubble formation (Crum et al. 2005) are implausible in the case of exposure to an impulsive broadband source like an airgun array. If seismic surveys disrupt diving patterns of deep-diving species, this might perhaps result in bubble formation and a form of “the bends”, as speculated to occur in beaked whales exposed to sonar. However, there is no specific evidence of this upon exposure to airgun pulses.

In general, very little is known about the potential for seismic survey sounds (or other types of strong underwater sounds) to cause non-auditory physical effects in marine mammals. Such effects, if they occur at all, would presumably be limited to short distances and to activities that extend over a prolonged period. The available data do not allow identification of a specific exposure level above which non-auditory effects can be expected (Southall et al. 2007), or any meaningful quantitative predictions of the numbers (if any) of marine mammals that might be affected in those ways. Marine mammals that show behavioral avoidance of seismic vessels, including most baleen whales, some odontocetes, and some pinnipeds, are especially unlikely to incur non-auditory physical effects. Also, the planned mitigation measures [§ II (3)], including shut downs of the airguns, will reduce any such effects that might otherwise occur.

Sea Turtles

The limited available data indicate that the frequency range of best hearing sensitivity by sea turtles extends from roughly 250–300 Hz to 500–700 Hz. Sensitivity deteriorates as one moves away from that range to either lower or higher frequencies. However, there is some sensitivity to frequencies as low as 60 Hz, and probably as low as 30 Hz. Thus, there is substantial overlap in the frequencies that sea turtles detect vs. the frequencies in airgun pulses. We are not aware of measurements of the absolute hearing thresholds of any sea turtle to waterborne sounds similar to airgun pulses. In the absence of relevant absolute threshold data, we cannot estimate how far away an airgun array might be audible. Moein et al. (1994) and Lenhardt (2002) reported TTS for loggerhead turtles exposed to many airgun pulses (Appendix B). This suggests that sounds from an airgun array might cause temporary hearing impairment in sea turtles if they do not avoid the (unknown) radius where TTS occurs. However, exposure duration during the planned surveys would be much less than during the aforementioned studies. Also, recent monitoring studies show that some sea turtles do show localized movement away from approaching airguns (Holst et al. 2005a, 2006; Holst and Smultea 2008). At short distances from the source, received sound level diminishes rapidly with increasing distance. In that situation, even a small-scale avoidance response could result in a significant reduction in sound exposure.

As noted above, the MMOs stationed on the *Melville* will also watch for sea turtles, and airgun operations will be powered down (or shut down if necessary) when a turtle enters the designated exclusion zone.

(b) Possible Effects of Multibeam Echosounder Signals

The Kongsberg EM 122 MBES will be operated from the source vessel during the planned study. Information about this equipment was provided in § II. Sounds from the MBES are very short pings, occurring for 2–15 ms once every 5–20 s, depending on water depth; at depths >2600 m, FM chirp pulses up to 100 ms long are used. Most of the energy in the sound emitted by this MBES is at frequencies near 12 kHz, and the maximum source level is 242 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{\text{rms}}$. The beam is narrow (1°) in the fore-aft extent and wide (150°) in the cross-track extent. Each ping consists of eight (in water >1000 m deep) or four (<1000 m deep) successive fan-shaped transmissions (segments) at different cross-track angles. Any given mammal at depth near the trackline would be in the main beam for only one or two of the nine segments. Also, marine mammals that encounter the Kongsberg EM 122 are unlikely to be subjected to repeated pings because of the narrow fore-aft width of the beam and will receive only limited amounts of energy because of the short pings. Animals close to the ship (where the beam is narrowest) are especially unlikely to be ensonified for more than one 2–15-ms ping or 100-ms chirp (or two pings or chirps if in the overlap area). Similarly, Kremser et al. (2005) noted that the probability of a cetacean swimming through the area of exposure when an MBES emits a ping is small. The animal would have to pass the transducer

at close range and be swimming at speeds similar to the vessel in order to receive the multiple pings that might result in sufficient exposure to cause TTS.

Navy sonars that have been linked to avoidance reactions and stranding of cetaceans (1) generally have a longer signal duration than the Kongsberg EM 122, and (2) are often directed close to horizontally vs. more downward for the MBES. The area of possible influence of the MBES is much smaller—a narrow band below the source vessel. The duration of exposure for a given marine mammal can be much longer for a naval sonar. During SIO's operations, the individual pings will be very short, and a given mammal would not receive many of the downward-directed pings as the vessel passes by. Possible effects of an MBES on marine mammals are outlined below.

Masking.—Marine mammal communications will not be masked appreciably by the MBES signals given the low duty cycle of the echosounder and the brief period when an individual mammal is likely to be within its beam. Furthermore, in the case of baleen whales, the MBES signals (12 kHz) do not overlap with the predominant frequencies in the calls, which would avoid any significant masking.

Behavioral Responses.—Behavioral reactions of free-ranging marine mammals to sonars, echosounders, and other sound sources appear to vary by species and circumstance. Observed reactions have included silencing and dispersal by sperm whales (Watkins et al. 1985), increased vocalizations and no dispersal by pilot whales (Rendell and Gordon 1999), and the previously mentioned beachings by beaked whales. During exposure to a 21–25 kHz “whale-finding” sonar with a source level of 215 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$, gray whales reacted by orienting slightly away from the source and being deflected from their course by ~200 m (Frankel 2005). When a 38-kHz echosounder and a 150-kHz acoustic Doppler current profiler were transmitting during studies in the ETP, baleen whales showed no significant responses, while spotted and spinner dolphins were detected slightly more often and beaked whales less often during visual surveys (Gerrodette and Pettis 2005).

Captive bottlenose dolphins and a white whale exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to 1-s tonal signals at frequencies similar to those that will be emitted by the MBES used by SIO, and to shorter broadband pulsed signals. Behavioral changes typically involved what appeared to be deliberate attempts to avoid the sound exposure (Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002; Finneran and Schlundt 2004). The relevance of those data to free-ranging odontocetes is uncertain, and in any case, the test sounds were quite different in duration as compared with those from an MBES.

Very few data are available on the reactions of pinnipeds to echosounder sounds at frequencies similar to those used during seismic operations. Hastie and Janik (2007) conducted a series of behavioral response tests on two captive gray seals to determine their reactions to underwater operation of a 375-kHz multibeam imaging echosounder that included significant signal components down to 6 kHz. Results indicated that the two seals reacted to the signal by significantly increasing their dive durations. Because of the likely brevity of exposure to the MBES sounds, pinniped reactions are expected to be limited to startle or otherwise brief responses of no lasting consequence to the animals.

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.—Given recent stranding events that have been associated with the operation of naval sonar, there is concern that mid-frequency sonar sounds can cause serious impacts to marine mammals (see above). However, the MBES proposed for use by SIO is quite different than sonars used for navy operations. Ping duration of the MBES is very short relative to the naval sonars. Also, at any given location, an individual marine mammal would be in the beam of the MBES for much less time given the generally downward orientation of the beam and its narrow fore-aft beamwidth; navy sonars often use near-horizontally-directed sound. Those factors would all reduce the sound energy received from the MBES rather drastically relative to that from the sonars used by the navy.

Given the maximum source level of 242 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{\text{rms}}$ (see § II), the received level for an animal within the MBES beam 100 m below the ship would be ~ 202 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$, assuming 40 dB of spreading loss over 100 m (circular spreading). Given the narrow beam, only one ping is likely to be received by a given animal as the ship passes overhead. The received energy level from a single ping of duration 15 ms would be about 184 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$, i.e., 202 dB + 10 log (0.015 s). That is below the TTS threshold for a cetacean receiving a single non-impulse sound (195 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$) and even further below the anticipated PTS threshold (215 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$) (Southall et al. 2007). In contrast, an animal that was only 10 m below the MBES when a ping is emitted would be expected to receive a level ~ 20 dB higher, i.e., 204 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ in the case of the EM 122. That animal might incur some TTS (which would be fully recoverable), but the exposure would still be below the anticipated PTS threshold for cetaceans. As noted by Burkhardt et al. (2008), cetaceans are very unlikely to incur PTS from operation of scientific sonars on a ship that is underway.

In the harbor seal, the TTS threshold for non-impulse sounds is about 183 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$, as compared with ~ 195 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ in odontocetes (Kastak et al. 2005; Southall et al. 2007). TTS onset occurs at higher received energy levels in the California sea lion and northern elephant seal than in the harbor seal. A harbor seal as much as 100 m below the *Melville* could receive a single MBES ping with received energy level of ≥ 184 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (as calculated in the toothed whale subsection above) and thus could incur slight TTS. Species of pinnipeds with higher TTS thresholds would not incur TTS unless they were closer to the transducers when a ping was emitted. However, the SEL criterion for PTS in pinnipeds (203 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$) might be exceeded for a ping received within a few meters of the transducers, although the risk of PTS is higher for certain species (e.g., harbor seal). Given the intermittent nature of the signals and the narrow MBES beam, only a small fraction of the pinnipeds below (and close to) the ship would receive a ping as the ship passed overhead.

Sea Turtles.—It is unlikely that MBES operations during the planned seismic survey would significantly affect sea turtles through masking, disturbance, or hearing impairment. Any effects would likely be negligible given the brief exposure and the fact that the MBES frequency is far above the range of optimal hearing by sea turtles (see Appendix B).

(c) Possible Effects of the Sub-bottom Profiler Signals

A sub-bottom profiler will be operated from the source vessel during the planned study. Details about this equipment were provided in § II. Sounds from the sub-bottom profiler are very short pulses, occurring for up to 64 ms once every second. Most of the energy in the sound pulses emitted by the sub-bottom profiler is at 3.5 kHz, and the beam is directed downward. The sub-bottom profiler on the R/V *Melville* has a maximum source level of 222 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$ (see § II). Kremser et al. (2005) noted that the probability of a cetacean swimming through the area of exposure when a bottom profiler emits a pulse is small, and—even for an SBP more powerful than that on the R/V *Melville*—if the animal was in the area, it would have to pass the transducer at close range and in order to be subjected to sound levels that could cause TTS.

Masking.—Marine mammal communications will not be masked appreciably by the SBP sounds given the directionality of the signal and the brief period when an individual mammal is likely to be within its beam. Furthermore, in the case of most baleen whales, the SBP signals do not overlap with the predominant frequencies in the calls, which would avoid significant masking.

Behavioral Responses.—Marine mammal behavioral reactions to other sound sources are discussed above, and responses to the SBP are likely to be similar to those for other non-impulse sources if received at the same levels. However, the signals from the SBP are considerably weaker than those

from the MBES. Therefore, behavioral responses are not expected unless marine mammals are very close to the source.

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects.—It is unlikely that the SBP produces sound levels strong enough to cause hearing impairment or other physical injuries even in an animal that is (briefly) in a position near the source. The SBP is usually operated simultaneously with other higher-power acoustic sources. Many marine mammals will move away in response to the approaching higher-power sources or the vessel itself before the mammals would be close enough for there to be any possibility of effects from the less intense sounds from the SBP. In the case of mammals that do not avoid the approaching vessel and its various sound sources, mitigation measures that would be applied to minimize effects of other sources [see § II(3)] would further reduce or eliminate any minor effects of the SBP.

Sea Turtles.—It is very unlikely that SBP operations during the planned seismic survey would significantly affect sea turtles through masking, disturbance, or hearing impairment. Any effects likely would be negligible given the brief exposure and relatively low source level. Also, the frequency of the SBP sounds is higher than the frequency range of best hearing by sea turtles.

(d) Possible Effects of Acoustic Release Signals

Once an OBS is ready to be retrieved, the acoustic release transponder used to communicate with the OBSs uses frequencies of 9–13 kHz. These signals will be used very intermittently. It is unlikely that the acoustic release signals would have a significant effect on marine mammals or sea turtles through masking, disturbance, or hearing impairment. Any effects likely would be negligible given the brief exposure at presumable low levels.

(e) Possible Non-acoustic Effects of Seismic Surveys

Possible non-acoustic effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals and/or sea turtles include disturbance by vessel noise, injury or mortality from collisions with vessels or entanglement in seismic gear, and effects of coring.

Vessel noise from the *Melville* could affect marine animals in the proposed survey area. Noise from large vessels generally dominates ambient noise at frequencies from 20 to 300 Hz (Richardson et al. 1995). Baleen whales are thought to be more sensitive to sound at these low frequencies than are toothed whales, possibly causing localized avoidance by marine mammals 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 rorquals (fin, blue, and minke 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).

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. Some dolphin species approach moving vessels to ride the bow or stern waves (Williams et al. 1992). 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) suggested that foraging efficiency of Cuvier's beaked whales can be reduced by close approach of vessels.

Another concern with vessel traffic is the potential for striking marine mammals. Jensen and Silber (2004) assembled a database of whale strikes reported throughout the world. Of the 292 records of

confirmed or possible ship strikes to large whales, most were reported in North America, but this may be an artifact of data collection procedures and/or decreased reporting in other global jurisdictions. The probability of a ship strike resulting in a lethal injury (mortality or severe injury) of a large cetacean increases with ship speed (Laist et al. 2001; Vanderlaan and Taggart 2007). Most lethal and severe injuries to large whales occur when vessels travel 14 kts or faster, and the probability of severe or lethal injury to a whale approaches 100% in the event of a direct strike when a ship is traveling faster than 15 kts (Laist et al. 2001; Vanderlaan and Taggart 2007). The probability of a ship strike is a function of vessel density, animal density, and vessel speed. Given the slow speed of the vessel (~5 kt), the probability of injurious or fatal strikes with mammals during the operations is considered to be low.

Sea turtles are also at risk from ship strikes. NMFS has recognized that sea turtles are highly susceptible to vessel collisions because they regularly surface to breathe and often rest at or near the surface. Of all dead sea turtle strandings recorded from Queensland, Australia, 14% were attributable to ship strikes (Hazel and Gyuris 2006). A study carried out to assess the ability of green turtles to avoid vessels in Morton Bay, Queensland, found that the proportion of turtles that displayed a flight response to approaching vessels decreased as speed increased, and that this was most notable for close encounters (Hazel et al. 2007). Turtles were observed to flee from slow-moving vessels (~4 km/hr) in 60% of observations (Hazel et al. 2007). This study also indicated that a turtle's ability to detect an approaching vessel was vision-dependent and so directly related to water clarity. Because the study was carried out using a small vessel (6-m boat with a 40-hp outboard motor) in shallow (2–4 m) water, it is uncertain how the results apply to the much larger seismic vessel in deeper water.

As noted above in § IV(1)(a) and in Appendix B, the limited available data indicate that sea turtles will hear airgun sounds and sometimes exhibit localized avoidance, thereby reducing the risk of a collision. Also, the probability of collision during the proposed seismic survey is expected to be low because few encounters with sea turtles are expected.

Entanglement of sea turtles in seismic gear is also a concern; whereas there have been reports of turtles being trapped and killed between the gaps in tail-buoys offshore from West Africa (Weir 2007). In April 2011, a dead olive ridley turtle was found in a deflector foil of the seismic gear on the R/V *Langseth* during equipment recovery at the conclusion of a survey off of Costa Rica, where sea turtles were numerous. Such incidents are possible, but this was the first case of sea turtle entanglement in seismic gear for the R/V *Langseth*, or for its predecessor, R/V *Maurice Ewing*, and the R/V *Melville* will not be using this type of equipment. Towing the hydrophone streamer or other equipment during the proposed survey is not expected to significantly interfere with sea turtle movements, including migration, because sea turtles are not expected to be abundant in the survey area.

(2) Mitigation Measures

Several mitigation measures are built into the proposed seismic survey as an integral part of the planned activities. These measures include the following: ramp ups, minimum of one dedicated observer maintaining a visual watch during all daytime airgun operations, two observers for 30 min before and during ramp ups during the day and at night (and when possible at other times), and shut downs when mammals or turtles are detected in or about to enter designated exclusion zones. These mitigation measures are described earlier in this document, in § II(3). The fact that the GI airgun, as a result of its design, directs the majority of the energy downward, and less energy laterally, is also an inherent mitigation measure.

Previous and subsequent analysis of the potential impacts take account of these planned mitigation measures. It would not be meaningful to analyze the effects of the planned activities without mitigation, as the mitigation (and associated monitoring) measures are a basic part of the activities.

(3) Numbers of Marine Mammals that could be Exposed to Various Received Sound Levels

All anticipated takes would be “takes by harassment”, involving temporary changes in behavior. The mitigation measures to be applied will minimize the possibility of injurious takes. (However, as noted earlier, there is no specific information demonstrating that injurious “takes” would occur even in the absence of the planned mitigation measures.) In the sections below, we describe methods to estimate the number of potential exposures to various received sound levels, and present estimates of the numbers of marine mammals that could be affected during the proposed seismic program. The estimates are based on consideration of the number of marine mammals that could be disturbed appreciably by ~1810.5 km² (includes primary and secondary lines and an additional 25% contingency) of seismic surveys in the SEP. The main sources of distributional and numerical data used in deriving the estimates are described in the next subsection.

It is assumed that, during simultaneous operations of the seismic sources and the other sources, any marine mammals close enough to be affected by the MBES or SBP would already be affected by the seismic sources. However, whether or not the seismic sources are operating simultaneously with the other sources, marine mammals are expected to exhibit no more than short-term and inconsequential responses to the MBES and SBP given their characteristics (e.g., narrow downward-directed beam) and other considerations described in § II and IV(1)(b and c), above. Such reactions are not considered to constitute “taking” (NMFS 2001). Therefore, no additional allowance is included for animals that might be affected by sound sources other than airguns.

(a) Basis for Estimating Exposure to Various Received Sound Levels

Extensive systematic ship-based surveys have been conducted by NMFS SWFSC for marine mammals in the ETP. We used densities from five sources: (1) SWFSC has recently developed habitat modeling as a method to estimate cetacean densities on a finer spatial scale than traditional line-transect analyses by using a continuous function of habitat variables, e.g., sea surface temperature, depth, distance from shore, and prey density (Barlow et al. 2009). For the ETP, the models are based on data from 12 SWFSC ship-based cetacean and ecosystem assessment surveys conducted during July–December from 1986 to 2006. The models have been incorporated into a web-based Geographic Information System (GIS) developed by Duke University’s Department of Defense Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) team in close collaboration with the SWFSC SERDP team (Read et al. 2009). For 11 cetacean species in the model, we used the GIS to obtain mean densities near the proposed survey area, i.e., in a rectangle bounded by 4° to 12 °S and 75° to 85° W which was the SE extent of the model; (2) For species sighted in SWFSC surveys whose sample sizes were too small to model density, we used densities from the surveys conducted during summer and fall 1986–1996, as summarized by Ferguson and Barlow (2001). Densities were calculated from Ferguson and Barlow (2003) for 5° x 5° blocks that include the proposed survey areas and corridors: Blocks 139, 159, 160, 200, 201, 202, 212, 213, and 219. Those blocks included 27,275 km of survey effort in Beaufort sea states 0–5, and 2564 km of survey effort in Beaufort sea states 0–2. Densities were obtained for an additional 5 species that were sighted in one or more of those blocks; (3) For dusky dolphins, we used the mean densities reported for Area A from aerial surveys in North and Central Patagonia (Shiavini et al. 1999), corrected for f(0), but not g(0). Since the closest density estimates were taken south of the proposed survey area, where dusky dolphin abundance is higher, we used 10% of the reported density to account for the decreased abundance of dusky dolphins in the proposed survey area; (4) For Chilean dolphins we used the estimated density of Chilean dolphins in

Patagonia from Heinrich (2006). The extralimital, offshore distribution of Chilean dolphins in the proposed survey area was corrected for by taking 1% of the densities reported by Heinrich (2006); (5) For blue whales we used the densities reported by Galletti-Vernazzani and Cabrera (2009) from aerial surveys in Patagonia in March 2007 and April in 2009 that took place south of the survey site (39°S-44°S). The density estimates were corrected for $f(0)$ and $g(0)$. Given the higher abundance of blue whales south of the survey site, we corrected the reported density for the proposed survey area by reducing the density by 50%.

For two endangered species for which there are only unconfirmed sightings in the region, the sei and fin whales, arbitrary low densities (equal to the density of the species with the lowest calculated density) were assigned. The same arbitrary low density was assigned to southern right whale dolphins and Burmeister's porpoise where no confirmed sightings were made within the survey region. In addition, there were no density estimates available for Humpback whales, minke whales, and Peale's dolphins but confirmed sightings have been made near the survey area. We arbitrarily assigned a density estimate of 0.8 animals/1000 km², which was similar to the densities reported for uncommon species in the area.

Oceanographic conditions, including occasional El Niño and La Niña events, influence the distribution and numbers of marine mammals present in the SEP and ETP, resulting in considerable year-to-year variation in the distribution and abundance of many marine mammal species (e.g., Escorza-Treviño 2009). Thus, for some species the densities derived from recent surveys may not be representative of the densities that will be encountered during the proposed seismic survey.

Table 3 gives the estimated densities for each cetacean species likely to occur in the study area, i.e., species for which we obtained or assigned densities. The densities have been corrected for both detectability and availability bias by the authors. Detectability bias is associated with diminishing sightability with increasing lateral distance from the trackline [$f(0)$]. Availability bias refers to the fact that there is less-than-100% probability of sighting an animal that is present along the survey trackline, and it is measured by $g(0)$. Corrections for $f(0)$ and $g(0)$ were made where mentioned above.

The estimated numbers of individuals potentially exposed are presented below based on the 160-dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ criterion for all cetaceans. It is assumed that marine mammals exposed to airgun sounds that strong might change their behavior sufficiently to be considered "taken by harassment".

It should be noted that the following estimates of exposures to various sound levels assume that the surveys will be fully completed; in fact, the planned number of line-kilometers has been increased to accommodate lines that may need to be repeated, equipment testing, etc. As is typical during ship surveys, inclement weather and equipment malfunctions are likely to cause delays and may limit the number of useful line-kilometers of seismic operations that can be undertaken. Furthermore, any marine mammal sightings within or near the designated exclusion zone will result in the shutdown of seismic operations as a mitigation measure. Thus, the following estimates of the numbers of marine mammals potentially exposed to 160-dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ sounds are precautionary, and probably overestimate the actual numbers of marine mammals that might be involved. These estimates assume that there will be no weather, equipment, or mitigation delays, which is highly unlikely.

IV. Environmental Consequences

TABLE 3. Densities of marine mammals in the SEP near the proposed survey area. Cetacean densities are based on the sources listed (see text for details). Species listed as "Endangered" under the ESA are in italics. Calculated take of different individuals that might be exposed during SIO's proposed seismic survey in SEP in May 2012 calculated from the estimated density (reported density x correction factor) multiplied by the 160dB ensonified area (1810.5 km² includes primary and secondary lines and 25% contingency). The column numbers in boldface shows the numbers of "takes" for which authorization is requested. Regional population estimates taken from Table 2; NA = Not available.

Species	Reported density (#/1000 km ²)					Correction factor	Estimated Density (#/1000 km ²) ¹	Ensonified area (km ²)	Calculated Take	% of Regional Pop'n	Requested Take Authorization
	Read et al (2009)	Ferguson and Barlow (2003)	Shiavini et al. (1999)	Heinrich (2006)	Galletti-Vernazzani and Cabrera (2009)						
Mysticetes											
<i>Humpback whale</i>							0.8 ²	1810.5	1	0.05	3*
Minke whale							0.8 ²	1810.5	1	NA	2*
Bryde's whale	0.96						0.96	1810.5	2	0.00	2
<i>Sei whale</i>							0.01 ³	1810.5	0	NA	0
<i>Fin whale</i>							0.01 ³	1810.5	0	0.00	0
<i>Blue whale</i>					4.87	0.5	2.44	1810.5	4	0.03	4
Odontocetes											
<i>Sperm whale</i>		3.95					3.95	1810.5	7	0.03	8*
Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales	0.03						0.03	1810.5	0	0.00	0
Cuvier's beaked whale	0.801						0.80	1810.5	1	0.01	1
Blainville's beaked	0.801						0.80	1810.5	1	0.00	1
<i>Mesoplodon</i> spp.	0.36						0.36	1810.5	1	0.00	1
Rough-toothed dolphin	4.19						4.19	1810.5	8	0.01	15*
Bottlenose dolphin	17.06						17.06	1810.5	31	0.01	72*
Spinner dolphin	35.7						35.70	1810.5	65	0.00	134*
Striped dolphin	67.8						67.80	1810.5	123	0.01	123
Short-beaked common dolphin	110.89						110.90	1810.5	201	0.01	254*
Risso's dolphin		10.21					10.21	1810.5	18	0.02	18
False killer whale		0.39					0.39	1810.5	1	0.00	1
Killer whale		0.85					0.85	1810.5	2	0.02	2
Long finned pilot whale	11.88						11.88	1810.5	22	0.01	22
Peale's dolphin							0.8 ²	1810.5	1	NA	4*
Dusky dolphin			368			0.1	37	1810.5	67	0.92	67
Southern right whale dolphin							0.01 ³	1810.5	0	NA	0
Burmeister's porpoise							0.01 ³	1810.5	0	NA	0
Chilean dolphin				222.2		0.01	11.11	1810.5	4	0.2	4

¹ Densities of other species included in Table 2 (e.g. pinnipeds) presumably would be lower than the lowest density in this table. ²Densities assigned an arbitrary density similar to densities reported for species that area uncommon in the survey area. ³Densities assigned an arbitrarily low number for rare species with unconfirmed sightings in the survey area. *Requested take authorization was increased to mean group size for delphinids if calculated numbers were between 1 and mean group size, and increased to the mean group size if calculated values were >0.05 for endangered species.

(b) Potential Number of Marine Mammals Exposed to ≥ 160 dB***Number of Cetaceans that could be Exposed to ≥ 160 dB***

The number of different individuals that could be exposed to GI-airgun sounds with received levels ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ on one or more occasions can be estimated by considering the total marine area that would be within the 160-dB radius around the operating seismic source on at least one occasion, along with the expected density of animals in the area. The proposed seismic lines are not in close proximity, which minimizes the number of times an individual mammal may be exposed during the survey; the area including overlap is only 1.2x the area excluding overlap.

The numbers of different individuals potentially exposed to ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ were calculated by multiplying the expected species density times the anticipated area to be ensonified to that level during GI-airgun operations. The area expected to be ensonified was determined by entering the planned survey lines into a MapInfo GIS, using the GIS to identify the relevant areas by “drawing” the applicable 160-dB buffer for the appropriate water depth (see Table 1) around each seismic line, and then calculating the total area within the buffers. Areas where overlap occurred (because of crossing lines) were included only once when estimating the number of individuals exposed.

Applying the approach described above, $\sim 1448.4 \text{ km}^2$ would be within the 160-dB isopleth on one or more occasions during the surveys (including primary and secondary lines). The total ensonified area used to calculate estimated numbers exposed was 1810.5 km^2 and includes an additional 25% increase in the calculated area for contingency. Because this approach does not allow for turnover in the mammal populations in the study area during the course of the survey, the actual number of individuals exposed may be underestimated, although the conservative (i.e., probably overestimated) line-kilometer distances used to calculate the area may offset this. Also, the approach assumes that no cetaceans will move away or toward the trackline as the R/V *Melville* approaches in response to increasing sound levels prior to the time the levels reach 160 dB. Another way of interpreting the estimates that follow is that they represent the number of individuals that are expected (in the absence of a seismic program) to occur in the waters that will be exposed to ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$.

Table 3 also shows the number of different individual marine mammals that potentially could be exposed to ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ during the seismic survey if no animals moved away from the survey vessel. The ***Requested Take Authorization***, is given in the far right column of Table 3. For Endangered Species the ***Requested Take Authorization*** has been increased to the mean group size listed in southern Chile where available (Viddi et al 2010) or the ETP (Wade and Gerodette 1993) where the calculated number of individuals exposed was between 0.05 and the mean group size (i.e., for sei, fin, humpback and sperm whales). For non-listed species, the ***Requested Take Authorization*** has been increased to the mean group size in the ETP (Wade and Gerodette 1993) or southern Chile (Viddi et al 2010; Zamorano-Abramson et al. 2010) in cases where the calculated number of individuals exposed was between 1 and the mean group size. For delphinids where typically large groups are encountered the ***Requested Take Authorization*** was increased to the mean group size in southern Chile (Aguayo et al 1998; Viddi et al 2010; Zamorano-Abramson et al. 2010) if the calculated number was greater than 1, but less than the mean group size.

The best estimate of the number of individual cetaceans that could be exposed to seismic sounds with received levels ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ during the survey is 561 (Table 3). That total includes 12 ***endangered*** whales: 4 blue whales (0.03%), 1 humpback whale (0.05%) and 7 sperm whales (0.03%) (Table 3). Most (96.4%) of the cetaceans potentially exposed are delphinids; rough-toothed, short-beaked common, striped, spinner, bottlenose, Risso's, and Dusky dolphins, and long-finned pilot whales are estimated to be the most common species in the area.

Number of Pinnipeds that could be Exposed to ≥ 160 dB.— Due to the extralimital distribution of pinnipeds in the study area, no pinnipeds are expected to be encountered during the proposed survey.

(4) Conclusions for Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles

The proposed seismic project will involve towing a pair of GI airguns that introduce pulsed sounds into the ocean, along with, at times, simultaneous operation of an MBES and an SBP. Routine vessel operations, other than the proposed seismic operations, are conventionally assumed not to affect marine mammals sufficiently to constitute “taking”. No “taking” of marine mammals is expected in association with echosounder operations given the considerations discussed in § IV(1)(b and c), i.e., sounds are beamed downward, the beam is narrow, and the pulses are extremely short.

(a) Cetaceans

Several species of mysticetes show strong avoidance reactions to seismic vessels at ranges up to 6–8 km and occasionally as far as 20–30 km from the source vessel when medium-large airgun arrays have been used. However, reactions at the longer distances appear to be atypical of most species and situations. If mysticetes are encountered, the numbers estimated to occur within the 160-dB isopleth in the survey area are expected to be low.

Odontocete reactions to seismic pulses, or at least the reactions of delphinids and porpoises, are expected to extend to lesser distances than are those of mysticetes. Odontocete low-frequency hearing is less sensitive than that of mysticetes, and delphinids are often seen from seismic vessels. In fact, there are documented instances of dolphins approaching active seismic vessels. However, delphinids as well as some other types of odontocetes sometimes show avoidance responses and/or other changes in behavior near operating seismic vessels.

Taking into account the mitigation measures that are planned (see § II), effects on cetaceans are generally expected to be limited to avoidance of the area around the seismic operation and short-term changes in behavior, falling within the MMPA definition of “Level B harassment”. Furthermore, the estimated numbers of animals potentially exposed to sound levels sufficient to cause appreciable disturbance are generally low percentages of the regional population sizes. The best estimate of the number of individuals that would be exposed to sounds ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ represent, for all species, <0.1% of the regional populations (Table 3).

Varying estimates of the numbers of marine mammals that could be exposed to strong airgun sounds during the proposed program have been presented, depending on the specific exposure criteria (≥ 160 or ≥ 170 dB) and density criterion used (best or maximum). The requested “take authorization” for each species is based on the estimated best number of individuals that could be exposed to ≥ 160 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. That figure likely overestimates the actual number of animals that will be exposed to and will react to the seismic sounds. The reasons for that conclusion are outlined above. The relatively short-term exposures are unlikely to result in any long-term negative consequences for the individuals or their populations.

The many cases of apparent tolerance by cetaceans of seismic exploration, vessel traffic, and some other human activities show that co-existence is possible. Mitigation measures such as controlled speed, course alternation, look outs, non-pursuit, and shut downs when marine mammals are seen within defined ranges should further reduce short-term reactions, and avoid or minimize any auditory effects. In all cases, the effects are expected to be short-term, with no lasting biological consequence.

(b) Sea Turtles

Four species—the leatherback, loggerhead, green, and olive ridley turtles—could be encountered in the study area. Mostly foraging or migrating individuals would occur. At the time of the proposed surveys, three species nest in areas far north of the proposed survey area. Leatherback, green, and olive ridley turtles nest mostly in Mexico and Costa Rica; The proposed survey is scheduled after the peak nesting periods for leatherbacks (October–March), green turtles (October–November), and olive ridleys (September–December). Green, leatherback and loggerhead turtles have been reported as bycatch in the Chilean longline fisheries, but leatherback turtles are the most likely to be encountered during the proposed survey. Although it is possible that some turtles will be encountered during the survey, it is anticipated that the proposed seismic survey will have, at most, a short-term effect on behavior and no long-term impacts on individual sea turtles or their populations.

(5) Direct Effects on Fish and Their Significance

One reason for the adoption of airguns as the standard energy source for marine seismic surveys is that, unlike explosives, they have not been associated with large-scale fish kills. However, existing information on the impacts of seismic surveys on marine fish populations is very limited (see Appendix C). There are three types of potential effects of exposure to seismic surveys: (1) pathological, (2) physiological, and (3) behavioral. Pathological effects involve lethal and temporary or permanent sub-lethal injury. Physiological effects involve temporary and permanent primary and secondary stress responses, such as changes in levels of enzymes and proteins. Behavioral effects refer to temporary and (if they occur) permanent changes in exhibited behavior (e.g., startle and avoidance behavior). The three categories are inter-related in complex ways. For example, it is possible that certain physiological and behavioral changes could potentially lead to an ultimate pathological effect on individuals (i.e., mortality).

The specific received sound levels at which permanent adverse effects to fish potentially could occur are little studied and largely unknown. Furthermore, the available information on the impacts of seismic surveys on marine fish is from studies of individuals or portions of a population; there have been no studies at the population scale. Thus, available information provides limited insight on possible real-world effects at the ocean or population scale. This makes drawing conclusions about impacts on fish problematic because ultimately, the most important aspect of potential impacts relates to how exposure to seismic survey sound affects marine fish populations and their viability, including their availability to fisheries.

The following sections provide a general synopsis of available information on the effects of exposure to seismic and other anthropogenic sound as relevant to fish. The information comprises results from scientific studies of varying degrees of rigor plus some anecdotal information. Some of the data sources may have serious shortcomings in methods, analysis, interpretation, and reproducibility that must be considered when interpreting their results (see Hastings and Popper 2005). Potential adverse effects of the program's sound sources on marine fish are then noted.

(a) Pathological Effects

The potential for pathological damage to hearing structures in fish depends on the energy level of the received sound and the physiology and hearing capability of the species in question (see Appendix C). For a given sound to result in hearing loss, the sound must exceed, by some specific amount, the hearing threshold of the fish for that sound (Popper 2005). The consequences of temporary or permanent hearing loss in individual fish on a fish population is unknown; however, it likely depends on the number of individuals affected and whether critical behaviors involving sound (e.g. predator avoidance, prey capture, orientation and navigation, reproduction, etc.) are adversely affected.

Little is known about the mechanisms and characteristics of damage to fish that may be inflicted by exposure to seismic survey sounds. Few data have been presented in the peer-reviewed scientific literature. As far as we know, there are only two valid papers with proper experimental methods, controls, and careful pathological investigation implicating sounds produced by actual seismic survey airguns with adverse anatomical effects. One such study indicated anatomical damage and the second indicated TTS in fish hearing. The anatomical case is McCauley et al. (2003), who found that exposure to airgun sound caused observable anatomical damage to the auditory maculae of “pink snapper” (*Pagrus auratus*). This damage in the ears had not been repaired in fish sacrificed and examined almost two months after exposure. On the other hand, Popper et al. (2005) documented only TTS (as determined by auditory brainstem response) in two of three fishes from the Mackenzie River Delta. This study found that broad whitefish (*Coregonus nasus*) that received a sound exposure level of 177 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2\cdot\text{s}$ showed no hearing loss. During both studies, the repetitive exposure to sound was greater than would have occurred during a typical seismic survey. However, the substantial low-frequency energy produced by the airgun arrays [less than ~400 Hz in the study by McCauley et al. (2003) and less than ~200 Hz in Popper et al. (2005)] likely did not propagate to the fish because the water in the study areas was very shallow (~9 m in the former case and <2 m in the latter). Water depth sets a lower limit on the lowest sound frequency that will propagate (the “cutoff frequency”) at about one-quarter wavelength (Urlick 1983; Rogers and Cox 1988).

Wardle et al. (2001) suggested that in water, acute injury and death of organisms exposed to seismic energy depends primarily on two features of the sound source: (1) the received peak pressure and (2) the time required for the pressure to rise and decay. Generally, as received pressure increases, the period for the pressure to rise and decay decreases, and the chance of acute pathological effects increases. According to Buchanan et al. (2004), for the types of seismic airguns and arrays involved with the proposed program, the pathological (mortality) zone for fish would be expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source. Numerous other studies provide examples of no fish mortality upon exposure to seismic sources (Falk and Lawrence 1973; Holliday et al. 1987; La Bella et al. 1996; Santulli et al. 1999; McCauley et al. 2000a,b, 2003; Bjarti 2002; Hassel et al. 2003; Popper et al. 2005).

Some studies have reported, some equivocally, that mortality of fish, fish eggs, or larvae can occur close to seismic sources (Kostyuchenko 1973; Dalen and Knutsen 1986; Booman et al. 1996; Dalen et al. 1996). Some of the reports claimed seismic effects from treatments quite different from actual seismic survey sounds or even reasonable surrogates. However, Payne et al. (2009) reported no statistical differences in mortality/morbidity between control and exposed groups of capelin eggs or monkfish larvae. Saetre and Ona (1996) applied a ‘worst-case scenario’ mathematical model to investigate the effects of seismic energy on fish eggs and larvae. They concluded that mortality rates caused by exposure to seismic surveys are so low, as compared to natural mortality rates, that the impact of seismic surveying on recruitment to a fish stock must be regarded as insignificant.

(b) Physiological Effects

Physiological effects refer to cellular and/or biochemical responses of fish to acoustic stress. Such stress potentially could affect fish populations by increasing mortality or reducing reproductive success. Primary and secondary stress responses of fish after exposure to seismic survey sound appear to be temporary in all studies done to date (Sverdrup et al. 1994; McCauley et al. 2000a,b). The periods necessary for the biochemical changes to return to normal are variable, and depend on numerous aspects of the biology of the species and of the sound stimulus (see Appendix C).

(c) Behavioral Effects

Behavioral effects include changes in the distribution, migration, mating, and catchability of fish populations. Studies investigating the possible effects of sound (including seismic survey sound) on fish

behavior have been conducted on both uncaged and caged individuals (Chapman and Hawkins 1969; Pearson et al. 1992; Santulli et al. 1999; Wardle et al. 2001; Hassel et al. 2003). Typically, in these studies fish exhibited a sharp “startle” response at the onset of a sound followed by habituation and a return to normal behavior after the sound ceased.

There is general concern about potential adverse effects of seismic operations on fisheries, namely a potential reduction in the “catchability” of fish involved in fisheries. Although reduced catch rates have been observed in some marine fisheries during seismic testing, in a number of cases the findings are confounded by other sources of disturbance (Dalen and Raknes 1985; Dalen and Knutsen 1986; Løkkeborg 1991; Skalski et al. 1992; Engås et al. 1996). In other airgun experiments, there was no change in catch per unit effort (CPUE) of fish when airgun pulses were emitted, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the seismic survey (Pickett et al. 1994; La Bella et al. 1996). For some species, reductions in catch may have resulted from a change in behavior of the fish, e.g., a change in vertical or horizontal distribution, as reported in Slotte et al. (2004).

In general, any adverse effects on fish behavior or fisheries attributable to seismic testing may depend on the species in question and the nature of the fishery (season, duration, fishing method). They may also depend on the age of the fish, its motivational state, its size, and numerous other factors that are difficult, if not impossible, to quantify at this point, given such limited data on effects of airguns on fish, particularly under realistic at-sea conditions.

(6) Direct Effects on Invertebrates and Their Significance

(a) Seismic operations

The existing body of information on the impacts of seismic survey sound on marine invertebrates is very limited. However, there is some unpublished and very limited evidence of the potential for adverse effects on invertebrates, thereby justifying further discussion and analysis of this issue. The three types of potential effects of exposure to seismic surveys on marine invertebrates are pathological, physiological, and behavioral. Based on the physical structure of their sensory organs, marine invertebrates appear to be specialized to respond to particle displacement components of an impinging sound field and not to the pressure component (Popper et al. 2001; see also Appendix D).

The only information available on the impacts of seismic surveys on marine invertebrates involves studies of individuals; there have been no studies at the population scale. Thus, available information provides limited insight on possible real-world effects at the regional or ocean scale. The most important aspect of potential impacts concerns how exposure to seismic survey sound ultimately affects invertebrate populations and their viability, including availability to fisheries.

Literature reviews of the effects of seismic and other underwater sound on invertebrates were provided by Moriyasu et al. (2004) and Payne et al. (2008). The following sections provide a synopsis of available information on the effects of exposure to seismic survey sound on species of decapod crustaceans and cephalopods, the two taxonomic groups of invertebrates on which most such studies have been conducted. The available information is from studies with variable degrees of scientific soundness and from anecdotal information. A more detailed review of the literature on the effects of seismic survey sound on invertebrates is provided in Appendix D.

Pathological Effects

In water, lethal and sub-lethal injury to organisms exposed to seismic survey sound could depend on at least two features of the sound source: (1) the received peak pressure, and (2) the time required for the pressure to rise and decay. Generally, as received pressure increases, the period for the pressure to rise and decay decreases, and the chance of acute pathological effects increases. For the type of seismic source

planned for the proposed program, the pathological (mortality) zone for crustaceans and cephalopods is expected to be within a few meters of the seismic source; however, very few specific data are available on levels of seismic signals that might damage these animals. This premise is based on the peak pressure and rise/decay time characteristics of seismic airgun arrays currently in use around the world.

Some studies have suggested that seismic survey sound has a limited pathological impact on early developmental stages of crustaceans (Pearson et al. 1994; Christian et al. 2003; DFO 2004). However, the impacts appear to be either temporary or insignificant compared to what occurs under natural conditions. Controlled field experiments on adult crustaceans (Christian et al. 2003, 2004; DFO 2004) and adult cephalopods (McCauley et al. 2000a,b) exposed to seismic survey sound have not resulted in any significant pathological impacts on the animals. It has been suggested that exposure to commercial seismic survey activities has injured giant squid (Guerra et al. 2004), but there was little evidence to support the claim. André et al. (2011) exposed cephalopods, primarily cuttlefish, to continuous 50–400 Hz sinusoidal wave sweeps for two hours while captive in relatively small tanks, and reported morphological and ultrastructural evidence of massive acoustic trauma (i.e., permanent and substantial alterations of statocyst sensory hair cells). The received SPL was reported as 157 ± 5 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$, with peak levels at 175 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$. As in the McCauley et al. (2003) paper on sensory hair cell damage in pink snapper as a result of exposure to seismic sound, the cephalopods were subjected to higher sound levels than they would be under natural conditions, and they were unable to swim away from the sound source.

Physiological Effects

Physiological effects refer mainly to biochemical responses by marine invertebrates to acoustic stress. Such stress potentially could affect invertebrate populations by increasing mortality or reducing reproductive success. Primary and secondary stress responses (i.e., changes in haemolymph levels of enzymes, proteins, etc.) of crustaceans have been noted several days or months after exposure to seismic survey sounds (Payne et al. 2007). The periods necessary for these biochemical changes to return to normal are variable and depend on numerous aspects of the biology of the species and of the sound stimulus.

Behavioral Effects

There is increasing interest in assessing the possible direct and indirect effects of seismic and other sounds on invertebrate behavior, particularly in relation to the consequences for fisheries. Changes in behavior could potentially affect such aspects as reproductive success, distribution, susceptibility to predation, and catchability by fisheries. Studies investigating the possible behavioral effects of exposure to seismic survey sound on crustaceans and cephalopods have been conducted on both uncaged and caged animals. In some cases, invertebrates exhibited startle responses (e.g., squid in McCauley et al. 2000a,b). In other cases, no behavioral impacts were noted (e.g., crustaceans in Christian et al. 2003, 2004; DFO 2004). There have been anecdotal reports of reduced catch rates of shrimp shortly after exposure to seismic surveys; however, other studies have not observed any significant changes in shrimp catch rate (Andriguetto-Filho et al. 2005). Any adverse effects on crustacean and cephalopod behavior or fisheries attributable to seismic survey sound depend on the species in question and the nature of the fishery (season, duration, fishing method).

(b) OBS deployment

A total of ~10 OBSs will be deployed during the proposed survey. LDEO OBS08 model broadband OBSs will be used during the cruise. This type of OBS has a height of ~122 cm and a width and depth of 76.2×106.7 cm. The anchor is made of two steel cylinders approximately 15 cm in diameter and 46 cm in length. Each cylinder weighs approximately 75 lbs in air. OBSs will remain on the seafloor to continue to collect data for approximately one year. Once an OBS is ready to be retrieved, an acoustic release

transponder interrogates the instrument at a frequency of 9–11 kHz, and a response is received at a frequency of 9–13 kHz. The burn-wire release assembly is then activated, and the instrument is released from the anchor to float to the surface. OBS anchors will be left behind upon equipment recovery. Although OBS placement will disrupt a very small area of seafloor habitat and could disturb benthic invertebrates, the impacts are expected to be localized and transitory.

(7) Indirect Effects on Marine Mammals, Sea Turtles, and Their Significance

The proposed seismic operations will not result in any permanent impact on habitats used by marine mammals or sea turtles, or to the food sources they use. The main impact issue associated with the proposed activities will be temporarily elevated noise levels and the associated direct effects on marine mammals and sea turtles, as discussed above.

During the seismic study, only a small fraction of the available habitat would be ensonified at any given time. Disturbance to fish species and invertebrates would be short-term, and fish would return to their pre-disturbance behavior once the seismic activity ceased [see § IV(5) and § IV(6), above]. Thus, the proposed survey would have little impact on the abilities of marine mammals or sea turtles to feed in the area where seismic work is planned.

Some mysticetes feed on concentrations of zooplankton. A reaction by zooplankton to a seismic impulse would only be relevant to whales if it caused a concentration of zooplankton to scatter. Pressure changes of sufficient magnitude to cause that type of reaction would probably occur only very close to the source. Impacts on zooplankton behavior are predicted to be negligible, and that would translate into negligible impacts on those mysticetes that feed on zooplankton.

(8) Cumulative Effects

Cumulative effects refer to the impacts on the environment that result from a combination of past, existing, and reasonably foreseeable projects and human activities. Causal agents of cumulative effects can include multiple causes, multiple effects, effects of activities in more than one locale, and recurring events. Human activities in the region of the proposed seismic survey in and near the proposed survey areas include commercial and recreational vessel traffic, fishing, and oil and gas exploration and production.

(a) Collisions with Vessels and Vessel Noise

Vessel traffic in the proposed study area will consist of fishing vessels, as well as other commercial (cargo), cruise, and pleasure vessels. Vessel noise could affect marine animals in the proposed study area. Shipping noise generally dominates ambient noise at frequencies from 20 to 300 Hz (Richardson et al. 1995). Baleen whales are thought to be more sensitive to sound at these low frequencies than are toothed whales. There may be some localized avoidance by marine mammals of commercial ships operating routinely in and near the proposed seismic survey area. On infrequent occasions, whales and ships collide, resulting in injury or death to the animal (Laist et al. 2001; Moore and Clarke 2002).

Large Vessel Traffic

Port container traffic is high along the coastline due west of the study area. At least 6 important ports occur between 5°S and 37°S with overall port container traffic of more than 2.1 million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) recorded in 2009 (Table 4). The most important ports are San Antonio, Valparaiso and San Vicente, Chile.

TABLE 4. Port container traffic for 2009 based on twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs). TEU is a standard linear measurement used in quantifying container traffic flows. Source: AAPA (2010).

Port (Country)	Latitude; longitude	TEUs
San Antonio (Chile)	33.6°S; 71.6°W	704,852
Arica (Chile)	18.6°S; 70.3°W	109,572
San Vicente (Chile)	36.7°S; 73.1°W	494,275
Valparaiso (Chile)	33.02°S; 71.6°W	677,432
Paita (Peru)	5°5'S; 81°6'W	85,192
Salaverry (Peru)	8°14'S; 78°58'W	2,043
Chimbote (Peru)	9°8'28'S; 78°36'W	6,760
Callao (Peru)	12°2'S; 77°8'W	1,089,83
Total		2,189,109

The port activity reflects the importance of the area for international trade. Several major international marine trade routes pass through the study area, leading to and from the Panama Canal, which connects the Pacific with the Atlantic Ocean. The Panama Canal is one of the world's major shipping routes and is a significant focus for marine shipping to Central America (Rodrigue et al. 2009).

Vessel traffic in the proposed study area will include bulk vessels, oil tankers, and container vessels. The most important vessel traffic will consist of bulk carrier vessels, which comprise 40% of the world's merchant fleets and range in size from single-hold mini-bulkers to ships able to carry 365,000 metric tons of deadweight. The Amver (from its original name Atlantic Merchant Vessel Emergency Reporting) system, a computer-based and voluntary global ship reporting system used worldwide by search and rescue authorities used by some 12,000 participating ships from over 140 nations (USCG 2010), gives an indication of the merchant ship traffic (over 100 gross tons) in the study area during the period of interest. Based on Amver monthly plots, ship density in the area during May would consist of 5-14 vessels per month in the study area (Fig. 3).




FIGURE 3. Amver monthly density plot for May 2011. Each colored dot displayed on the chart approximates a one-degree cell. Purple cells: 4 or fewer vessels; green cells: 5–14 vessels; orange cells: 15–49 vessels; red cells: >50 vessels. Source: USCG (2011).

Recreational Vessel Traffic

Cruise ships depart Santiago, Chile primarily between December and March. Most cruise vessels travel to Patagonia in southern Chile or farther south. Lindblad Expeditions offers cruises to Antarctica and South Georgia Island between January and March 2012, and the other major cruise line, Princess Cruises, only offers cruises between January and March 2012 (Fig. 4). Typically there are only 1-3 cruise ships departing port Valparaiso, Santiago each month during the peak season. Recreational vessel traffic is much greater south of the survey area in Patagonia, where ferries run regularly between Puerto Montt and Puerto Natales. The high season for vessel traffic in southern Chile is between November 1 and March 31. There is one record of a sei whale ship-strike in 2009 that involved a cruise ship departing from Puerto Montt in southern Chile. The cruise ship struck a baleen whale which was later identified as a sei whale (Brownell et al. 2009).

Boat tours off Prat pier in Valparaiso are also a popular tourist attraction. Hundreds of small and medium sized boats offer rides to tourists off the coast year-round. Typically the tours stay within the harbor and are unlikely to be encountered in the off-shore survey area.



FIGURE 4. General route taken by cruise ships along Chile (Source:Princess Cruises)

(b) Fisheries

The primary contributions of fishing to potential cumulative impacts on marine mammals and sea turtles involve direct removal of prey items, vessel noise, potential entanglement, and bycatch. There may be some localized avoidance by marine mammals of fishing vessels near the seismic area. Also, bycatch and entanglement in fishing gear can lead to mortality of marine mammals and sea turtles (see below). Commercial fishing in the SEP takes place in one Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) area, the southeast Pacific.

Commercial Fisheries

The most important fisheries in the southeast Pacific in terms of catch volume is the tuna fishery, with purse seiners of the international fleet operating in EEZ waters under a license system. The total catch from purse seine fisheries represents more than half of landings, from commercial fisheries from all reported areas in the Chile EEZ (Table 5).

The Chilean fisheries products represent 12% of the total national exports. The sector involves 200,000 workers direct and indirectly. Pelagic resources (mainly horse mackerel, anchovy, sardine and hake) contributes over 73% of the total fish export and are heavily exploited. These species are primarily

used as the main raw material for fishmeal (FAO 1999). Longline fisheries for swordfish occur off the coast of Chile as well, but these do not form a major part of Chile's fisheries export.

The artisanal fisheries (small-scale, decentralized operations) in Chile captured 763,000 tonnes in 2004 using small sea-faring vessels (FAO 2011). In 2004, 14,000 fishing vessels were registered to artisanal fishers which included 8,905 motor boats and 1,219 row boats (FAO 2011).

TABLE 5. Commercial fisheries landings (tons) in 2006 by gear-type for the Pacific EEZs of Chile, and the islands in the Juan Fernandez Archipelago and Desventuradas, Chile. Source: Sea Around Us (2011).

EEZ	Total	Purse seines	Traps	Hooks, gorges ¹	Bottom trawls	Gillnets	Mid-water trawls	Seine nets	Other
Chile	2,822,881	1,646,555	36,413	11,494	403,783	95,415	138,027	242,081	249,113
J. Fernandez Isl. (Chile) ²	128,681	23,350	2,179	915	950	17,658	13,310	51,515	18,804
Desventuradas Isl. (Chile)	116,394	20,292	1,956	1,552	1,937	14,906	11,603	44,091	20,057
Total	3,067,956	1,690,197	40,548	13,961	406,670	127,979	162,940	337,687	287,974

¹ Includes squid hooks but not longlines

² Includes Juan Fernandez, Felix and Ambrosio Isl.

Recreational Fisheries

Sport fishing for billfish and tuna are pursued in most Latin American coastal nations. Sport fishing is popular in both freshwater and marine environments in Chile. Species targeted in the marine recreational fisheries include: sole, tuna, and sea bass among others. Salmon are typically fished in estuaries along the central and southern regions in Chile. The recreational fisheries industry is regulated by the National Fishing Service - Servicio Nacional de Pesca (SERNAPESCA) that provides fishing licenses to local residents and foreign visitors. SIO's seismic operations in the study area are expected to have a negligible contribution to cumulative impacts in the study area when compared to that of commercial and recreational fisheries activities.

Aquaculture

Chilean aquaculture takes place mainly in coastal marine environments and secondarily in freshwater environments (rivers and lakes). Aquaculture activities are concentrated almost entirely in two administrative areas of the country: Regions III-IV (north of the proposed survey area), and Regions X-XI (south of the survey area) which contributed 5% and 92 % of the national harvest in 2003 respectively (FAO 2011). In 2007 over 800,000 tonnes of aquaculture products were harvested (FAO 2011). The breakdown of the harvest was: 80 % fish (primarily salmon and trout), 13% shellfish and 7 % algae (primarily *Gracilaria*). The total area of aquaculture concessions granted in Chile in 2004 reached 19 600 hectares, and the aquaculture industry is growing steadily in Chile (FAO 2011).

Most aquaculture production occurs in the intensive cultivation of salmonids in suspended systems (floating cages) in marine and estuarine environments, and secondarily in freshwater. Most production units used are circular in design (10-15 m in diameter) and approximately 15 to 20 m in height. These are arranged in trains of up to 10 units. Culture centers can have up to 3 trains of rafts, depending on the concession area. The second largest aquaculture production is focused on semi-intensive cultures of oyster long-lines and to a lesser extent on field crops of other bivalves (mussels, and

abalone). Of the 14 species grown commercially in aquaculture facilities, only 6 species are native (FAO 2011).

(c) Oil and Gas Activities

In most Latin American countries, hydrocarbons are an asset of the state, and state-owned oil and gas companies are responsible for conducting extraction and development activities. In recent years, however, several countries have introduced regulatory reforms to allow for increased participation of the private sector in oil and gas production activities.

Most of Chile's energy sector is privatized, with Empresa Nacional del Petroleo (ENAP) controlling the oil sector. ENAP is also the sole producer and refiner in the country. Energy policy decisions are the shared responsibility of the National Energy Commission (Comisión Nacional de Energía - CNE), the Ministry of Economy and Energy (Ministerio de Economía y Energía - MME), and the Superintendency of Electricity and Fuels (Superintendencia de Electricidad y Combustibles - SEC) (Mbendi 2011). In 2006 Chile had only 150 million barrels of crude oil reserves. Oil production in Chile is consequently limited, and has been dwindling over the past two decades, from 49,000 barrels per day in 1983 to 15,100 barrels per day in 2006 (production includes crude, natural gas liquids and refinery gain). In contrast, oil consumption in Chile has increased significantly, with Chile consuming an average of 341.72 thousand barrels a day of oil in 200. The country's main source of crude oil imports is Argentina. Other oil import sources include Brazil, Angola and Nigeria (Mbendi 2011).

ENAP first started production at its Poseidon project in the CAM 2A Sur block offshore Tierra del Fuego (south of the survey area) in June 2003. The Poseidon platform was the first to be installed in the area, 14km off the northeast coast of Tierra del Fuego in Argentine territorial waters (BNAmericas 2003). On April 30, 2008 the Chilean Government granted eight blocks (territory portion) for the exploration of oil and natural gas deposits, in Magallanes Region, south of the survey area (Fig. 5). ENAP was one of the forerunning companies in this process. The other blocks granted, and the awarded companies and consortiums were: Tranquilo Block, IPR- Manas; Russfin Block, Apache; Brótula Isla Magdalena and Porvenir Blocks. The awarded companies participate in a 50% association with ENAP in the three remaining blocks, el Coirón (Pan American Energy), Caupolicán (Greymouth) and Lenga (Apache). In December 2010, international oil companies were invited to become partners with ENAP in hydrocarbon exploration work in five areas located on Tierra del Fuego island in the 12th Region of Magallanes and Chilean Antarctic. In September 2011, ENAP, and the companies Geopark, YPF and Wintershall, presented Special Petroleum Operations Contract (CEOP, in Spanish) requests to the Ministry of Energy, concerning five exploration blocks in Magallanes Region: Isla Norte, Campanario, Flamenco, San Sebastián and Marazzi-Lago Mercedes. The Chilean Secretary of State will define the awarding of these CEOPs in 2012 (ENAP 2011).

(d) Previous Seismic Research

Previous reflection and refraction imaging of this segment of the Peru/Chile trench include: site surveys for ODP Leg 141 near the South Chile triple junction and additional profiles across the south-central margin (Bangs et al., 1992; Bangs and Cande, 1997); highresolution seismic reflection data acquired in 2002-2004 as part of FONDEF Project DOOII04 entitled "Submarine gas hydrates: A new source of energy for the 21st century" (Contardo et al., 2008); the GEOMAR led international CONDOR expedition to image subduction of the Juan Fernandez Ridge (e.g. von Huene et al., 1997; Flueh et al., 1998); and cruises JC23A&B in 2008 to the segment of the plate boundary that ruptured in 2010 (IFM-

GEOMAR report no. 20, 2008). The 2008 cruise included 3 onshore/offshore refraction profiles across the region of maximum slip and a variety of high resolution seafloor and subseafloor imaging and sampling experiments to study the relationship between fluid flow and slope instability in the outer accretionary wedge south of 35°S (Fig. 6).




FIGURE 5. Petroleum exploration and development titles in the Magallanes region, Chile. Source: PetroMagallanes, 2011




Figure 6. (left) Regional topography and location of prior experiments. CONDOR, TACO10 and JC23 are discussed in the text. Lines 728-732 are seismic reflection lines shot by the R/V Conrad for the Chilean National Oil Company just before the ODP Leg 141 site survey to the south (Bangs and Cande, 1997). (right) Detailed view of the region of greatest slip in the Maule earthquake. Black

dashed lines show GEOMAR onshore/offshore seismic refraction lines shot during JC23A. Black dotted lines show high-resolution seismic reflections (Contardo et al. 2008).

(e) Hunting and Incidental Mortality

Chile is a member of the International Whaling Commission (IWC 2011), but does not take part in commercial whaling. Historically, sea lions and small cetaceans (including Commerson's dolphins, Chilean dolphins, dusky dolphins, Burmeister's porpoise and southern right whale dolphins) were hunted in southern Chile as bait for the artisanal southern king crab fisheries (Lescrauwaet and Gibbons 1994). Regulations prohibiting the catch and processing of cetaceans were put in place in 1977 by the Chile Ministry of Agriculture, but Lescrauwaet and Gibbons (1994) found reports of continued takes of small cetaceans and sea lions until 1987. In October 2008 a Law on Cetacean Protection expanded the protection of cetaceans by prohibiting all hunting, killing, pursuing, or possessing any cetacean species that inhabit or cross into the maritime space of Chile's jurisdiction. There have been no updates on cetacean hunting since then. However, subsistence whaling of several species of small cetaceans, including the bottlenose dolphin, takes place north of the survey area in territorial coastal waters of Peru (Read et al. 1998). These hunts are mainly for human consumption and uses gill nets, purse seines, and harpoons. Read et al. (1998) estimated that approximately 10,000 dolphins and porpoises were landed in Peru in 1985.

The fishing industry has adverse effects on marine mammals and sea turtles. For example, the average annual mortality of dolphins as bycatch in the eastern Pacific Ocean (EPO) during 2000–2005 was 1550 (IATTC 2008). This estimate decreased to an average bycatch of 862 dolphins in 2006–2007, but increased slightly to 1169 dolphins in 2008 (IATTC 2008). At its peak in 1986, the annual estimate of dolphin mortality through bycatch in the EPO was 132,169 (IATTC 2008). Initial systematic studies of cetaceans in the ETP were prompted by the incidental killing of dolphins in the purse-seine fishery for yellowfin tuna, *Thunnus albacares*, in the area (Smith 1983). The main cetacean species that have been affected by the fishery are pantropical spotted dolphins and spinner dolphins (Smith 1983). Short-beaked common dolphins, striped dolphins, bottlenose dolphins, Fraser's dolphins, rough-toothed dolphins, and short-finned pilot whales have also been killed in the fishery (e.g., Hall and Boyer 1989). Despite a reduction in bycatch in recent years (IATTC 2008), populations of offshore spotted dolphins and eastern spinner dolphins have not yet recovered (Gerrodette and Forcada 2005). Wade et al. (2007) proposed that the lack of recovery of the pantropical spotted and spinner dolphins was as likely caused by the fishery as it was by changes in the ecosystem, and warned that the purse-seine fishery could impact dolphin stocks beyond what can be observed through the analysis of fishery mortality.

Commercial fisheries may also accidentally entangle and drown or injure other cetacean species during fishing operations or by lost and discarded fishing gear (e.g., Northridge and Hofman 1999). Humpback whales, perhaps because of their abundance in coastal waters where nets are commonly used or because of the many barnacles they carry, seem to be extremely vulnerable to entanglement in fishing gear (Lien 2002). Trites et al. (1997) suggested that fisheries might indirectly compete with cetaceans by reducing the amount of primary production accessible to cetaceans, thereby negatively affecting their numbers.

Incidental catch in fisheries is also widely recognized as a major mortality factor for sea turtles. An estimated average of 37 sea turtles died as a result of their incidental capture by purse-seine fishing vessels in the EPO during 2001–2008 (IATTC 2008). Sea turtle bycatch in longline fishing operations was evaluated off the Pacific coast of Costa Rica from October 1991–February 1992 (Segura and Arauz 1995). A total of 31 sea turtles were caught during 13 of 27 longline deployments, 29 of which were olive ridleys and 2 were green turtles (Segura and Arauz 1995). The mortality rate of olive ridleys was 10.3% (Segura and Arauz 1995).

The Chilean gillnet swordfish fishery captured almost exclusively leatherback turtles (Kelez et al. 2010), and the swordfish longline fishery has records of leatherback, loggerhead and green sea turtles reported as bycatch (Donoso and Dutton 2010). Most of the leatherback turtles reported as bycatch were juveniles (Donoso and Dutton 2010).

(f) Summary of Cumulative Impacts to Marine Mammals

Impacts of SIO's proposed seismic survey in the SEP are expected to be no more than a very minor (and short-term) increment when viewed in light of other human activities within the study area. Unlike some other ongoing and routine activities, SIO's activities are not expected to result in injuries or deaths of marine mammals. Although the sounds from the seismic survey will have higher source levels than those of some other human activities in the area, GI airgun operations will take place only for a total of ~15 days, in contrast to other noise-producing activities that occur continuously over extended periods.

(g) Cumulative Impacts to Sea Turtles

Major threats to sea turtles include hunting and poaching, the collection of eggs, coastal development, increased tourism including beaches obstructed with lights and chairs, beach sand mining, pedestrian traffic, oil spills, ship strikes, entanglement in fishing gear, ingestion of plastic and marine garbage, and destruction of feeding habitat in coral reefs and seagrass beds (Horrocks 1992; Marcovaldi et al. 2003). Unlike those activities, the low-energy seismic operations will not result in sea turtle injury or mortality. Because only small numbers of foraging or migrating turtles would likely be encountered, and given the planned mitigation measures, any short-term disturbance caused by the seismic surveys will be a negligible contribution to cumulative impacts.

(9) Unavoidable Impacts

Unavoidable impacts to the species of marine mammals and turtles occurring in the proposed study area will be limited to short-term, localized changes in behavior of individuals. For cetaceans, some of the changes in behavior may be sufficient to fall within the MMPA definition of "Level B Harassment" (behavioral disturbance; no serious injury or mortality). No long-term or significant impacts are expected on any of these individual marine mammals or turtles, or on the populations to which they belong. Effects on recruitment or survival are expected to be (at most) negligible.

(10) Coordination with Other Agencies and Processes

This document will be used as supporting documentation for an IHA application submitted by SIO to NMFS, under the U.S. MMPA, for "taking by harassment" (disturbance) of small numbers of marine mammals during this proposed seismic project. Potential impacts to endangered species and critical habitat have also been assessed in the document; therefore, it will be used to support the ESA Section 7 consultation process with NMFS.

SIO will work with the US Department of State to obtain the necessary approvals for operating in the foreign EEZ of Chile. SIO and NSF will coordinate the planned marine mammal monitoring program associated with the seismic survey with other parties that may have interest in this area. SIO and NSF have coordinated, and will continue to coordinate, with other applicable Federal agencies as required, and will comply with their requirements.

Alternative Action: Another Time

An alternative to issuing the IHA for the period requested, and to conducting the project then, is to issue the IHA for another time, and to conduct the project at that alternative time. The proposed dates for the cruise (~4-18 May 2012) are the dates when the personnel and equipment essential to meet the overall project objectives are available.

Marine mammals and sea turtles are expected to be found throughout the proposed study area and throughout the time period during which the project may occur. A number of marine mammal species (see Table 2) are year-round residents in the SEP, so altering the timing of the proposed project likely would result in no net benefits for those species (see § III, above). Baleen whales have been observed near the survey site between July-September and migrating baleen whales might be encountered during the May survey period, as individuals travel north for the austral winter. However, the peak in mysticete sightings during April-June south of the survey area suggests most baleen whales would still be south of the survey area during the proposed survey period.

No Action Alternative

An alternative to conducting the proposed activities is the “No Action” alternative, i.e. do not issue an IHA and do not conduct the operations. If the research were not conducted, the “No Action” alternative would result in no disturbance to marine mammals or sea turtles attributable to the proposed activities, however valuable scientific data about megathrust earthquakes would be lost. Enhanced knowledge of geohazards, with potential for improving our ability to understand, predict, and mitigate for damages, would also be foregone.

V. LIST OF PREPARERS

National Science Foundation

Olivia Lee, PhD., Arlington, VA*
Holly E. Smith, M.A., Arlington, VA

Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Woody Sutherland, M.S., La Jolla, CA

LGL Ltd., environmental research associates

William E. Cross, M.Sc., King City, Ont.
Nathalie Patenaude, Ph.D., King City, Ont.
Patrick Abgrall, Ph.D., King City, Ont.
Meike Holst, M.Sc., Sidney, B.C.
John Christian, M.Sc., St. John's, Nfld.
Mark Fitzgerald, B.A.A., King City, Ont.
William R. Koski, M.Sc., King City, Ont.
W. John Richardson, Ph.D., King City, Ont.

Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory

John Diebold, Ph.D., Palisades, NY

* Principal preparers of this specific document. Others listed above contributed to a lesser extent, or contributed substantially to previous related documents from which material has been excerpted.

VI. LITERATURE CITED

Marine Mammals and Acoustics

- Abend, A. G. and T. D. Smith. 1999. Review of Distribution of the Long-Finned Pilot Whales (*Globicephala melas*) in the North Atlantic and Mediterranean. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE. U.S. Department of Commerce
- Acevedo J, Olavarria C, Plana J, Cortes D, Aguayo-Lobo A and L. A. Pastene. 2007. Dwarf minke whales (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) in Antarctic Areas I and II. Document SC/59/IA24 presented to the IWC Scientific Committee, May 2007, 8 pp
- Acevedo J, Aguayo-Lobo A, Acuna P, Pastene L.A. 2006. A note on the first record of the dwarf minke whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*) in Chilean waters. *J Cetacean Res Manag* 8(3):293–296
- Acevedo, A. and M.A. Smultea. 1995. First records of humpback whales including calves at Golfo Dulce and Isla del Coco, Costa Rica, suggesting geographical overlap of northern and southern hemisphere populations. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 11(4):554-560.
- Acevedo-Gutiérrez, A. 1994. First record of a sea lion, *Zalophus californianus*, at Isla del Coco, Costa Rica. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 10(4):484-485.
- Acevedo-Gutierrez, A. 1996. Lista de mamíferos marinos en Golfo Dulce e Isla del Coco, Costa Rica. **Rev. Biol.Trop.** 44:933-934.
- Acevedo, A. and M.A. Smultea. 1995. First records of humpback whales including calves at Golfo Dulce and Isla del Coco, Costa Rica, suggesting geographical overlap of northern and southern hemisphere populations. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 11(4):554-560.
- ACS (American Cetacean Society). 2007. American Cetacean Society fact sheet: spinner dolphin, *Stenella longirostris*. Accessed on 7 May 2010 at <http://www.acsonline.org/factpack/SpinnerDolphin.htm>
- Aguayo, A.L. 1974. Baleen whales off continental Chile. p. 209-217 *In*: W.E. Schevill (ed.), The whale problem: a status report. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Aguayo, A., J. Cárdenas, and D. Torres. 1992. Análisis de los avistamientos de *Eubalaena australis* (Desmoulins, 1822) en aguas chilenas, desde 1983 hasta 1989. **Seri. Cient. Inst. Antárt. Chileno** 42:77-91.
- Aguayo A, Bernal R, Olavarria C, Vallejos V, Hucke R (1998) Cetacean observations carried out between Valparaiso and Easter Island, Chile, in the winters of 1993, 1994 and 1995. *Rev Biol Mar Ocean* 33: 101-123
- Alava, J.J. and S. Salazar. 2006. Status and conservation of otariids in Ecuador and the Galápagos Islands. p. 495-519 *In*: Sea lions of the world. Alaska Sea Grant College Program, AK-SG-06-01.
- Allen, R.L. 1985. Dolphins and the purse-seine fishery for yellowfin tuna. p. 236-252 *In*: J.R. Beddington, R.J.H. Beverton, and D.M. Lavigne (eds.), Marine mammals and fisheries. George Allen & Unwin, London, U.K. 354 p.
- Archer, F.I., II and W.F. Perrin. 1999. *Stenella coeruleoalba*. **Mamm. Species** 603:1–9.
- Arias-Schreiber, M. and Rivas, C. 1998. Distribución, tamaño poblacional y estructura de las poblaciones de lobos marinos (*Arctocephalus australis* y *Otaria byronia*) en el litoral peruano en noviembre de 1996 y Marzo de 1997. Informe Progresivo 73: 16-32
- Arnbom, T. and H. Whitehead. 1989. Observations on the composition and behaviour of groups of female sperm whale near the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Zool.** 67(1):1-7.
- Au, D.K.W. and W.L. Perryman. 1985. Dolphin habitats in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Fish. Bull.** 83(4):623-643.
- Aurióles, D. and F. Trillmich. 2008. *Arctocephalus philippii*. *In*: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Downloaded on 15 December 2011
- Bailey, H., B.R. Mate, D.M. Palacios, L. Irvine, S.J. Bograd and D.P. Costa. 2009. Behavioural estimation of blue whale movements in the Northeast Pacific from state-space model analysis of satellite tracks. **Endang. Species Res.** 10:93-106.

- Bain, D.E. and R. Williams. 2006. Long-range effects of airgun noise on marine mammals: responses as a function of received sound level and distance. Working Pap. SC/58/E35. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 13 p.
- Baird, R.W., A.D. Ligon, and S.K. Hooker. 2000. Sub-surface and night-time behavior of humpback whales off Maui, Hawaii: a preliminary report. Rep. prepared under Contract #40ABNC050729 from the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, Kihei, HI, to the Hawaii Wildlife Fund, Paia, HI.
- Baird, R.W. 2002a. Risso's dolphin. p. 1037-1039 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Baird, R.W. 2002b. False killer whale. p. 411-412 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Baird, R.W., M.B. Hanson, E.A. Ashe, M.R. Heithaus, and G.J. Marshall. 2003. Studies of foraging in "southern resident" killer whales during July 2002: Dive depths, bursts in speed, and the use of a "Cittercam" system for examining sub-surface behavior. Rep. for the National Marine Fisheries Service, National Marine Mammal Laboratory, Seattle, WA.
- Baird, R.W., D.L. Webster, D.J. McSweeney, A.D. Ligon, G.S. Schorr, and J. Barlow. 2006. Diving behaviour of Cuvier's (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and Blainville's (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) beaked whales in Hawai'i. **Can. J. Zool.** 84:1120-1128.
- Balcomb, K.C., III and D.E. Claridge. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. **Bahamas J. Sci.** 8(2):2-12.
- Barkaszi, M.J., D.M. Epperson, and B. Bennett. 2009. Six-year compilation of cetacean sighting data collected during commercial seismic survey mitigation observations throughout the Gulf of Mexico, USA. p. 24-25 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Barlow, J. and K.A. Forney. 2007. Abundance and population density of cetaceans in the California Current ecosystem. **Fish. Bull.** 105(4):509-526.
- Barlow, J. and R. Gisner. 2006. Mitigating, monitoring and assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):239-249.
- Barros, N.B., D.A. Duffield, P.H. Ostrom, D.K. Odell, and V.R. Cornish. 1998. Nearshore vs. offshore ecotype differentiation of *Kogia breviceps* and *K. simus* based on hemoglobin, morphometric and dietary analyses. Abstr. World Mar. Mamm. Sci. Conf., Monaco, 20-24 January 1998.
- Barlow, J., M.C. Ferguson, E.A. Becker, J.V. Redfern, K.A. Forney, I.L. Vilchis, P.C. Fiedler, T. Gerrodette, and L.T. Ballance. 2009. Predictive modeling of marine mammal densities in the eastern Pacific Ocean. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA-TMNMFS-SWFSC-444. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 206 p.
- Baumgartner, M.F. 1997. The distribution of Risso's dolphin (*Grampus griseus*) with respect to the physiography of the Northern Gulf of Mexico. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 13(4):614-638.
- Bernard, H. J. and Reilly, S. B. 1999. Pilot whales *Globicephala* Lesson, 1828. In: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6: The second book of dolphins and the porpoises, pp. 245-279. Academic Press, San Diego, CA, USA
- Berzin, A.A. 1978. Whale distribution in tropical eastern Pacific waters. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 28:173-177.
- Best, P.B. 1979. Social organization in sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*. p. 227-289 In: H.E. Winn and B.L. Olla (eds.), Behavior of marine animals, Vol. 3. Plenum, New York, NY.
- Black, N.A., A. Schulman-Janiger, R.L. Ternullo, and M. Guerrero-Ruiz. 1997. Killer whales of California and western Mexico: A catalog of photo-identified individuals. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-247. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 174 p.
- Bloch, D., Heide-Jorgensen, M. P, Steffansson, E., Mikkelsen, B., Ofstad, L. H., Dietz, R. and Andersen, L. W. 2003. Short-term movements of long-finned pilot whales *Globicephala melas* around the Faroe Islands. **Wildlife Biology** 9: 47-58

- Bowles, A.E., M. Smultea, B. Würsig, D.P. DeMaster, and D. Palka. 1994. Relative abundance and behavior of marine mammals exposed to transmissions from the Heard Island Feasibility Test. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 96(4):2469-2484.
- Branch, T.A., D.M. Palacios, K.M. Stafford, C. Allison, J.L. Bannister, C.L.K. Burton, K.C.S. Jenner, M-N.M. Jenner, B. Maughan, T. Miyashita, M.G. Morrice, V.J. Sturrock, R.C. Anderson, A.N. Baker, P.B. Best, P. Borsa, S. Childerhouse, K.P. Findlay, A.D. Ilangakoon, M. Joergensen, B. Kahn, B. Maughan, Y.A. Mikhalev, Oman Whale and Dolphin Research Group, D. Thiele, D. Tormosov, K. Van Waerebeek, and R.M. Warneke. 2006. Past and present distribution of blue whales in the Southern Hemisphere and northern Indian Ocean. Working Pap. SC/58/SH16. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 27 p.
- Brownell, R.L., Jr. and P.J. Clapham. 1999. Burmeister's porpoise *Phocoena spinipinnis* Burmeister, 1865. p. 393-410 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6. The second book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 486 p.
- Brownell Jr., R. L. and Cipriano, F. 1999. Dusky dolphin *Lagenorhynchus obscurus* (Gray, 1828). In: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6: The second book of dolphins and the porpoises, pp. 85-104. Academic Press, San Diego, USA
- Brownell Jr., R. L., Crespo, J. E. A. and Donahue, M. A. 1999. Peale's dolphin *Lagenorhynchus australis* (Peale, 1848). In: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6: The second book of dolphins and the porpoises, pp. 105-120. Academic Press.
- Brownell, R. L., Galletti Vernazzani, B., Carlson, C. A. 1996. Vessel Collision with a large whale off southern Chile. Report of the subcommittee on Southern Hemisphere baleen whales. International Whaling Commission. 46: 117-138
- Burkhardt, E., O. Boebel, H. Bornemann, and C. Ruholl. 2008. Risk assessment of scientific sonars. **Bioacoustics** 17:235-237.
- Cabrera, E., Carlson, C. A., Galletti, V. M., Cardenas, J. C. and Brownell Jr., R. L. 2005. A pygmy right whale (*Caperea marginata*) from Chiloe Island, Chile. Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission, Ulsan, Korea
- Calambokidis, J. and S.D. Osmek. 1998. Marine mammal research and mitigation in conjunction with air gun operation for the USGS 'SHIPS' seismic surveys in 1998. Rep. by Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA, for U.S. Geol. Surv., Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., and Minerals Manage. Serv.
- Calambokidis, J., G.H. Steiger, J.M. Straley, L.M. Herman, S. Cerchio, D.R. Salden, J. Urbán R., J.K. Jacobsen, O. von Ziegesar, K.C. Balcomb, C.M. Gabriele, M.E. Dahlheim, S. Uchida, G. Ellis, Y. Miyamura, P. Ladrón de Guevara P., M. Yamaguchi, F. Sato, S.A. Mizroch, L. Schlender, K. Rasmussen, J. Barlow, and T.J. Quinn II. 2001. Movements and population structure of humpback whales in the North Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17:769-794.
- Calambokidis, J. E. Oleson, M. McDonald, W. Burgess, J. Francis, and J. Hildebrand. 2003. Feeding and vocal behavior of blue whales determined through suction-cup attached tags. Environmental Consequences of Underwater Sound (ECOUS) Symposium. 12-16 May 2003, San Antonio, Texas.
- Calambokidis, J., A. Gouglas, and F. Garita. 2010. Summary of 2010 humpback whale research along the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica. Oceanic Society Research Expeditions, Exploritas and Cascadia Research Collective. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at <http://www.cascadiaresearch.org/costarica/Summary%20of%20Southern%20Costa%20Rica%20Jan-Feb%20mm%20surveys-FINAL-2010.pdf>
- Campagna, C. 2008a. *Otaria flavescens*. In: IUCN 2010. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2010.1. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 15 December 2011 at www.iucnredlist.org.
- Campagna, C. 2008b. *Arctocephalus australis*. In: IUCN 2010. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2010.1. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 15 December 2010 at www.iucnredlist.org.
- Campagna, C. 2008. *Mirounga leonina*. In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 15 December 2011.

- Capella J.J., L. Flórez-González, P. Falk-Fernández, and D.M. Palacios. 2002. Regular appearance of otariid pinnipeds along the Colombian Pacific coast. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 28(1):67-72.
- Carretta, J.V., K.A. Forney, M.S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. Baker, D. Johnston, B. Hanson, R.L. Brownell Jr., J. Robbins, D.K. Mattila, K. Ralls, M.M. Muto, D. Lynch, and L. Carswell. 2010. U.S. Pacific marine mammal stock assessments: 2009. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-453. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 336 p.
- Chandler, T.E. and J. Calambokidis. 2004. Costa Rica Dome blue whale cruise report. Unpublished report, 6 p. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at <http://www.cascadiaresearch.org/reports/CRUISE%20REPORT.pdf>.
- Clapham, P.J. and D.K. Mattila. 1990. Humpback whale songs as indicators of migration routes. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 6:155-160.
- Clapham P.J. and J.G. Mead. 1999. *Megaptera novaeangliae*. **Mamm. Spec.** 604:1-9.
- Claridge, D.E. 2003. Examining distribution and habitat preferences of deep-diving cetaceans, including beaked whales, in Northwest Providence Channel, the Bahamas, using geographic information system (GIS) mapping techniques. Presentation at the 15th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Greensboro, NC.
- Clark, C.W. and W.T. Ellison. 2004. Potential use of low-frequency sounds by baleen whales for probing the environment: evidence from models and empirical measurements. p. 564-582 *In*: Thomas, J.A., C.F. Moss and M. Vater (eds.) Echolocation in bats and dolphins. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Clark, C.W. and G.C. Gagnon. 2006. Considering the temporal and spatial scales of noise exposures from seismic surveys on baleen whales. Working Pap. SC/58/E9. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 9 p.
- Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G. D'Spain, A. Fernández, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hildebrand, D. Houser, T. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. MacLeod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D.C. Mountain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Mead, and L. Benner. 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):177-187.
- Crespo, E. A., Pedraza, S. N., Coscarella, M., Garcia, N. A., Dans, S. L., Iniguez, M., Reyes, L. M., Alonso, M. K., Schiavini, A. C. M. and Gonzalez, R. 1997. Distribution and school size of dusky dolphins, *Lagenorhynchus obscurus* (Gray, 1828), in the southwestern South Atlantic Ocean. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 47: 693-698
- Croll, D.A., A. AcevedoGutierrez, B.R. Tershy and J. UrbanRamirez. 2001. The diving behavior of blue and fin whales: is dive duration shorter than expected based on oxygen stores? **Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A** 129:797-809.
- Crum, L.A., M.R. Bailey, J. Guan, P.R. Hilmo, S.G. Kargl, and T.J. Matula. 2005. Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue ex vivo and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. **Acoustic Res. Lett. Online** 6(3):214-220.
- Cubero-Pardo, P. and J. Rodríguez F. 2000. *Zalophus californianus* (Pinnipedia:Otariidae) en Costa Rica. **Rev. Biol. Trop.** 48(1):273.
- Culik, B.M. 2002. Review on small cetaceans: distribution, behaviour, migration and threats. Compiled for the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). Bonn, Germany.
- Culik, B.M. 2010. Odontocetes: the toothed whales: *Mesoplodon grayi*. UNEP/CMS Secretariat, Bonn, Germany. Accessed on 10 May 2010 at http://www.cms.int/reports/small_cetaceans/index.htm.
- Cummings, W. C. 1985. Bryde's whale. p. 137-154 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3. The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Dahlheim, M.E. and J.E. Heyning. 1999. Killer whale *Orcinus orca* (Linnaeus, 1758). p. 281-322 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6. The second book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 486 p.

- Dahlheim, M.E., S. Leatherwood, and W.F. Perrin. 1982. Distribution of killer whales in the warm temperate and tropical eastern Pacific. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 32:647-653.
- Dalebout, M.L., G.J.B. Ross, C.S. Baker, R.C. Anderson, P.B. Best, V.G. Cockcroft, H.L. Hinsz, V. Peddemors, and R.L. Pitman. 2003. Appearance, distribution, and genetic distinctiveness of Longman's beaked whale, *Indopacetus pacificus*. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 19(3):421-461.
- Dans, S. L., Crespo, E. A., Garcia, N. A., Reyes, L. M., Pedraza, S. N. and Alonso, M. K. 1997. Incidental mortality of Patagonian dusky dolphins in mid-water trawling: retrospective effects from the early 1980s. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 47: 699-703.
- Davis, R.W., G.S. Fargion, N. May, T.D. Leming, M. Baumgartner, W.E. Evans, L.J. Hansen, and K. Mullin. 1998. Physical habitat of cetaceans along the continental slope in the north-central and western Gulf of Mexico. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 14(3):490-507.
- de Haro, J. C. and Iniguez, M. A. 1997. Ecology and behaviour of the Peale's dolphin, *Lagenorhynchus australis* (Peale, 1848), at Cabo Virgenes (52 degree 30'S, 68 degree 28'W), in Patagonia, Argentina. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 47: 723-728
- Dietz, R., J. Teilmann, M.-P.H. Jørgensen, and M.V. Jensen. 2002. Satellite tracking of humpback whales in West Greenland. Roskilde, Denmark: National Environmental Research Institute Technical Report 411.
- Dizon, A.E., S.O. Southern, and W.F. Perrin. 1991. Molecular analysis of mtDNA types in exploited populations of spinner dolphins (*Stenella longirostris*). **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 13:183-202.
- Dolar, M.L.L. 2002. Fraser's dolphin—*Lagenodelphis hosei*. p. 485-487 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Dolphin, W.F. 1987. Ventilation and dive patterns of humpback whales, *Megaptera novaeangliae*, on their Alaskan feeding grounds. **Can. J. Zool.** 65(1): 83-90.
- DoN (Department of the Navy). 2005. Marine resource assessment for the Northeast Operating Areas: Atlantic City, Narragansett Bay, and Boston. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic; Norfolk, VA. Contract No. N62470-02-D-9997, Task Order No. 0018. Prepared by GeoMarine, Inc., Newport News, VA.
- Donovan, G.P. 1984. Blue whales off Peru, December 1982, with special reference to pygmy blue whales. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 34:473-476.
- Donovan, G.P. 1991. A review of IWC stock boundaries. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 13:39-68.
- Dufault, S. and H. Whitehead. 1995. The geographic stock structure of female and immature sperm whales in the South Pacific. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 45:401-405.
- Duffield, D.A., S.H. Ridgway, and L.H. Cornell. 1983. Hematology distinguishes coastal and offshore forms of dolphins (*Tursiops*). **Can. J. Zool.** 61(4):930-933.
- Engel, M.H., M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F.O. Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos. 2004. Are seismic surveys responsible for cetacean strandings? An unusual mortality of adult humpback whales in Abrolhos Bank, northeastern coast of Brazil. Working Paper SC/56/E28. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 8 p.
- Escorza-Treviño, S. 2009. North Pacific marine mammals. p. 781-788 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals, 2nd edit. 1414 p.
- Evans, W.E. 1994. Common dolphin, white-bellied porpoise *Delphinus delphis* Linnaeus, 1758. p. 191-224 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5. The first Book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Félix F. and B. Haase. 2005. Distribution of humpback whales along the coast of Ecuador and management implications. **J. Cetacean Res. Manage.** 7:21-31.
- Félix, F., B. Haase, and J. Samaniego. 1995. [First record of pygmy killer whale *Feresa attenuata* (Cetacea, Delphinidae) and dwarf sperm whale *Kogia simus* (Cetacea, Physeteridae) on the Ecuadorean continental coast]. *Estud. Oceanol.* 14:77-85. [In Spanish].
- Félix, F., C. Castro, B. Haase and M. Scheidat. 2005. New estimate of the Southeastern Pacific Humpback Whale Stock. Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., December 2005, San Diego, CA.

- Ferguson, M.C. and J. Barlow. 2001. Spatial distribution and density of cetaceans in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean based on summer/fall research vessel surveys in 1986–96. Admin. Rep. LJ-01-04, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 61 p.
- Ferguson, M.C. and J. Barlow. 2003. Addendum: Spatial distribution and density of cetaceans in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean based on summer/fall research vessel surveys in 1986–96. Admin. Rep. LJ-01-04, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 120 p.
- Ferguson, M.C., J. Barlow, S.B. Reilly, and T. Gerrodette. 2006a. Predicting Cuvier's (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and *Mesoplodon* beaked whale population density from habitat characteristics in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean. **J. Cetacean Res. Manage.** 7(3): 287-299
- Ferguson, M.C., J. Barlow, P. Fiedler, S.B. Reilly, and T. Gerrodette. 2006b. Spatial models of delphinid (family Delphinidae) encounter rate and group size in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. **Ecol. Model.** 193(3-4):645-662.
- Ferguson, M. C. and Barlow, J. 2001. Spatial distribution and density of cetaceans in the eastern Pacific Ocean based on summer/fall research vessel surveys in 1986-96. Southwest Fisheries Science Center Administrative Report LJ-01-04: 61 pp
- Fernández, A., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, E. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and P.D. Jepson. 2004. Pathology: whales, sonar and decompression sickness (reply). **Nature** 428(6984):1.
- Fernández, A., J.F. Edwards, F. Rodriguez, A.E. de los Monteros, P. Herráez, P. Castro, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, and M. Arbelo. 2005. "Gas and fat embolic syndrome" involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. **Vet. Pathol.** 42(4):446-457.
- Finneran, J.J. and C.E. Schlundt. 2004. Effects of intense pure tones on the behavior of trained odontocetes. TR 1913, SSC San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, D.A. Carder, J.A. Clark, J.A. Young, J.B. Gaspin, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Auditory and behavioral responses of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) and beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*) to impulsive sounds resembling distant signatures of underwater explosions. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 108(1):417-431.
- Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2002. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 111(6):2929-2940.
- Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt, and S.H. Ridgway. 2005. Temporary threshold shift in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to mid-frequency tones. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 118(4):2696-2705.
- Ford, J.K.B. 2002. Killer whale. p. 669-675 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Frankel, A.S. 2005. Gray whales hear and respond to a 21–25 kHz high-frequency whale-finding sonar. Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Frantz, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? **Nature** 392(6671):29.
- Gailey, G., B. Würsig, and T.L. McDonald. 2007. Abundance, behavior, and movement patterns of western gray whales in relation to a 3-D seismic survey, northeast Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3):75-91. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9812-1.
- Gallardo, V.A., D. Arcos, M. Salamanca, and L. Pastene. 1983. On the occurrence of Bryde's Whales (*Balaenoptera edeni* Anderson, 1878) in an upwelling area off central Chile. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 33:481-488.
- Gallo, J. P. 1994. Factors affecting the population status of Guadalupe fur seal, *Arctocephalus townsendi* (Merriam, 1897), at Isla de Guadalupe, Baja California, Mexico. Ph.D. Thesis, University of California, Santa Cruz. 199 p.
- Galletti Vernazzani, B., Carlson, C. A., Cabrera, E., and Brownell Jr., R. L. 2007. Status of blue whales off Isla de

- Chiloe, Chile, during 2007 field season. C/59/SH1. IWC meeting.
- Galletti Vernazzani, B. and E. Cabrera. 2009. First aerial surveys to estimate abundance of blue whales off southern Chile, IWC SC/61/SH21
- Gambell, R. 1976. World whale stocks. **Mamm. Rev.** 6:41-53.
- Gambell, R. 1985a. Sei whale *Balaenoptera borealis* Lesson, 1828. p. 155-170 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3. The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Gambell, R. 1985b. Fin whale *Balaenoptera physalus* (Linnaeus, 1758). p. 171-192 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3. The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Gannier, A. 2000. Distribution of cetaceans off the Society Islands (French Polynesia) as obtained from dedicated surveys. **Aquat. Mamm.** 26(2):111-126.
- Gedamke, J., S. Frydman, and N. Gales. 2008. Risk of baleen whale hearing loss from seismic surveys: preliminary results from simulations accounting for uncertainty and individual variation. Working Pap. SC/60/E9. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 10 p.
- Gentry, R. (ed). 2002. Report of the workshop on acoustic resonance as a source of tissue trauma in cetaceans. 24-25 April, NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 19 p. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at: <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/acoustics/cetaceans.pdf>.
- Gerrodette, T., and J. Forcada. 2002. Estimates of abundance of northeastern offshore spotted, coastal spotted, and eastern spinner dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Admin. Rep. LJ-02-06, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 43 p.
- Gerrodette, T. and J. Forcada. 2005. Non-recovery of two spotted and spinner dolphin populations in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 291:1-21.
- Gerrodette, T. and J. Pettis. 2005. Responses of tropical cetaceans to an echosounder during research vessel Surveys. p. 104 In: Abstr. 16th Bien. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Gerrodette, T., G. Watters, W. Perryman and L. Balance. 2008. Estimates of 2006 dolphin abundance in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, with revised estimates from 1986-2003. Tech. Memo. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-422. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 39p.
- Gilpatrick, J.W., Jr., R.L. Pitman, L.T. Ballance, R. LeDuc, and H. Fearnbach. 2005. Killer whales prey upon a blue whale calf on the Costa Rica Dome: genetics, morphometrics and composition of the herd. Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 Dec. 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Goodall R.N.P. 1994. Chilean dolphin - *Cephalorhynchus eutropia* (Gray, 1846). In: Handbook of marine mammals (Ridgway SH, Harrison SR eds.) Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London, pp. 269-288.
- Goodall, R. N. P., De Haro, J. C., Iniguez, M. A. and Norris, K. S. 1997. Sightings and behavior of Peale's dolphins, *Lagenorhynchus australis*, with notes on dusky dolphins, *L. obscurus*, off southernmost South America. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 47: 757-776.
- Goodall, R.N.P., K.S. Norris, G. Harris, J.A. Oporto and H.P. Castello. 1995. Notes on the biology of the Burmeister's porpoise, *Phocoena spinipinnis*, off southern South America. Reports of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 16:317-348.
- Goodall, R.N.P., B. Würsig, M. Würsig, G. Harris and K.S. Norris. 1995. Sightings of Burmeister's porpoise, *Phocoena spinipinnis*, off southern South America. Reports of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 16:297-316.
- Goold, J.C. 1996a. Acoustic assessment of common dolphins off the west Wales coast, in conjunction with 16th round seismic surveying. Rep. from School of Ocean Sciences, Univ. Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Explor. (UK) Ltd., and Aran Energy Explor. Ltd. 22 p.
- Goold, J.C. 1996b. Acoustic assessment of populations of common dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in conjunction with seismic surveying. **J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.** 76:811-820.

- Goold, J.C. 1996c. Acoustic cetacean monitoring off the west Wales coast. Rep. from School of Ocean Sciences, Univ. Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Explor. (UK) Ltd, and Aran Energy Explor. Ltd. 20 p.
- Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M.P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. 2004. A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):16-34.
- Gordon, J., R. Antunes, N. Jaquet, and B. Würsig. 2006. An investigation of sperm whale headings and surface behaviour before, during and after seismic line changes in the Gulf of Mexico. Working Pap. SC/58/E45. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 10 p.
- Gosselin, J.-F. and J. Lawson. 2004. Distribution and abundance indices of marine mammals in the Gully and two adjacent canyons of the Scotian Shelf before and during nearby hydrocarbon seismic exploration programmes in April and July 2003. Res. Doc. 2004/133. Can. Sci. Advis. Secretariat, Fisheries & Oceans Canada. 24 p. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas/Csas/DocREC/2004/RES2004_133_e.pdf.
- Greene, C.R., Jr. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. p. 3-1 to 3-63 In: W.J. Richardson (ed.) Northstar marine mammal monitoring program, 1996: marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of a seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. LGL Rep. 2121-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Explor. (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 245 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999a. Bowhead whale calls. p. 6-1 to 6-23 In: Richardson, W.J. (ed.) Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and U.S. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999b. The influence of seismic survey sounds on bowhead whale calling rates. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(4, Pt. 2):2280 (Abstract).
- Gregg, E.J. and A.W. Trites. 2001. Predictions of critical habitat for five whale species in the waters of coastal British Columbia. **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 58: 1265-1285.
- Haase, B. and F. Félix. 1994. A note on the incidental mortality of sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) in Ecuador. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 15:481-483.
- Hall, M.A. and S.D. Boyer. 1989. Estimates of incidental mortality of dolphins in the eastern Pacific fishery for tropical tunas in 1987. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 39:321-322.
- Hammond, P.S., Bearzi, G., Bjørge, A., Forney, K., Karczmarski, L., Kasuya, T., Perrin, W.F., Scott, M.D., Wang, J.Y., Wells, R.S. & Wilson, B. 2008. *Lissodelphis peronii*. In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 15 December 2011
- Hammond, P.S., Bearzi, G., Bjørge, A., Forney, K., Karczmarski, L., Kasuya, T., Perrin, W.F., Scott, M.D., Wang, J.Y., Wells, R.S. & Wilson, B. 2008. *Lagenorhynchus obscurus*. In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 15 December 2011
- Hansen, L.J., K.D. Mullin, and C.L. Roden. 1994. Preliminary estimates of cetacean abundance in the U.S. Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone from 1992 vessel surveys. Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami Laboratory. Contribution No. MIA-93/94-58.
- Harris, R.E., G.W. Miller, and W.J. Richardson. 2001. Seal responses to airgun sounds during summer seismic surveys in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17(4):795-812.
- Harris, R.E., T. Elliot, and R.A. Davis. 2007. Results of mitigation and monitoring program, Beaufort Span 2-D marine seismic program, open water season 2006. LGL Ltd. LGL Rep. TA4319-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for GX Technol., Houston, TX. 48 p.
- Hastie, G.D. and V.M. Janik. 2007. Behavioural responses of grey seals to multibeam imaging sonars. In: Abstr. 17th Bien. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 29 Nov–3 Dec., Cape Town, South Africa.

- Hauser, D.D.W., M. Holst, and V.D. Moulton. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, April-August 2008. LGL Rep. TA4656/7-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and St. John's, Nfld, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 98 p.
- Heide-Jørgensen, M.P., D. Bloch, E. Stefansson, B. Mikkelsen, L.H. Ofstad, and R. Dietz. 2002. Diving behaviour of long-finned pilot whales *Globicephala melas* around the Faroe Islands. *Wildl. Biol.* 8:307-313.
- Heinrich, S. 2006. Ecology of Chilean dolphins and Peale's dolphins at Isla Chiloé, southern Chile. Ph.D. Thesis, University of St Andrews
- Heyning, J.E. 1989. Cuvier's beaked whale *Ziphius cavirostris* G. Cuvier, 1823. p. 289-308 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 4. River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 444 p.
- Heyning, J.E. and W.F. Perrin. 1994. Evidence for two species of common dolphins (genus *Delphinus*) from the Eastern North Pacific. **Contribut. Sci.** 442:1-35.
- Hildebrand, J.A. 2005. Impacts of anthropogenic sound. p. 101-124 *In*: J.E. Reynolds, W.F. Perrin, R.R. Reeves, S. Montgomery, and T. Ragen (eds.), *Marine mammal research: conservation beyond crisis*. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD. 223 p.
- Hoelzel, A.R., C.W. Potter, and P.B. Best. 1998. Genetic differentiation between parapatric 'nearshore' and 'offshore' populations of the bottlenose dolphin. **Proc. R. Soc Lond. B** 265:1177-1183.
- Hogarth, W.T. 2002. Declaration of William T. Hogarth in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 23 October 2002. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Div.
- Holst, M. and J. Beland. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic testing and calibration study in the northern Gulf of Mexico, November 2007–February 2008. LGL Rep. TA4295-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 77 p.
- Holst, M. and M.A. Smultea. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off Central America, February–April 2008. LGL Rep. TA4342-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 133 p.
- Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005a. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off the Northern Yucatán Peninsula in the Southern Gulf of Mexico, January–February 2005. LGL Rep. TA2822-31. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 96 p.
- Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005b. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean off Central America, November–December 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-30. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 125 p.
- Holst, M., W.J. Richardson, W.R. Koski, M.A. Smultea, B. Haley, M.W. Fitzgerald, and M. Rawson. 2006. Effects of large and small-source seismic surveys on marine mammals and sea turtles. Abstract. Presented at Am. Geophys. Union - Soc. Explor. Geophys. Joint Assembly on Environ. Impacts from Marine Geophys. & Geological Studies - Recent Advances from Academic & Industry Res. Progr., Baltimore, MD, May 2006.
- Horwood, J. 1987. The sei whale: population biology, ecology, and management. Croom Helm, Beckenham, Kent, U.K. 375 p.
- Huckstadt, L. A. 2005. New records of cetaceans for the VIII region, Chile (1997 to 1999). *Gayana* 69:291–299.

- IAGC (International Association of Geophysical Contractors). 2004. Further analysis of 2002 Abrolhos Bank, Brazil humpback whale strandings coincident with seismic surveys. Int. Assoc. Geophys. Contr., Houston, TX.
- Ireland, D., M. Holst, and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program off the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, July–August 2005. LGL Report TA4089-3. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University, Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.
- IATTC (Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission). 2008. Annual report of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission 2008. IATTC, La Jolla, CA. 100 p. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at <http://www.iattc.org/PDFFiles2/IATTC-Annual-Report-2008.pdf>.
- IUCN (The World Conservation Union). 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Version 2011.2. Accessed on 12 December 2011 at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>.
- IWC (International Whaling Commission). 2010. IWC members and commissioners. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at <http://www.iwcoffice.org/commission/members.htm>.
- IWC (International Whaling Commission). 2007. Report of the Scientific Committee. Annex Q. Progress Reports. J. Cetacean Res. Manage. (Suppl.) 9:353-400.
- IWC (International Whaling Commission). 2007b. Report of the Scientific Committee. Report to the International Whaling Commission IWC/59/Rep 1.
- IWC (International Whaling Commission). 2007c. Report of the standing working group on environmental concerns. Annex K to Report of the Scientific Committee. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 9 (Suppl.):227-260.
- Jackson, A., T. Gerrodette, S. Chivers, M. Lynn, S. Rankin, and S. Mesnick. 2008. Marine mammal data collected during a survey in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean aboard the NOAA ships *David Starr Jordan* and *MacArthur II*, July 28–December 7 2006. NOAA Tech. Memo. TM-NMFS-SWFSC-421. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 45 p.
- Jacquet, N. and H. Whitehead. 1996. Scale-dependent correlation of sperm whale distribution with environmental features and productivity in the South Pacific. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 135(1-3):1-9.
- Jefferson, T. A., Leatherwood, S. and Webber, M. A. 1993. Marine Mammals of the World: FAO Species Identification Guide. United Nation Environment Programme and Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN.
- Jefferson, T.A., M.A. Webber, and R.L. Pitman. 2008. Marine mammals of the world—A comprehensive guide to their identification. Elsevier, Academic Press, Amsterdam, Holland. 573 p.
- Jefferson, T. A., Newcomer, M. W., Leatherwood, S. and K. Van Waerebeek. 1994. Right whale dolphins *Lissodelphis borealis* (Peale, 1848) and *Lissodelphis peronii* (Lacepede, 1804). In: S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds), Handbook of marine mammals, pp. 335-362. Academic Press.
- Jepson, P.D., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, F. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and A. Fernández. 2003. Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans. **Nature** 425(6958):575-576.
- Jochens, A., D. Biggs, K. Benoit-Bird, D. Engelhaupt, J. Gordon, C. Hu, N. Jaquet, M. Johnson, R. Leben, B. Mate, P. Miller, J. Ortega-Ortiz, A. Thode, P. Tyack, and B. Würsig. 2008. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico: synthesis report. OCS Study MMS 2008-006. Rep. from Dep. Oceanogr., Texas A & M Univ., College Station, TX, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Gulf of Mexico OCS Reg., New Orleans, LA. 341 p.
- Johnson, M., P.T. Madsen, W.M.X. Zimmer, N. Aguilar de Soto, and P.L. Tyack. 2004. Beaked whales echolocate on prey. **Proc. Royal Soc.Lond. Ser. B Suppl.** 04BL0042.S1-S4.
- Johnson, S.R., W.J. Richardson, S.B. Yazvenko, S.A. Blokhin, G. Gailey, M.R. Jenkerson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, A.S. Perlov, S.A. Rutenko, B. Würsig, C.R. Martin, and D.E. Egging. 2007. A western gray whale mitigation and monitoring program for a 3-D seismic survey, Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3):1-19. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9813-0.

- Kastak, D., R.L. Schusterman, B.L. Southall, and C.J. Reichmuth. 1999. Underwater temporary threshold shift induced by octave-band noise in three species of pinnipeds. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(2):1142-1148.
- Kastak, D., B.L. Southall, R.J. Schusterman, and C. Reichmuth. 2005. Underwater temporary threshold shift in pinnipeds: effects of noise level and duration. **J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.** 118(5):3154-3163.
- Kato, H. 2002. Bryde's whales. . p. 171-176 *In*: W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and H. G. M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Kenney, R.D. and H.E. Winn. 1987. Cetacean high-use habitats of the northeast United States continental shelf. **Fish. Bull.** 84:345-357.
- Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals from underwater explosions. p. 391-407 *In*: Kastelein, R.A., J.A. Thomas, and P.E. Nachtigall (eds.), Sensory systems of aquatic mammals. De Spil Publ., Woerden, Netherlands. 588 p.
- Ketten, D.R., J. Lien, and S. Todd. 1993. Blast injury in humpback whale ears: evidence and implications. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 94(3, Pt. 2):1849-1850.
- Ketten, D.R., J. O'Malley, P.W.B. Moore, S. Ridgway, and C. Merigo. 2001. Aging, injury, disease, and noise in marine mammal ears. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 110(5, Pt. 2):2721.
- Kinzey, D., T. Gerrodette, J. Barlow, A. Dizon, W. Perryman, P. Olson, and A. Von Sauner. 1999. Marine mammal data collected during a survey in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean aboard the NOAA ships *McArthur* and *David Starr Jordan* and the UNOLS ship *Endeavor* July 31-December 9, 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-283. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 113 p.
- Kinzey, D., T. Gerrodette, J. Barlow, A. Dizon, W. Perryman, and P. Olson. 2000. Marine mammal data collected during a survey in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean aboard the NOAA ships *McArthur* and *David Starr Jordan*, July 28-December 9, 1998. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-293. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 89 p.
- Kinzey, D., T. Gerrodette, A. Dizon, W. Perryman, P. Olson, and S. Rankin. 2001. Marine mammal data collected during a survey in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean aboard the NOAA ships *McArthur* and *David Starr Jordan*, July 28-December 9, 2000. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-303. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 100 p.
- Klatsky, L.J., R.S. Wells, and J.C. Sweeney. 2007. Offshore bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*): Movement and dive behavior near the Bermuda Pedestal. **J. Mamm.** 88:59-66.
- Kremser, U., P. Klemm, and W.D. Kötz. 2005. Estimating the risk of temporary acoustic threshold shift, caused by hydroacoustic devices, in whales in the Southern Ocean. **Antarctic Sci.** 17(1):3-10.
- Kruse, S., D.K. Caldwell, and M.C. Caldwell. 1999. Risso's dolphin *Grampus griseus* (G. Cuvier, 1812). p. 183-212 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 6. The mecond book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 486 p.
- Kryter, K.D. 1985. The effects of noise on man, 2nd ed. Academic Press, Orlando, FL. 688 p.
- Lagerquist, B.A., K.M. Stafford, and B.R. Mate. 2000. Dive characteristics of satellite-monitored blue whales (*Balaenoptera musculus*) off the central California coast. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 16(2):375-391.
- Laist, D.W., A.R. Knowlton, J.G. Mead, A.S. Collet, and M. Podesta. 2001. Collisions between ships and whales. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17:35-75.
- Laurinolli, M.H. and N.A. Cochrane. 2005. Hydroacoustic analysis of marine mammal vocalization data from ocean bottom seismometer mounted hydrophones in the Gully. p. 89-95 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain and G.V. Hurley (eds.) Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p. Published 2007.
- Leatherwood, S. and R.R. Reeves. 1983. The Sierra Club handbook of whales and dolphins. Sierra Club, San Francisco, CA.

- Leatherwood, S., R.R. Reeves, W.F. Perrin, and W.E. Evans. 1988. Whales, dolphins and porpoises of the eastern North Pacific and adjacent arctic waters. Dover Publications, New York, NY. 245 p.
- Leatherwood, S., J.S. Grove, and A.E. Zuckerman. 1991. Dolphins of the genus *Lagenorhynchus* in the tropical South Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 7(2):194-197.
- Lee, T. 1993. Summary of cetacean survey data collected between the years of 1974 and 1985. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SWFSC-181. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center, La Jolla, CA. 184 p.
- Lescrauwaet, A. and J. Gibbons. 1994. Mortality of Small Cetaceans and the Crab Bait Fishery in the Magallanes Area of Chile Since 1980. Report for the International Whaling Commission (SPECIAL ISSUE 15). SC/46LSM11
- Lien, J. 2002. Entrapment and entanglement. p. 394-395 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Lipsky, J. D. 2002. Right whale dolphins *Lissodelphis borealis* and *L. peronii*. In: W. F. Perrin, B. Wursig and J. G. M. Thewissen (eds), Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals, pp. 1030-1033. Academic Press
- Ljungblad, D.K., B. Würsig, S.L. Swartz, and J.M. Keene. 1988. Observations on the behavioral responses of bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) to active geophysical vessels in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. **Arctic** 41(3):183-194.
- Lockyer, C.H. and S.G. Brown. 1981. The migration of whales. p. 105-137 In: D.J. Aidley (ed.), Animal migration. Soc. Exp. Biol. Sem. Ser. 13, Cambridge University Press, London, U.K.
- Lucke, K., U. Siebert, P.A. Lepper, and M.-A. Blanchet. 2009. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after exposure to seismic airgun stimuli. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 125(6):4060-4070.
- Lusseau, D. and L. Bejder. 2007. The long-term consequences of short-term responses to disturbance experience from whalewatching impact assessment. **Intern. J. Comp. Psych.** 20(2-3):228-236.
- Mackintosh, N.A. 1965. The stocks of whales. Fishing News, London.
- Mackintosh, N.A. 1966. The distribution of southern blue and fin whales. p. 125-144 In: K.S. Norris (ed.), Whales, dolphins and porpoises. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA. 789 p.
- MacLean, S.A. and B. Haley. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Støregga Slide area of the Norwegian Sea, August–September 2003. LGL Rep. TA2822-20. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 59 p.
- MacLean, S.A. and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Gulf of Alaska, August–September 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-28. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 102 p.
- MacLeod, C.D. and A. D'Amico. 2006. A review of beaked whale behaviour and ecology in relation to assessing and mitigating impacts of anthropogenic noise. **J. Cetacean Res. Manage.** 7(3): 211-221
- MacLeod, C.D. and G. Mitchell. 2006. Known key areas for beaked whales around the world. **J. Cetacean Res. Manage.** 7: 309-320.
- MacLeod, C.D. and A.F. Zuur. 2005. Habitat utilization by Blainville's beaked whales off Great Abaco, northern Bahamas, in relation to seabed topography. **Mar. Biol.** 147:1-11.
- MacLeod, C.D., N. Hauser, and H. Peckham. 2004. Diversity, relative density and structure of the cetacean community in summer months east of Great Abaco, Bahamas. **J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.** 84:469-474.
- Madsen, P.T., B. Møhl, B.K. Nielsen, and M. Wahlberg. 2002. Male sperm whale behavior during exposures to distant seismic survey pulses. **Aquat. Mamm.** 28(3):231-240.

- Madsen, P.T., M. Johnson, P.J.O. Miller, N. Aguilar de Soto, J. Lynch, and P.L. Tyack. 2006. Quantitative measures of air gun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 120(4):2366–2379.
- Malakoff, D. 2002. Suit ties whale deaths to research cruise. **Science** 298(5594):722-723.
- Malme, C.I. and P.R. Miles. 1985. Behavioral responses of marine mammals (gray whales) to seismic discharges. p. 253-280 *In*: G.D. Greene, F.R. Engelhardt, and R.J. Paterson (eds.), Proc. workshop on effects of explosives use in the marine environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, N.S. Tech. Rep. 5. Can. Oil & Gas Lands Admin., Environ. Prot. Br., Ottawa, Ont. 398 p.
- Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. 1984. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Rep. 5586. Rep. by Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc., Cambridge, MA, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Anchorage, AK. Var. pag. NTIS PB86-218377.
- Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, P. Tyack, C.W. Clark, and J.E. Bird. 1985. Investigation of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on feeding humpback whale behavior. BBN Rep. 5851; OCS Study MMS 85-0019. Rep. by BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Anchorage, AK. Var. pag. NTIS PB86-218385.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1986. Behavioral responses of gray whales to industrial noise: feeding observations and predictive modeling. Outer Cont. Shelf Environ. Assess. Progr., Final Rep. Princ. Invest., NOAA, Anchorage, AK 56(1988):393-600. BBN Rep. 6265. 600 p. OCS Study MMS 88-0048; NTIS PB88-249008.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1988. Observations of feeding gray whale responses to controlled industrial noise exposure. p. 55-73 *In*: Sackinger, W.M., M.O. Jeffries, J.L. Imm, and S.D. Treacy (eds.), Port and ocean engineering under arctic conditions, Vol. II. Geophysical Inst., Univ. Alaska, Fairbanks, AK. 111 p.
- Martin, A. R. 1994. *Globicephala melas* - langflossen-Grindwal. *In*: J. Niethammer and F. Krapp (eds), Handbuch de Säugetiere Europas, pp. 407-421. Aula-Verlag, Weibaden, Germany
- Martínez-Fernández, D., A. Montero-Cordero and L. May-Collado. 2005. Occurrence of *Pseudorca crassidens* in the pacific coastal waters of Costa Rica. Poster presentation. 16th Bien. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Mate, B.R., B.A. Lagerquist, and J. Calambokidis. 1999. Movements of North Pacific blue whales during the feeding season off southern California and their southern fall migration. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(4):1246-1257.
- May-Collado, L., T. Gerrodette, J. Calambokidis, K. Rasmussen, and I. Sereg. 2005. Patterns of cetacean sighting distribution in the Pacific Exclusive Economic Zone of Costa Rica based on data collected from 1979-2001. **Rev Biol. Trop.** 53:249-263.
- McAlpine, D.F. 2002. Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales *Kogia breviceps* and *K. sima*. p. 1007-1009 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. **APPEA (Austral. Petrol. Product. Explor. Assoc.) J.** 38:692-707.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin Univ., Perth, W.A., for Austral. Petrol. Prod. Assoc., Sydney, N.S.W. 188 p.

- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, K. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. **APPEA (Austral. Petrol. Product. Explor. Assoc.) J.** 40:692-708.
- McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.C. Webb. 1995. Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the Northeast Pacific. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 98(2 Pt.1):712-721.
- Mead, J.G. 1989. Beaked whales of the genus *Mesoplodon*. p. 349-430 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4, River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Miller, G.W., R.E. Elliott, W.R. Koski, V.D. Moulton, and W.J. Richardson. 1999. Whales. p. 5-1 to 5-109 *In*: Richardson, W.J. (ed.) Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and U.S. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Miller, G.W., V.D. Moulton, R.A. Davis, M. Holst, P. Millman, A. MacGillivray, and D. Hannay. 2005. Monitoring seismic effects on marine mammals—southeastern Beaufort Sea, 2001–2002. p. 511-542 *In*: Armsworthy, S.L., P.J. Cranford, and K. Lee (eds.) Offshore oil and gas environmental effects monitoring/Approaches and technologies. Battelle Press, Columbus, OH.
- Miller, P.J.O., M.P. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, N. Biassoni, M. Quero, and P.L. Tyack. 2009. Using at-sea experiments to study the effects of airguns on the foraging behavior of sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico. **Deep-Sea Res. I** 56(7):1168-1181.
- Miyazaki, N. and W.F. Perrin. 1994. Rough-toothed dolphin *Steno bredanensis* (Lesson, 1828). p. 1-21 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5: The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Miyashita, T., Kato, H. and Kasuya, T. 1996. *Worldwide Map of Cetacean Distribution Based on Japanese Sighting Data*. National Research Institute of Far Seas Fisheries
- Mizroch, S.A., D.W. Rice, and J.M. Breiwick. 1984. The blue whale, *Balaenoptera musculus*. **Mar. Fish. Rev.** 46(4):15-19.
- Moore, S.E. and J.T. Clarke. 2002. Potential impact of offshore human activities on gray whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 4(1):19-25.
- Moulton, V.D. and J.W. Lawson. 2002. Seals, 2001. p. 3-1 to 3-48 *In*: Richardson, W.J. (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of WesternGeco's open water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 2001. LGL Rep. TA2564-4. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for WesternGeco, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD.
- Moulton, V.D. and G.W. Miller. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring of a seismic survey on the Scotian Slope, 2003. p. 29-40 *In*: Lee, K., H. Bain, and G.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in the Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic programs. *Env. Stud. Res. Funds Rep.* No. 151. 154 p. + xx.
- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, and R.A. Buchanan. 2005. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Resources' 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2004. LGL Rep. SA817. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, Alb., ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, Alb. 90 p. + appendices.
- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, R.E. Harris, and R.A. Buchanan. 2006a. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Limited's 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2005. LGL Rep. SA843. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, Alb., ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, Alb. 111 p. + appendices.
- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, and R.A. Buchanan. 2006b. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Conoco-Phillips' 3-D seismic program in the Laurentian Sub-basin, 2005. LGL Rep. SA849. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for ConocoPhillips Canada Resources Corp., Calgary, Alb. 97 p. + appendices.

- Mullin, K.D., T.A. Jefferson, L.J. Hansen, and W. Hoggard. 1994. First sightings of melon-headed whales (*Peponocephala electra*) in the Gulf of Mexico. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 10(3):342-348.
- Muñoz-Hincapié, M.F., D.M. Mora-Pinto, D.M. Palacios, E.R. Secchi, and A.A. Mignucci-Giannoni. 1998. First osteological record of the dwarf sperm whale in Colombia, with notes on the zoogeography of Kogia in South America. **Revista Acad. Colomb. Cien.** 22(84):433-444.
- NatureServe. 2009. NatureServe Explorer: An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. Version 7.1. NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at <http://www.natureserve.org/explorer>.
- Nieukirk, S.L., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, R.P. Dziak, and C.G. Fox. 2004. Low-frequency whale and seismic airgun sounds recorded in the mid-Atlantic Ocean. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 115(4):1832-1843.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1995. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; offshore seismic activities in southern California. **Fed. Regist.** 60(200, 17 Oct.):53753-53760.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 1998. Recovery plan for the blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*). Prepared by R.R. Reeves, P.J. Clapham, R.L. Brownell, Jr., and G.K. Silber for the National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD. 42 p.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2000. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; marine seismic-reflection data collection in southern California/Notice of receipt of application. **Fed. Regist.** 65(60, 28 Mar.):16374-16379.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2001. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; oil and gas exploration drilling activities in the Beaufort Sea/Notice of issuance of an incidental harassment authorization. **Fed. Regist.** 66(26, 7 Feb.):9291-9298.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2005. Endangered fish and wildlife; notice of intent to prepare an environmental impact statement. **Fed. Regist.** 70(7, 11 Jan.):1871-1875.
- NOAA and USN (National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration and U.S. Navy). 2001. Joint interim report: Bahamas marine mammal stranding event of 15–16 March 2000. U.S. Dep. Commer., Nat. Oceanic Atmos. Admin., Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Sec. Navy, Assist. Sec. Navy, Installations and Environ. 51 p. Accessed on 11 May 2010 at http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/health/stranding_bahamas2000.pdf.
- Norris, T.F., M. McDonald, and J. Barlow. 1999. Acoustic detections of singing humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) in the eastern North Pacific during their northbound migration. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(1):506-514.
- Northridge, S.P. and R.J. Hofman. 1999. Marine mammal interactions with fisheries. p. 99-119 *In*: J.R. Twiss, Jr. and R.R. Reeves (eds.), Conservation and management of marine mammals. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.
- Nowacek, D.P., L.H. Thorne, D.W. Johnston, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. **Mamm. Rev.** 37(2):81-115.
- NRC (National Research Council). 2005. Marine mammal populations and ocean noise/Determining when noise causes biologically significant effects. U.S. Nat. Res. Council, Ocean Studies Board, Committee on Characterizing Biologically Significant Marine Mammal Behavior (Wartzok, D.W., J. Altmann, W. Au, K. Ralls, A. Starfield, and P.L. Tyack). Nat. Acad. Press, Washington, DC. 126 p.
- Odell, D.K. and K.M. McClune. 1999. False killer whale *Pseudorca crassidens* (Owen, 1846). p. 213-243 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals. Vol. 6. The second Book of dolphins and the porpoises. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 486 p.
- Olson, P.A. and S. B. Reilly. 2002. Pilot whales. p. 898-893 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Palacios, D.M. 1996a. On the specimen of the ginkgo-toothed beaked whale, *Mesoplodon ginkgodens*, from the Galápagos Islands. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 12(3):444-446.
- Palacios, D.M. 1996b. Earlier observations of presumed Galápagos sea lions, *Zalophus californianus wollebaeki*, from coastal Ecuador [letter]. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 12(3):497.

- Palacios, D.M. 1999. Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) occurrence off the Galápagos Islands, 1978-1995. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 1(1):41-51.
- Palacios, D.M., F. Félix, L. Flórez-González, J.J. Cappela, D. Chiliza, and B.J.M. Haase. 1997. Sightings of Galápagos sea lions (*Zalophus californianus wolfebaeki*) on the coasts of Colombia and Ecuador. **Mammalia** 61(1):114-116.
- Palacios, D.M. K.M. Stafford, and F.B. Schwing. 2005. Temporal variations in blue whale acoustic detections in relation to environmental conditions in the northeastern tropical Pacific, 1996-2002. Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.
- Panigada, S., M. Zanardelli, S. Canese and M. Jahoda. 1999. How deep can baleen whales dive? **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 187:309–311.
- Papastavrou, V., S.C. Smith, and H. Whitehead. 1989. Diving behaviour of the sperm whale, *Physeter macrocephalus*, off the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Zool.** 67(4):839-846.
- Pastene L.A., Acevedo, J., Goto, M., Zerbini, A. N., Acuna, P., and Aguayo-Lobo, A. 2009. Population structure and possible migratory links of common minke whales, *Balaenoptera acutorostrata*, in the Southern Hemisphere. *Conservation Genetics*. 11(4):1553-1558. DOI: 10.1007/s10592-009-9944-7
- Parente, C.L., M.C.C. Marcondes, and M.H. Engel. 2006. Humpback whale strandings and seismic surveys in Brazil from 1999 to 2004. Working Pap. SC/58/E41. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 16 p.
- Perez-Alvarez M.J., Alvarez E, Aguayo-Lobo A, and C. Olavarria. 2007. Occurrence and distribution of Chilean dolphin (*Cephalorhynchus eutropia*) in coastal waters of central Chile. **N Z J Mar Freshw Res** 41: 405-409
- Perrin, W.F. 1990. Subspecies of *Stenella longirostris* (Mammalia: Cetacea, Delphinidae). **Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash.** 103(2):453-463.
- Perrin, W.F. and J.W. Gilpatrick, Jr. 1994. Spinner dolphin. p. 99-128 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 5. The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Perrin, W.F. and A.A. Hohn. 1994. Pantropical spotted dolphin *Stenella attenuata*. p. 71-98 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 5. The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Perrin, W.F. and W.A. Walker. 1975. The rough-toothed porpoise, *Steno bredanensis*, in the eastern tropical Pacific. **J. Mammal.** 56:905-907.
- Perrin, W.F., M.D. Scott, G.J. Walker, and V.L. Cass. 1985. Review of geographical stocks of tropical dolphins (*Stenella* spp. and *Delphinus delphis*) in the eastern Pacific. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS 28. 28 p.
- Perrin, W.F., C.E. Wilson, and F.I. Archer II. 1994a. Striped dolphin *Stenella coeruleoalba* (Meyen, 1833). p. 129-159 In: S. H. Ridgway and R. J. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 5. The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Perrin, W.F., S. Leatherwood, and A. Collet. 1994b. Fraser's dolphin *Lagenodelphis hosei* Fraser, 1956. p. 225-240 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 5. The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London, U.K. 416 p.
- Perry, S.L., D.P. DeMaster, and G.K. Silber. 1999. The great whales: history and status of six species listed as endangered under the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973. **Mar. Fish. Rev.** 61:1-74.
- Perryman, W.L. 2002. Melon-headed whale—*Peponocephala electra*. p. 733-735 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), *Encyclopedia of marine mammals*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Perryman, W.L. and T.C. Foster. 1980. Preliminary report of predation by small whales, mainly the false killer whale, *Pseudorca crassidens*, on dolphins (*Stenella* spp. and *Delphinus delphis*) in the eastern tropical Pacific. Admin. Rep. LJ-80-05. Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. 9 p.
- Perryman, W.L. and M.S. Lynn. 1993. Identification of geographic forms of common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*) from aerial photogrammetry. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 9(2):119-137.

- Perryman, W.L., D.W.K. Au, S. Leatherwood, and T.A. Jefferson. 1994. Melon-headed whale *Peponocephala electra* Gray, 1846. p. 363-386 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 5. The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, London, U.K. 416 p.
- Pierson, M.O., J.P. Wagner, V. Langford, P. Birnie, and M.L. Tasker. 1998. Protection from, and mitigation of, the potential effects of seismic exploration on marine mammals. Chapter 7 In: Tasker, M.L. and C. Weir (eds.), Proceedings of the seismic and marine mammals workshop, 23–25 June 1998, London, U.K.
- Pitman, R.L. 2002. Mesoplodont whales *Mesoplodon spp.* p. 738-742 In: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Pitman, R.L. and L.T. Ballance. 1992. Parkinson's petrel distribution and foraging ecology in the eastern tropical Pacific: Aspects of an exclusive feeding relationships with dolphins. **Condor** 94(4):825-835.
- Pitman, R.L. and M.S. Lynn. 2001. Biological observations of an unidentified Mesoplodont whale in the eastern tropical Pacific and probable identity: *Mesoplodon peruvianus*. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17(3): 648-657.
- Pitman, R.L., A. Aguayo L., and J. Urbán R. 1987. Observations of an unidentified beaked whale (*Mesoplodon* sp.) in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 3(4):345-352.
- Pitman, R.L., D.M. Palacios, P.L.R. Brennan, B.J. Brennan, K.C. Balcomb, III, and T. Miyashita. 1999. Sightings and possible identity of a bottlenose whale in the tropical Indo-Pacific: *Indopacetus pacificus*? **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(2): 513-518.
- Polacheck, T. 1987. Relative abundance, distribution and inter-specific relationship of cetacean schools in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 3(1):54-77.
- Potter, J.R., M. Thillet, C. Douglas, M.A. Chitre, Z. Doborzynski, and P.J. Seekings. 2007. Visual and passive acoustic marine mammal observations and high-frequency seismic source characteristics recorded during a seismic survey. **IEEE J. Oceanic Eng.** 32(2):469-483.
- Rasmussen, K., J. Calambokidis, and G.H. Steiger. 2004. Humpback whales and other marine mammals off Costa Rica and surrounding waters, 1996-2003. Report of the Oceanic Society 2003 field season in cooperation with elderhostel volunteers. Cascadia Research, Olympia, WA. 24 p.
- Rasmussen, K., D.M. Palacios, J. Calambokidis, M.T. Saborio, L. Dalla Rosa, E.R. Secchi, G.H. Steiger, J.M. Allen, and G.S. Stone. 2007. Southern Hemisphere humpback whales wintering off Central America: insights from water temperature into the longest mammalian migration. **Biol. Lett.** 3:302-305.
- Read, A.J., K. Van Waerebeek, J.C. Reyes, J.S. McKinnon, and L.C. Lehman. 1998. The exploitation of small cetaceans in Coastal Peru. **Biol. Conserv.** 46:53-70.
- Read, A.J., P.N. Halpin, L.B. Crowder, B.D. Best, and E. Fujioka (eds.). 2009. OBIS-SEAMAP: Mapping marine mammals, birds and turtles. World Wide Web electronic publication. Accessed on 17 April 2010 at http://seamap.env.duke.edu/prod/serdp/serdp_map.php.
- Reeves, R.R., B.S. Stewart, P.J. Clapham, and J.A. Powell. 2002. Guide to marine mammals of the world. Chanticleer Press, New York, NY. 527 p.
- Reeves, R.R., Crespo, E.A., Dans, S., Jefferson, T.A., Karczmarski, L., Laidre, K., O'Corry-Crowe, G., Pedraza, S., Rojas-Bracho, L., Secchi, E.R., Slooten, E., Smith, B.D., Wang, J.Y., & Zhou, K. 2008. *Cephalorhynchus eutropia*. In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 08 December 2011
- Reilly, S.B., Bannister, J.L., Best, P.B., Brown, M., Brownell Jr., R.L., Butterworth, D.S., Clapham, P.J., Cooke, J., Donovan, G.P., Urbán, J. & Zerbini, A.N. 2008. *Balaenoptera bonaerensis*. In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 09 December 2011
- Reilly, S.B., Bannister, J.L., Best, P.B., Brown, M., Brownell Jr., R.L., Butterworth, D.S., Clapham, P.J., Cooke, J., Donovan, G.P., Urbán, J. & Zerbini, A.N. 2008. *Eubalaena australis* (Chile-Peru subpopulation). In: IUCN 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2011.2. <www.iucnredlist.org>. Accessed on 08 December 2011
- Reilly, S.B. 1990. Seasonal changes in distribution and habitat differences among dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 66(1-2):1-11.

- Reilly, S.B. and V.G. Thayer. 1990. Blue whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*) distribution in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 6:265-277.
- Reilly, S.B. and P.C. Fiedler. 1994. Interannual variability of dolphin habitats in the eastern tropical Pacific. I: Research vessel surveys, 1986–1990. **Fish. Bull.** 92(2):434-450.
- Rendell, L.E. and J.C.D. Gordon. 1999. Vocal response of long-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala melas*) to military sonar in the Ligurian Sea. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(1):198-204.
- Reyes, J.C., 2002. Burmeister's porpoise *Phocoena spinipinnis*. pp. 177-179 in W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J.G.M. Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press
- Reyes, J.C. and K. Van Waerebeek. 1995. Aspects of the biology of Burmeister's porpoise from Peru. Reports of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 16:349-364.
- Reyes, J.C., J.G. Mead, and K. Van Waerebeek. 1991. A new species of beaked whale *Mesoplodon peruvianus* sp. n. (Cetacea: Ziphiidae) from Peru. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 7(1):1-24.
- Reyes, J., Van Waerebeek, K., Cardenas, J. C. and Yanez, J. L. 1996. *Mesoplodon bahamondi* sp. n. (Cetacea, Ziphiidae), a new living beaked whale from the Juan Fernandez Archipelago, Chile. Boletín de Museum Nacional de History Natural, Chile 45: 31-44
- Rice, D.W. 1989. Sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* Linnaeus, 1758. p. 177-233 In: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4. River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 444 p.
- Rice, D.W. 1998. Marine mammals of the world, systematics and distribution. Spec. Publ. 4. Soc. Mar. Mammal., Allen Press, Lawrence, KS. 231 p.
- Richardson, W.J., B. Würsig, and C.R. Greene. 1986. Reactions of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, to seismic exploration in the Canadian Beaufort Sea. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 79(4):1117-1128.
- Richardson, W.J., R.A. Davis, C.R. Evans, D.K. Ljungblad, and P. Norton. 1987. Summer distribution of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, relative to oil industry activities in the Canadian Beaufort Sea, 1980–84. **Arctic** 40(2):93-104.
- Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press, San Diego. 576 p.
- Richardson, W.J., G.W. Miller, and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Displacement of migrating bowhead whales by sounds from seismic surveys in shallow waters of the Beaufort Sea. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(4, Pt. 2):2281 (Abstract).
- Richardson, W.J., M. Holst, W.R. Koski and M. Cummings. 2009. Responses of cetaceans to large-source seismic surveys by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. p. 213 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., October 2009, Québec City, Que. 306 p.
- Ritter, F. and B. Brederlau. 1999. Behavioural observations of dense beaked whales (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) off La Gomera, Canary Islands (1995–1997). **Aquat. Mamm.** 25(2):55-61.
- Rodríguez-Fonseca, J. 2001. Diversity and distribution of Costa Rica's cetaceans (Cetacea: Delphinidae, Physeteridae, Ziphiidae and Balaenopteridae). **Rev. Biol. Trop.** 49, Suppl. 2:135-143. (Spanish, Engl. summ.)
- Rodríguez-Fonseca, J. and P. Cubero-Pardo. 2001. Cetacean strandings in Costa Rica (1966-1999). **Rev. Biol. Trop.** 49(2):667-672.
- Rodríguez-Herrera, B., F.A. Chinchilla, and L.J. May-Collado. 2002. Lista de especies, endemismo y conservación de los de mamíferos de Costa Rica. **Rev. Mex. Mastozoología** 6:19-41.
- Romero, A., A.I. Agudo, S.M. Green, and G. Notarbartolo di Sciara. 2001. Cetaceans of Venezuela: their distribution and conservation status. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS 151. U.S. Dep. Comm., Seattle, WA. 60 p.
- Rosales, M.L. and S. Escorza-Trefiño. 2005. Population structure and sex biased dispersal of spotted dolphins (*Stenella attenuata*) in the eastern tropical Pacific. 2005. Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 12–16 December 2005, San Diego, CA.

- Rose, B. and Payne, A. I. L. 1991. Occurrence and behavior of the southern right whale dolphin *Lissodelphis peronii* off Namibia. *Marine Mammal Science* 7: 25-34.
- Ross, G. J.B. and S. Leatherwood. 1994. Pygmy killer whale *Feresa attenuata* Gray, 1874. p. 387-404 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), *Handbook of marine mammals*, Vol. 5. The first book of dolphins. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 416 p.
- Santillán L., M. Roca, M. Apaza, L. Rosa de Oliveira, and K. Ontón. 2004. New record of mother-calf pair of southern right whale, *Eubalaena australis*, off the Peruvian coast. *LAJAM* 3: 83-84.
- Sanino, G. P., and J. Yanez. 1997. Estudios sobre un cachalote pigmeo, *Kogia breviceps* (de Blainville, 1838), varado en la costa de Chile. *Boletín del Museo Nacional de Historia Natural Chile* 46: 81-9
- Schlundt, C.E., J.J. Finneran, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Temporary shift in masking hearing thresholds of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*, after exposure to intense tones. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 107(6):3496-3508.
- Scott, M.D. and S.J. Chivers. 1990. Distribution and herd structure of bottlenose dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. p. 387-402. *In*: S. Leatherwood and R.R. Reeves (eds.), *The bottlenose dolphin*. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 653 p.
- Scott, M.D., A.A. Hohn, A.J. Westgate, J.R. Nicolas, B.R. Whitaker, and W.B. Campbell. 2001. A note on the release and tracking of a rehabilitated pygmy sperm whale (*Kogia breviceps*). *J. Cetac. Res. Manage.* 3:87-94.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1977. Stocks of fin whales *Balaenoptera physalus* L. in the North Atlantic Ocean. *Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.* 27:460-473.
- Shane, S.H., R.S. Wells, and B. Würsig. 1986. Ecology, behavior and social organization of the bottlenose dolphin: a review. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 2:34-63.
- Schiavini, A., Pedraza, S.N., and E.A. Crespo. 1999. Abundance of Dusky Dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*) off north and central Patagonia, Argentina, in spring and a comparison with incidental catch in fisheries. *Marine Mammal Science* 15(3):828-840
- Simard, Y., F. Samaran, and N. Roy. 2005. Measurement of whale and seismic sounds in the Scotian Gully and adjacent canyons in July 2003. p. 97-115 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain, and C.V. Hurley (eds.), *Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys*. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p (Published 2007).
- Simmonds, M. P. and L.F. Lopez-Jurado. 1991. Whales and the military. *Nature* 351(6326):448.
- Smith, S.D. and H. Whitehead. 1999. Distribution of dolphins in Galápagos waters. *Mar. Mam. Sci.* 15(2):550-555.
- Smith, S.C. and H. Whitehead. 2000. The diet of Galápagos sperm whales *Physeter macrocephalus* as indicated by fecal sample analysis. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* 16(2):315-325.
- Smith, T.D. 1983. Changes in size of three dolphin (*Stenella* spp.) populations in the eastern tropical Pacific. *Fish. Bull.* 81(1):1-13.
- Smultea, M.A. and M. Holst. 2003. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Hess Deep area of the Eastern Equatorial Tropical Pacific, July 2003. LGL Rep. TA2822-16. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 68 p.
- Smultea, M.A., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and S. Stoltz. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean, April-June 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-26. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 106 p.
- Southall, B.L., A.E. Bowles, W.T. Ellison, J.J. Finneran, R.L. Gentry, C.R. Greene Jr., D. Kastak, D.R. Ketten, J.H. Miller, P.E. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, J.A. Thomas, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. *Aquat. Mamm.* 33(4):411-522.

- Stafford, K.M. 2003. Two types of blue whale calls recorded in the Gulf of Alaska. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 19(4):682-693.
- Stafford, K.M., S.L. Nieukirk, and C.G. Fox. 1999a. Low-frequency whale sounds recorded on hydrophones moored in the eastern tropical Pacific. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(6):3687-3698.
- Stafford, K.M., S.L. Nieukirk, and C.G. Fox. 1999b. An acoustic link between blue whales in the eastern tropical Pacific and the Northeast Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(4):1258-1268.
- Stafford, K.M., S.L. Nieukirk, and C.G. Fox. 2001. Geographic and seasonal variation of blue whale calls in the North Pacific. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 3(1):65-76
- Stafford, K.M., D.K. Mellinger, S.E. Moore, and C.G. Fox. 2007. Seasonal variability and detection range modeling of baleen whale calls in the Gulf of Alaska, 1999–2002. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 122(6):3378-3390.
- Stewart, B.S. and S. Leatherwood. 1985. Minke whale *Balaenoptera acutorostrata* Lacépède, 1804. p. 91-136 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3. The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, London, U.K. 362 p.
- Stone, C.J. 2003. The effects of seismic activity on marine mammals in UK waters 1998–2000. JNCC Report 323. Joint Nature Conservancy, Aberdeen, Scotland. 43 p.
- Stone, C.J. and M.L. Tasker. 2006. The effects of seismic airguns on cetaceans in UK waters. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 8(3):255-263.
- Swartz, S.L., T. Cole, M.A. McDonald, J.A. Hildebrand, E.M. Oleson, A. Martinez, P.J. Clapham, J. Barlow, and M. L. Jones. 2003. Acoustic and visual survey of humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) distribution in the eastern and southeastern Caribbean Sea. **Caribb. J. Sci.** 39(2):195-208.
- Teloni, V., P.M. Johnson, P.J.O. Miller, and P.T. Madsen. 2008. Shallow food for deep divers: dynamic foraging of male sperm whales. **J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.** 354(1):119-131.
- Tershy B.R., J. Urbán- Ramírez, D. Breese, L. Rojas-B., and L.Y. Findley. 1993. Are fin whales resident to the Gulf of California? Univ. Auton. Baja Calif. Sur., **Rev. Invest. Cient.** 1:69–71.
- Thompson, D., M. Sjöberg, E.B. Bryant, P. Lovell, and A. Bjørge. 1998. Behavioural and physiological responses of harbour (*Phoca vitulina*) and grey (*Halichoerus grypus*) seals to seismic surveys. Abstr. World Mar. Mamm. Sci. Conf., Monaco.
- Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, S. Webb, D. Bohnenstiehl, and E. Chapp. 2004a. Acoustic calibration measurements. Chapter 3 *In*: Richardson, W.J. (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustic monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's acoustic calibration study in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 2003. Revised ed. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, ON, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.
- Tolstoy, M., J.B. Diebold, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, E. Chapp, R.C. Holmes, and M. Rawson. 2004b. Broad-band calibration of R/V *Ewing* seismic sources. **Geophys. Res. Lett.** 31:L14310. doi: 10.1029/2004GL020234.
- Trites, A.W., V. Christensen, and D. Pauly. 1997. Competition between fisheries and marine mammals for prey and primary production in the Pacific Ocean. **J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci.** 22:173-187.
- Tyack, P.L. 2009. Human-generated sound and marine mammals. **Phys. Today** 62(11, Nov.):39-44.
- Tyack, P., M. Johnson, and P. Miller. 2003. Tracking responses of sperm whales to experimental exposures of airguns. p. 115-120 *In*: A.E. Jochens and D.C. Biggs (eds.), Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/annual report: Year 1. OCS Study MMS 2003-069. Rep. by Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Gulf of Mexico OCS Reg., New Orleans, LA.
- Tyack, P.L., M. Johnson, N. Aguilar Soto, A. Sturlese, and P.T. Madsen. 2006. Extreme diving of beaked whales. **J. Exp. Biol.** 209(21):4238-4253.
- UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre). 2009. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna. Appendices I, II, and III. Valid from 22 May 2009. Accessed on 26 April 2010 at <http://www.cites.org/eng/app/e-appendices.pdf>.

- Urbán-Ramírez, J. and D. Aurióles-Gamboa. 1992. First record of the pygmy beaked whale *Mesoplodon peruvianus* in the North Pacific. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 8(4):420-425.
- Urick, R.J. 1983. Principles of underwater sound, 3rd Ed. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY. 423 p.
- Valdivia, J., Franco, F. and Ramirez, P. 1981. The exploitation of Bryde's whales in the Peruvian Sea. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission* 31: 441-448.
- Van Waerebeek, K. 1994. A note on the status of the dusky dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*) off Peru. *Reports of the International Whaling Commission* 15: 525-527.
- Van Waerebeek, K. and J.C. Reyes. 1988. First record of the pygmy killer whale, *Feresa attenuata* Gray, 1975 from Peru, with a summary of distribution in the eastern Pacific. **Z. Säugetierkunde** 53:253-255.
- Van Waerebeek, K., J. Canto, J. Gonzalez, J. Oporto, and J.L. Brito. 1991. Southern right whale dolphins, *Lissodelphis peronii* off the Pacific coast of South America. **Z. Säugetierkunde** 56:284-295.
- Van Waerebeek, K., Van Bresseem, M. F., Felix, F., Alfaro-Shigueto, J., Garcia-Godos, A., Chavez-Lisambart, L., Onton, K., Montes, D. and R. Bello. 1997. Mortality of Dolphins and Porpoises in Coastal Fisheries off Peru and Southern Ecuador in 1994. **Biological Conservation** 81: 43-49
- Viddi, F. A., Huckle-Gaete, R., Torres-Florez, J. P., and Ribeiro, S. 2010. Spatial and seasonal variability in cetacean distribution in the fjords of northern Patagonia, Chile. – **ICES Journal of Marine Science**, 67: 959–970.
- Viddi, F. A. and Lescrauwaet, A. K. 2005. Insights on habitat selection and behavioral patterns of Peale's dolphins (*Lagenorhynchus australis*) in the Strait of Magellan, southern Chile. **Aquatic Mammals** 31(2): 176-183
- Wade, L.S. and G.L. Friedrichsen. 1979. Recent sightings of the blue whale, *Balaenoptera musculus*, in the northeastern tropical Pacific. **Fish. Bull.** 76(4):915-919.
- Wade, P.R. and T. Gerrodette. 1993. Estimates of cetacean abundance and distribution in the eastern tropical Pacific. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 43:477-493.
- Wade, P.R., G.M. Watters, T. Gerrodette, and S.B. Reilly. 2007. Depletion of spotted and spinner dolphins in the eastern tropical Pacific: modeling hypotheses for their lack of recovery. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 343:1-14.
- Walker, J.L., C.W. Potter, and S.A. Macko. 1999. The diets of modern and historic bottlenose dolphin populations reflected through stable isotopes. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(2):335-350.
- Wang, M.C., W.A. Walker, K.T. Shao, and L.S. Chou. 2002. Comparative analysis of the diets of pygmy sperm whales and dwarf sperm whales in Taiwanese waters. **Acta Zool. Taiwan.** 13(2):53-62.
- Waring, G. T., Josephson, E., Fairfield, C. P. and Maze-Foley, K. (eds). 2006. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments - 2005. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE, pp. 346 pp
- Waring, G.T., T. Hamazaki, D. Sheehan, G. Wood, and S. Baker. 2001. Characterization of beaked whale (Ziphiidae) and sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) summer habitat in shelf-edge and deeper waters off the northeast U.S. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17:703-717.
- Wartzok, D., A.N. Popper, J. Gordon, and J. Merrill. 2004. Factors affecting the responses of marine mammals to acoustic disturbance. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):6-15.
- Watkins, W.A. and K.E. Moore. 1982. An underwater acoustic survey for sperm whales (*Physeter catodon*) and other cetaceans in the southeast Caribbean. **Cetology** 46:1-7.
- Watkins, W.A., K.E. Moore, and P. Tyack. 1985. Sperm whale acoustic behaviors in the southeast Caribbean. **Cetology** 49:1-15.
- Watkins, W.A., M.A. Daher, G.M. Reppucci, J.E. George, D.L. Martin, N.A. DiMarzio, and D.P. GWhitehead, H. 1989. Formations of foraging sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*, off the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Zool.** 67(9):2131-2139.
- Watkins, W.A., M.A. Daher, G.M. Reppucci, J.E. George, D. L. Martin, N.A. DiMarzio, and D.P. Gannon. 2000. Seasonality and distribution of whale calls in the North Pacific. **Oceanogr.** 13(1):62-67.
- Weilgart, L.S. 2007. A brief review of known effects of noise on marine mammals. **Intern. J. Comp. Psychol.** 20:159-168.

- Weir, C.R. 2008. Overt responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), and Atlantic spotted dolphins (*Stenella frontalis*) to seismic exploration off Angola. **Aquat. Mamm.** 34(1):71-83.
- Weir, C.R. and S.J. Dolman. 2007. Comparative review of the regional marine mammal mitigation guidelines implemented during industrial seismic surveys, and guidance towards a worldwide standard. **J. Int. Wildl. Law Policy** 10(1):1-27.
- Whitehead, H. and Rendell, L. 2004. Movements, habitat use and feeding success of cultural clans of South Pacific sperm whales. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 73: 190–196. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2004.00798.x
- Whitehead, H. 1989. Formations of foraging sperm whales, *Physeter macrocephalus*, off the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Zool.** 67(9):2131-2139.
- Whitehead, H. 2002. Estimates of the current global population size and historical trajectory for sperm whales. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 242:295-304.
- Whitehead, H. 2003. Sperm whales: social evolution in the ocean. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL. 431 p.
- Whitehead, H. and S. Waters. 1990. Social organization and population structure of sperm whales off the Galápagos Islands, Ecuador (1985–1987). **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm., Spec. Iss.** 12:249-257.
- Whitehead, H., S. Waters, and T. Lyrholm. 1992. Population structure of female and immature sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) off the Galápagos Islands. **Can. J. Fish. Aquatic Sci.** 49(1):78-84.
- Wieting, D. 2004. Background on development and intended use of criteria. p. 20 *In*: S. Orenstein, L. Langstaff, L. Manning, and R. Maund (eds.), Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals, final meet. summary. Second meet., April 28–30, 2004, Arlington, VA. Sponsored by the Mar. Mamm. Comm.
- Wildlife Conservation Society. 2011. Elephant seal tracked by WCS travels 18000 miles. <http://www.wcs.org/wcs-org/news-and-features-main/jackson-elephant-seal.aspx>. Accessed on 12 December 2011
- Williams, R, Huckle-Gaete R, Torres JP, Ashe E and Y. Montecinos. 2009. Preliminary report on a survey to estimate abundance and distribution of blue whales in the Chiloense Ecoregion, southern Chile in 2009. IWC Report SC/61/SH33
- Willis, P.M. and R.W. Baird. 1998. Sightings and strandings of beaked whales on the west coast of Canada. **Aquat. Mamm.** 24:21-25.
- Winsor, M.H. and B.R. Mate. 2006. Seismic survey activity and the proximity of satellite tagged sperm whales. Working Pap. SC/58/E16. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 8 p.
- Würsig, B., S.K. Lynn, T.A. Jefferson, and K.D. Mullin. 1998. Behaviour of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. **Aquat. Mamm.** 24(1):41-50.
- Würsig, B.G., D.W. Weller, A.M. Burdin, S.H. Reeve, A.L. Bradford, S.A. Blokhin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 1999. Gray whales summering off Sakhalin Island, Far East Russia: July-October 1997. A joint U.S.-Russian scientific investigation. Final Report. Rep. from Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, and Kamchatka Inst. Ecol. & Nature Manage., Russian Acad. Sci., Kamchatka, Russia, for Sakhalin Energy Investment Co. Ltd and Exxon Neftegaz Ltd, Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia. 101 p.
- Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, R.M. Nielson, V.L. Vladimirov, and P.W. Wainwright. 2007a. Distribution and abundance of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3):45-73. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9809-9.
- Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, H.R. Melton, and M.W. Newcomer. 2007b. Feeding activity of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assess.** 134(1-3): 93-106. doi: 10.1007/s10661-007-9810-3.
- Yochem, P.K. and S. Leatherwood. 1985. Blue whale. p. 193-240 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 3. The sirenians and baleen whales. Academic Press, New York, NY. 362 p.

Yoder, J.A. 2002. Declaration of James A. Yoder in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 28 October 2002. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division.

Sea Turtles, Fish, and Other

- AAPA (American Association of Port Authorities). 2010. Alliance of the ports of Canada, the Caribbean, Latin America and the United States. Central and South America port container traffic (1999–2008). Accessed on 4 May 2010 at <http://aapa.files.cms-plus.com/Statistics/CENTRAL%5FSOUTH%5FAMERICA%5FCONTAINER%5FTRAFFIC.pdf>
- Alava, J.J. 2008. Loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in marine waters off Ecuador: occurrence, distribution and bycatch from the eastern Pacific Ocean. *Mar. Turtle Newsl.* 119:8-11.
- Alfaro-Shigueto J., P.H. Dutton, J. Mangel, and D. Vega. 2004. First confirmed occurrence of loggerhead turtles in Peru. *Mar. Turtle Newsl.* 103:7-11.
- Alvarado, J. and A. Figueroa. 1995. East Pacific green turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. p. 24-36 *In*: P.T. Plotkin (ed.), National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service status reviews for sea turtles listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 139 p.
- André, M., M. Solé, M. Lenoir, M. Durfort, C. Quero, A. Mas, A. Lombarte, M. van der Schaar, M. López-Bejar, M. Morell, S. Zaugg, and L. Houégnigan. 2011. Low-frequency sounds induce acoustic trauma in cephalopods. **Front. Ecol. Environ.** doi:10.1890/100124.
- Aprill, M. L. 1994. Visitation and predation of the olive ridley sea turtle, *Lepidochelys olivacea*, at nest sites in Osaítion, Costa Rica. p. 3-6 *In*: K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson and P.J. Eliazar (compilers), Proc. 14th Annu. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-351. 323 p.
- Arenas, P. and M. Hall. 1991. The association of sea turtles and other pelagic fauna with floating objects in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. p. 7-10 *In*: M. Salmon and J. Wyneken (compilers), Proc. 11th Annu. Workshop Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-302. 195 p.
- Arauz, R.M., R. Vargas, I. Narango, and C. Gamboa. 1998. Analysis of the incidental capture and mortality of sea turtles in the shrimp fleet of Pacific Costa Rica. p. 1-3 *In*: S.P. Epperly and J. Braun (comp.), Proc. 17th Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-415. 294 p.
- Bangs, N.L. and S.C. Cande. 1997. Episodic development of a convergent margin inferred from structures and processes along the southern Chile margin, *Tectonics*. 16: 489-503.
- Bangs, N.L., S.C. Cande, S.D. Lewis, and J. J. Miller. 1992. Structural framework of the Chile margin at the Chile Ridge collision zone: In Behrmann, J.H., S.D. Lewis, R. J. Musgrave et al., *Proceedings Ocean Drilling Program Init. Repts.*, v. 141, College Station, Texas (Ocean Drilling Program), 11-21, 1992.
- BBC News. 2010. Ecuadorean threat to oil giants. Published 18 April 2010. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/americas/8627799.stm>.
- Berkson, H. 1967. Physiological adjustments to deep diving in the Pacific green turtle (*Chelonia mydas agassizii*). **Comp. Biochem. Physiol.** 21:507-524.
- Bjarti, T. 2002. An experiment on how seismic shooting affects caged fish. Faroese Fisheries Laboratory, University of Aberdeen. 41 p.
- Bjorndal, K.A. 1982. The consequences of herbivory for the life history pattern of the Caribbean green turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. p. 111-116 *In*: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.), *Biology and conservation of sea turtles*. Smithsonian Inst. Press, Washington, D.C. 583 p.
- BNAmericas. 2003. Enap expects first Poseidon production – June. Accessed 20 December 2011. http://www.bnamericas.com/news/oilandgas/Enap_expects_first_Poseidon_production_June
- Booman, C., J. Dalen, H. Leivestad, A. Levsen, T. van der Meeren, and K. Toklum. 1996. Effekter av luftkanon-skyting på egg, larver og yngel. **Fisken og Havet** 1996(3):1-83. (Norwegian with English summary).
- Bourne, W.R.P., de Brooke, M. L., Clark, G.S. and T. Stone. 1992. Wildlife conservation problems in the Juan Fernández Archipelago, Chile. *Oryx*(26):43-51 doi:10.1017/S003060530002322X

- Brill, R.W., G.H. Balazs, K.N. Holland, R.K.C. Chang, S. Sullivan, and J.C. George. 1995. Daily movements, habitat use, and submergence intervals of normal and tumor-bearing juvenile green turtles (*Chelonia mydas* L.) within a foraging area in the Hawaiian Islands. **J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.** 185:203-218.
- Brown, C.H. and W.M. Brown. 1982. Status of sea turtles in the southeastern Pacific: emphasis on Peru. p. 235-240 *In*: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.), *Biology and conservation of sea turtles*. Smithsonian Inst. Press, Washington, DC. 583 p.
- Buchanan, R.A., J.R. Christian, V.D. Moulton, B. Mactavish, and S. Dufault. 2004. 2004 Laurentian 2-D seismic survey environmental assessment. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Canning & Pitt Associates, Inc., St. John's, Nfld., for ConocoPhillips Canada Resources Corp., Calgary, Alta. 274 p.
- Byles, R.A. 1988. Behavior and ecology of sea turtles from Chesapeake Bay, Virginia. Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
- Carr, A. 1975. The Ascension Island green turtle colony. **Copeia** 1975:574-555.
- Carr, A., M.H. Carr, and A.B. Meylan. 1978. The ecology and migrations of sea turtles: the west Caribbean green turtle colony. **Bull. Am. Mus. Hist.** 162(1):1-46.
- Chandler, M. 1991. New records of sea turtles in Chile. **Marine Turtle Newsletter** 52:8-11
- Chapman, C.J. and A.D. Hawkins. 1969. The importance of sound in fish behaviour in relation to capture by trawls. **FAO Fish. Rep.** 62:717-729.
- Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, D.H. Thomson, D. White, and R.A. Buchanan. 2003. Effect of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for Environmental Studies Research Fund (ESRF), Calgary, Alta. 56 p.
- Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, and R.A. Buchanan. 2004. Chronic effects of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 158, March 2004. Calgary, Alta. 45 p.
- CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). 2010a. Central America and Caribbean: Panama, economy. The world factbook. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pm.html>.
- CIA (Central Intelligence Agency). 2010b. South America: Ecuador, economy. The world factbook. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ec.html>.
- Contardo, X., J. Cembrano, A. Jensen, and J. Diaz-Naveas. 2008. Tectono-sedimentary evolution of marineslope basins in the Chilean forearc: Insights into their link with the subduction process, Tectonophysics. 459: 206-218
- Dalen, J. and G.M. Knutsen. 1986. Scaring effects in fish and harmful effects on eggs, larvae and fry by offshore seismic explorations. p. 93-102 *In*: Merklinger, H.M. (ed.), *Progress in underwater acoustics*. Plenum, New York, NY. 839 p.
- Dalen, J. and A. Raknes. 1985. Scaring effects on fish from three dimensional seismic surveys. Inst. Mar. Res. Rep. FO 8504/8505, Bergen, Norway. (In Norwegian, with an English summary).
- Dalen, J., E. Ona, A.V. Soldal, and R. Saetre. 1996. Seismiske undersøkelser til havs: en vurdering av konsekvenser for fisk og fiskerier [Seismic investigations at sea: an evaluation of consequences for fish and fisheries]. *Fisken og Havet* 1996:1-26. (in Norwegian, with an English summary).
- DFO (Fisheries and Oceans Canada). 2004. Potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Habitat Status Rep. 2004/003.
- Donoso, M. and P.H. Dutton. 2010. Sea turtle bycatch in the Chilean pelagic longline fishery in the southeastern Pacific: opportunities for conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 143: 2672-2684.
- Donoso, M., P. Dutton, R. Serra, and J.L. Brito-Montero. 2000. Sea turtles found in waters off Chile. p. 218-219 *In*: H.J. Kalb and T. Wibbels (compilers), *Proc. 19th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv.* NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-443. 291 p.

- Dutton, P., S.R. Benson, and S.A. Eckert. 2006. Identifying origins of leatherback turtles from Pacific foraging grounds off central California, U.S.A. p. 228 *In*: N.J. Pilcher (compiler), Proc. 23rd Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-536. 261 p.
- Eckert, K.L. 1995. Leatherback sea turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*. p. 37-75 *In*: P.T. Plotkin (ed.), National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service status reviews of sea turtles listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Nat. Mar. Fish. Service, Silver Spring, MD. 139 p.
- Eckert, S.A. 2002. Distribution of juvenile leatherback sea turtle *Dermochelys coriacea* sightings. **Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.** 230:289-293.
- Eckert, S.A., K.L. Eckert, and G.L. Kooyman. 1986. Diving patterns of two leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during the interesting intervals at Sandy Point, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands. **Herpetologica** 42:381-388.
- Eckert, S.A., K.L. Eckert, P. Ponganis, and G.L. Kooyman. 1989. Diving and foraging behaviour of leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). **Can J. Zool.** 67:2834-2840.
- Eckert, S.A., H.C. Liew, K.L. Eckert, and E.H. Chan. 1996. Shallow water diving by leatherback turtles in the South China Sea. **Chelonian Cons. Biol.** 2:237-243.
- Engås, A, S. Løkkeborg, E. Ona, and A.V. Soldal. 1996. Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (*G. morhua*) and haddock (*M. aeglefinus*). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 53:2238-2249.
- ENAP. 2011. Exploitation and production. Accessed on: 15 December 2011. <http://www.enap.cl/english/>
- EOE (Encyclopedia of Earth). 2008. Energy profile of Peru. *In* Cutler J. Cleveland (eds.), The encyclopedia of earth. Environmental Information Coalition, National Council for Science and the Environment, Washington, D.C. Accessed on 6 May 2010 at http://www.eoearth.org/article/Energy_profile_of_Peru.
- EuroTurtle. 2006a. Species outlines. Leatherback turtle *Dermochelys coriacea*. Accessed on 28 April 2010 at <http://www.euroturtle.org/outline/leather4.htm>.
- Falk, M.R. and M.J. Lawrence. 1973. Seismic exploration: its nature and effect on fish. Fisheries and Marine Service, Resource Management Branch, Fisheries Operations Directorate: Technical Report CENT-73-9.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). 2011. Fisheries and aquaculture country profiles: Chile. Accessed on 15 December 2011 at http://www.fao.org/fishery/countrysector/FI-CP_CO/en.
- Flueh, E., N. Vidal, C.R. Ranero, A. Hojka, R. von Huene, J. Bialas, K. Hinz, D. Cordoba, J.J. Danobeitia and C. Zelt. 1998. Seismic investigations of the continental margin off- and onshore Valparaíso, Chile. Tectonophysics. 288: 251-263.
- Fritts, T.H., M.L. Stinson, and R. Márquez. 1982. Status of sea turtle nesting in southern Baja California, Mexico. **Bull. South. Calif. Acad. Sci.** 81:51-60.
- Green, D. and F. Ortiz-Crespo. 1995. Status of sea turtle populations in the central eastern Pacific. p. 221-233 *In*: K.A. Bjorndal (ed.), Biology and conservation of sea turtles. Rev. edit. Smithsonian Inst. Press, Washington, DC. 615 p.
- Guerra, A., A.F. González, and F. Rocha. 2004. A review of the records of giant squid in the north-eastern Atlantic and severe injuries in *Architeuthis dux* stranded after acoustic explorations. ICES CM 2004/CC: 29.
- Harvey, J., S. Benson, and T. Graham. 2006. Foraging ecology of leatherbacks in the California Current. p. 192 *In*: M. Frick, A. Panagopoulou, A.F. Rees, and K. Williams (compilers), Book of abstracts, 26th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. International Sea Turtle Society, Athens, Greece. 376 p.
- Hasbún, C. R. and M. Vásquez. 1999. Sea turtles of El Salvador. **Mar. Turtle Newsl.** 85:7-9.
- Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, S. Løkkeborg, K. Skaar, Ø. Østensen, E.K. Haugland, M. Fonn, Å. Høines, and O.A. Misund. 2003. Reaction of sandeel to seismic shooting: a field experiment and fishery statistics study. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway.
- Hastings, M.C. and A.N. Popper. 2005. Effects of sound on fish. Prepared for Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, CA, for California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA. 28 January.

- Hays, G.C., C.R. Adams, A.C. Broderick, B.J. Godley, D.J. Lucas, J.D. Metcalfe, and A.A. Prior. 2000. The diving behaviour of green turtles at Ascension Island. **Anim. Behav.** 59:577-586.
- Hochscheid, S., B.J. Godley, A.C. Broderick, and R.P. Wilson. 1999. Reptilian diving: highly variable dive patterns in the green turtle *Chelonia mydas*. **Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.** 185:101-112.
- Holliday, D.V., R.E. Piper, M.E. Clarke, and C.F. Greenlaw. 1987. The effects of airgun energy release on the eggs, larvae, and adults of the northern anchovy (*Engraulis mordax*). American Petroleum Institute, Washington, DC. Tracer Applied Sciences.
- Holst, M. and M.A. Smultea. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off Central America, February–April 2008. LGL Rep. TA4342-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 133 p.
- Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005a. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean off Central America, November–December 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-30. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 125 p.
- IUCN (The World Conservation Union). 2011. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Version 2011.2. Accessed on 15 December 2011 at <http://www.iucnredlist.org>.
- Kalb, H. and D. Owens. 1994. Differences between solitary and arribada nesting olive ridley females during the interesting period. p. 68 *In*: K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson and P.J. Eliazar (compilers), Proc. 14th Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-351. 323 p.
- Kelez, S., X. Velez-Zuzzo, F. Angulo, and C. Manrique. 2009. Olive ridley *Lepidochelys olivacea* nesting in Peru: the southernmost records in the eastern Pacific. **Mar. Turtle Newsl.** 126:5-9.
- Kelez, S., B. Wallace, D. Dunn, W.J. Nichols, and L.B. Crowder. 2010. Sea turtle bycatch in the eastern Pacific: a regional review (Abstract). p. 110 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.
- Kopitsky, K., R.L. Pitman, and P.H. Dutton. 2002. Reproductive ecology of olive ridleys in the open ocean in the eastern tropical Pacific. p. 90-91 *In*: A. Mosier, A. Foley, and B. Brost (compilers), Proc. 20th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-477. 369 p.
- Kostyuchenko, L.P. 1973. Effect of elastic waves generated in marine seismic prospecting on fish eggs on the Black Sea. **Hydrobiol. J.** 9:45-48.
- LaBella, G., C. Frogli, A. Modica, S. Ratti, and G. Rivas. 1996. First assessment of effects of air-gun seismic shooting on marine resources in the central Adriatic Sea. Society of Petroleum Engineers, Inc. International Conference on Health, Safety and Environment, 9–12 June 1996, New Orleans, LA.
- Laist, D.W., A.R. Knowlton, J.G. Mead, A.S. Collet, and M. Podesta. 2001. Collisions between ships and whales. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17(1):35-75.
- Lien, J. 2002. Entrapment and entanglement. p. 394-395 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.
- Løkkeborg, S. 1991. Effects of geophysical survey on catching success in longline fishing. **ICES CM B** 40. 9 p.
- Lutcavage, M.E. 1996. Planning your next meal: leatherback travel routes and ocean fronts. p. 174-178 *In*: J.A. Keinath, D.E. Barnard, J.A. Musick, and B.A. Bell (compilers), Proc. 15th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-351. 355 p.
- Lutcavage, M.E., and P.L. Lutz. 1997. Diving physiology. p. 277-296 *In*: P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick (eds.), The biology of sea turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. 432 p.
- Lux, J., R.Reina, and L. Stokes. 2003. Nesting activity of leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in relation to tidal and lunar cycles at Playa Grande, Costa Rica. p. 215-216 *In*: J.A. Seminoff (comp.), Proc. 22nd Annu. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-503. 308 p.

- Mangel, J.C., J. Alfaro-Shigueto, M. Pajuelo, C.M. Caceres-Bueno, F. Bernedo, D.G. Foley, B. Godley, P.H. Dutton, and J. Seminoff. 2010. Use of satellite telemetry to assess loggerhead turtle movements and fisheries interactions off Peru (Abstract). p. 113-114 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.
- MBendi. 2011. Overview: Oil and gas in Chile. Accessed on 16 December 2011.
<http://www.mbendi.com/indy/oilg/sa/cl/p0005.htm>
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: Analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes, and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin Univ., Perth, W.A., for Austral. Petrol. Prod. Assoc., Sydney, N.S.W. 188 p.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, M.-N. Jenner, M.-N., C. Jenner, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, K. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. **APPEA J.** 40:692-708.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, and A.N. Popper. 2003. High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 113(1):638-642.
- Moore, S.E. and J.T. Clarke. 2002. Potential impact of offshore human activities on gray whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 4(1):19-25.
- Moriyasu, M., R. Allain, K. Benhalima, and R. Claytor. 2004. Effects of seismic and marine noise on invertebrates: A literature review. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Science. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2004/126.
- Morreale, S., E. Standora, F. Paladino, and J. Spotila. 1994. Leatherback migrations along deepwater bathymetric contours. p.109 *In*: B.A. Schroeder and B.E. Witherington (compilers), Proc. 13th Annu. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-341. 281 p.
- Morreale, S.J., P.T. Plotkin, D.J. Shaver, and H.J. Kalb. 2007. Adult migration and habitat utilization: ridley turtles in their element. p. 213-229 *In*: P.T. Plotkin (ed.), Biology and conservation of ridley sea turtles. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD. 356 p.
- Musick, J.A. and C.J. Limpus. 1997. Habitat utilization and migration in juvenile sea turtles. p. 137-163 *In*: P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick (eds.), The biology of sea turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. 432 p.
- Nichols, W.J. 2005. Following redwood logs, rubber ducks, and drift bottles: transoceanic developmental migrations of loggerhead turtles in the North Pacific Ocean. p. 66 *In*: M.S. Coyne and R.D. Clark (compilers), Proc. 21st Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-528. 368 p.
- Nichols, W.J., A. Resendiz, and C. Mayoral-Rousseau. 2000. Biology and conservation of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in Baja California, Mexico. p. 169-171 *In*: H.J. Kalb and T. Wibbels (compilers), Proc. 19th Annu. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-443. 291 p.
- NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2002. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion: Authorization of pelagic fisheries under the Fishery Management Plan for pelagic fisheries of the western Pacific region. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Region, Pacific Islands Area Office. 365 p.
- NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1998a. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*). Nat. Mar. Fish. Service, Silver Spring, MD. 66 p.
- NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1998b. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*). Nat. Mar. Fish. Service, Silver Spring, MD. 66 p.
- NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1998c. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). Nat. Mar. Fish. Service, Silver Spring, MD. 84p.

- NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1998d. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the olive ridley turtle (*Lepidochelys olivacea*). Nat. Mar. Fish. Service, Silver Spring, MD. 53 p.
- NMFS and USFWS (National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2007. Green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) 5-year review: summary and evaluation. National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD. 102 p. Accessed on 28 April 2010 at <http://www.fws.gov/northflorida/SeaTurtles/2007-Reviews/2007-green-turtle-5-year-review-final.pdf>
- Northridge, S.P. and R.J. Hofman. 1999. Marine mammal interactions with fisheries. p. 99-119 *In*: J.R. Twiss, Jr. and R.R. Reeves (eds.), Conservation and management of marine mammals. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.
- Ocean Resources Foundation. 1998. Construction on Playa La Flor National Wildlife Refuge-Nicaragua. Accessed on 2 May 2008 at <http://www.orf.org/currents001b.htm>.
- Offshore. 2009a. SCAN completes Peruvian survey. 1 Jun 2009. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at http://www.offshore-mag.com/index/article-display/4701263039/articles/offshore/geology-geophysics/latin-america/scan-completes_peruvian.html.
- Offshore. 2009b. Brazil's presalt tops Latin American E&P plays: Peru. 1 May 2009. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at <http://www.offshore-mag.com/index/article-display/361016/articles/offshore/volume-69/issue-5/international-report/brazilrsquo-presalt-tops-latin-american-eampp-plays.html>.
- Offshore. 2010. Global E&P. 1 Feb 2010. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at http://www.offshore-mag.com/index/article-display/2412454512/articles/offshore/volume-70/issue-2/departments/global-e___p/global-e_amp_p.html.
- Oilvoice. 2009. Karoon Gas announces Peru Block Z-38 2D marine seismic acquisition survey. 17 February 2009. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at http://www.oilvoice.com/n/Karoon_Gas_Announces_Peru_Block_Z38_2D_Marine_Seismic_Acquisition_Survey/8c4fc39b.aspx
- Parker, D.M., P.H. Dutton, K. Kopitsky, and R.L. Pitman. 2003. Movement and dive behavior determined by satellite telemetry for male and female olive ridley turtles in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. p. 48-49 *In*: J.A. Seminoff (compiler), Proc. 22nd Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-503. 308 p.
- Parker, D.M., P.H. Dutton, S. Eckert, D.R. Kobayashi, J.J. Polovina, D. Dutton, and G.H. Balazs. 2005. Trans-pacific migration along oceanic fronts by loggerhead turtles released from Sea World San Diego. p. 280-281 *In*: M.S. Coyne and R.D. Clark (compilers), Proc. 21st Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-528. 368 p.
- Payne, J.F., C.A. Andrews, L.L. Fancey, A.L. Cook, and J.R. Christian. 2007. Pilot study on the effects of seismic air gun noise on lobster (*Homarus americanus*). **Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquatic Sci.** 2712.
- Payne, J.F., C. Andrews, L. Fancey, D. White, and J. Christian. 2008. Potential effects of seismic energy on fish and shellfish: An update since 2003. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2008/060. Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/Publications/ResDocs-DocRech/2008/2008_060_e.pdf. Lasted updated 26 November 2008. 16 p.
- Payne, J.F., J. Coady, and D. White. 2009. Potential effects of seismic airgun discharges on monkfish eggs (*Lophius americanus*) and larvae. Environmental Studies Research Funds Report No. 170. St. John's, NL. 35 p.
- Pearson, W.H., J.R. Skalski, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on behaviour of captive rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 49(7):1343-1356.
- Pearson, W., J. Skalski, S. Sulkin, and C. Malme. 1994. Effects of seismic energy releases on the survival and development of zoeal larvae of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). **Mar. Environ. Res.** 38:93-113.
- Perupetro. 2010. Blocks distribution in northwest Peru. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at <http://mirror.perupetro.com.pe/exploracion02-e.asp>

- Pickett, G.D., D.R. Eaton, R.M.H. Seaby, and G.P. Arnold. 1994. Results of bass tagging in Poole Bay during 1992. Lab. Leaflet 74, MAFF Direct. Fish. Res., Lowestoft, U.K. 12 p.
- Pitman, R.L. 1990. Pelagic distribution and biology of sea turtles in the Eastern Tropical Pacific. p. 143-144 *In*: T.H. Richardson, J.I. Richardson, and M. Donnelly (compilers), Proc. 10th Ann. Workshop Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-278. 286 p.
- Pitman, R.L. 1992. Sea turtle associations with flotsam in the Eastern Pacific. p. 94 *In*: M. Salmon and J. Wyneken (compilers), Proc. 11th Ann. Workshop Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-302. 195 p.
- Plotkin, P.T., R.A. Byles, and D.W. Owens. 1994a. Post-breeding movements of male olive ridley sea turtles *Lepidochelys olivacea* from a nearshore breeding area. p. 119 *In*: K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson, and P.J. Eliazar (compilers), Proc. 14th Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-351. 323 p.
- Plotkin, P.T., R.A. Byles, and D.W. Owens. 1994b. Migratory and reproductive behavior of *Lepidochelys olivacea* in the eastern Pacific Ocean. p. 138 *In*: B.A. Schroeder and B.E. Witherington (compilers), Proc. 13th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. and Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-341. 281 p.
- Polovina, J.J., E. Howell, D.M. Parker, and G.H. Balazs. 2003. Dive-depth distribution of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and olive ridley (*Lepidochelys olivacea*) sea turtles in the central North Pacific: Might deep longline sets catch fewer turtles? **Fish. Bull.** 101(1):189-193.
- Popper, A.N. 2005. A review of hearing by sturgeon and lamprey. Report by A.N. Popper, Environmental Bio-Acoustics, LLC, Rockville, MD, for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District.
- Popper, A.N., M. Salmon, and K.W. Horch. 2001. Acoustic detection and communication by decapod crustaceans. **J. Comp. Physiol. A** 187:83-89.
- Popper, A.N., M.E. Smith, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, A.O. MacGilvray, M.E. Austin, and D.A. Mann. 2005. Effects of exposure to seismic air gun use on hearing of three fish species. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 117(6):3958-3971.
- Renaud, M.L. and J.A. Carpenter. 1994. Movements and submergence patterns of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Gulf of Mexico determined through satellite telemetry. **Bull. Mar. Sci.** 55:1-15.
- Rice, M.R. and G.H. Balazs. 2010. Hawaiian green turtles dive to record depths during oceanic migrations (Abstract). p. 61 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.
- Richardson, W.J., C. Greene, C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 576 p.
- Rodrigue, J.-P., C. Comtois, and B. Slack. 2009. The Strategic space of international transportation. 2nd edition. Taylor & Francis e-library. 352 p. Accessed on 5 May 2010 at <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch5en/conc5en/ch5c1en.html>.
- Rogers, P. and M. Cox. 1988. Underwater sound as a biological stimulus. p. 131-149 *In*: J. Atema, R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga (eds.), The sensory biology of aquatic animals. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Rossi, N.A., S.H. Peckham, V. de la Toba, R. Ochoa, E. Flores, A.A. Aguirre, and W.J. Nichols. 2010. Size distribution and reproductive status of loggerhead turtles at Baja California Sur, Mexico (Abstract). p. 140 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.
- Saetre, R. and E. Ona. 1996. Seismike undersøkelser og på fiskeegg og -larver en vurdering av mulige effekter på bestandsniva. [Seismic investigations and damages on fish eggs and larvae; an evaluation of possible effects on stock level]. **Fisken og Havet** 1996:1-17, 1-8. (In Norwegian, with an English summary).
- Sakamoto, W., I. Uchida, Y. Naito, K. Kureha, M. Tujimura, and K. Sato. 1990. Deep diving behavior of the loggerhead turtle near the frontal zone. **Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi** 56(9):1435-1443.
- Sakamoto, W., K. Sato, H. Tanaka, and Y. Naito. 1993. Diving patterns and swimming environment of two loggerhead turtles during interbreeding. **Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi** 59(7):1129-1137.

- Santulli, La A., A. Modica, C. Messina, L. Ceffa, A. Curatolo, G. Rivas, G. Fabi, and V. D'Amelio. 1999. Biochemical responses of European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax* L.) to the stress induced by off shore experimental seismic prospecting. **Mar. Pollut. Bull.** 38:1105-1114.
- Segura, A. and R.M. Arauz. 1995. By-catch capture of sea turtles by two kinds of experimental longline gears in Pacific Costa Rica waters. p. 125-127 *In*: J.I. Richardson and T.H. Richardson (comp.), Proc. 12th Ann. Workshop Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-361. 274 p.
- Sea Around Us. 2009. Sea Around Us Project. Fisheries, ecosystems and biodiversity: Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs). Accessed on 6 May 2010 at <http://www.seaaroundus.org/eez/>
- Shillinger, G.L., D.M. Palacios, H. Bailey, S.J. Bograd, A.M. Swithenbank, J.R. Spotila, B.P. Wallace, F.V. Paladino, S.A. Eckert, R. Piedra, and B.A. Block. 2010. Four years and forty-six turtles: tracking the movements and behaviors of leatherback sea turtles in the eastern Pacific (Abstract). p. 53 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.
- Skalski, J.R., W.H. Pearson, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on catch-per-unit-effort in a hook-and-line fishery for rockfish (*Sebastes* spp). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 49:1357-1365.
- Slotte, A., K. Hansen, J. Dalen, and E. Ona. 2004. Acoustic mapping of pelagic fish distribution and abundance in relation to a seismic shooting area off the Norwegian west coast. **Fish. Res.** 67:143-150.
- Southwood, A.L., R.D. Andrews, D.R. Jones, M.E. Lutcavage, F.V. Paladino, and N.H. West. 1998. Heart rate and dive behaviour of the leatherback sea turtle during the interesting interval. p. 100-101 *In*: S.P. Epperly and J. Braun (comp.), Proc. 17th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-415. 294 p.
- Spotila, J.R. 2004. Sea turtles: a complete guide to their biology, behavior, and conservation. The Johns Hopkins University Press and Oakwood Arts, Baltimore, MD. 227 p.
- Stinson, M.L. 1984. Biology of sea turtles in San Diego Bay, California, and in the northeastern Pacific Ocean. Master's Thesis, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA. 578 p.
- Subsea World. 2008. SCAN Geophysical get contract for 2D seismic survey offshore Ecuador. 16 November 2008. Accessed on 8 May 2010 at <http://www.subseaworld.com/contracts/scan-geophysical-get-contract-for-2d-seismic-survey-offshore-ecuador-02558.html>.
- Sverdrup, A., E. Kjellsby, P.G. Krüger, R. Fløysand, F.R. Knudsen, P.S. Enger, G. Serck-Hanssen, and K.B. Helle. 1994. Effects of experimental seismic shock on vasoactivity of arteries, integrity of the vascular endothelium and on primary stress hormones of the Atlantic salmon. **J. Fish Biol.** 45:973-995.
- Trites, A.W., V. Christensen, and D. Pauly. 1997. Competition between fisheries and marine mammals for prey and primary production in the Pacific Ocean. **J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci.** 22:173-187.
- UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Program-World Conservation Monitoring Centre). 2005. World Heritage sites: Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection, Republic of Panama. 6 p. Accessed on 10 May 2010 at <http://www.unep-wcmc.org/sites/wh/pdf/COIBA%20PANAMA.pdf>.
- UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Program-World Conservation Monitoring Centre). 2006. World Heritage sites: Malpelo Fauna and Flora Sanctuary, Colombia. 7 p. Accessed on 10 May 2010 at <http://www.unep-wcmc.org/sites/wh/pdf/MALPELO.pdf>.
- UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Program-World Conservation Monitoring Centre). 2008a. World Heritage sites: Cocos Island National Park, Costa Rica. 6 p. Accessed on 10 May 2010 at <http://www.unep-wcmc.org/sites/wh/pdf/Cocos%20I.pdf>.
- UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Program-World Conservation Monitoring Centre). 2008b. World Heritage sites: Galápagos Islands National Park and Marine Reserve, Ecuador. 15 p. Accessed on 10 May 2010 at <http://www.unep-wcmc.org/sites/wh/pdf/Galapagos.pdf>.

- UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre). 2009. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna. Appendices I, II, and III. Valid from 22 May 2009. Accessed on 26 April 2010 at: <http://www.cites.org/eng/app/e-appendices.pdf>.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation). 2010. World Heritage: Malpelo Fauna and Flora Sanctuary. Accessed on 10 May 2010 at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/1216>. Urick, R.J. 1983. Sound propagation in the sea. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY. 423 p.
- USCG (United States Coast Guard). 2010. History of the Amver System. Accessed on 5 May 2010 at <http://www.amver.com/amverhistory.asp>.
- von Huene, R., J. Corvalan, E.R. Flueh, K. Hinz, J. Korstgard, C.R. Ranero, W. Weinrebe and the CONDOR Scientists. 1997. Tectonic control of the subducting Juan Fernandez Ridge on the Andean margin near Valparaiso, Chile. *Tectonics*. 16: 474-488.
- Wardle, C.S., T.J. Carter, G.G. Urquhart, A.D.F. Johnstone, A.M. Ziolkowski, G. Hampson, and D. Mackie. 2001. Effects of seismic air guns on marine fish. **Cont. Shelf Res.** 21(8-10):1005-1027.
- Williams, K.L., A.C. Steyermark, C.C. Hurd, A.J. Schwandt, F.V. Paladino, and J.R. Spotila. 1996. Population ecology, nesting and success of leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea*, at Las Baulas de Guanacaste National Park, Costa Rica. p. 340 *In*: J.A. Keinath, D.E. Barnard, J.A. Musick, and B.A. Bell (compilers), Proc. 15th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-351. 355 p.
- Yañez, I.L., A.R. Gaos, and R.M. Aruaz. 2010. Eastern Pacific leatherback, green, and olive ridley sea turtle nesting at Playa Naranjo; first census in eight years (Abstract). p. 193 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.
- Zárate, P.M., M.A. Parra, M. Robles, P.H. Dutton, and J.A. Seminoff. 2010a. Sea turtle strandings and mortality in the Galapagos Archipelago: causes and threats (Abstract). p. 126 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.
- Zárate, P.M., M.A. Parra, M. Robles, and J.A. Seminoff. 2010b. Nesting site fidelity of green turtle in the Galapagos Islands (Abstract). p. 64 *In*: K. Dean and M.C. Lopez Castro (compilers), Proc. 28th Ann. Symp. Sea Turtle Biol. Conserv. NOAA Tech. Mem. NMFS-SEFSC-602. 272 p.

APPENDIX A:

REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON MARINE MAMMALS⁴

The following subsections review relevant information concerning the potential effects of airguns on marine mammals. Because this review is intended to be of general usefulness, it includes references to types of marine mammals that will not be found in some specific regions.

1. Categories of Noise Effects

The effects of noise on marine mammals are highly variable, and can be categorized as follows (adapted from Richardson et al. 1995):

1. The noise may be too weak to be heard at the location of the animal, i.e., lower than the prevailing ambient noise level, the hearing threshold of the animal at relevant frequencies, or both;
2. The noise may be audible but not strong enough to elicit any overt behavioral response, i.e., the mammal may tolerate it, either without or with some deleterious effects (e.g., masking, stress);
3. The noise may elicit behavioral reactions of variable conspicuousness and variable relevance to the well being of the animal; these can range from subtle effects on respiration or other behaviors (detectable only by statistical analysis) to active avoidance reactions;
4. Upon repeated exposure, animals may exhibit diminishing responsiveness (habituation), or disturbance effects may persist; the latter is most likely with sounds that are highly variable in characteristics, unpredictable in occurrence, and associated with situations that the animal perceives as a threat;
5. Any man-made noise that is strong enough to be heard has the potential to reduce (mask) the ability of marine mammals to hear natural sounds at similar frequencies, including calls from conspecifics, echolocation sounds of odontocetes, and environmental sounds such as surf noise or (at high latitudes) ice noise. However, intermittent airgun or sonar pulses could cause strong masking for only a small proportion of the time, given the short duration of these pulses relative to the inter-pulse intervals;
6. Very strong sounds have the potential to cause temporary or permanent reduction in hearing sensitivity, or other physical or physiological effects. Received sound levels must far exceed the animal's hearing threshold for any temporary threshold shift to occur. Received levels must be even higher for a risk of permanent hearing impairment.

2. Hearing Abilities of Marine Mammals

The hearing abilities of marine mammals are functions of the following (Richardson et al. 1995; Au et al. 2000):

1. Absolute hearing threshold at the frequency in question (the level of sound barely audible in the absence of ambient noise). The "best frequency" is the frequency with the lowest absolute threshold.
2. Critical ratio (the signal-to-noise ratio required to detect a sound at a specific frequency in the presence of background noise around that frequency).

⁴ By **W. John Richardson** and **Valerie D. Moulton**, with subsequent updates (to Feb. 2010) by WJR and VDM plus **Patrick Abgrall**, **William E. Cross**, **Meike Holst**, and **Mari A. Smultea**, all of LGL Ltd., environmental research associates

3. The ability to determine sound direction at the frequencies under consideration.
4. The ability to discriminate among sounds of different frequencies and intensities.

Marine mammals rely heavily on the use of underwater sounds to communicate and to gain information about their surroundings. Experiments and monitoring studies also show that they hear and may react to many man-made sounds including sounds made during seismic exploration (Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Tyack 2008).

2.1 Toothed Whales (Odontocetes)

Hearing abilities of some toothed whales (odontocetes) have been studied in detail (reviewed in Chapter 8 of Richardson et al. [1995] and in Au et al. [2000]). Hearing sensitivity of several species has been determined as a function of frequency. The small to moderate-sized toothed whales whose hearing has been studied have relatively poor hearing sensitivity at frequencies below 1 kHz, but extremely good sensitivity at, and above, several kHz. There are very few data on the absolute hearing thresholds of most of the larger, deep-diving toothed whales, such as the sperm and beaked whales. However, Cook et al. (2006) found that a stranded juvenile Gervais' beaked whale showed evoked potentials from 5 kHz up to 80 kHz (the entire frequency range that was tested), with best sensitivity at 40–80 kHz. An adult Gervais' beaked whale had a similar upper cutoff frequency (80–90 kHz; Finneran et al. 2009).

Most of the odontocete species have been classified as belonging to the “mid-frequency” (MF) hearing group, and the MF odontocetes (collectively) have functional hearing from about 150 Hz to 160 kHz (Southall et al. 2007). However, individual species may not have quite so broad a functional frequency range. Very strong sounds at frequencies slightly outside the functional range may also be detectable. The remaining odontocetes—the porpoises, river dolphins, and members of the genera *Cephalorhynchus* and *Kogia*—are distinguished as the “high frequency” (HF) hearing group. They have functional hearing from about 200 Hz to 180 kHz (Southall et al. 2007).

Airguns produce a small proportion of their sound at mid- and high-frequencies, although at progressively lower levels with increasing frequency. In general, most of the energy in the sound pulses emitted by airgun arrays is at low frequencies; strongest spectrum levels are below 200 Hz, with considerably lower spectrum levels above 1000 Hz, and smaller amounts of energy emitted up to ~150 kHz (Goold and Fish 1998; Sodal 1999; Goold and Coates 2006; Potter et al. 2007).

Despite the relatively poor sensitivity of small odontocetes at the low frequencies that contribute most of the energy in pulses of sound from airgun arrays, airgun sounds are sufficiently strong, and contain sufficient mid- and high-frequency energy, that their received levels sometimes remain above the hearing thresholds of odontocetes at distances out to several tens of kilometers (Richardson and Würsig 1997). There is no evidence that most small odontocetes react to airgun pulses at such long distances. However, beluga whales do seem quite responsive at intermediate distances (10–20 km) where sound levels are well above the ambient noise level (see below).

In summary, even though odontocete hearing is relatively insensitive to the predominant low frequencies produced by airguns, sounds from airgun arrays are audible to odontocetes, sometimes to distances of 10s of kilometers.

2.2 Baleen Whales (Mysticetes)

The hearing abilities of baleen whales (mysticetes) have not been studied directly. Behavioral and anatomical evidence indicates that they hear well at frequencies below 1 kHz (Richardson et al. 1995; Ketten 2000). Frankel (2005) noted that gray whales reacted to a 21–25 kHz whale-finding sonar. Some baleen whales react to pinger sounds up to 28 kHz, but not to pingers or sonars emitting sounds at 36 kHz

or above (Watkins 1986). In addition, baleen whales produce sounds at frequencies up to 8 kHz and, for humpbacks, with components to >24 kHz (Au et al. 2006). The anatomy of the baleen whale inner ear seems to be well adapted for detection of low-frequency sounds (Ketten 1991, 1992, 1994, 2000; Parks et al. 2007b). Although humpbacks and minke whales (Berta et al. 2009) may have some auditory sensitivity to frequencies above 22 kHz, for baleen whales as a group, the functional hearing range is thought to be about 7 Hz to 22 kHz and they are said to constitute the “low-frequency” (LF) hearing group (Southall et al. 2007). The absolute sound levels that they can detect below 1 kHz are probably limited by increasing levels of natural ambient noise at decreasing frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). Ambient noise levels are higher at low frequencies than at mid frequencies. At frequencies below 1 kHz, natural ambient levels tend to increase with decreasing frequency.

The hearing systems of baleen whales are undoubtedly more sensitive to low-frequency sounds than are the ears of the small toothed whales that have been studied directly. Thus, baleen whales are likely to hear airgun pulses farther away than can small toothed whales and, at closer distances, airgun sounds may seem more prominent to baleen than to toothed whales. However, baleen whales have commonly been seen well within the distances where seismic (or other source) sounds would be detectable and often show no overt reaction to those sounds. Behavioral responses by baleen whales to seismic pulses have been documented, but received levels of pulsed sounds necessary to elicit behavioral reactions are typically well above the minimum levels that the whales are assumed to detect (see below).

2.3 Seals and Sea Lions (Pinnipeds)

Underwater audiograms have been obtained using behavioral methods for three species of phocinid seals, two species of monachid seals, two species of otariids, and the walrus (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995: 211ff; Kastak and Schusterman 1998, 1999; Kastelein et al. 2002, 2009). The functional hearing range for pinnipeds in water is considered to extend from 75 Hz to 75 kHz (Southall et al. 2007), although some individual species—especially the eared seals—do not have that broad an auditory range (Richardson et al. 1995). In comparison with odontocetes, pinnipeds tend to have lower best frequencies, lower high-frequency cutoffs, better auditory sensitivity at low frequencies, and poorer sensitivity at the best frequency.

At least some of the phocid seals have better sensitivity at low frequencies (≤ 1 kHz) than do odontocetes. Below 30–50 kHz, the hearing thresholds of most species tested are essentially flat down to ~1 kHz, and range between 60 and 85 dB re 1 μ Pa. Measurements for harbor seals indicate that, below 1 kHz, their thresholds under quiet background conditions deteriorate gradually with decreasing frequency to ~75 dB re 1 μ Pa at 125 Hz (Kastelein et al. 2009).

For the otariid (eared) seals, the high frequency cutoff is lower than for phocinids, and sensitivity at low frequencies (e.g., 100 Hz) is poorer than for seals (harbor seal).

2.4 Manatees and Dugong (Sirenians)

The West Indian manatee can apparently detect sounds and low-frequency vibrations from 15 Hz to 46 kHz, based on a study involving behavioral testing methods (Gerstein et al. 1999, 2004). A more recent study found that, in one Florida manatee, auditory sensitivity extended up to 90.5 kHz (Bauer et al. 2009). Thus, manatees may hear, or at least detect, sounds in the low-frequency range where most seismic energy is released. It is possible that they are able to feel these low-frequency sounds using vibrotactile receptors or because of resonance in body cavities or bone conduction.

Based on measurements of evoked potentials, manatee hearing is apparently best around 1–1.5 kHz (Bullock et al. 1982). However, behavioral tests suggest that best sensitivities are at 6–20 kHz (Gerstein

et al. 1999) or 8–32 kHz (Bauer et al. 2009). The ability to detect high frequencies may be an adaptation to shallow water, where the propagation of low frequency sound is limited (Gerstein et al. 1999, 2004).

2.5 Sea Otter and Polar Bear

No data are available on the hearing abilities of sea otters (Ketten 1998), although the in-air vocalizations of sea otters have most of their energy concentrated at 3–5 kHz (McShane et al. 1995; Thomson and Richardson 1995). Sea otter vocalizations are considered to be most suitable for short-range communication among individuals (McShane et al. 1995). However, Ghoull et al. (2009) noted that the in-air “screams” of sea otters are loud signals (source level of 93–118 dB re 20 μPa_{pk}) that may be used over larger distances; screams have a frequency of maximum energy ranging from 2 to 8 kHz. In-air audiograms for two river otters indicate that this related species has its best hearing sensitivity at the relatively high frequency of 16 kHz, with some sensitivity from about 460 Hz to 33 kHz (Gunn 1988). However, these data apply to a different species of otter, and to in-air rather than underwater hearing.

Data on the specific hearing capabilities of polar bears are limited. A recent study of the in-air hearing of polar bears applied the auditory evoked potential method while tone pips were played to anesthetized bears (Nachtigall et al. 2007). Hearing was tested in $\frac{1}{2}$ octave steps from 1 to 22.5 kHz, and best hearing sensitivity was found between 11.2 and 22.5 kHz. Although low-frequency hearing was not studied, the data suggested that medium- and some high-frequency sounds may be audible to polar bears. However, polar bears’ usual behavior (e.g., remaining on the ice, at the water surface, or on land) reduces or avoids exposure to underwater sounds.

3. Characteristics of Airgun Sounds

Airguns function by venting high-pressure air into the water. The pressure signature of an individual airgun consists of a sharp rise and then fall in pressure, followed by several positive and negative pressure excursions caused by oscillation of the resulting air bubble. The sizes, arrangement, and firing times of the individual airguns in an array are designed and synchronized to suppress the pressure oscillations subsequent to the first cycle. The resulting downward-directed pulse has a duration of only 10–20 ms, with only one strong positive and one strong negative peak pressure (Caldwell and Dragoset 2000). Most energy emitted from airguns is at relatively low frequencies. For example, typical high-energy airgun arrays emit most energy at 10–120 Hz. However, the pulses contain significant energy up to 500–1000 Hz and some energy at higher frequencies (Goold and Fish 1998; Potter et al. 2007). Studies in the Gulf of Mexico have shown that the horizontally-propagating sound can contain significant energy above the frequencies that airgun arrays are designed to emit (DeRuiter et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Tyack et al. 2006a). Energy at frequencies up to 150 kHz was found in tests of single 60-in³ and 250-in³ airguns (Goold and Coates 2006). Nonetheless, the predominant energy is at low frequencies.

The pulsed sounds associated with seismic exploration have higher peak levels than other industrial sounds (except those from explosions) to which whales and other marine mammals are routinely exposed. The nominal source levels of the 2- to 36-airgun arrays used by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (L-DEO) from the R/V *Maurice Ewing* (now retired) and R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* (36 airguns) are 236–265 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{p-p}}$. These are the nominal source levels applicable to downward propagation. The effective source levels for horizontal propagation are lower than those for downward propagation when the source consists of numerous airguns spaced apart from one another. Explosions are the only man-made sources with effective source levels as high as (or higher than) a large array of airguns. However, high-power sonars can have source pressure levels as high as a small array of airguns, and signal duration can be longer for a sonar than for an airgun array, making the source energy levels of some sonars more comparable to those of airgun arrays.

Several important mitigating factors need to be kept in mind. (1) Airgun arrays produce intermittent sounds, involving emission of a strong sound pulse for a small fraction of a second followed by several seconds of near silence. In contrast, some other sources produce sounds with lower peak levels, but their sounds are continuous or discontinuous but continuing for longer durations than seismic pulses. (2) Airgun arrays are designed to transmit strong sounds downward through the seafloor, and the amount of sound transmitted in near-horizontal directions is considerably reduced. Nonetheless, they also emit sounds that travel horizontally toward non-target areas. (3) An airgun array is a distributed source, not a point source. The nominal source level is an estimate of the sound that would be measured from a theoretical point source emitting the same total energy as the airgun array. That figure is useful in calculating the expected received levels in the far field, i.e., at moderate and long distances, but not in the near field. Because the airgun array is not a single point source, there is no one location within the near field (or anywhere else) where the received level is as high as the nominal source level.

The strengths of airgun pulses can be measured in different ways, and it is important to know which method is being used when interpreting quoted source or received levels. Geophysicists usually quote peak-to-peak (p-p) levels, in bar-meters or (less often) dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$. The peak (= zero-to-peak, or 0-p) level for the same pulse is typically ~6 dB less. In the biological literature, levels of received airgun pulses are often described based on the “average” or “root-mean-square” (rms) level, where the average is calculated over the duration of the pulse. The rms value for a given airgun pulse is typically ~10 dB lower than the peak level, and 16 dB lower than the peak-to-peak value (Greene 1997; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). A fourth measure that is increasingly used is the energy, or Sound Exposure Level (SEL), in dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$. Because the pulses, even when stretched by propagation effects (see below), are usually <1 s in duration, the numerical value of the energy is usually lower than the rms pressure level. However, the units are different.⁵ Because the level of a given pulse will differ substantially depending on which of these measures is being applied, it is important to be aware which measure is in use when interpreting any quoted pulse level. In the past, the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has commonly referred to rms levels when discussing levels of pulsed sounds that might “harass” marine mammals.

Seismic sound pulses received at any given point will arrive via a direct path, indirect paths that include reflection from the sea surface and bottom, and often indirect paths including segments through the bottom sediments. Sounds propagating via indirect paths travel longer distances and often arrive later than sounds arriving via a direct path. (However, sound traveling in the bottom may travel faster than that in the water, and thus may, in some situations, arrive slightly earlier than the direct arrival despite traveling a greater distance.) These variations in travel time have the effect of lengthening the duration of the received pulse, or may cause two or more received pulses from a single emitted pulse. Near the source, the predominant part of a seismic pulse is ~10–20 ms in duration. In comparison, the pulse duration as received at long horizontal distances can be much greater. For example, for one airgun array operating in

⁵ The rms value for a given airgun array pulse, as measured at a horizontal distance on the order of 0.1 km to 1–10 km in the units dB re 1 μPa , usually averages 10–15 dB higher than the SEL value for the same pulse measured in dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (e.g., Greene 1997). However, there is considerable variation, and the difference tends to be larger close to the airgun array, and less at long distances (Blackwell et al. 2007; MacGillivray and Hannay 2007a,b). In some cases, generally at longer distances, pulses are “stretched” by propagation effects to the extent that the rms and SEL values (in the respective units mentioned above) become very similar (e.g., MacGillivray and Hannay 2007a,b).

the Beaufort Sea, pulse duration was ~300 ms at a distance of 8 km, 500 ms at 20 km, and 850 ms at 73 km (Greene and Richardson 1988).

The rms level for a given pulse (when measured over the duration of that pulse) depends on the extent to which propagation effects have “stretched” the duration of the pulse by the time it reaches the receiver (e.g., Madsen 2005). As a result, the rms values for various received pulses are not perfectly correlated with the SEL (energy) values for the same pulses. There is increasing evidence that biological effects are more directly related to the received energy (e.g., to SEL) than to the rms values averaged over pulse duration (Southall et al. 2007).

Another important aspect of sound propagation is that received levels of low-frequency underwater sounds diminish close to the surface because of pressure-release and interference phenomena that occur at and near the surface (Urlick 1983; Richardson et al. 1995; Potter et al. 2007). Paired measurements of received airgun sounds at depths of 3 vs. 9 or 18 m have shown that received levels are typically several decibels lower at 3 m (Greene and Richardson 1988). For a mammal whose auditory organs are within 0.5 or 1 m of the surface, the received level of the predominant low-frequency components of the airgun pulses would be further reduced. In deep water, the received levels at deep depths can be considerably higher than those at relatively shallow (e.g., 18 m) depths and the same horizontal distance from the airguns (Tolstoy et al. 2004a,b).

Pulses of underwater sound from open-water seismic exploration are often detected 50–100 km from the source location, even during operations in nearshore waters (Greene and Richardson 1988; Burgess and Greene 1999). At those distances, the received levels are usually low, <120 dB re 1 μ Pa on an approximate rms basis. However, faint seismic pulses are sometimes detectable at even greater ranges (e.g., Bowles et al. 1994; Fox et al. 2002). In fact, low-frequency airgun signals sometimes can be detected thousands of kilometers from their source. For example, sound from seismic surveys conducted offshore of Nova Scotia, the coast of western Africa, and northeast of Brazil were reported as a dominant feature of the underwater noise field recorded along the mid-Atlantic ridge (Nieukirk et al. 2004).

4. Masking Effects of Airgun Sounds

Masking is the obscuring of sounds of interest by interfering sounds, generally at similar frequencies (Richardson et al. 1995). Introduced underwater sound will, through masking, reduce the effective communication distance of a marine mammal species if the frequency of the source is close to that used as a signal by the marine mammal, and if the anthropogenic sound is present for a significant fraction of the time (Richardson et al. 1995). If little or no overlap occurs between the introduced sound and the frequencies used by the species, communication is not expected to be disrupted. Also, if the introduced sound is present only infrequently, communication is not expected to be disrupted much if at all. The duty cycle of airguns is low; the airgun sounds are pulsed, with relatively quiet periods between pulses. In most situations, strong airgun sound will only be received for a brief period (<1 s), with these sound pulses being separated by at least several seconds of relative silence, and longer in the case of deep-penetration surveys or refraction surveys. A single airgun array might cause appreciable masking in only one situation: When propagation conditions are such that sound from each airgun pulse reverberates strongly and persists for much or all of the interval up to the next airgun pulse (e.g., Simard et al. 2005; Clark and Gagnon 2006). Situations with prolonged strong reverberation are infrequent, in our experience. However, it is common for reverberation to cause some lesser degree of elevation of the background level between airgun pulses (e.g., Guerra et al. 2009), and this weaker reverberation presumably reduces the detection range of calls and other natural sounds to some degree.

Although masking effects of pulsed sounds on marine mammal calls and other natural sounds are expected to be limited, there are few specific studies on this. Some whales continue calling in the presence of seismic pulses and whale calls often can be heard between the seismic pulses (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986; McDonald et al. 1995; Greene et al. 1999a,b; Nieuwirth et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b, 2006; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). However, there is one recent summary report indicating that calling fin whales distributed in one part of the North Atlantic went silent for an extended period starting soon after the onset of a seismic survey in the area (Clark and Gagnon 2006). It is not clear from that preliminary paper whether the whales ceased calling because of masking, or whether this was a behavioral response not directly involving masking. Also, bowhead whales in the Beaufort Sea may decrease their call rates in response to seismic operations, although movement out of the area might also have contributed to the lower call detection rate (Blackwell et al. 2009a,b). In contrast, Di Iorio and Clark (2009) found evidence of *increased* calling by blue whales during operations by a lower-energy seismic source—a sparker.

Among the odontocetes, there has been one report that sperm whales ceased calling when exposed to pulses from a very distant seismic ship (Bowles et al. 1994). However, more recent studies of sperm whales found that they continued calling in the presence of seismic pulses (Madsen et al. 2002; Tyack et al. 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2006; Jochens et al. 2008). Madsen et al. (2006) noted that airgun sounds would not be expected to mask sperm whale calls given the intermittent nature of airgun pulses. Dolphins and porpoises are also commonly heard calling while airguns are operating (Gordon et al. 2004; Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b; Potter et al. 2007). Masking effects of seismic pulses are expected to be negligible in the case of the smaller odontocetes, given the intermittent nature of seismic pulses plus the fact that sounds important to them are predominantly at much higher frequencies than are the dominant components of airgun sounds.

Pinnipeds, sirenians and sea otters have best hearing sensitivity and/or produce most of their sounds at frequencies higher than the dominant components of airgun sound, but there is some overlap in the frequencies of the airgun pulses and the calls. However, the intermittent nature of airgun pulses presumably reduces the potential for masking.

A few cetaceans are known to increase the source levels of their calls in the presence of elevated sound levels, shift their peak frequencies in response to strong sound signals, or otherwise modify their vocal behavior in response to increased noise (Dahlheim 1987; Au 1993; reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995:233ff, 364ff; Lesage et al. 1999; Terhune 1999; Nieuwirth et al. 2005; Scheifele et al. 2005; Parks et al. 2007a, 2009; Di Iorio and Clark 2009; Hanser et al. 2009). It is not known how often these types of responses occur upon exposure to airgun sounds. However, blue whales in the St. Lawrence Estuary significantly increased their call rates during sparker operations (Di Iorio and Clark 2009). The sparker, used to obtain seismic reflection data, emitted frequencies of 30–450 Hz with a relatively low source level of 193 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{pk-pk}}$. If cetaceans exposed to airgun sounds sometimes respond by changing their vocal behavior, this adaptation, along with directional hearing and preadaptation to tolerate some masking by natural sounds (Richardson et al. 1995), would all reduce the importance of masking by seismic pulses.

5. Disturbance by Seismic Surveys

Disturbance includes a variety of effects, including subtle to conspicuous changes in behavior, movement, and displacement. In the terminology of the 1994 amendments to the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), seismic noise could cause “Level B” harassment of certain marine mammals. Level B harassment is defined as “...disruption of behavioral patterns, including, but not limited to, migration, breathing, nursing, breeding, feeding, or sheltering.”

There has been debate regarding how substantial a change in behavior or mammal activity is required before the animal should be deemed to be “taken by Level B harassment”. NMFS has stated that

“...a simple change in a marine mammal’s actions does not always rise to the level of disruption of its behavioral patterns. ... If the only reaction to the [human] activity on the part of the marine mammal is within the normal repertoire of actions that are required to carry out that behavioral pattern, NMFS considers [the human] activity not to have caused a disruption of the behavioral pattern, provided the animal’s reaction is not otherwise significant enough to be considered disruptive due to length or severity. Therefore, for example, a short-term change in breathing rates or a somewhat shortened or lengthened dive sequence that are within the animal’s normal range and that do not have any biological significance (i.e., do not disrupt the animal’s overall behavioral pattern of breathing under the circumstances), do not rise to a level requiring a small take authorization.” (NMFS 2001, p. 9293).

Based on this guidance from NMFS, and on NRC (2005), simple exposure to sound, or brief reactions that do not disrupt behavioral patterns in a potentially significant manner, do not constitute harassment or “taking”. In this analysis, we interpret “potentially significant” to mean in a manner that might have deleterious effects on the well-being of individual marine mammals or their populations.

Even with this guidance, there are difficulties in defining what marine mammals should be counted as “taken by harassment”. Available detailed data on reactions of marine mammals to airgun sounds (and other anthropogenic sounds) are limited to relatively few species and situations (see Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Southall et al. 2007). Behavioral reactions of marine mammals to sound are difficult to predict in the absence of site- and context-specific data. Reactions to sound, if any, depend on species, state of maturity, experience, current activity, reproductive state, time of day, and many other factors (Richardson et al. 1995; Wartzok et al. 2004; Southall et al. 2007; Weilgart 2007). If a marine mammal reacts to an underwater sound by changing its behavior or moving a small distance, the impacts of the change are unlikely to be significant to the individual, let alone the stock or population. However, if a sound source displaces marine mammals from an important feeding or breeding area for a prolonged period, impacts on individuals and populations could be significant (e.g., Lusseau and Bejder 2007; Weilgart 2007). Also, various authors have noted that some marine mammals that show no obvious avoidance or behavioral changes may still be adversely affected by noise (Brodie 1981; Richardson et al. 1995:317ff; Romano et al. 2004; Weilgart 2007; Wright et al. 2009). For example, some research suggests that animals in poor condition or in an already stressed state may not react as strongly to human disturbance as would more robust animals (e.g., Beale and Monaghan 2004).

Studies of the effects of seismic surveys have focused almost exclusively on the effects on individual species or related groups of species, with little scientific or regulatory attention being given to broader community-level issues. Parente et al. (2007) suggested that the diversity of cetaceans near the Brazil coast was reduced during years with seismic surveys. However, a preliminary account of a more recent analysis suggests that the trend did not persist when additional years were considered (Britto and Silva Barreto 2009).

Given the many uncertainties in predicting the quantity and types of impacts of sound on marine mammals, it is common practice to estimate how many mammals would be present within a particular distance of human activities and/or exposed to a particular level of anthropogenic sound. In most cases, this approach likely overestimates the numbers of marine mammals that would be affected in some biologically important manner. One of the reasons for this is that the selected distances/isopleths are based on limited studies indicating that some animals exhibited short-term reactions at this distance or

sound level, whereas the calculation assumes that all animals exposed to this level would react in a biologically significant manner.

The definitions of “taking” in the U.S. MMPA, and its applicability to various activities, were slightly altered in November 2003 for military and federal scientific research activities. Also, NMFS is proposing to replace current Level A and B harassment criteria with guidelines based on exposure characteristics that are specific to particular groups of mammal species and to particular sound types (NMFS 2005). Recently, a committee of specialists on noise impact issues has proposed new science-based impact criteria (Southall et al. 2007). Thus, for projects subject to U.S. jurisdiction, changes in procedures may be required in the near future.

The sound criteria used to estimate how many marine mammals might be disturbed to some biologically significant degree by seismic survey activities are primarily based on behavioral observations of a few species. Detailed studies have been done on humpback, gray, bowhead, and sperm whales, and on ringed seals. Less detailed data are available for some other species of baleen whales and small toothed whales, but for many species there are no data on responses to marine seismic surveys.

5.1 Baleen Whales

Baleen whales generally tend to avoid operating airguns, but avoidance radii are quite variable among species, locations, whale activities, oceanographic conditions affecting sound propagation, etc. (reviewed in Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004). Whales are often reported to show no overt reactions to pulses from large arrays of airguns at distances beyond a few kilometers, even though the airgun pulses remain well above ambient noise levels out to much longer distances. However, baleen whales exposed to strong sound pulses from airguns often react by deviating from their normal migration route and/or interrupting their feeding and moving away. Some of the major studies and reviews on this topic are Malme et al. (1984, 1985, 1988); Richardson et al. (1986, 1995, 1999); Ljungblad et al. (1988); Richardson and Malme (1993); McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a,b); Miller et al. (1999, 2005); Gordon et al. (2004); Moulton and Miller (2005); Stone and Tasker (2006); Johnson et al. (2007); Nowacek et al. (2007) and Weir (2008a). Although baleen whales often show only slight overt responses to operating airgun arrays (Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008a), strong avoidance reactions by several species of mysticetes have been observed at ranges up to 6–8 km and occasionally as far as 20–30 km from the source vessel when large arrays of airguns were used. Experiments with a single airgun showed that bowhead, humpback and gray whales all showed localized avoidance to a single airgun of 20–100 in³ (Malme et al. 1984, 1985, 1986, 1988; Richardson et al. 1986; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a,b).

Studies of gray, bowhead, and humpback whales have shown that seismic pulses with received levels of 160–170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ seem to cause obvious avoidance behavior in a substantial portion of the animals exposed (Richardson et al. 1995). In many areas, seismic pulses from large arrays of airguns diminish to those levels at distances ranging from 4–15 km from the source. More recent studies have shown that some species of baleen whales (bowheads and humpbacks in particular) at times show strong avoidance at received levels lower than 160–170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. The largest avoidance radii involved migrating bowhead whales, which avoided an operating seismic vessel by 20–30 km (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999). In the cases of migrating bowhead (and gray) whales, the observed changes in behavior appeared to be of little or no biological consequence to the animals—they simply avoided the sound source by displacing their migration route to varying degrees, but within the natural boundaries of the migration corridors (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985; Richardson et al. 1995). Feeding bowhead whales, in contrast to migrating whales, show much smaller avoidance distances (Miller et al.

2005; Harris et al. 2007), presumably because moving away from a food concentration has greater cost to the whales than does a course deviation during migration.

The following subsections provide more details on the documented responses of particular species and groups of baleen whales to marine seismic operations.

Humpback Whales.—Responses of humpback whales to seismic surveys have been studied during migration, on the summer feeding grounds, and on Angolan winter breeding grounds; there has also been discussion of effects on the Brazilian wintering grounds. McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a) studied the responses of migrating humpback whales off Western Australia to a full-scale seismic survey with a 16-airgun 2678-in³ array, and to a single 20 in³ airgun with a (horizontal) source level of 227 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{\text{p-p}}$. They found that the overall distribution of humpbacks migrating through their study area was unaffected by the full-scale seismic program, although localized displacement varied with pod composition, behavior, and received sound levels. Observations were made from the seismic vessel, from which the maximum viewing distance was listed as 14 km. Avoidance reactions (course and speed changes) began at 4–5 km for traveling pods, with the closest point of approach (CPA) being 3–4 km at an estimated received level of 157–164 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ (McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). A greater stand-off range of 7–12 km was observed for more sensitive resting pods (cow-calf pairs; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a). The mean received level for initial avoidance of an approaching airgun was 140 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ for humpback pods containing females, and at the mean CPA distance the received level was 143 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. One startle response was reported at 112 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. The initial avoidance response generally occurred at distances of 5–8 km from the airgun array and 2 km from the single airgun. However, some individual humpback whales, especially males, approached within distances of 100–400 m, where the maximum received level was 179 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. The McCauley et al. (1998, 2000a,b) studies show evidence of greater avoidance of seismic airgun sounds by pods with females than by other pods during humpback migration off Western Australia.

Humpback whales on their summer feeding grounds in southeast Alaska did not exhibit persistent avoidance when exposed to seismic pulses from a 1.64-L (100 in³) airgun (Malme et al. 1985). Some humpbacks seemed “startled” at received levels of 150–169 dB re 1 μPa . Malme et al. (1985) concluded that there was no clear evidence of avoidance, despite the possibility of subtle effects, at received levels up to 172 re 1 μPa on an approximate rms basis.

Among wintering humpback whales off Angola ($n = 52$ useable groups), there were no significant differences in encounter rates (sightings/hr) when a 24-airgun array (3147 in³ or 5085 in³) was operating vs. silent (Weir 2008a). There was also no significant difference in the mean CPA (closest observed point of approach) distance of the humpback sightings when airguns were on vs. off (3050 m vs. 2700 m, respectively).

It has been suggested that South Atlantic humpback whales wintering off Brazil may be displaced or even strand upon exposure to seismic surveys (Engel et al. 2004). The evidence for this was circumstantial and subject to alternative explanations (IAGC 2004). Also, the evidence was not consistent with subsequent results from the same area of Brazil (Parente et al. 2006), or with direct studies of humpbacks exposed to seismic surveys in other areas and seasons (see above). After allowance for data from subsequent years, there was “no observable direct correlation” between strandings and seismic surveys (IWC 2007, p. 236).

Bowhead Whales.—Responsiveness of bowhead whales to seismic surveys can be quite variable depending on their activity (feeding vs. migrating). Bowhead whales on their summer feeding grounds in the Canadian Beaufort Sea showed no obvious reactions to pulses from seismic vessels at distances of 6–99 km and received sound levels of 107–158 dB on an approximate rms basis (Richardson et al. 1986);

their general activities were indistinguishable from those of a control group. However, subtle but statistically significant changes in surfacing–respiration–dive cycles were evident upon statistical analysis. Bowheads usually did show strong avoidance responses when seismic vessels approached within a few kilometers (~3–7 km) and when received levels of airgun sounds were 152–178 dB (Richardson et al. 1986, 1995; Ljungblad et al. 1988; Miller et al. 2005). They also moved away when a single airgun fired nearby (Richardson et al. 1986; Ljungblad et al. 1988). In one case, bowheads engaged in near-bottom feeding began to turn away from a 30-airgun array with a source level of 248 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$ at a distance of 7.5 km, and swam away when it came within ~2 km; some whales continued feeding until the vessel was 3 km away (Richardson et al. 1986). This work and subsequent summer studies in the same region by Miller et al. (2005) and Harris et al. (2007) showed that many feeding bowhead whales tend to tolerate higher sound levels than migrating bowhead whales (see below) before showing an overt change in behavior. On the summer feeding grounds, bowhead whales are often seen from the operating seismic ship, though average sighting distances tend to be larger when the airguns are operating. Similarly, preliminary analyses of recent data from the Alaskan Beaufort Sea indicate that bowheads feeding there during late summer and autumn also did not display large-scale distributional changes in relation to seismic operations (Christie et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009). However, some individual bowheads apparently begin to react at distances a few kilometers away, beyond the distance at which observers on the ship can sight bowheads (Richardson et al. 1986; Citta et al. 2007). The feeding whales may be affected by the sounds, but the need to feed may reduce the tendency to move away until the airguns are within a few kilometers.

Migrating bowhead whales in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea seem more responsive to noise pulses from a distant seismic vessel than are summering bowheads. Bowhead whales migrating west across the Alaskan Beaufort Sea in autumn are unusually responsive, with substantial avoidance occurring out to distances of 20–30 km from a medium-sized airgun source at received sound levels of around 120–130 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999; see also Manly et al. 2007). Those results came from 1996–98, when a partially-controlled study of the effect of Ocean Bottom Cable (OBC) seismic surveys on westward-migrating bowheads was conducted in late summer and autumn in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. At times when the airguns were not active, many bowheads moved into the area close to the inactive seismic vessel. Avoidance of the area of seismic operations did not persist beyond 12–24 h after seismic shooting stopped. Preliminary analysis of recent data on traveling bowheads in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea also showed a stronger tendency to avoid operating airguns than was evident for feeding bowheads (Christie et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009).

Bowhead whale calls detected in the presence and absence of airgun sounds have been studied extensively in the Beaufort Sea. Early work on the summering grounds in the Canadian Beaufort Sea showed that bowheads continue to produce calls of the usual types when exposed to airgun sounds, although numbers of calls detected may be somewhat lower in the presence of airgun pulses (Richardson et al. 1986). Studies during autumn in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, one in 1996–1998 and another in 2007–2008, have shown that numbers of calls detected are significantly lower in the presence than in the absence of airgun pulses (Greene et al. 1999a,b; Blackwell et al. 2009a,b; Koski et al. 2009; see also Nations et al. 2009). This decrease could have resulted from movement of the whales away from the area of the seismic survey or a reduction in calling behavior, or a combination of the two. However, concurrent aerial surveys showed that there was strong avoidance of the operating airguns during the 1996–98 study, when most of the whales appeared to be migrating (Miller et al. 1999; Richardson et al. 1999). In contrast, aerial surveys during the 2007–08 study showed less consistent avoidance by the bowheads, many of which appeared to be feeding (Christie et al. 2009; Koski et al. 2009). The reduction in call detection rates during periods of airgun operation may have been more dependent on actual avoidance

during the 1996–98 study and more dependent on reduced calling behavior during the 2007–08 study, but further analysis of the recent data is ongoing.

There are no data on reactions of bowhead whales to seismic surveys in winter or spring.

Gray Whales.—Malme et al. (1986, 1988) studied the responses of feeding eastern gray whales to pulses from a single 100-in³ airgun off St. Lawrence Island in the northern Bering Sea. They estimated, based on small sample sizes, that 50% of feeding gray whales stopped feeding at an average received pressure level of 173 dB re 1 μ Pa on an (approximate) rms basis, and that 10% of feeding whales interrupted feeding at received levels of 163 dB re 1 μ Pa_{rms}. Malme et al. (1986) estimated that an average pressure level of 173 dB occurred at a range of 2.6–2.8 km from an airgun array with a source level of 250 dB re 1 μ Pa_{peak} in the northern Bering Sea. These findings were generally consistent with the results of studies conducted on larger numbers of gray whales migrating off California (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985) and western Pacific gray whales feeding off Sakhalin, Russia (Würsig et al. 1999; Gailey et al. 2007; Johnson et al. 2007; Yazvenko et al. 2007a,b), along with a few data on gray whales off British Columbia (Bain and Williams 2006).

Malme and Miles (1985) concluded that, during migration off California, gray whales showed changes in swimming pattern with received levels of ~160 dB re 1 μ Pa and higher, on an approximate rms basis. The 50% probability of avoidance was estimated to occur at a CPA distance of 2.5 km from a 4000-in³ airgun array operating off central California. This would occur at an average received sound level of ~170 dB re 1 μ Pa_{rms}. Some slight behavioral changes were noted when approaching gray whales reached the distances where received sound levels were 140 to 160 dB re 1 μ Pa_{rms}, but these whales generally continued to approach (at a slight angle) until they passed the sound source at distances where received levels averaged ~170 dB re 1 μ Pa_{rms} (Malme et al. 1984; Malme and Miles 1985).

There was no indication that western gray whales exposed to seismic noise were displaced from their overall feeding grounds near Sakhalin Island during seismic programs in 1997 (Würsig et al. 1999) and in 2001 (Johnson et al. 2007; Meier et al. 2007; Yazvenko et al. 2007a). However, there were indications of subtle behavioral effects among whales that remained in the areas exposed to airgun sounds (Würsig et al. 1999; Gailey et al. 2007; Weller et al. 2006a). Also, there was evidence of localized redistribution of some individuals within the nearshore feeding ground so as to avoid close approaches by the seismic vessel (Weller et al. 2002, 2006b; Yazvenko et al. 2007a). Despite the evidence of subtle changes in some quantitative measures of behavior and local redistribution of some individuals, there was no apparent change in the frequency of feeding, as evident from mud plumes visible at the surface (Yazvenko et al. 2007b). The 2001 seismic program involved an unusually comprehensive combination of real-time monitoring and mitigation measures designed to avoid exposing western gray whales to received levels of sound above about 163 dB re 1 μ Pa_{rms} (Johnson et al. 2007). The lack of strong avoidance or other strong responses was presumably in part a result of the mitigation measures. Effects probably would have been more significant without such intensive mitigation efforts.

Gray whales in British Columbia exposed to seismic survey sound levels up to ~170 dB re 1 μ Pa did not appear to be strongly disturbed (Bain and Williams 2006). The few whales that were observed moved away from the airguns but toward deeper water where sound levels were said to be higher due to propagation effects (Bain and Williams 2006).

Rorquals.—Blue, sei, fin, and minke whales (all of which are members of the genus *Balaenoptera*) often have been seen in areas ensonified by airgun pulses (Stone 2003; MacLean and Haley 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006), and calls from blue and fin whales have been localized in areas with airgun operations (e.g., McDonald et al. 1995; Dunn and Hernandez 2009). Sightings by observers on seismic vessels during 110 large-source seismic surveys off the U.K. from 1997 to 2000 suggest that, during times of good

sightability, sighting rates for mysticetes (mainly fin and sei whales) were similar when large arrays of airguns were shooting vs. silent (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). However, these whales tended to exhibit localized avoidance, remaining significantly further (on average) from the airgun array during seismic operations compared with non-seismic periods ($P = 0.0057$; Stone and Tasker 2006). The average CPA distances for baleen whales sighted when large airgun arrays were operating vs. silent were about 1.6 vs. 1.0 km. Baleen whales, as a group, were more often oriented away from the vessel while a large airgun array was shooting compared with periods of no shooting ($P < 0.05$; Stone and Tasker 2006). In addition, fin/sei whales were less likely to remain submerged during periods of seismic shooting (Stone 2003).

In a study off Nova Scotia, Moulton and Miller (2005) found little difference in sighting rates (after accounting for water depth) and initial average sighting distances of baleenopterid whales when airguns were operating (mean = 1324 m) vs. silent (mean = 1303 m). However, there were indications that these whales were more likely to be moving away when seen during airgun operations. Baleen whales at the average sighting distance during airgun operations would have been exposed to sound levels (via direct path) of about 169 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ (Moulton and Miller 2005). Similarly, ship-based monitoring studies of blue, fin, sei and minke whales offshore of Newfoundland (Orphan Basin and Laurentian Sub-basin) found no more than small differences in sighting rates and swim directions during seismic vs. non-seismic periods (Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a,b). Analyses of CPA data yielded variable results.⁶ The authors of the Newfoundland reports concluded that, based on observations from the seismic vessel, some mysticetes exhibited localized avoidance of seismic operations (Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a).

Minke whales have occasionally been observed to approach active airgun arrays where received sound levels were estimated to be near 170–180 dB re 1 μPa (McLean and Haley 2004).

Discussion and Conclusions.—Baleen whales generally tend to avoid operating airguns, but avoidance radii are quite variable. Whales are often reported to show no overt reactions to airgun pulses at distances beyond a few kilometers, even though the airgun pulses remain well above ambient noise levels out to much longer distances. However, studies done since the late 1990s of migrating humpback and migrating bowhead whales show reactions, including avoidance, that sometimes extend to greater distances than documented earlier. Avoidance distances often exceed the distances at which boat-based observers can see whales, so observations from the source vessel can be biased. Observations over broader areas may be needed to determine the range of potential effects of some large-source seismic surveys where effects on cetaceans may extend to considerable distances (Richardson et al. 1999; Bain and Williams 2006; Moore and Angliss 2006). Longer-range observations, when required, can sometimes be obtained via systematic aerial surveys or aircraft-based observations of behavior (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986, 1999; Miller et al. 1999, 2005; Yazvenko et al. 2007a,b) or by use of observers on one or more support vessels operating in coordination with the seismic vessel (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004; Johnson et al. 2007). However, the presence of other vessels near the source vessel can, at least at times, reduce sightability of cetaceans from the source vessel (Beland et al. 2009), thus complicating interpretation of sighting data.

⁶ The CPA of baleen whales sighted from the seismic vessels was, on average, significantly closer during non-seismic periods vs. seismic periods in 2004 in the Orphan Basin (means 1526 m vs. 2316 m, respectively; Moulton et al. 2005). In contrast, mean distances without vs. with seismic did not differ significantly in 2005 in either the Orphan Basin (means 973 m vs. 832 m, respectively; Moulton et al. 2006a) or in the Laurentian Sub-basin (means 1928 m vs. 1650 m, respectively; Moulton et al. 2006b). In both 2005 studies, mean distances were greater (though not significantly so) *without* seismic.

Some baleen whales show considerable tolerance of seismic pulses. However, when the pulses are strong enough, avoidance or other behavioral changes become evident. Because the responses become less obvious with diminishing received sound level, it has been difficult to determine the maximum distance (or minimum received sound level) at which reactions to seismic become evident and, hence, how many whales are affected.

Studies of gray, bowhead, and humpback whales have determined that received levels of pulses in the 160–170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ range seem to cause obvious avoidance behavior in a substantial fraction of the animals exposed. In many areas, seismic pulses diminish to these levels at distances ranging from 4 to 15 km from the source. A substantial proportion of the baleen whales within such distances may show avoidance or other strong disturbance reactions to the operating airgun array. However, in other situations, various mysticetes tolerate exposure to full-scale airgun arrays operating at even closer distances, with only localized avoidance and minor changes in activities. At the other extreme, in migrating bowhead whales, avoidance often extends to considerably larger distances (20–30 km) and lower received sound levels (120–130 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$). Also, even in cases where there is no conspicuous avoidance or change in activity upon exposure to sound pulses from distant seismic operations, there are sometimes subtle changes in behavior (e.g., surfacing–respiration–dive cycles) that are only evident through detailed statistical analysis (e.g., Richardson et al. 1986; Gailey et al. 2007).

Mitigation measures for seismic surveys, especially nighttime seismic surveys, typically assume that many marine mammals (at least baleen whales) tend to avoid approaching airguns, or the seismic vessel itself, before being exposed to levels high enough for there to be any possibility of injury. This assumes that the ramp-up (soft-start) procedure is used when commencing airgun operations, to give whales near the vessel the opportunity to move away before they are exposed to sound levels that might be strong enough to elicit TTS. As noted above, single-airgun experiments with three species of baleen whales show that those species typically do tend to move away when a single airgun starts firing nearby, which simulates the onset of a ramp up. The three species that showed avoidance when exposed to the onset of pulses from a single airgun were *gray whales* (Malme et al. 1984, 1986, 1988); *bowhead whales* (Richardson et al. 1986; Ljungblad et al. 1988); and *humpback whales* (Malme et al. 1985; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a,b). Since startup of a single airgun is equivalent to the start of a ramp-up (=soft start), this strongly suggests that many baleen whales will begin to move away during the initial stages of a ramp-up.

Data on short-term reactions by cetaceans to impulsive noises are not necessarily indicative of long-term or biologically significant effects. It is not known whether impulsive sounds affect reproductive rate or distribution and habitat use in subsequent days or years. However, gray whales have continued to migrate annually along the west coast of North America despite intermittent seismic exploration (and much ship traffic) in that area for decades (Appendix A in Malme et al. 1984; Richardson et al. 1995), and there has been a substantial increase in the population over recent decades (Angliss and Outlaw 2008). The western Pacific gray whale population did not seem affected by a seismic survey in its feeding ground during a prior year (Johnson et al. 2007). Similarly, bowhead whales have continued to travel to the eastern Beaufort Sea each summer despite seismic exploration in their summer and autumn range for many years (Richardson et al. 1987), and their numbers have increased notably (Angliss and Outlaw 2008). Bowheads also have been observed over periods of days or weeks in areas ensonified repeatedly by seismic pulses (Richardson et al. 1987; Harris et al. 2007). However, it is generally not known whether the same individual bowheads were involved in these repeated observations (within and between years) in strongly ensonified areas. In any event, in the absence of some unusual circumstances, the history of coexistence between seismic surveys and baleen whales suggests that brief exposures to sound pulses from any single seismic survey are unlikely to result in prolonged effects.

5.2 Toothed Whales

Little systematic information is available about reactions of toothed whales to noise pulses. Few studies similar to the more extensive baleen whale/seismic pulse work summarized above have been reported for toothed whales. However, there are recent systematic data on sperm whales (e.g., Gordon et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). There is also an increasing amount of information about responses of various odontocetes to seismic surveys based on monitoring studies (e.g., Stone 2003; Smultea et al. 2004; Moulton and Miller 2005; Bain and Williams 2006; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Potter et al. 2007; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; Weir 2008a; Barkaszi et al. 2009; Richardson et al. 2009).

Delphinids (Dolphins and similar) and Monodontids (Beluga).—Seismic operators and marine mammal observers on seismic vessels regularly see dolphins and other small toothed whales near operating airgun arrays, but in general there is a tendency for most delphinids to show some avoidance of operating seismic vessels (e.g., Goold 1996a,b,c; Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; Stone 2003; Moulton and Miller 2005; Holst et al. 2006; Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008a; Richardson et al. 2009; see also Barkaszi et al. 2009). In most cases, the avoidance radii for delphinids appear to be small, on the order of 1 km or less, and some individuals show no apparent avoidance. Studies that have reported cases of small toothed whales close to the operating airguns include Duncan (1985), Arnold (1996), Stone (2003), and Holst et al. (2006). When a 3959 in³, 18-airgun array was firing off California, toothed whales behaved in a manner similar to that observed when the airguns were silent (Arnold 1996). Some dolphins seem to be attracted to the seismic vessel and floats, and some ride the bow wave of the seismic vessel even when a large array of airguns is firing (e.g., Moulton and Miller 2005). Nonetheless, small toothed whales more often tend to head away, or to maintain a somewhat greater distance from the vessel, when a large array of airguns is operating than when it is silent (e.g., Stone and Tasker 2006; Weir 2008a).

Weir (2008b) noted that a group of short-finned pilot whales initially showed an avoidance response to ramp up of a large airgun array, but that this response was limited in time and space. Although the ramp-up procedure is a widely-used mitigation measure, it remains uncertain how effective it is at alerting marine mammals (especially odontocetes) and causing them to move away from seismic operations (Weir 2008b).

Goold (1996a,b,c) studied the effects on common dolphins of 2D seismic surveys in the Irish Sea. Passive acoustic surveys were conducted from the “guard ship” that towed a hydrophone. The results indicated that there was a local displacement of dolphins around the seismic operation. However, observations indicated that the animals were tolerant of the sounds at distances outside a 1-km radius from the airguns (Goold 1996a). Initial reports of larger-scale displacement were later shown to represent a normal autumn migration of dolphins through the area, and were not attributable to seismic surveys (Goold 1996a,b,c).

The beluga is a species that (at least at times) shows long-distance avoidance of seismic vessels. Aerial surveys conducted in the southeastern Beaufort Sea in summer found that sighting rates of belugas were significantly lower at distances 10–20 km compared with 20–30 km from an operating airgun array (Miller et al. 2005). The low number of beluga sightings by marine mammal observers on the vessel seemed to confirm there was a strong avoidance response to the 2250 in³ airgun array. More recent seismic monitoring studies in the same area have confirmed that the apparent displacement effect on belugas extended farther than has been shown for other small odontocetes exposed to airgun pulses (e.g., Harris et al. 2007).

Observers stationed on seismic vessels operating off the U.K. from 1997 to 2000 have provided data on the occurrence and behavior of various toothed whales exposed to seismic pulses (Stone 2003;

Gordon et al. 2004; Stone and Tasker 2006). Dolphins of various species often showed more evidence of avoidance of operating airgun arrays than has been reported previously for small odontocetes. Sighting rates of white-sided dolphins, white-beaked dolphins, *Lagenorhynchus* spp., and all small odontocetes combined were significantly lower during periods when large-volume⁷ airgun arrays were shooting. Except for the pilot whale and bottlenose dolphin, CPA distances for all of the small odontocete species tested, including killer whales, were significantly farther from large airgun arrays during periods of shooting compared with periods of no shooting. Pilot whales were less responsive than other small odontocetes in the presence of seismic surveys (Stone and Tasker 2006). For small odontocetes as a group, and most individual species, orientations differed between times when large airgun arrays were operating vs. silent, with significantly fewer animals traveling towards and/or more traveling away from the vessel during shooting (Stone and Tasker 2006). Observers' records suggested that fewer cetaceans were feeding and fewer were interacting with the survey vessel (e.g., bow-riding) during periods with airguns operating, and small odontocetes tended to swim faster during periods of shooting (Stone and Tasker 2006). For most types of small odontocetes sighted by observers on seismic vessels, the median CPA distance was ≥ 0.5 km larger during airgun operations (Stone and Tasker 2006). Killer whales appeared to be more tolerant of seismic shooting in deeper waters.

Data collected during seismic operations in the Gulf of Mexico and off Central America show similar patterns. A summary of vessel-based monitoring data from the Gulf of Mexico during 2003–2008 showed that delphinids were generally seen farther from the vessel during seismic than during non-seismic periods (based on Barkaszi et al. 2009, excluding sperm whales). Similarly, during two NSF-funded L-DEO seismic surveys that used a large 20 airgun array (~ 7000 in³), sighting rates of delphinids were lower and initial sighting distances were farther away from the vessel during seismic than non-seismic periods (Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a, 2006; Richardson et al. 2009). Monitoring results during a seismic survey in the Southeast Caribbean showed that the mean CPA of delphinids was 991 m during seismic operations vs. 172 m when the airguns were not operational (Smultea et al. 2004). Surprisingly, nearly all acoustic detections via a towed passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) array, including both delphinids and sperm whales, were made when the airguns were operating (Smultea et al. 2004). Although the number of sightings during monitoring of a seismic survey off the Yucatán Peninsula, Mexico, was small ($n = 19$), the results showed that the mean CPA distance of delphinids there was 472 m during seismic operations vs. 178 m when the airguns were silent (Holst et al. 2005a). The acoustic detection rates were nearly 5 times higher during non-seismic compared with seismic operations (Holst et al. 2005a).

For two additional NSF-funded L-DEO seismic surveys in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, both using a large 36-airgun array (~ 6600 in³), the results are less easily interpreted (Richardson et al. 2009). During both surveys, the delphinid detection rate was lower during seismic than during non-seismic periods, as found in various other projects, but the mean CPA distance of delphinids was closer (not farther) during seismic periods (Hauser et al. 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008).

During two seismic surveys off Newfoundland and Labrador in 2004–05, dolphin sighting rates were lower during seismic periods than during non-seismic periods after taking temporal factors into account, although the difference was statistically significant only in 2004 (Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a). In 2005, the mean CPA distance of dolphins was significantly farther during seismic periods (807 vs. 652 m); in 2004, the corresponding difference was not significant.

⁷ Large volume means at least 1300 in³, with most (79%) at least 3000 in³.

Among Atlantic spotted dolphins off Angola ($n = 16$ useable groups), marked short-term and localized displacement was found in response to seismic operations conducted with a 24-airgun array (3147 in³ or 5085 in³) (Weir 2008a). Sample sizes were low, but CPA distances of dolphin groups were significantly larger when airguns were on (mean 1080 m) vs. off (mean 209 m). No Atlantic spotted dolphins were seen within 500 m of the airguns when they were operating, whereas all sightings when airguns were silent occurred within 500 m, including the only recorded “positive approach” behaviors.

Reactions of toothed whales to a single airgun or other small airgun source are not well documented, but tend to be less substantial than reactions to large airgun arrays (e.g., Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). During 91 site surveys off the U.K. in 1997–2000, sighting rates of all small odontocetes combined were significantly lower during periods the low-volume⁸ airgun sources were operating, and effects on orientation were evident for all species and groups tested (Stone and Tasker 2006). Results from four NSF-funded L-DEO seismic surveys using small arrays (up to 3 GI guns and 315 in³) were inconclusive. During surveys in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (Holst et al. 2005b) and in the Northwest Atlantic (Haley and Koski 2004), detection rates were slightly lower during seismic compared to non-seismic periods. However, mean CPAs were closer during seismic operations during one cruise (Holst et al. 2005b), and greater during the other cruise (Haley and Koski 2004). Interpretation of the data was confounded by the fact that survey effort and/or number of sightings during non-seismic periods during both surveys was small. Results from another two small-array surveys were even more variable (MacLean and Koski 2005; Smultea and Holst 2008).

Captive bottlenose dolphins and beluga whales exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to strong pulsed sounds similar in duration to those typically used in seismic surveys (Finneran et al. 2000, 2002, 2005). Finneran et al. (2002) exposed a captive bottlenose dolphin and beluga to single impulses from a water gun (80 in³). As compared with airgun pulses, water gun impulses were expected to contain proportionally more energy at higher frequencies because there is no significant gas-filled bubble, and thus little low-frequency bubble-pulse energy (Hutchinson and Detrick 1984). The captive animals sometimes vocalized after exposure and exhibited reluctance to station at the test site where subsequent exposure to impulses would be implemented (Finneran et al. 2002). Similar behaviors were exhibited by captive bottlenose dolphins and a beluga exposed to single underwater pulses designed to simulate those produced by distant underwater explosions (Finneran et al. 2000). It is uncertain what relevance these observed behaviors in captive, trained marine mammals exposed to single transient sounds may have to free-ranging animals exposed to multiple pulses. In any event, the animals tolerated rather high received levels of sound before exhibiting the aversive behaviors mentioned above.

Odontocete responses (or lack of responses) to noise pulses from underwater explosions (as opposed to airgun pulses) may be indicative of odontocete responses to very strong noise pulses. During the 1950s, small explosive charges were dropped into an Alaskan river in attempts to scare belugas away from salmon. Success was limited (Fish and Vania 1971; Frost et al. 1984). Small explosive charges were “not always effective” in moving bottlenose dolphins away from sites in the Gulf of Mexico where larger demolition blasts were about to occur (Klima et al. 1988). Odontocetes may be attracted to fish killed by explosions, and thus attracted rather than repelled by “scare” charges. Captive false killer whales showed no obvious reaction to single noise pulses from small (10 g) charges; the received level was ~185 dB re 1 μ Pa (Akamatsu et al. 1993). Jefferson and Curry (1994) reviewed several additional studies that found limited or no effects of noise pulses from small explosive charges on killer whales and

⁸ For low volume arrays, maximum volume was 820 in³, with most (87%) ≤ 180 in³.

other odontocetes. Aside from the potential for causing auditory impairment (see below), the tolerance to these charges may indicate a lack of effect, or the failure to move away may simply indicate a stronger desire to feed, regardless of circumstances.

Phocoenids (Porpoises).—Porpoises, like delphinids, show variable reactions to seismic operations, and reactions apparently depend on species. The limited available data suggest that harbor porpoises show stronger avoidance of seismic operations than Dall’s porpoises (Stone 2003; MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006). In Washington State waters, the harbor porpoise—despite being considered a high-frequency specialist—appeared to be the species affected by the lowest received level of airgun sound (<145 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ at a distance >70 km; Bain and Williams 2006). Similarly, during seismic surveys with large airgun arrays off the U.K. in 1997–2000, there were significant differences in directions of travel by harbor porpoises during periods when the airguns were shooting vs. silent (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006). A captive harbor porpoise exposed to single sound pulses from a small airgun showed aversive behavior upon receipt of a pulse with received level above 174 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{pk-pk}}$ or SEL >145 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (Lucke et al. 2009). In contrast, Dall’s porpoises seem relatively tolerant of airgun operations (MacLean and Koski 2005; Bain and Williams 2006), although they too have been observed to avoid large arrays of operating airguns (Calambokidis and Osmek 1998; Bain and Williams 2006). The apparent tendency for greater responsiveness in the harbor porpoise is consistent with their relative responsiveness to boat traffic and some other acoustic sources (Richardson et al. 1995; Southall et al. 2007).

Beaked Whales.—There are almost no specific data on the behavioral reactions of beaked whales to seismic surveys. Most beaked whales tend to avoid approaching vessels of other types (e.g., Würsig et al. 1998). They may also dive for an extended period when approached by a vessel (e.g., Kasuya 1986), although it is uncertain how much longer such dives may be as compared to dives by undisturbed beaked whales, which also are often quite long (Baird et al. 2006; Tyack et al. 2006b). In any event, it is likely that most beaked whales would also show strong avoidance of an approaching seismic vessel, regardless of whether or not the airguns are operating. However, this has not been documented explicitly. Northern bottlenose whales sometimes are quite tolerant of slow-moving vessels not emitting airgun pulses (Reeves et al. 1993; Hooker et al. 2001). The few detections (acoustic or visual) of northern bottlenose whales from seismic vessels during recent seismic surveys off Nova Scotia have been during times when the airguns were shut down; no detections were reported when the airguns were operating (Moulton and Miller 2005; Potter et al. 2007). However, other visual and acoustic studies indicated that some northern bottlenose whales remained in the general area and continued to produce high-frequency clicks when exposed to sound pulses from distant seismic surveys (Gosselin and Lawson 2004; Laurinoli and Cochran 2005; Simard et al. 2005).

There are increasing indications that some beaked whales tend to strand when military exercises involving mid-frequency sonar operation are ongoing nearby (e.g., Simmonds and Lopez-Jurado 1991; Frantzis 1998; NOAA and USN 2001; Jepson et al. 2003; Barlow and Gisiner 2006; see also the “Strandings and Mortality” subsection, later). These strandings are apparently at least in part a disturbance response, although auditory or other injuries or other physiological effects may also be a factor. Whether beaked whales would ever react similarly to seismic surveys is unknown. Seismic survey sounds are quite different from those of the sonars in operation during the above-cited incidents. No conclusive link has been established between seismic surveys and beaked whale strandings. There was a stranding of two Cuvier’s beaked whales in the Gulf of California (Mexico) in September 2002 when the R/V *Maurice Ewing* was conducting a seismic survey in the general area (e.g., Malakoff 2002; Hildebrand 2005). However, NMFS did not establish a cause and effect relationship between this stranding and the seismic survey activities (Hogarth 2002). Cox et al. (2006) noted the “lack of knowledge regard-

ing the temporal and spatial correlation between the [stranding] and the sound source”. Hildebrand (2005) illustrated the approximate temporal-spatial relationships between the stranding and the *Ewing*’s tracks, but the time of the stranding was not known with sufficient precision for accurate determination of the CPA distance of the whales to the *Ewing*. Another stranding of Cuvier’s beaked whales in the Galápagos occurred during a seismic survey in April 2000; however “There is no obvious mechanism that bridges the distance between this source and the stranding site” (Gentry [ed.] 2002).

Sperm Whales.—All three species of sperm whales have been reported to show avoidance reactions to standard vessels not emitting airgun sounds (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995; Würsig et al. 1998; McAlpine 2002; Baird 2005). However, most studies of the sperm whale *Physeter macrocephalus* exposed to airgun sounds indicate that this species shows considerable tolerance of airgun pulses. The whales usually do not show strong avoidance (i.e., they do not leave the area) and they continue to call.

There were some early and limited observations suggesting that sperm whales in the Southern Ocean ceased calling during some (but not all) times when exposed to weak noise pulses from extremely distant (>300 km) seismic exploration. However, other operations in the area could also have been a factor (Bowles et al. 1994). This “quieting” was suspected to represent a disturbance effect, in part because sperm whales exposed to pulsed man-made sounds at higher frequencies often cease calling (Watkins and Schevill 1975; Watkins et al. 1985). Also, there was an early preliminary account of possible long-range avoidance of seismic vessels by sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico (Mate et al. 1994). However, this has not been substantiated by subsequent more detailed work in that area (Gordon et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009).

Recent and more extensive data from vessel-based monitoring programs in U.K. waters and off Newfoundland and Angola suggest that sperm whales in those areas show little evidence of avoidance or behavioral disruption in the presence of operating seismic vessels (Stone 2003; Stone and Tasker 2006; Moulton et al. 2005, 2006a; Weir 2008a). Among sperm whales off Angola ($n = 96$ useable groups), there were no significant differences in encounter rates (sightings/hr) when a 24-airgun array (3147 in³ or 5085 in³) was operating vs. silent (Weir 2008a). There was also no significant difference in the CPA distances of the sperm whale sightings when airguns were on vs. off (means 3039 m vs. 2594 m, respectively). Encounter rate tended to increase over the 10-month duration of the seismic survey. These types of observations are difficult to interpret because the observers are stationed on or near the seismic vessel, and may underestimate reactions by some of the more responsive animals, which may be beyond visual range. However, these results do seem to show considerable tolerance of seismic surveys by at least some sperm whales. Also, a study off northern Norway indicated that sperm whales continued to call when exposed to pulses from a distant seismic vessel. Received levels of the seismic pulses were up to 146 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{p-p}}$ (Madsen et al. 2002).

Similarly, a study conducted off Nova Scotia that analyzed recordings of sperm whale vocalizations at various distances from an active seismic program did not detect any obvious changes in the distribution or behavior of sperm whales (McCall Howard 1999).

Sightings of sperm whales by observers on seismic vessels operating in the Gulf of Mexico during 2003–2008 were at very similar average distances regardless of the airgun operating conditions (Barkaszi et al. 2009). For example, the mean sighting distance was 1839 m when the airgun array was in full operation ($n=612$) vs. 1960 m when all airguns were off ($n=66$).

A controlled study of the reactions of tagged sperm whales to seismic surveys was done recently in the Gulf of Mexico — the Sperm Whale Seismic Study or SWSS (Gordon et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2006; Winsor and Mate 2006; Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). During SWSS, D-tags (Johnson and Tyack 2003) were used to record the movement and acoustic exposure of eight foraging sperm whales

before, during, and after controlled exposures to sound from airgun arrays (Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009). Whales were exposed to maximum received sound levels of 111–147 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ (131–162 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{pk-pk}}$) at ranges of ~1.4–12.8 km from the sound source (Miller et al. 2009). Although the tagged whales showed no discernible horizontal avoidance, some whales showed changes in diving and foraging behavior during full-array exposure, possibly indicative of subtle negative effects on foraging (Jochens et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2009; Tyack 2009). Two indications of foraging that they studied were oscillations in pitch and occurrence of echolocation buzzes, both of which tend to occur when a sperm whale closes-in on prey. "Oscillations in pitch generated by swimming movements during foraging dives were on average 6% lower during exposure than during the immediately following post-exposure period, with all 7 foraging whales exhibiting less pitching ($P = 0.014$). Buzz rates, a proxy for attempts to capture prey, were 19% lower during exposure..." (Miller et al. 2009). Although the latter difference was not statistically significant ($P = 0.141$), the percentage difference in buzz rate during exposure vs. post-exposure conditions appeared to be strongly correlated with airgun-whale distance (Miller et al. 2009: Fig. 5; Tyack 2009).

Discussion and Conclusions.—Dolphins and porpoises are often seen by observers on active seismic vessels, occasionally at close distances (e.g., bow riding). However, some studies near the U.K., Newfoundland and Angola, in the Gulf of Mexico, and off Central America have shown localized avoidance. Also, belugas summering in the Canadian Beaufort Sea showed larger-scale avoidance, tending to avoid waters out to 10–20 km from operating seismic vessels. In contrast, recent studies show little evidence of conspicuous reactions by sperm whales to airgun pulses, contrary to earlier indications.

There are almost no specific data on responses of beaked whales to seismic surveys, but it is likely that most if not all species show strong avoidance. There is increasing evidence that some beaked whales may strand after exposure to strong noise from sonars. Whether they ever do so in response to seismic survey noise is unknown. Northern bottlenose whales seem to continue to call when exposed to pulses from distant seismic vessels.

Overall, odontocete reactions to large arrays of airguns are variable and, at least for delphinids and some porpoises, seem to be confined to a smaller radius than has been observed for some mysticetes. However, other data suggest that some odontocetes species, including belugas and harbor porpoises, may be more responsive than might be expected given their poor low-frequency hearing. Reactions at longer distances may be particularly likely when sound propagation conditions are conducive to transmission of the higher-frequency components of airgun sound to the animals' location (DeRuiter et al. 2006; Goold and Coates 2006; Tyack et al. 2006a; Potter et al. 2007).

For delphinids, and possibly the Dall's porpoise, the available data suggest that a ≥ 170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ disturbance criterion (rather than ≥ 160 dB) would be appropriate. With a medium-to-large airgun array, received levels typically diminish to 170 dB within 1–4 km, whereas levels typically remain above 160 dB out to 4–15 km (e.g., Tolstoy et al. 2009). Reaction distances for delphinids are more consistent with the typical 170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ distances. The 160 dB (rms) criterion currently applied by NMFS was developed based primarily on data from gray and bowhead whales. Avoidance distances for delphinids and Dall's porpoises tend to be shorter than for those two mysticete species. For delphinids and Dall's porpoises, there is no indication of strong avoidance or other disruption of behavior at distances beyond those where received levels would be ~ 170 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$.

5.3 Pinnipeds

Few studies of the reactions of pinnipeds to noise from open-water seismic exploration have been published (for review of the early literature, see Richardson et al. 1995). However, pinnipeds have been observed during a number of seismic monitoring studies. Monitoring in the Beaufort Sea during 1996–2002 provided a substantial amount of information on avoidance responses (or lack thereof) and associated behavior. Additional monitoring of that type has been done in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas in 2006–2009. Pinnipeds exposed to seismic surveys have also been observed during seismic surveys along the U.S. west coast. Some limited data are available on physiological responses of pinnipeds exposed to seismic sound, as studied with the aid of radio telemetry. Also, there are data on the reactions of pinnipeds to various other related types of impulsive sounds.

Early observations provided considerable evidence that pinnipeds are often quite tolerant of strong pulsed sounds. During seismic exploration off Nova Scotia, gray seals exposed to noise from airguns and linear explosive charges reportedly did not react strongly (J. Parsons *in* Greene et al. 1985). An airgun caused an initial startle reaction among South African fur seals but was ineffective in scaring them away from fishing gear (Anonymous 1975). Pinnipeds in both water and air sometimes tolerate strong noise pulses from non-explosive and explosive scaring devices, especially if attracted to the area for feeding or reproduction (Mate and Harvey 1987; Reeves et al. 1996). Thus, pinnipeds are expected to be rather tolerant of, or to habituate to, repeated underwater sounds from distant seismic sources, at least when the animals are strongly attracted to the area.

In the U.K., a radio-telemetry study demonstrated short-term changes in the behavior of harbor (=common) and gray seals exposed to airgun pulses (Thompson et al. 1998). Harbor seals were exposed to seismic pulses from a 90-in³ array (3 × 30 in³ airguns), and behavioral responses differed among individuals. One harbor seal avoided the array at distances up to 2.5 km from the source and only resumed foraging dives after seismic stopped. Another harbor seal exposed to the same small airgun array showed no detectable behavioral response, even when the array was within 500 m. Gray seals exposed to a single 10-in³ airgun showed an avoidance reaction: they moved away from the source, increased swim speed and/or dive duration, and switched from foraging dives to predominantly transit dives. These effects appeared to be short-term as gray seals either remained in, or returned at least once to, the foraging area where they had been exposed to seismic pulses. These results suggest that there are interspecific as well as individual differences in seal responses to seismic sounds.

Off California, visual observations from a seismic vessel showed that California sea lions “typically ignored the vessel and array. When [they] displayed behavior modifications, they often appeared to be reacting visually to the sight of the towed array. At times, California sea lions were attracted to the array, even when it was on. At other times, these animals would appear to be actively avoiding the vessel and array” (Arnold 1996). In Puget Sound, sighting distances for harbor seals and California sea lions tended to be larger when airguns were operating; both species tended to orient away whether or not the airguns were firing (Calambokidis and Osmek 1998). Bain and Williams (2006) also stated that their small sample of harbor seals and sea lions tended to orient and/or move away upon exposure to sounds from a large airgun array.

Monitoring work in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea during 1996–2001 provided considerable information regarding the behavior of seals exposed to seismic pulses (Harris et al. 2001; Moulton and Lawson 2002). Those seismic projects usually involved arrays of 6–16 airguns with total volumes 560–1500 in³. Subsequent monitoring work in the Canadian Beaufort Sea in 2001–2002, with a somewhat larger airgun system (24 airguns, 2250 in³), provided similar results (Miller et al. 2005). The combined results suggest that some seals avoid the immediate area around seismic vessels. In most survey years, ringed seal

sightings averaged somewhat farther away from the seismic vessel when the airguns were operating than when they were not (Moulton and Lawson 2002). Also, seal sighting rates at the water surface were lower during airgun array operations than during no-airgun periods in each survey year except 1997. However, the avoidance movements were relatively small, on the order of 100 m to (at most) a few hundreds of meters, and many seals remained within 100–200 m of the trackline as the operating airgun array passed by.

The operation of the airgun array had minor and variable effects on the behavior of seals visible at the surface within a few hundred meters of the airguns (Moulton and Lawson 2002). The behavioral data indicated that some seals were more likely to swim away from the source vessel during periods of airgun operations and more likely to swim towards or parallel to the vessel during non-seismic periods. No consistent relationship was observed between exposure to airgun noise and proportions of seals engaged in other recognizable behaviors, e.g., “looked” and “dove”. Such a relationship might have occurred if seals seek to reduce exposure to strong seismic pulses, given the reduced airgun noise levels close to the surface where “looking” occurs (Moulton and Lawson 2002).

Monitoring results from the Canadian Beaufort Sea during 2001–2002 were more variable (Miller et al. 2005). During 2001, sighting rates of seals (mostly ringed seals) were similar during all seismic states, including periods without airgun operations. However, seals tended to be seen closer to the vessel during non-seismic than seismic periods. In contrast, during 2002, sighting rates of seals were higher during non-seismic periods than seismic operations, and seals were seen farther from the vessel during non-seismic compared to seismic activity (a marginally significant result). The combined data for both years showed that sighting rates were higher during non-seismic periods compared to seismic periods, and that sighting distances were similar during both seismic states. Miller et al. (2005) concluded that seals showed very limited avoidance to the operating airgun array.

Vessel-based monitoring also took place in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort seas during 2006–2008 (Reiser et al. 2009). Observers on the seismic vessels saw phocid seals less frequently while airguns were operating than when airguns were silent. Also, during airgun operations, those observers saw seals less frequently than did observers on nearby vessels without airguns. Finally, observers on the latter “no-airgun” vessels saw seals more often when the nearby source vessels’ airguns were operating than when they were silent. All of these observations are indicative of a tendency for phocid seals to exhibit localized avoidance of the seismic source vessel when airguns are firing (Reiser et al. 2009).

In summary, visual monitoring from seismic vessels has shown only slight (if any) avoidance of airguns by pinnipeds, and only slight (if any) changes in behavior. These studies show that many pinnipeds do not avoid the area within a few hundred meters of an operating airgun array. However, based on the studies with large sample size, or observations from a separate monitoring vessel, or radio telemetry, it is apparent that some phocid seals do show localized avoidance of operating airguns. The limited nature of this tendency for avoidance is a concern. It suggests that one cannot rely on pinnipeds to move away, or to move very far away, before received levels of sound from an approaching seismic survey vessel approach those that may cause hearing impairment (see below).

5.4 Sirenians, Sea Otter and Polar Bear

We are not aware of any information on the reactions of sirenians to airgun sounds.

Behavior of sea otters along the California coast was monitored by Riedman (1983, 1984) while they were exposed to a single 100 in³ airgun and a 4089 in³ airgun array. No disturbance reactions were evident when the airgun array was as close as 0.9 km. Sea otters also did not respond noticeably to the single airgun. These results suggest that sea otters may be less responsive to marine seismic pulses than

some other marine mammals, such as mysticetes and odontocetes (summarized above). Also, sea otters spend a great deal of time at the surface feeding and grooming (Riedman 1983, 1984). While at the surface, the potential noise exposure of sea otters would be much reduced by pressure-release and interference (Lloyd's mirror) effects at the surface (Greene and Richardson 1988; Richardson et al. 1995).

Airgun effects on polar bears have not been studied. However, polar bears on the ice would be largely unaffected by underwater sound. Sound levels received by polar bears in the water would be attenuated because polar bears generally do not dive much below the surface and received levels of airgun sounds are reduced near the surface because of the aforementioned pressure release and interference effects at the water's surface.

6. Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects of Seismic Surveys

Temporary or permanent hearing impairment is a possibility when marine mammals are exposed to very strong sounds. Temporary threshold shift (TTS) has been demonstrated and studied in certain captive odontocetes and pinnipeds exposed to strong sounds (reviewed in Southall et al. 2007). However, there has been no specific documentation of TTS let alone permanent hearing damage, i.e. permanent threshold shift (PTS), in free-ranging marine mammals exposed to sequences of airgun pulses during realistic field conditions. Current NMFS policy regarding exposure of marine mammals to high-level sounds is that cetaceans and pinnipeds should not be exposed to impulsive sounds ≥ 180 and 190 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$, respectively (NMFS 2000). Those criteria have been used in establishing the safety (=shut-down) radii planned for numerous seismic surveys conducted under U.S. jurisdiction. However, those criteria were established before there was any information about the minimum received levels of sounds necessary to cause auditory impairment in marine mammals. As discussed below,

- the 180-dB criterion for cetaceans is probably quite precautionary, i.e., lower than necessary to avoid temporary auditory impairment let alone permanent auditory injury, at least for delphinids.
- TTS is not injury and does not constitute "Level A harassment" in U.S. MMPA terminology.
- the minimum sound level necessary to cause permanent hearing impairment ("Level A harassment") is higher, by a variable and generally unknown amount, than the level that induces barely-detectable TTS.
- the level associated with the onset of TTS is often considered to be a level below which there is no danger of permanent damage. The actual PTS threshold is likely to be well above the level causing onset of TTS (Southall et al. 2007).

Recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria for marine mammals, frequency-weighting procedures, and related matters were published recently (Southall et al. 2007). Those recommendations have not, as of late 2009, been formally adopted by NMFS for use in regulatory processes and during mitigation programs associated with seismic surveys. However, some aspects of the recommendations have been taken into account in certain EISs and small-take authorizations. NMFS has indicated that it may issue new noise exposure criteria for marine mammals that account for the now-available scientific data on TTS, the expected offset between the TTS and PTS thresholds, differences in the acoustic frequencies to which different marine mammal groups are sensitive, and other relevant factors. Preliminary information about possible changes in the regulatory and mitigation requirements, and about the possible structure of new criteria, was given by Wieting (2004) and NMFS (2005).

Several aspects of the monitoring and mitigation measures that are now often implemented during seismic survey projects are designed to detect marine mammals occurring near the airgun array, and to avoid exposing them to sound pulses that might, at least in theory, cause hearing impairment. In addition, many cetaceans and (to a limited degree) pinnipeds show some avoidance of the area where received

levels of airgun sound are high enough such that hearing impairment could potentially occur. In those cases, the avoidance responses of the animals themselves will reduce or (most likely) avoid the possibility of hearing impairment.

Non-auditory physical effects may also occur in marine mammals exposed to strong underwater pulsed sound. Possible types of non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that might (in theory) occur include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, and other types of organ or tissue damage. It is possible that some marine mammal species (i.e., beaked whales) may be especially susceptible to injury and/or stranding when exposed to strong pulsed sounds. The following subsections summarize available data on noise-induced hearing impairment and non-auditory physical effects.

6.1 Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS)

TTS is the mildest form of hearing impairment that can occur during exposure to a strong sound (Kryter 1985). While experiencing TTS, the hearing threshold rises and a sound must be stronger in order to be heard. It is a temporary phenomenon, and (especially when mild) is not considered to represent physical damage or “injury” (Southall et al. 2007). Rather, the onset of TTS is an indicator that, if the animal is exposed to higher levels of that sound, physical damage is ultimately a possibility.

The magnitude of TTS depends on the level and duration of noise exposure, and to some degree on frequency, among other considerations (Kryter 1985; Richardson et al. 1995; Southall et al. 2007). For sound exposures at or somewhat above the TTS threshold, hearing sensitivity recovers rapidly after exposure to the noise ends. In terrestrial mammals, TTS can last from minutes or hours to (in cases of strong TTS) days. Only a few data have been obtained on sound levels and durations necessary to elicit mild TTS in marine mammals (none in mysticetes), and none of the published data concern TTS elicited by exposure to multiple pulses of sound during operational seismic surveys (Southall et al. 2007).

Toothed Whales.—There are empirical data on the sound exposures that elicit onset of TTS in captive bottlenose dolphins and belugas. The majority of these data concern non-impulse sound, but there are some limited published data concerning TTS onset upon exposure to a single pulse of sound from a watergun (Finneran et al. 2002). A detailed review of all TTS data from marine mammals can be found in Southall et al. (2007). The following summarizes some of the key results from odontocetes.

Recent information corroborates earlier expectations that the effect of exposure to strong transient sounds is closely related to the total amount of acoustic energy that is received. Finneran et al. (2005) examined the effects of tone duration on TTS in bottlenose dolphins. Bottlenose dolphins were exposed to 3 kHz tones (non-impulsive) for periods of 1, 2, 4 or 8 s, with hearing tested at 4.5 kHz. For 1-s exposures, TTS occurred with SELs of 197 dB, and for exposures >1 s, SEL >195 dB resulted in TTS (SEL is equivalent to energy flux, in dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$). At an SEL of 195 dB, the mean TTS (4 min after exposure) was 2.8 dB. Finneran et al. (2005) suggested that an SEL of 195 dB is the likely threshold for the onset of TTS in dolphins and belugas exposed to tones of durations 1–8 s (i.e., TTS onset occurs at a near-constant SEL, independent of exposure duration). That implies that, at least for non-impulsive tones, a doubling of exposure time results in a 3 dB lower TTS threshold.

The assumption that, in marine mammals, the occurrence and magnitude of TTS is a function of cumulative acoustic energy (SEL) is probably an oversimplification. Kastak et al. (2005) reported preliminary evidence from pinnipeds that, for prolonged non-impulse noise, higher SELs were required to elicit a given TTS if exposure duration was short than if it was longer, i.e., the results were not fully consistent with an equal-energy model to predict TTS onset. Mooney et al. (2009a) showed this in a bottlenose dolphin exposed to octave-band non-impulse noise ranging from 4 to 8 kHz at SPLs of 130 to 178 dB re 1 μPa for periods of 1.88 to 30 min. Higher SELs were required to induce a given TTS if exposure

duration short than if it was longer. Exposure of the aforementioned bottlenose dolphin to a sequence of brief sonar signals showed that, with those brief (but non-impulse) sounds, the received energy (SEL) necessary to elicit TTS was higher than was the case with exposure to the more prolonged octave-band noise (Mooney et al. 2009b). Those authors concluded that, when using (non-impulse) acoustic signals of duration ~ 0.5 s, SEL must be at least 210–214 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ to induce TTS in the bottlenose dolphin.

On the other hand, the TTS threshold for odontocetes exposed to a single impulse from a watergun (Finneran et al. 2002) appeared to be somewhat lower than for exposure to non-impulse sound. This was expected, based on evidence from terrestrial mammals showing that broadband pulsed sounds with rapid rise times have greater auditory effect than do non-impulse sounds (Southall et al. 2007). The received energy level of a single seismic pulse that caused the onset of mild TTS in the beluga, as measured without frequency weighting, was ~ 186 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ or 186 dB SEL (Finneran et al. 2002).⁹ The rms level of an airgun pulse (in dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$ measured over the duration of the pulse) is typically 10–15 dB higher than the SEL for the same pulse when received within a few kilometers of the airguns. Thus, a single airgun pulse might need to have a received level of ~ 196 – 201 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ in order to produce brief, mild TTS. Exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each has a flat-weighted received level near 190 dB_{rms} (175–180 dB SEL) could result in cumulative exposure of ~ 186 dB SEL (flat-weighted) or ~ 183 dB SEL (M_{mf} -weighted), and thus slight TTS in a small odontocete. That assumes that the TTS threshold upon exposure to multiple pulses is (to a first approximation) a function of the total received pulse energy, without allowance for any recovery between pulses.

The above TTS information for odontocetes is derived from studies on the bottlenose dolphin and beluga. For the one harbor porpoise tested, the received level of airgun sound that elicited onset of TTS was lower. The animal was exposed to single pulses from a small (20 in^3) airgun, and auditory evoked potential methods were used to test the animal's hearing sensitivity at frequencies of 4, 32, or 100 kHz after each exposure (Lucke et al. 2009). Based on the measurements at 4 kHz, TTS occurred upon exposure to one airgun pulse with received level ~ 200 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{pk-pk}}$ or an SEL of 164.3 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$. If these results from a single animal are representative, it is inappropriate to assume that onset of TTS occurs at similar received levels in all odontocetes (*cf.* Southall et al. 2007). Some cetaceans may incur TTS at lower sound exposures than are necessary to elicit TTS in the beluga or bottlenose dolphin.

Insofar as we are aware, there are no published data confirming that the auditory effect of a sequence of airgun pulses received by an odontocete is a function of their cumulative energy. Southall et al. (2007) consider that to be a reasonable, but probably somewhat precautionary, assumption. It is precautionary because, based on data from terrestrial mammals, one would expect that a given energy exposure would have somewhat less effect if separated into discrete pulses, with potential opportunity for partial auditory recovery between pulses. However, as yet there has been little study of the rate of recovery from TTS in marine mammals, and in humans and other terrestrial mammals the available data on recovery are quite variable. Southall et al. (2007) concluded that—until relevant data on recovery are available from marine mammals—it is appropriate not to allow for any assumed recovery during the intervals between pulses within a pulse sequence.

Additional data are needed to determine the received sound levels at which small odontocetes would start to incur TTS upon exposure to repeated, low-frequency pulses of airgun sound with variable

⁹ If the low-frequency components of the watergun sound used in the experiments of Finneran et al. (2002) are downweighted as recommended by Southall et al. (2007) using their M_{mf} -weighting curve, the effective exposure level for onset of mild TTS was 183 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (Southall et al. 2007).

received levels. To determine how close an airgun array would need to approach in order to elicit TTS, it is necessary to determine the total energy that a mammal would receive as an airgun array approaches, passes at various CPA distances, and moves away (e.g., Erbe and King 2009). At the present state of knowledge, it is also necessary to assume that the effect is directly related to total received energy even though that energy is received in multiple pulses separated by gaps. The lack of data on the exposure levels necessary to cause TTS in toothed whales when the signal is a series of pulsed sounds, separated by silent periods, remains a data gap, as is the lack of published data on TTS in odontocetes other than the beluga, bottlenose dolphin, and harbor porpoise.

Baleen Whales.—There are no data, direct or indirect, on levels or properties of sound that are required to induce TTS in any baleen whale. The frequencies to which mysticetes are most sensitive are assumed to be lower than those to which odontocetes are most sensitive, and natural background noise levels at those low frequencies tend to be higher. As a result, auditory thresholds of baleen whales within their frequency band of best hearing are believed to be higher (less sensitive) than are those of odontocetes at their best frequencies (Clark and Ellison 2004). From this, it is suspected that received levels causing TTS onset may also be higher in mysticetes (Southall et al. 2007). However, based on preliminary simulation modeling that attempted to allow for various uncertainties in assumptions and variability around population means, Gedamke et al. (2008) suggested that some baleen whales whose closest point of approach to a seismic vessel is 1 km or more could experience TTS or even PTS.

In practice during seismic surveys, few if any cases of TTS are expected given the strong likelihood that baleen whales would avoid the approaching airguns (or vessel) before being exposed to levels high enough for there to be any possibility of TTS (see above for evidence concerning avoidance responses by baleen whales). This assumes that the ramp-up (soft-start) procedure is used when commencing airgun operations, to give whales near the vessel the opportunity to move away before they are exposed to sound levels that might be strong enough to elicit TTS. As discussed earlier, single-airgun experiments with bowhead, gray, and humpback whales show that those species do tend to move away when a single airgun starts firing nearby, which simulates the onset of a ramp up.

Pinnipeds.—In pinnipeds, TTS thresholds associated with exposure to brief pulses (single or multiple) of underwater sound have not been measured. Two California sea lions did not incur TTS when exposed to single brief pulses with received levels of ~178 and 183 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ and total energy fluxes of 161 and 163 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (Finneran et al. 2003). However, initial evidence from more prolonged (non-pulse) exposures suggested that some pinnipeds (harbor seals in particular) incur TTS at somewhat lower received levels than do small odontocetes exposed for similar durations (Kastak et al. 1999, 2005; Ketten et al. 2001). Kastak et al. (2005) reported that the amount of threshold shift increased with increasing SEL in a California sea lion and harbor seal. They noted that, for non-impulse sound, doubling the exposure duration from 25 to 50 min (i.e., a +3 dB change in SEL) had a greater effect on TTS than an increase of 15 dB (95 vs. 80 dB) in exposure level. Mean threshold shifts ranged from 2.9–12.2 dB, with full recovery within 24 hr (Kastak et al. 2005). Kastak et al. (2005) suggested that, for non-impulse sound, SELs resulting in TTS onset in three species of pinnipeds may range from 183 to 206 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$, depending on the absolute hearing sensitivity.

As noted above for odontocetes, it is expected that—for impulse as opposed to non-impulse sound—the onset of TTS would occur at a lower cumulative SEL given the assumed greater auditory effect of broadband impulses with rapid rise times. The threshold for onset of mild TTS upon exposure of a harbor seal to impulse sounds has been estimated indirectly as being an SEL of ~171 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (Southall et al. 2007). That would be approximately equivalent to a single pulse with received level ~181–186 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$, or a series of pulses for which the highest rms values are a few dB lower.

At least for non-impulse sounds, TTS onset occurs at appreciably higher received levels in California sea lions and northern elephant seals than in harbor seals (Kastak et al. 2005). Thus, the former two species would presumably need to be closer to an airgun array than would a harbor seal before TTS is a possibility. Insofar as we are aware, there are no data to indicate whether the TTS thresholds of other pinniped species are more similar to those of the harbor seal or to those of the two less-sensitive species.

Sirenians, Sea Otter and Polar Bear.—There are no available data on TTS in sea otters and polar bears. However, TTS is unlikely to occur in sea otters or polar bears if they are on the water surface, given the pressure release and Lloyd's mirror effects at the water's surface. Furthermore, sea otters tend to inhabit shallow coastal habitats where large seismic survey vessels towing large spreads of streamers may be unable to operate. TTS is also considered unlikely to occur in sirenians as a result of exposure to sounds from a seismic survey. They, like sea otters, tend to inhabit shallow coastal habitats and rarely range far from shore, whereas seismic survey vessels towing large arrays of airguns and (usually) even larger arrays of streamers normally must remain farther offshore because of equipment clearance and maneuverability limitations. Exposures of sea otters and sirenians to seismic surveys are more likely to involve smaller seismic sources that can be used in shallow and confined waters. The impacts of these are inherently less than would occur from a larger source of the types often used farther offshore.

Likelihood of Incurring TTS.—Most cetaceans show some degree of avoidance of seismic vessels operating an airgun array (see above). It is unlikely that these cetaceans would be exposed to airgun pulses at a sufficiently high level for a sufficiently long period to cause more than mild TTS, given the relative movement of the vessel and the marine mammal. TTS would be more likely in any odontocetes that bow- or wake-ride or otherwise linger near the airguns. However, while bow- or wake-riding, odontocetes would be at the surface and thus not exposed to strong sound pulses given the pressure-release and Lloyd Mirror effects at the surface. But if bow- or wake-riding animals were to dive intermittently near airguns, they would be exposed to strong sound pulses, possibly repeatedly.

If some cetaceans did incur mild or moderate TTS through exposure to airgun sounds in this manner, this would very likely be a temporary and reversible phenomenon. However, even a temporary reduction in hearing sensitivity could be deleterious in the event that, during that period of reduced sensitivity, a marine mammal needed its full hearing sensitivity to detect approaching predators, or for some other reason.

Some pinnipeds show avoidance reactions to airguns, but their avoidance reactions are generally not as strong or consistent as those of cetaceans. Pinnipeds occasionally seem to be attracted to operating seismic vessels. There are no specific data on TTS thresholds of pinnipeds exposed to single or multiple low-frequency pulses. However, given the indirect indications of a lower TTS threshold for the harbor seal than for odontocetes exposed to impulse sound (see above), it is possible that some pinnipeds close to a large airgun array could incur TTS.

NMFS (1995, 2000) concluded that cetaceans should not be exposed to pulsed underwater noise at received levels >180 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. The corresponding limit for pinnipeds has been set by NMFS at 190 dB, although the HESS Team (HESS 1999) recommended a 180-dB limit for pinnipeds in California. The 180 and 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ levels have not been considered to be the levels above which TTS might occur. Rather, they were the received levels above which, in the view of a panel of bioacoustics specialists convened by NMFS before TTS measurements for marine mammals started to become available, one could not be certain that there would be no injurious effects, auditory or otherwise, to marine mammals. As summarized above, data that are now available imply that TTS is unlikely to occur in various odontocetes (and probably mysticetes as well) unless they are exposed to a sequence of several airgun pulses stronger than 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. On the other hand, for the harbor seal, harbor porpoise, and perhaps

some other species, TTS may occur upon exposure to one or more airgun pulses whose received level equals the NMFS “do not exceed” value of 190 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. That criterion corresponds to a single-pulse SEL of 175–180 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ in typical conditions, whereas TTS is suspected to be possible in harbor seals and harbor porpoises with a cumulative SEL of ~171 and ~164 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$, respectively.

It has been shown that most large whales and many smaller odontocetes (especially the harbor porpoise) show at least localized avoidance of ships and/or seismic operations (see above). Even when avoidance is limited to the area within a few hundred meters of an airgun array, that should usually be sufficient to avoid TTS based on what is currently known about thresholds for TTS onset in cetaceans. In addition, ramping up airgun arrays, which is standard operational protocol for many seismic operators, should allow cetaceans near the airguns at the time of startup (if the sounds are aversive) to move away from the seismic source and to avoid being exposed to the full acoustic output of the airgun array (see above). Thus, most baleen whales likely will not be exposed to high levels of airgun sounds provided the ramp-up procedure is applied. Likewise, many odontocetes close to the trackline are likely to move away before the sounds from an approaching seismic vessel become sufficiently strong for there to be any potential for TTS or other hearing impairment. Therefore, there is little potential for baleen whales or odontocetes that show avoidance of ships or airguns to be close enough to an airgun array to experience TTS. In the event that a few individual cetaceans did incur TTS through exposure to strong airgun sounds, this is a temporary and reversible phenomenon unless the exposure exceeds the TTS-onset threshold by a sufficient amount for PTS to be incurred (see below). If TTS but not PTS were incurred, it would most likely be mild, in which case recovery is expected to be quick (probably within minutes).

6.2 Permanent Threshold Shift (PTS)

When PTS occurs, there is physical damage to the sound receptors in the ear. In some cases, there can be total or partial deafness, whereas in other cases, the animal has an impaired ability to hear sounds in specific frequency ranges (Kryter 1985). Physical damage to a mammal’s hearing apparatus can occur if it is exposed to sound impulses that have very high peak pressures, especially if they have very short rise times. (Rise time is the interval required for sound pressure to increase from the baseline pressure to peak pressure.)

There is no specific evidence that exposure to pulses of airgun sound can cause PTS in any marine mammal, even with large arrays of airguns. However, given the likelihood that some mammals close to an airgun array might incur at least mild TTS (see above), there has been further speculation about the possibility that some individuals occurring very close to airguns might incur PTS (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995, p. 372ff; Gedamke et al. 2008). Single or occasional occurrences of mild TTS are not indicative of permanent auditory damage, but repeated or (in some cases) single exposures to a level well above that causing TTS onset might elicit PTS.

Relationships between TTS and PTS thresholds have not been studied in marine mammals, but are assumed to be similar to those in humans and other terrestrial mammals (Southall et al. 2007). Based on data from terrestrial mammals, a precautionary assumption is that the PTS threshold for impulse sounds (such as airgun pulses as received close to the source) is at least 6 dB higher than the TTS threshold on a peak-pressure basis, and probably >6 dB higher (Southall et al. 2007). The low-to-moderate levels of TTS that have been induced in captive odontocetes and pinnipeds during controlled studies of TTS have been confirmed to be temporary, with no measurable residual PTS (Kastak et al. 1999; Schlundt et al. 2000; Finneran et al. 2002, 2005; Nachtigall et al. 2003, 2004). However, very prolonged exposure to sound strong enough to elicit TTS, or shorter-term exposure to sound levels well above the TTS threshold, can cause PTS, at least in terrestrial mammals (Kryter 1985). In terrestrial mammals, the received sound level from a single non-impulsive sound exposure must be far above the TTS threshold for

any risk of permanent hearing damage (Kryter 1994; Richardson et al. 1995; Southall et al. 2007). However, there is special concern about strong sounds whose pulses have very rapid rise times. In terrestrial mammals, there are situations when pulses with rapid rise times (e.g., from explosions) can result in PTS even though their peak levels are only a few dB higher than the level causing slight TTS. The rise time of airgun pulses is fast, but not as fast as that of an explosion.

Some factors that contribute to onset of PTS, at least in terrestrial mammals, are as follows:

- exposure to single very intense sound,
- fast rise time from baseline to peak pressure,
- repetitive exposure to intense sounds that individually cause TTS but not PTS, and
- recurrent ear infections or (in captive animals) exposure to certain drugs.

Cavanagh (2000) reviewed the thresholds used to define TTS and PTS. Based on this review and SACLANT (1998), it is reasonable to assume that PTS might occur at a received sound level 20 dB or more above that inducing mild TTS. However, for PTS to occur at a received level only 20 dB above the TTS threshold, the animal probably would have to be exposed to a strong sound for an extended period, or to a strong sound with rather rapid rise time.

More recently, Southall et al. (2007) estimated that received levels would need to exceed the TTS threshold by at least 15 dB, on an SEL basis, for there to be risk of PTS. Thus, for cetaceans exposed to a sequence of sound pulses, they estimate that the PTS threshold might be an M-weighted SEL (for the sequence of received pulses) of ~ 198 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ (15 dB higher than the M_{mf} -weighted TTS threshold, in a beluga, for a waterygun impulse). Additional assumptions had to be made to derive a corresponding estimate for pinnipeds, as the only available data on TTS-thresholds in pinnipeds pertained to non-impulse sound (see above). Southall et al. (2007) estimated that the PTS threshold could be a cumulative M_{pw} -weighted SEL of ~ 186 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ in the case of a harbor seal exposed to impulse sound. The PTS threshold for the California sea lion and northern elephant seal would probably be higher given the higher TTS thresholds in those species. Southall et al. (2007) also note that, regardless of the SEL, there is concern about the possibility of PTS if a cetacean or pinniped received one or more pulses with peak pressure exceeding 230 or 218 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$, respectively. Thus, PTS might be expected upon exposure of cetaceans to either $\text{SEL} \geq 198$ dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ or peak pressure ≥ 230 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}$. Corresponding proposed dual criteria for pinnipeds (at least harbor seals) are ≥ 186 dB SEL and ≥ 218 dB peak pressure (Southall et al. 2007). These estimates are all first approximations, given the limited underlying data, assumptions, species differences, and evidence that the “equal energy” model is not be entirely correct.

Sound impulse duration, peak amplitude, rise time, number of pulses, and inter-pulse interval are the main factors thought to determine the onset and extent of PTS. Ketten (1994) has noted that the criteria for differentiating the sound pressure levels that result in PTS (or TTS) are location and species-specific. PTS effects may also be influenced strongly by the health of the receiver’s ear.

As described above for TTS, in estimating the amount of sound energy required to elicit the onset of TTS (and PTS), it is assumed that the auditory effect of a given cumulative SEL from a series of pulses is the same as if that amount of sound energy were received as a single strong sound. There are no data from marine mammals concerning the occurrence or magnitude of a potential partial recovery effect between pulses. In deriving the estimates of PTS (and TTS) thresholds quoted here, Southall et al. (2007) made the precautionary assumption that no recovery would occur between pulses.

The TTS section (above) concludes that exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each have flat-weighted received levels near 190 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ (175–180 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ SEL) could result in cumulative exposure of ~ 186 dB SEL (flat-weighted) or ~ 183 dB SEL (M_{mf} -weighted), and thus slight

TTS in a small odontocete. Allowing for the assumed 15 dB offset between PTS and TTS thresholds, expressed on an SEL basis, exposure to several strong seismic pulses that each have flat-weighted received levels near 205 dB_{rms} (190–195 dB SEL) could result in cumulative exposure of ~198 dB SEL (M_{mf} -weighted), and thus slight PTS in a small odontocete. However, the levels of successive pulses that will be received by a marine mammal that is below the surface as a seismic vessel approaches, passes and moves away will tend to increase gradually and then decrease gradually, with periodic decreases superimposed on this pattern when the animal comes to the surface to breathe. To estimate how close an odontocete's CPA distance would have to be for the cumulative SEL to exceed 198 dB SEL (M_{mf} -weighted), one would (as a minimum) need to allow for the sequence of distances at which airgun shots would occur, and for the dependence of received SEL on distance in the region of the seismic operation (e.g., Erbe and King 2009).

It is unlikely that an odontocete would remain close enough to a large airgun array for sufficiently long to incur PTS. There is some concern about bowriding odontocetes, but for animals at or near the surface, auditory effects are reduced by Lloyd's mirror and surface release effects. The presence of the vessel between the airgun array and bow-riding odontocetes could also, in some but probably not all cases, reduce the levels received by bow-riding animals (e.g., Gabriele and Kipple 2009). The TTS (and thus PTS) thresholds of baleen whales are unknown but, as an interim measure, assumed to be no lower than those of odontocetes. Also, baleen whales generally avoid the immediate area around operating seismic vessels, so it is unlikely that a baleen whale could incur PTS from exposure to airgun pulses. The TTS (and thus PTS) thresholds of some pinnipeds (e.g., harbor seal) as well as the harbor porpoise may be lower (Kastak et al. 2005; Southall et al. 2007; Lucke et al. 2009). If so, TTS and potentially PTS may extend to a somewhat greater distance for those animals. Again, Lloyd's mirror and surface release effects will ameliorate the effects for animals at or near the surface.

Although it is unlikely that airgun operations during most seismic surveys would cause PTS in many marine mammals, caution is warranted given

- the limited knowledge about noise-induced hearing damage in marine mammals, particularly baleen whales, pinnipeds, and sea otters;
- the seemingly greater susceptibility of certain species (e.g., harbor porpoise and harbor seal) to TTS and presumably also PTS; and
- the lack of knowledge about TTS and PTS thresholds in many species, including various species closely related to the harbor porpoise and harbor seal.

The avoidance reactions of many marine mammals, along with commonly-applied monitoring and mitigation measures (visual and passive acoustic monitoring, ramp ups, and power downs or shut downs when mammals are detected within or approaching the "safety radii"), would reduce the already-low probability of exposure of marine mammals to sounds strong enough to induce PTS.

6.3 Strandings and Mortality

Marine mammals close to underwater detonations of high explosives can be killed or severely injured, and the auditory organs are especially susceptible to injury (Ketten et al. 1993; Ketten 1995). However, explosives are no longer used in marine waters for commercial seismic surveys or (with rare exceptions) for seismic research; they have been replaced by airguns and other non-explosive sources. Airgun pulses are less energetic and have slower rise times, and there is no specific evidence that they can cause serious injury, death, or stranding even in the case of large airgun arrays. However, the association of mass strandings of beaked whales with naval exercises and, in one case, a seismic survey (Malakoff 2002; Cox et al. 2006), has raised the possibility that beaked whales exposed to strong "pulsed" sounds

may be especially susceptible to injury and/or behavioral reactions that can lead to stranding (e.g., Hildebrand 2005; Southall et al. 2007). Hildebrand (2005) reviewed the association of cetacean strandings with high-intensity sound events and found that deep-diving odontocetes, primarily beaked whales, were by far the predominant (95%) cetaceans associated with these events, with 2% mysticete whales (minke). However, as summarized below, there is no definitive evidence that airguns can lead to injury, strandings, or mortality even for marine mammals in close proximity to large airgun arrays.

Specific sound-related processes that lead to strandings and mortality are not well documented, but may include (1) swimming in avoidance of a sound into shallow water; (2) a change in behavior (such as a change in diving behavior that might contribute to tissue damage, gas bubble formation, hypoxia, cardiac arrhythmia, hypertensive hemorrhage or other forms of trauma; (3) a physiological change such as a vestibular response leading to a behavioral change or stress-induced hemorrhagic diathesis, leading in turn to tissue damage; and (4) tissue damage directly from sound exposure, such as through acoustically mediated bubble formation and growth or acoustic resonance of tissues. Some of these mechanisms are unlikely to apply in the case of impulse sounds. However, there are increasing indications that gas-bubble disease (analogous to “the bends”), induced in supersaturated tissue by a behavioral response to acoustic exposure, could be a pathologic mechanism for the strandings and mortality of some deep-diving cetaceans exposed to sonar. The evidence for this remains circumstantial and associated with exposure to naval mid-frequency sonar, not seismic surveys (Cox et al. 2006; Southall et al. 2007).

Seismic pulses and mid-frequency sonar signals are quite different, and some mechanisms by which sonar sounds have been hypothesized to affect beaked whales are unlikely to apply to airgun pulses. Sounds produced by airgun arrays are broadband impulses with most of the energy below 1 kHz. Typical military mid-frequency sonars emit non-impulse sounds at frequencies of 2–10 kHz, generally with a relatively narrow bandwidth at any one time (though the frequency may change over time). Thus, it is not appropriate to assume that the effects of seismic surveys on beaked whales or other species would be the same as the apparent effects of military sonar. For example, resonance effects (Gentry 2002) and acoustically-mediated bubble-growth (Crum et al. 2005) are implausible in the case of exposure to broadband airgun pulses. Nonetheless, evidence that sonar signals can, in special circumstances, lead (at least indirectly) to physical damage and mortality (e.g., Balcomb and Claridge 2001; NOAA and USN 2001; Jepson et al. 2003; Fernández et al. 2004, 2005; Hildebrand 2005; Cox et al. 2006) suggests that caution is warranted when dealing with exposure of marine mammals to any high-intensity “pulsed” sound. One of the hypothesized mechanisms by which naval sonars lead to strandings might, in theory, also apply to seismic surveys: If the strong sounds sometimes cause deep-diving species to alter their surfacing–dive cycles in a way that causes bubble formation in tissue, that hypothesized mechanism might apply to seismic surveys as well as mid-frequency naval sonars. However, there is no specific evidence of this upon exposure to airgun pulses.

There is no conclusive evidence of cetacean strandings or deaths at sea as a result of exposure to seismic surveys, but a few cases of strandings in the general area where a seismic survey was ongoing have led to speculation concerning a possible link between seismic surveys and strandings. • Suggestions that there was a link between seismic surveys and strandings of humpback whales in Brazil (Engel et al. 2004) were not well founded (IAGC 2004; IWC 2007). • In Sept. 2002, there was a stranding of two Cuvier’s beaked whales in the Gulf of California, Mexico, when the L-DEO seismic vessel R/V *Maurice Ewing* was operating a 20-airgun, 8490-in³ airgun array in the general area. The evidence linking the stranding to the seismic survey was inconclusive and not based on any physical evidence (Hogarth 2002; Yoder 2002). The ship was also operating its multibeam echosounder at the same time, but this had much less potential than the aforementioned naval sonars to affect beaked whales, given its downward-directed beams, much shorter pulse durations, and lower duty cycle. Nonetheless, the Gulf of California incident

plus the beaked whale strandings near naval exercises involving use of mid-frequency sonar suggest a need for caution in conducting seismic surveys in areas occupied by beaked whales until more is known about effects of seismic surveys on those species (Hildebrand 2005).

6.4 Non-Auditory Physiological Effects

Based on evidence from terrestrial mammals and humans, sound is a potential source of stress (Wright and Kuczaj 2007; Wright et al. 2007a,b, 2009). However, almost no information is available on sound-induced stress in marine mammals, or on its potential (alone or in combination with other stressors) to affect the long-term well-being or reproductive success of marine mammals (Fair and Becker 2000; Hildebrand 2005; Wright et al. 2007a,b). Such long-term effects, if they occur, would be mainly associated with chronic noise exposure, which is characteristic of some seismic surveys and exposure situations (McCauley et al. 2000a:62ff; Nieuwkirk et al. 2009) but not of some others.

Available data on potential stress-related impacts of anthropogenic noise on marine mammals are extremely limited, and additional research on this topic is needed. We know of only two specific studies of noise-induced stress in marine mammals. (1) Romano et al. (2004) examined the effects of single underwater impulse sounds from a seismic water gun (source level up to 228 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{\text{p-p}}$) and single short-duration pure tones (sound pressure level up to 201 dB re 1 μPa) on the nervous and immune systems of a beluga and a bottlenose dolphin. They found that neural-immune changes to noise exposure were minimal. Although levels of some stress-released substances (e.g., catecholamines) changed significantly with exposure to sound, levels returned to baseline after 24 hr. (2) During playbacks of recorded drilling noise to four captive beluga whales, Thomas et al. (1990) found no changes in blood levels of stress-related hormones. Long-term effects were not measured, and no short-term effects were detected. For both studies, caution is necessary when extrapolating these results to wild animals and to real-world situations given the small sample sizes, use of captive animals, and other technical limitations of the two studies.

Aside from stress, other types of physiological effects that might, in theory, be involved in beaked whale strandings upon exposure to naval sonar (Cox et al. 2006), such as resonance and gas bubble formation, have not been demonstrated and are not expected upon exposure to airgun pulses (see preceding subsection). If seismic surveys disrupt diving patterns of deep-diving species, this might perhaps result in bubble formation and a form of “the bends”, as speculated to occur in beaked whales exposed to sonar. However, there is no specific evidence that exposure to airgun pulses has this effect.

In summary, very little is known about the potential for seismic survey sounds (or other types of strong underwater sounds) to cause non-auditory physiological effects in marine mammals. Such effects, if they occur at all, would presumably be limited to short distances and to activities that extend over a prolonged period. The available data do not allow identification of a specific exposure level above which non-auditory effects can be expected (Southall et al. 2007), or any meaningful quantitative predictions of the numbers (if any) of marine mammals that might be affected in these ways.

7. Literature Cited

- Akamatsu, T., Y. Hatakeyama, and N. Takatsu. 1993. Effects of pulsed sounds on escape behavior of false killer whales. *Nipp. Suis. Gakkaishi* 59(8):1297-1303.
- Angliss, R.P. and R.B. Outlaw. 2008. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2007. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-180. 252 p.
- Anonymous. 1975. Phantom killer whales. *S. Afr. Ship. News & Fishing Indus. Rev.* 30(7):50-53.

- Arnold, B.W. 1996. Visual monitoring of marine mammal activity during the Exxon 3-D seismic survey: Santa Ynez unit, offshore California 9 November to 12 December 1995. Rep. from Impact Sciences Inc., San Diego, CA, for Exxon Co., U.S.A., Thousand Oaks, CA. 20 p.
- Au, W.W.L. 1993. The Sonar of Dolphins. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY. 277 p.
- Au, W.W.L., A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay. 2000. Hearing by Whales and Dolphins. Springer Handbook of Auditory Res. Vol. 12. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY. 458 p.
- Au, W.W.L., A.A. Pack, M.O. Lammers, L.M. Herman, M.H. Deakos, and K. Andrews. 2006. Acoustic properties of humpback whale songs. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 120(2):1103-1110.
- Backus, R.H. and W.E. Schevill. 1966. *Physeter* clicks. p. 510-528 in K.S. Norris (ed.), Whales, dolphins, and porpoises. Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley, CA. 789 p
- Bain, D.E. and R. Williams. 2006. Long-range effects of airgun noise on marine mammals: responses as a function of received sound level and distance. Paper SC/58/E35 presented to the IWC Scient. Commit., IWC Annu. Meet., 1-13 June, St. Kitts.
- Baird, R.W. 2005. Sightings of dwarf (*Kogia sima*) and pygmy (*K. breviceps*) sperm whales from the main Hawaiian Islands. **Pacific Sci.** 59(3):461-466.
- Baird, R.W., D.L. Webster, D.J. McSweeney, A.D. Ligon, G.S. Schorr, and J. Barlow. 2006. Diving behavior and ecology of Cuvier's (*Ziphius cavirostris*) and Blainville's (*Mesoplodon densirostris*) beaked whales in Hawaii. **Can. J. Zool.** 84(8):1120-1128.
- Balcomb, K.C., III and D.E. Claridge. 2001. A mass stranding of cetaceans caused by naval sonar in the Bahamas. **Bahamas J. Sci.** 8(2):2-12.
- Barkaszi, M.J., D.M. Epperson, and B. Bennett. 2009. Six-year compilation of cetacean sighting data collected during commercial seismic survey mitigation observations throughout the Gulf of Mexico, USA. p. 24-25 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Barlow, J. and R. Gisiner. 2006. Mitigating, monitoring and assessing the effects of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):239-249.
- Bauer, G.B., J.C. Gaspard, K. Dziuk, A. Cardwell, L. Read, R.L. Reep, and D.A. Mann. 2009. The manatee audiogram and auditory critical ratios. p. 27-28 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Beale, C.M. and P. Monaghan. 2004. Behavioural responses to human disturbance: a matter of choice? **Anim. Behav.** 68(5):1065-1069.
- Beland, J.A., B. Haley, C.M. Reiser, D.M. Savarese, D.S. Ireland and D.W. Funk. 2009. Effects of the presence of other vessels on marine mammal sightings during multi-vessel operations in the Alaskan Chukchi Sea. p. 29 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Oct. 2009:29. 306 p.
- Berta, A., R. Racicot and T. Deméré. 2009. The comparative anatomy and evolution of the ear in *Balaenoptera* mysticetes. p. 33 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Blackwell, S.B., R.G. Norman, C.R. Greene Jr., and W.J. Richardson. 2007. Acoustic measurements. p. 4-1 to 4-52 In: Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by Shell Offshore Inc. in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas, July-September 2006: 90-day report. LGL Rep. P891-1. Rep. from LGL Alaska Res. Assoc. Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Shell Offshore Inc., Houston, TX, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD, and U.S. Fish & Wildl. Serv., Anchorage, AK. 199 p.
- Blackwell, S.B., C.R. Greene, T.L. McDonald, C.S. Nations, R.G. Norman, and A. Thode. 2009a. Beaufort Sea bowhead whale migration route study. Chapter 8 In: D.S. Ireland, D.W. Funk, R. Rodrigues, and W.R. Koski (eds.). 2009. Joint Monitoring Program in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas, open water seasons, 2006-2007. LGL Alaska Rep. P971-2. Rep. from LGL Alaska Res. Assoc. Inc. (Anchorage, AK) et al. for Shell Offshore Inc. (Anchorage, AK) et al. 485 p. plus appendices.
- Blackwell, S.B., C.S. Nations, T.L. McDonald, A.M. Thode, K.H. Kim, C.R. Greene, and M.A. Macrander. 2009b. Effects of seismic exploration activities on the calling behavior of bowhead whales in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. p. 35 In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, 12-16 Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Bowles, A.E., M. Smultea, B. Würsig, D.P. DeMaster, and D. Palka. 1994. Relative abundance and behavior of marine mammals exposed to transmissions from the Heard Island Feasibility Test. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.**

- 96(4):2469-2484. Bullock, T.H., T.J. Oshea, and M.C. McClune. 1982. Auditory evoked-potentials in the West Indian manatee (*Sirenia, Trichechus manatus*). **J. Comp. Physiol.** 148(4):547-554.
- Britto, M.K. and A. Silva Barreto. 2009. Marine mammal diversity registered on seismic surveys in Brazil, between 2000 and 2008. p. 41 *In*: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Brodie, P.F. 1981. Energetic and behavioural considerations with respect to marine mammals and disturbance from underwater noise. p. 287-290 *In*: N.M. Peterson (ed.), The question of sound from icebreaker operations: Proceedings of a workshop. Arctic Pilot Proj., Petro-Canada, Calgary, Alb. 350 p.
- Bullock, T.H., T.J. O'Shea, and M.C. McClune. 1982. Auditory evoked potentials in the West Indian manatee (*Sirenia: Trichechus manatus*). **J. Comp. Physiol. A** 148(4):547-554.
- Burgess, W.C. and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Physical acoustics measurements. p. 3-1 to 3-63 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA22303. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Calambokidis, J. and S.D. Osmeck. 1998. Marine mammal research and mitigation in conjunction with air gun operation for the USGS 'SHIPS' seismic surveys in 1998. Rep. from Cascadia Res., Olympia, WA, for U.S. Geol. Surv., Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., and Minerals Manage. Serv.
- Caldwell, J. and W. Dragoset. 2000. A brief overview of seismic air-gun arrays. **Leading Edge** 19(8):898-902.
- Cavanagh, R.C. 2000. Criteria and thresholds for adverse effects of underwater noise on marine animals. AFRL-HE-WP-TR-2000-0092. Rep. from Science Applications Intern. Corp., McLean, VA, for Air Force Res. Lab., Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.
- Christie, K., C. Lyons, W.R. Koski, D.S. Ireland, and D.W. Funk. 2009. Patterns of bowhead whale occurrence and distribution during marine seismic operations in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. p. 55 *In*: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, 12-16 Oct. 2009.
- Citta, J.J., L.T. Quakenbush, R.J. Small, and J.C. George. 2007. Movements of a tagged bowhead whale in the vicinity of a seismic survey in the Beaufort Sea. Poster Paper, Soc. Mar. Mammal. 17th Bienn. Meet., Cape Town, South Africa.
- Clark, C.W. and W.T. Ellison. 2004. Potential use of low-frequency sounds by baleen whales for probing the environment: Evidence from models and empirical measurements. p. 564-589 *In*: J.A. Thomas, C.F. Moss and M. Vater (eds.), Echolocation in Bats and Dolphins. Univ. Chicago Press, Chicago, IL. 604 p.
- Clark, C.W. and G.C. Gagnon. 2006. Considering the temporal and spatial scales of noise exposures from seismic surveys on baleen whales. Working Pap. SC/58/E9. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 9 p.
- Cook, M.L.H., R.A. Varela, J.D. Goldstein, S.D. McCulloch, G.D. Bossart, J.J. Finneran, D. Houser, and A. Mann. 2006. Beaked whale auditory evoked potential hearing measurements. **J. Comp. Physiol. A** 192:489-495.
- Cox, T.M., T.J. Ragen, A.J. Read, E. Vos, R.W. Baird, K. Balcomb, J. Barlow, J. Caldwell, T. Cranford, L. Crum, A. D'Amico, G. D'Spain, A. Fernández, J. Finneran, R. Gentry, W. Gerth, F. Gulland, J. Hildebrand, D. Houser, R. Hullar, P.D. Jepson, D. Ketten, C.D. Macleod, P. Miller, S. Moore, D.C. Mountain, D. Palka, P. Ponganis, S. Rommel, T. Rowles, B. Taylor, P. Tyack, D. Wartzok, R. Gisiner, J. Meads, and L. Benner. 2006. Understanding the impacts of anthropogenic sound on beaked whales. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):177-187.
- Crum, L.A., M.R. Bailey, J. Guan, P.R. Hilmo, S.G. Kargl, and T.J. Matula. 2005. Monitoring bubble growth in supersaturated blood and tissue ex vivo and the relevance to marine mammal bioeffects. **Acoustic Res. Lett. Online** 6(3):214-220.
- Dahlheim, M.E. 1987. Bio-acoustics of the gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*). Ph.D. Dissertation, Univ. British Columbia, Vancouver, BC. 315 p.
- DeRuiter, S.L., P.L. Tyack, Y.-T. Lin, A.E. Newhall, J.F. Lynch, and P.J.O. Miller. 2006. Modeling acoustic propagation of airgun array pulses recorded on tagged sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 120(6):4100-4114.
- Di Iorio, L. and C.W. Clark. 2010. Exposure to seismic survey alters blue whale acoustic communication. **Biol. Lett.** 6(1):51-54.

- Duncan, P.M. 1985. Seismic sources in a marine environment. p. 56-88 *In: Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment*, Jan. 1985, Halifax, N.S. Tech. Rep. 5. Can. Oil & Gas Lands Admin., Environ. Prot. Branch, Ottawa, Ont.
- Dunn, R.A. and O. Hernandez. 2009. Tracking blue whales in the eastern tropical Pacific with an ocean-bottom seismometer and hydrophone array. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 126(3):1084-1094.
- Engel, M.H., M.C.C. Marcondes, C.C.A. Martins, F.O. Luna, R.P. Lima, and A. Campos. 2004. Are seismic surveys responsible for cetacean strandings? An unusual mortality of adult humpback whales in Abrolhos Bank, northeastern coast of Brazil. Paper SC/56/E28 presented to the IWC Scient. Commit., IWC Annu. Meet., 19-22 July, Sorrento, Italy.
- Erbe, C. and A.R. King. 2009. Modeling cumulative sound exposure around marine seismic surveys. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 125(4):2443-2451.
- Fair, P.A. and P.R. Becker. 2000. Review of stress in marine mammals. **J. Aquat. Ecosyst. Stress Recov.** 7:335-354.
- Fernández, A., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, E. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and P.D. Jepson. 2004. Pathology: whales, sonar and decompression sickness (reply). **Nature** 428(6984, 15 Apr.). doi: 10.1038/nature02528a.
- Fernández, A., J.F. Edwards, F. Rodriguez, A.E. de los Monteros, P. Herráez, P. Castro, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, and M. Arbelo. 2005. "Gas and fat embolic syndrome" involving a mass stranding of beaked whales (Family Ziphiidae) exposed to anthropogenic sonar signals. **Veterin. Pathol.** 42(4):446-457.
- Finneran, J.J. and C.E. Schlundt. 2004. Effects of intense pure tones on the behavior of trained odontocetes. Tech. Rep. 1913. Space and Naval Warfare (SPAWAR) Systems Center, San Diego, CA. 15 p.
- Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, D.A. Carder, J.A. Clark, J.A. Young, J.B. Gaspin, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Auditory and behavioral responses of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) and beluga whale (*Delphinapterus leucas*) to impulsive sounds resembling distant signatures of underwater explosions. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 108(1):417-431.
- Finneran, J.J., C.E. Schlundt, R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2002. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in odontocetes after exposure to single underwater impulses from a seismic watergun. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 111(6):2929-2940.
- Finneran, J.J., R. Dear, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2003. Auditory and behavioral responses of California sea lions (*Zalophus californianus*) to single underwater impulses from an arc-gap transducer. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 114(3):1667-1677.
- Finneran, J.J., D.A. Carder, C.E. Schlundt, and S.H. Ridgway. 2005. Temporary threshold shift in bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) exposed to mid-frequency tones. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 118(4):2696-2705.
- Finneran, J.J., D.S. Houser, B. Mase-Guthrie, R.Y. Ewing and R.G. Lingenfelter. 2009. Auditory evoked potentials in a stranded Gervais' beaked whale (*Mesoplodon europaeus*). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 126(1):484-490.
- Fish, J.F. and J.S. Vania. 1971. Killer whale, *Orcinus orca*, sounds repel white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*. **Fish. Bull.** 69(3):531-535.
- Fox, C.G., R.P. Dziak, and H. Matsumoto. 2002. NOAA efforts in monitoring of low-frequency sound in the global ocean. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 112(5, Pt. 2):2260 (Abstract).
- Frankel, A. 2005. Gray whales hear and respond to a 21-25 kHz high-frequency whale-finding sonar. p. 97 *In: Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm.*, San Diego, CA, Dec. 2005. 306 p.
- Frantzis, A. 1998. Does acoustic testing strand whales? **Nature** 392(6671):29.
- Frost, K.J., L.F. Lowry, and R.R. Nelson. 1984. Belukha whale studies in Bristol Bay, Alaska. p. 187-200 *In: B.R. Melteff and D.H. Rosenberg (eds.), Proceedings of the Workshop on Biological Interactions among Marine Mammals and Commercial Fisheries in the Southeastern Bering Sea*, Oct. 1983, Anchorage, AK. Univ. Alaska Sea Grant Rep. 84-1. Univ. Alaska, Fairbanks, AK.
- Gabriele, C.M. and B. Kipple. 2009. Measurements of near-surface, near-bow underwater sound from cruise ships. p. 86 *In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm.*, Québec, Oct. 2009. 306 p.

- Gailey, G., B. Würsig, and T.L. McDonald. 2007. Abundance, behavior, and movement patterns of western gray whales in relation to a 3-D seismic survey, northeast Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assessm.** 134(1-3):75-91.
- Gedamke, J., S. Frydman, and N. Gales. 2008. Risk of baleen whale hearing loss from seismic surveys: preliminary results from simulations accounting for uncertainty and individual variation. Working Pap. SC/60/E9. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 10 p.
- Gentry, R. (ed.). 2002. Report of the workshop on acoustic resonance as a source of tissue trauma in cetaceans. 24-25 April, Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 19 p. Available at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/acoustics/reports.htm>
- Gerstein, E.R., L.A. Gerstein, S.E. Forsythe, and J.E. Blue. 1999. The underwater audiogram of a West Indian manatee (*Trichechus manatus*). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 105(6):3575-3583.
- Gerstein, E., L. Gerstein, S. Forsythe and J. Blue. 2004. Do manatees utilize infrasonic communication or detection? **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 115(5, Pt. 2):2554-2555 (Abstract).
- Ghoul, A., C. Reichmuth, and J. Mulsow. 2009. Source levels and spectral analysis of southern sea otter (*Enhydra lutris nereis*) scream vocalizations. p. 90 *In*: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Goold, J.C. 1996a. Acoustic assessment of common dolphins off the West Wales coast, in conjunction with 16th round seismic surveying. Rep. from School of Ocean Sciences, Univ. Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd., Repsol Exploration (UK) Ltd., and Aran Energy Exploration Ltd. 22 p.
- Goold, J.C. 1996b. Acoustic assessment of populations of common dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in conjunction with seismic surveying. **J. Mar. Biol. Assoc. U.K.** 76:811-820.
- Goold, J.C. 1996c. Acoustic cetacean monitoring off the west Wales coast. Rep. from School of Ocean Sciences, Univ. Wales, Bangor, Wales, for Chevron UK Ltd, Repsol Explor. (UK) Ltd, and Aran Energy Explor. Ltd. 20 p.
- Goold, J.C. and R.F.W. Coates. 2006. Near source, high frequency air-gun signatures. Paper SC/58/E30 presented to the IWC Scient. Commit., IWC Annu. Meet., 1-13 June, St. Kitts.
- Goold, J.C. and P.J. Fish. 1998. Broadband spectra of seismic survey air-gun emissions, with reference to dolphin auditory thresholds. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 103(4):2177-2184.
- Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M.P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. 2004. A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):16-34.
- Gordon, J., R. Antunes, N. Jaquet, and B. Würsig. 2006. An investigation of sperm whale headings and surface behaviour before, during and after seismic line changes in the Gulf of Mexico. Working Pap. SC/58/E45. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 10 p.
- Gosselin, J.-F. and J. Lawson. 2004. Distribution and abundance indices of marine mammals in the Gully and two adjacent canyons of the Scotian Shelf before and during nearby hydrocarbon seismic exploration programmes in April and July 2003. Res. Doc. 2004/133. Can. Sci. Advis. Secretariat, Fisheries & Oceans Canada. 24 p. Available at http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas/Csas/DocREC/2004/RES2004_133_e.pdf
- Greene, C.R., Jr. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. p. 3-1 to 3-63 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Northstar marine mammal monitoring program, 1996: marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of a seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. LGL Rep. 2121-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Explor. (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 245 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr. and W.J. Richardson. 1988. Characteristics of marine seismic survey sounds in the Beaufort Sea. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 83(6):2246-2254.
- Greene, G.D., F.R. Engelhardt, and R.J. Paterson (eds.). 1985. Proceedings of the Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, NS. Tech. Rep. 5. Can. Oil & Gas Lands Admin., Environ. Prot. Branch, Ottawa, Ont.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman, and W.J. Richardson. 1999a. Bowhead whale calls. p. 6-1 to 6-23 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont.,

- and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., N.S. Altman and W.J. Richardson. 1999b. The influence of seismic survey sounds on bowhead whale calling rates. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(4, Pt. 2):2280 (Abstract).
- Guerra, M., A.M. Thode, S.B. Blackwell, C.R. Greene Jr. and M. Macrander. 2009. Quantifying masking effects of seismic survey reverberation off the Alaskan North Slope. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 126(4, Pt. 2):2230 (Abstract).
- Gunn, L.M. 1988. A behavioral audiogram of the North American river otter (*Lutra canadensis*). M.S. thesis, San Diego State Univ., San Diego, CA. 40 p.
- Haley, B., and W.R. Koski. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, July–August 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-27. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. November. 80 p.
- Hanser, S.F., L.R. Doyle, A.R. Szabo, F.A. Sharpe and B. McCowan. 2009. Bubble-net feeding humpback whales in Southeast Alaska change their vocalization patterns in the presence of moderate vessel noise. p. 105 *In*: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Harris, R.E., G.W. Miller, and W.J. Richardson. 2001. Seal responses to airgun sounds during summer seismic surveys in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 17:795-812.
- Harris, R.E., [R.E.] T. Elliott, and R.A. Davis. 2007. Results of mitigation and monitoring program, Beaufort Span 2-D marine seismic program, open-water season 2006. LGL Rep. TA4319-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for GX Technol. Corp., Houston, TX. 48 p.
- Hauser, D.D.W., M Holst, and V.D. Moulton. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, April–August 2008. LGL Rep. TA4656/7-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City., Ont., and St. John's, Nfld, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 98 p.
- HESS Team. 1999. High Energy Seismic Survey review process and interim operational guidelines for marine surveys offshore Southern California. Rep. from High Energy Seismic Survey Team for Calif. State Lands Commis. and Minerals Manage. Serv., Camarillo, CA. 39 p. + Appendices.
Available at www.mms.gov/omm/pacific/lease/fullhessrept.pdf
- Hildebrand, J.A. 2005. Impacts of anthropogenic sound. p. 101-124 *In*: J.E. Reynolds, W.F. Perrin, R.R. Reeves, S. Montgomery, and T. Ragen (eds.), Marine Mammal Research: Conservation Beyond Crisis. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD. 223 p.
- Hogarth, W.T. 2002. Declaration of William T. Hogarth in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 23 Oct. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of Calif., San Francisco Div.
- Holst, M. and M.A. Smultea. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off Central America, February – April 2008. LGL Rep. TA4342-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 133 p.
- Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005a. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off the Northern Yucatán Peninsula in the Southern Gulf of Mexico, January–February 2005. LGL Rep. TA2822-31. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.
- Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005b. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean off Central America, November–December 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-30. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.

- Holst, M., W.J. Richardson, W.R. Koski, M.A. Smultea, B. Haley, M.W. Fitzgerald, and M. Rawson. 2006. Effects of large- and small-source seismic surveys on marine mammals and sea turtles. **Eos**, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Suppl., Abstract OS42A-01. 23-26 May, Baltimore, MD.
- Hooker, S.K., R.W. Baird, S. Al-Omari, S. Gowans, and H. Whitehead. 2001. Behavioral reactions of northern bottlenose whales (*Hyperoodon ampullatus*) to biopsy darting and tag attachment procedures. **Fish. Bull.** 99(2):303-308.
- Hutchinson, D.R. and R.S. Detrick. 1984. Water gun vs. air gun: a comparison. **Mar. Geophys. Res.** 6(3):295-310.
- IAGC. 2004. Further analysis of 2002 Abrolhos Bank, Brazil humpback whale strandings coincident with seismic surveys. Intern. Assoc. Geophys. Contractors, Houston, TX. 12 p.
- Ireland, D., M. Holst, and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program off the Aleutian Islands, Alaska, July-August 2005. LGL Rep. TA4089-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 67 p.
- IWC. 2007. Report of the standing working group on environmental concerns. Annex K to Report of the Scientific Committee. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 9(Suppl.):227-260.
- Jefferson, T.A. and B.E. Curry. 1994. Review and evaluation of potential acoustic methods of reducing or eliminating marine mammal-fishery interactions. Rep. from the Mar. Mamm. Res. Progr., Texas A & M Univ., College Station, TX, for U.S. Mar. Mamm. Commis., Washington, DC. 59 p. NTIS PB95-100384.
- Jepson, P.D., M. Arbelo, R. Deaville, I.A.P. Patterson, P. Castro, J.R. Baker, E. Degollada, H.M. Ross, P. Herráez, A.M. Pocknell, F. Rodríguez, F.E. Howie, A. Espinosa, R.J. Reid, J.R. Jaber, V. Martin, A.A. Cunningham, and A. Fernández. 2003. Gas-bubble lesions in stranded cetaceans. **Nature** 425(6958):575-576.
- Jochens, A., D. Biggs, K. Benoit-Bird, D. Engelhaupt, J. Gordon, C. Hu, N. Jaquet, M. Johnson, R. Leben, B. Mate, P. Miller, J. Ortega-Ortiz, A. Thode, P. Tyack, and B. Würsig. 2008. Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/Synthesis report. OCS Study MMS 2008-006. Rep. from Dep. Oceanogr., Texas A & M Univ., College Station, TX, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Gulf of Mexico OCS Reg., New Orleans, LA. 323 p.
- Johnson, M.P. and P.L. Tyack. 2003. A digital acoustic recording tag for measuring the response of wild marine mammals to sound. **IEEE J. Oceanic Eng.** 28(1):3-12.
- Johnson, S.R., W.J. Richardson, S.B. Yazvenko, S.A. Blokhin, G. Gailey, M.R. Jenkerson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, A.S. Perlov, S.A. Rutenko, B. Würsig, C.R. Martin, and D.E. Egging. 2007. A western gray whale mitigation and monitoring program for a 3-D seismic survey, Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assessm.** 134(1-3):1-19.
- Kastak, D. and R.J. Schusterman. 1998. Low-frequency amphibious hearing in pinnipeds: methods, measurements, noise, and ecology. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 103(4):2216-2228.
- Kastak, D. and R.J. Schusterman. 1999. In-air and underwater hearing sensitivity of a northern elephant seal (*Mirounga angustirostris*). **Can. J. Zool.** 77(11):1751-1758.
- Kastak, D., R.L. Schusterman, B.L. Southall, and C.J. Reichmuth. 1999. Underwater temporary threshold shift induced by octave-band noise in three species of pinnipeds. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(2):1142-1148.
- Kastak, D., B.L. Southall, R.J. Schusterman, and C. Reichmuth. 2005. Underwater temporary threshold shift in pinnipeds: effects of noise level and duration. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 118(5):3154-3163.
- Kastelein, R.A., P. Mosterd, B. van Santen, M. Hagedoorn, and D. de Haan. 2002. Underwater audiogram of a Pacific walrus (*Odobenus rosmarus divergens*) measured with narrow-band frequency-modulated signals. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 112(5):2173-2182.
- Kastelein, R.A., W.C. Verboom, N. Jennings, and D. de Haan. 2008. Behavioral avoidance threshold level of a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) for a continuous 50 kHz pure tone (L). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 123(4):1858-1861.
- Kastelein, R.A., P.J. Wensveen, L. Hoek, W.C. Verboom and J.M. Terhune. 2009. Underwater detection of tonal signals between 0.125 and 100 kHz by harbor seals (*Phoca vitulina*). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 125(2):1222-1229.

- Kasuya, T. 1986. Distribution and behavior of Baird's beaked whales off the Pacific coast of Japan. **Sci. Rep. Whales Res. Inst.** 37:61-83.
- Ketten, D.R. 1991. The marine mammal ear: specializations for aquatic audition and echolocation. p. 717-750 *In*: D. Webster, R. Fay and A. Popper (eds.), *The Biology of Hearing*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Ketten, D.R. 1992. The cetacean ear: form, frequency, and evolution. p. 53-75 *In*: J.A. Thomas, R.A. Kastelein, and A. Ya Supin (eds.), *Marine Mammal Sensory Systems*. Plenum, New York, NY.
- Ketten, D.R. 1994. Functional analysis of whale ears: adaptations for underwater hearing. **IEEE Proc. Underwater Acoust.** 1:264-270.
- Ketten, D.R. 1995. Estimates of blast injury and acoustic trauma zones for marine mammals from underwater explosions. p. 391-407 *In*: R.A. Kastelein, J.A. Thomas, and P.E. Nachtigall (eds.), *Sensory Systems of Aquatic Mammals*. De Spil Publishers, Woerden, Netherlands. 588 p.
- Ketten, D.R. 1998. Marine mammal auditory systems: a summary of audiometric and anatomical data and its implications for underwater acoustic impacts. NOAA Tech. Memo. NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFSC-256. Southwest Fisheries Sci. Cent., La Jolla, CA. 74 p.
- Ketten, D.R. 2000. Cetacean ears. p. 43-108 *In*: W.W.L. Au, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay (eds.), *Hearing by Whales and Dolphins*. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY. 485 p.
- Ketten, D.R., J. Lien and S. Todd. 1993. Blast injury in humpback whale ears: evidence and implications. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 94(3, Pt. 2):1849-1850 (Abstract).
- Ketten, D.R., J. O'Malley, P.W.B. Moore, S. Ridgway, and C. Merigo. 2001. Aging, injury, disease, and noise in marine mammal ears. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 110(5, Pt. 2):2721 (Abstract).
- Klima, E.F., G.R. Gitschlag, and M.L. Renaud. 1988. Impacts of the explosive removal of offshore petroleum platforms on sea turtles and dolphins. **Mar. Fish. Rev.** 50(3):33-42.
- Koski, W.R., D.W. Funk, D.S. Ireland, C. Lyons, K. Christie, A.M. Macrander, and S.B. Blackwell. 2009. An update on feeding by bowhead whales near an offshore seismic survey in the central Beaufort Sea. Working Pap. SC/61/BRG3. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 15 p
- Kraus, S., A. Read, A. Solov, K. Baldwin, T. Spradlin, E. Anderson, and J. Williamson. 1997. Acoustic alarms reduce porpoise mortality. **Nature** 388(6642):525.
- Kryter, K.D. 1985. *The Effects of Noise on Man*. 2nd ed. Academic Press, Orlando, FL. 688 p.
- Kryter, K.D. 1994. *The Handbook of Hearing and the Effects of Noise*. Academic Press, Orlando, FL. 673 p.
- Laurinolli, M.H. and N.A. Cochrane. 2005. Hydroacoustic analysis of marine mammal vocalization data from ocean bottom seismometer mounted hydrophones in the Gully. p. 89-95 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain and G.V. Hurley (eds.), *Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys*. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p. Published 2007.
- Lesage, V., C. Barrette, M.C.S. Kingsley, and B. Sjare. 1999. The effect of vessel noise on the vocal behavior of belugas in the St. Lawrence River estuary, Canada. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 15(1):65-84.
- Ljungblad, D.K., B. Würsig, S.L. Swartz, and J.M. Keene. 1988. Observations on the behavioral responses of bowhead whales (*Balaena mysticetus*) to active geophysical vessels in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. **Arctic** 41(3):183-194.
- Lucke, K., U. Siebert, P.A. Lepper and M.-A. Blanchet. 2009. Temporary shift in masked hearing thresholds in a harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) after exposure to seismic airgun stimuli. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 125(6):4060-4070.
- Lusseau, D. and L. Bejder. 2007. The long-term consequences of short-term responses to disturbance experience from whalewatching impact assessment. **Intern. J. Compar. Psychol.** 20(2-3):228-236.
- MacGillivray, A.O. and D. Hannay. 2007a. Summary of noise assessment. p. 3-1 to 3-21 *In*: Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by ConocoPhillips Alaska, Inc., in the Chukchi Sea, July-October 2006. LGL Rep. P903-2 (Jan. 2007). Rep. from LGL Alaska Res. Assoc. Inc., Anchorage, AK, and JASCO Res. Ltd., Victoria, B.C., for ConocoPhillips Alaska Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 116 p.
- MacGillivray, A. and D. Hannay. 2007b. Field measurements of airgun array sound levels. p. 4-1 to 4-19 *In*: Marine mammal monitoring and mitigation during open water seismic exploration by GX Technology in the Chukchi Sea, October-November 2006: 90-day report. LGL Rep. P891-1 (Feb. 2007). Rep. from LGL

- Alaska Res. Assoc. Inc., Anchorage, AK, and JASCO Res. Ltd., Victoria, B.C., for GX Technology, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 118 p.
- MacLean, S.A. and B. Haley. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic study in the Støregga Slide area of the Norwegian Sea, August - September 2003. LGL Rep. TA2822-20. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 59 p.
- MacLean, S.A. and W.R. Koski. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Gulf of Alaska, August–September 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-28. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 102 p.
- Madsen, P.T. 2005. Marine mammals and noise: problems with root mean square sound pressure levels for transients. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 117(6):3952-3957.
- Madsen, P.T., B. Mohl, B.K. Nielsen, and M. Wahlberg. 2002. Male sperm whale behavior during exposures to distant seismic survey pulses. **Aquat. Mamm.** 28(3):231-240.
- Madsen, P.T., M. Johnson, P.J.O. Miller, N. Aguilar de Soto, J. Lynch, and P.L. Tyack. 2006. Quantitative measures of air gun pulses recorded on sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) using acoustic tags during controlled exposure experiments. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 120(4):2366–2379.
- Malakoff, D. 2002. Suit ties whale deaths to research cruise. **Science** 298(5594):722-723.
- Malme, C.I. and P.R. Miles. 1985. Behavioral responses of marine mammals (gray whales) to seismic discharges. p. 253-280 *In*: G.D. Greene, F.R. Engelhard, and R.J. Paterson (eds.), Proc. Workshop on Effects of Explosives Use in the Marine Environment, Jan. 1985, Halifax, NS. Tech. Rep. 5. Can. Oil & Gas Lands Admin., Environ. Prot. Br., Ottawa, Ont. 398 p.
- Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. 1984. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Rep. 5586. Rep. from Bolt Beranek & Newman Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Alaska OCS Region, Anchorage, AK. NTIS PB86-218377.
- Malme, C.I., P.R. Miles, P. Tyack, C.W. Clark, and J.E. Bird. 1985. Investigation of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on feeding humpback whale behavior. BBN Rep. 5851; OCS Study MMS 85-0019. Rep. from BBN Labs Inc., Cambridge, MA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK. NTIS PB86-218385.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1986. Behavioral responses of gray whales to industrial noise: feeding observations and predictive modeling. BBN Rep. 6265. OCS Study MMS 88-0048. Outer Contin. Shelf Environ. Assess. Progr., Final Rep. Princ. Invest., NOAA, Anchorage 56(1988): 393-600. NTIS PB88-249008.
- Malme, C.I., B. Würsig, B., J.E. Bird, and P. Tyack. 1988. Observations of feeding gray whale responses to controlled industrial noise exposure. p. 55-73 *In*: W.M. Sackinger, M.O. Jeffries, J.L. Imm, and S.D. Treacy (eds.), Port and Ocean Engineering Under Arctic Conditions. Vol. II. Symposium on Noise and Marine Mammals. Univ. Alaska Fairbanks, Fairbanks, AK. 111 p.
- Manly, B.F.J., V.D. Moulton, R.E. Elliott, G.W. Miller and W.J. Richardson. 2007. Analysis of covariance of fall migrations of bowhead whales in relation to human activities and environmental factors, Alaskan Beaufort Sea: Phase I, 1996-1998. LGL Rep. TA2799-2; OCS Study MMS 2005-033. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and WEST Inc., Cheyenne, WY, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Herndon, VA, and Anchorage, AK. 128 p.
- Mate, B.R. and J.T. Harvey. 1987. Acoustical deterrents in marine mammal conflicts with fisheries. ORESU-W-86-001. Oregon State Univ., Sea Grant Coll. Prog., Corvallis, OR. 116 p.
- Mate, B.R., K.M. Stafford, and D.K. Ljungblad. 1994. A change in sperm whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*) distribution correlated to seismic surveys in the Gulf of Mexico. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 96(5, Pt. 2):3268-3269 (Abstract).
- McAlpine, D.F. 2002. Pygmy and dwarf sperm whales. p. 1007-1009 *In*: W.F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J.G.M. Thewissen (eds.), Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 1414 p.

- McCall Howard, M.P. 1999. Sperm whales *Physeter macrocephalus* in the Gully, Nova Scotia: Population, distribution, and response to seismic surveying. B.Sc. (Honours) Thesis. Dalhousie Univ., Halifax, NS.
- McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. **APPEA J.** 38:692-707.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: Analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin Univ., Perth, Western Australia, for Australian Petrol. Produc. & Explor. Association, Sydney, NSW. 188 p.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, M.-N. Jenner, M.-N., C. Jenner, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, K. McCabe and J. Murdoch. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. **APPEA J.** 40: 692-708.
- McDonald, M.A., J.A. Hildebrand, and S.C. Webb. 1995. Blue and fin whales observed on a seafloor array in the Northeast Pacific. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 98(2, Pt. 1):712-721.
- McShane, L.J., J.A. Estes, M.L. Riedman, and M.M. Staedler. 1995. Repertoire, structure, and individual variation of vocalizations in the sea otter. **J. Mammal.** 76(2):414-427.
- Meier, S.K., S.B. Yazvenko, S.A. Blokhin, P. Wainwright, M.K. Maminov, Y.M. Yakovlev, and M.W. Newcomer. 2007. Distribution and abundance of western gray whales off northeastern Sakhalin Island, Russia, 2001-2003. **Environ. Monit. Assessm.** 134(1-3):107-136.
- Miller, G.W., R.E. Elliott, W.R. Koski, V.D. Moulton, and W.J. Richardson. 1999. Whales. p. 5-1 to 5-109 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1998. LGL Rep. TA2230-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 390 p.
- Miller, G.W., V.D. Moulton, R.A. Davis, M. Holst, P. Millman, A. MacGillivray, and D. Hannay. 2005. Monitoring seismic effects on marine mammals—southeastern Beaufort Sea, 2001-2002. p. 511-542 *In*: S.L. Armsworthy, P.J. Cranford, and K. Lee (eds.), Offshore Oil and Gas Environmental Effects Monitoring/Approaches and Technologies. Battelle Press, Columbus, OH.
- Miller, P.J.O., M.P. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, N. Biassoni, M. Quero, and P.L. Tyack. 2009. Using at-sea experiments to study the effects of airguns on the foraging behavior of sperm whales in the Gulf of Mexico. **Deep-Sea Res.** 56(7):1168-1181.
- Mooney, T.A., P.E. Nachtigall, M. Breese, S. Vlachos, and W.W.L. Au. 2009a. Predicting temporary threshold shifts in a bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*): the effects of noise level and duration. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 125(3):1816-1826.
- Mooney, T.A., P.E. Nachtigall and S. Vlachos. 2009b. Sonar-induced temporary hearing loss in dolphins. **Biol. Lett.** 4(4):565-567.
- Moore, S.E. and Angliss, R.P. 2006. Overview of planned seismic surveys offshore northern Alaska, July-October 2006. Paper SC/58/E6 presented to IWC Scient. Commit., IWC Annu. Meet., 1-13 June, St Kitts.
- Morton A.B. and H.K. Symonds. 2002. Displacement of *Orcinus orca* (L.) by high amplitude sound in British Columbia, Canada. **ICES J. Mar. Sci.** 59(1):71-80
- Moulton, V.D. and J.W. Lawson. 2002. Seals, 2001. p. 3-1 to 3-48 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of WesternGeco's open water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 2001. LGL Rep. TA2564-4. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for WesternGeco, Houston, TX, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 95 p.
- Moulton, V.D. and G.W. Miller. 2005. Marine mammal monitoring of a seismic survey on the Scotian Slope, 2003. p. 29-40 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain, and G.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in the Gully and outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic programs. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p (Published 2007).

- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, and R.A. Buchanan. 2005. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Resources' 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2004. LGL Rep. SA817. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, NL, for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, Alb., ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, Alb. 90 p. + appendices.
- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, R.E. Harris, and R.A. Buchanan. 2006a. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Chevron Canada Limited's 3-D seismic program on the Orphan Basin, 2005. LGL Rep. SA843. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for Chevron Canada Resources, Calgary, Alb., ExxonMobil Canada Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., and Imperial Oil Resources Ventures Ltd., Calgary, Alb. 111 p. + appendices.
- Moulton, V.D., B.D. Mactavish, and R.A. Buchanan. 2006b. Marine mammal and seabird monitoring of Conoco-Phillips' 3-D seismic program in the Laurentian Sub-basin, 2005. LGL Rep. SA849. Rep. by LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld., for ConocoPhillips Canada Resources Corp., Calgary, Alb. 97 p. + appendices.
- Nachtigall, P.E., J.L. Pawloski, and W.W.L. Au. 2003. Temporary threshold shifts and recovery following noise exposure in the Atlantic bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 113(6):3425-3429.
- Nachtigall, P.E., A.Y. Supin, J. Pawloski, and W.W.L. Au. 2004. Temporary threshold shifts after noise exposure in the bottlenose dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*) measured using evoked auditory potentials. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 20(4):673-687.
- Nachtigall, P.E., A.Y. Supin, M. Amundin, B. Röken, T. Møller, A. Mooney, K.A. Taylor, and M. Yuen. 2007. Polar bear *Ursus maritimus* hearing measured with auditory evoked potentials. **J. Exp. Biol.** 210(7):1116-1122.
- Nations, C.S., S.B. Blackwell, K.H. Kim, A.M. Thode, C.R. Greene Jr., A.M. Macrander, and T.L. McDonald. 2009. Effects of seismic exploration in the Beaufort Sea on bowhead whale call distributions. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 126(4, Pt. 2):2230 (Abstract).
- Nieukirk, S.L., K.M. Stafford, D.K. Mellinger, R.P. Dziak, and C.G. Fox. 2004. Low-frequency whale and seismic airgun sounds recorded in the mid-Atlantic Ocean. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 115(4):1832-1843.
- Nieukirk, S.L., D.K. Mellinger, J.A. Hildebrand, M.A. McDonald, and R.P. Dziak. 2005. Downward shift in the frequency of blue whale vocalizations. p. 205 *In: Abstr. 16th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., San Diego, CA, 12-16 Dec. 2005.*
- Nieukirk, S.L., S.L. Heimlich, S.E. Moore, K.M. Stafford, R.P. Dziak, M. Fowler, J. Haxel, J. Goslin and D.K. Mellinger. 2009. Whales and airguns: an eight-year acoustic study in the central North Atlantic. p. 181-182 *In: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Oct. 2009.* 306 p.
- NMFS. 1995. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; offshore seismic activities in southern California. **Fed. Regist.** 60(200):53753-53760.
- NMFS. 2000. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; marine seismic-reflection data collection in southern California. **Fed. Regist.** 65(20):16374-16379.
- NMFS. 2001. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities; oil and gas exploration drilling activities in the Beaufort Sea/Notice of issuance of an incidental harassment authorization. **Fed. Regist.** 66(26):9291-9298.
- NMFS. 2005. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. **Fed. Regist.** 70(7):1871-1875.
- NOAA and U.S. Navy. 2001. Joint interim report: Bahamas marine mammal stranding event of 15-16 March 2000. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD, and Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations & Environ., Washington, DC. 61 p. Available at <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/acoustics/reports.htm>
- Nowacek, D.P., L.H. Thorne, D.W. Johnston, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. **Mammal Rev.** 37(2):81-115.
- NRC. 2005. Marine Mammal Populations and Ocean Noise: Determining When Noise Causes Biologically Significant Effects. U. S. Nat. Res. Council, Ocean Studies Board. (Authors D.W. Wartzok, J. Altmann, W. Au, K. Ralls, A. Starfield, and P.L. Tyack). Nat. Acad. Press, Washington, DC. 126 p.
- Parente, C.L., M.C.C. Marcondes, and M.H. Engel. 2006. Humpback whale strandings and seismic surveys in Brazil from 1999 to 2004. Working Pap. SC/58/E41. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 16 p.
- Parente, C.L., J.P. de Araújo and M.E. de Araújo. 2007. Diversity of cetaceans as tool in monitoring environmental impacts of seismic surveys. **Biota Neotrop.** 7(1):1-7.

- Parks, S.E., C.W. Clark, and P.L. Tyack. 2007a. Short- and long-term changes in right whale calling behavior: the potential effects of noise on acoustic communication. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 122(6):3725-3731.
- Parks, S.E., D.R. Ketten, J.T. O'Malley and J. Arruda. 2007b. Anatomical predictions of hearing in the North Atlantic right whale. **Anat. Rec.** 290(6):734-744.
- Parks, S.E., I. Urazghildiev and C.W. Clark. 2009. Variability in ambient noise levels and call parameters of North Atlantic right whales in three habitat areas. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 125(2):1230-1239.
- Potter, J.R., M. Thillet, C. Douglas, M.A. Chitre, Z. Doborzynski, and P.J. Seekings. 2007. Visual and passive acoustic marine mammal observations and high-frequency seismic source characteristics recorded during a seismic survey. **IEEE J. Oceanic Eng.** 32(2):469-483.
- Reeves, R.R. 1992. Whale responses to anthropogenic sounds: A literature review. Sci. & Res. Ser. 47. New Zealand Dep. Conserv., Wellington. 47 p.
- Reeves, R.R., E. Mitchell, and H. Whitehead. 1993. Status of the northern bottlenose whale, *Hyperoodon ampullatus*. **Can. Field-Nat.** 107(4):490-508.
- Reeves, R.R., R.J. Hofman, G.K. Silber, and D. Wilkinson. 1996. Acoustic deterrence of harmful marine mammal-fishery interactions: proceedings of a workshop held in Seattle, Washington, 20-22 March 1996. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-OPR-10. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Northwest Fisheries Sci. Cent., Seattle, WA. 70 p.
- Reiser, C.M., B. Haley, J. Beland, D.M. Savarese, D.S. Ireland, and D.W. Funk. 2009. Evidence of short-range movements by phocid species in reaction to marine seismic surveys in the Alaskan Chukchi and Beaufort seas. p. 211 *In*: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Canada, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Richardson, W.J. and C.I. Malme. 1993. Man-made noise and behavioral responses. p. 631-700 *In*: J.J. Burns, J.J. Montague, and C.J. Cowles (eds.), The Bowhead Whale. Spec. Publ. 2, Soc. Mar. Mammal., Lawrence, KS. 787 p.
- Richardson, W.J. and B. Würsig. 1997. Influences of man-made noise and other human actions on cetacean behaviour. **Mar. Freshw. Behav. Physiol.** 29(1-4):183-209.
- Richardson, W.J., B. Würsig, and C.R. Greene. 1986. Reactions of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, to seismic exploration in the Canadian Beaufort Sea. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 79(4):1117-1128.
- Richardson, W.J., R.A. Davis, C.R. Evans, D.K. Ljungblad, and P. Norton. 1987. Summer distribution of bowhead whales, *Balaena mysticetus*, relative to oil industry activities in the Canadian Beaufort Sea, 1980-84. **Arctic** 40(2):93-104.
- Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine Mammals and Noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 576 p.
- Richardson, W.J., G.W. Miller, and C.R. Greene, Jr. 1999. Displacement of migrating bowhead whales by sounds from seismic surveys in shallow waters of the Beaufort Sea. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 106(4, Pt. 2):2281 (Abstract).
- Richardson, W.J., M. Holst, W.R. Koski and M. Cummings. 2009. Responses of cetaceans to large-source seismic surveys by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. p. 213 *In*: Abstr. 18th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., Québec, Oct. 2009. 306 p.
- Riedman, M.L. 1983. Studies of the effects of experimentally produced noise associated with oil and gas exploration and development on sea otters in California. Rep. from Center for Coastal Marine Studies, Univ. Calif., Santa Cruz, CA, for MMS, Anchorage, AK. 92 p. NTIS PB86-218575.
- Riedman, M.L. 1984. Effects of sounds associated with petroleum industry activities on the behavior of sea otters in California. p. D-1 to D-12 *In*: C.I. Malme, P.R. Miles, C.W. Clark, P. Tyack, and J.E. Bird. Investigations of the potential effects of underwater noise from petroleum industry activities on migrating gray whale behavior/Phase II: January 1984 migration. BBN Rep. 5586. Rep. from BBN Inc., Cambridge, MA, for Minerals Manage. Serv. Anchorage, AK. NTIS PB86-218377.
- Romano, T.A., M.J. Keogh, C.Kelly, P. Feng, L. Berk, C.E. Schlundt, D.A. Carder, and J.J. Finneran. 2004. Anthropogenic sound and marine mammal health: measures of the nervous and immune systems before and after intense sound exposure. **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 61(7):1124-1134.
- SACLANT. 1998. Estimation of cetacean hearing criteria levels. Section II, Chapter 7 *In*: SACLANTCEN Bioacoustics Panel Summary Record and Report. Rep. from NATO Undersea Res. Center. Available at <http://enterprise.spawar.navy.mil/nepa/whales/pdf/doc2-7.pdf>

- Scheifele, P.M., S. Andrew, R.A. Cooper, M. Darre, F.E. Musiek, and L. Max. 2005. Indication of a Lombard vocal response in the St. Lawrence River beluga. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 117(3, Pt. 1):1486-1492.
- Schlundt, C.E., J.J. Finneran, D.A. Carder, and S.H. Ridgway. 2000. Temporary shift in masking hearing thresholds of bottlenose dolphins, *Tursiops truncatus*, and white whales, *Delphinapterus leucas*, after exposure to intense tones. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 107(6):3496-3508.
- Simard, Y., F. Samaran and N. Roy. 2005. Measurement of whale and seismic sounds in the Scotian Gully and adjacent canyons in July 2003. p. 97-115 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain and C.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and Outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p (Published 2007).
- Simmonds, M. P. and L.F. Lopez-Jurado. 1991. Whales and the military. **Nature** 351(6326):448.
- Smultea, M.A. and M. Holst. 2008. Marine mammal monitoring during a University of Texas Institute for Geophysics seismic survey in the Northeast Pacific Ocean, July 2008. LGL Rep. TA4584-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 80 p.
- Smultea, M.A., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and S. Stoltz. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the Southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean, April-June 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-26. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 106 p.
- Sodal, A. 1999. Measured underwater acoustic wave propagation from a seismic source. Proc. Airgun Environmental Workshop, 6 July, London, UK.
- Southall, B.L., A.E. Bowles, W.T. Ellison, J.J. Finneran, R.L. Gentry, C.R. Greene Jr., D. Kastak, D.R. Ketten, J.H. Miller, P.E. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, J.A. Thomas, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. **Aquat. Mamm.** 33(4):411-522.
- Stone, C.J. 2003. The effects of seismic activity on marine mammals in UK waters 1998-2000. JNCC Rep. 323. Joint Nature Conserv. Commit., Aberdeen, Scotland. 43 p.
- Stone, C.J. and M.L. Tasker. 2006. The effects of seismic airguns on cetaceans in UK waters. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 8(3):255-263.
- Terhune, J.M. 1999. Pitch separation as a possible jamming-avoidance mechanism in underwater calls of bearded seals (*Erignathus barbatus*). **Can. J. Zool.** 77(7):1025-1034.
- Thomas, J.A., R.A. Kastelein and F.T. Awbrey. 1990. Behavior and blood catecholamines of captive belugas during playbacks of noise from an oil drilling platform. **Zoo Biol.** 9(5):393-402.
- Thompson, D., M. Sjöberg, E.B. Bryant, P. Lovell, and A. Bjørge. 1998. Behavioural and physiological responses of harbour (*Phoca vitulina*) and grey (*Halichoerus grypus*) seals to seismic surveys. p. 134 *In*: Abstr. 12th Bienn. Conf. and World Mar. Mamm. Sci. Conf., 20-25 Jan., Monte Carlo, Monaco. 160 p.
- Thomson, D.H. and W.J. Richardson. 1995. Marine mammal sounds. p. 159-204 *In*: W.J. Richardson, C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. Marine Mammals and Noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 576 p.
- Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, S. Webb, D. Bohnenstiehl, and E. Chapp. 2004a. Acoustic calibration measurements. Chapter 3 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Marine mammal and acoustic monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's acoustic calibration study in the northern Gulf of Mexico, 2003. Revised Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD.
- Tolstoy, M., J.B. Diebold, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, E. Chapp, R.C. Holmes, and M. Rawson. 2004b. Broadband calibration of R/V *Ewing* seismic sources. **Geophys. Res. Lett.** 31:L14310. doi: 10.1029/2004GL020234
- Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, L. Doermann, S. Nooner, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohnenstiehl, T.J. Crone and R.C. Holmes. 2009. Broadband calibration of the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* four-string seismic sources. **Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.** 10(8):1-15. Q08011.
- Tyack, P.L. 2008. Implications for marine mammals of large-scale changes in the marine acoustic environment. **J. Mammal.** 89(3):549-558.
- Tyack, P.L. 2009. Human-generated sound and marine mammals. **Phys. Today** 62(11, Nov.):39-44.

- Tyack, P., M. Johnson, and P. Miller. 2003. Tracking responses of sperm whales to experimental exposures of airguns. p. 115-120 *In*: A.E. Jochens and D.C. Biggs (eds.), Sperm whale seismic study in the Gulf of Mexico/Annual Report: Year 1. OCS Study MMS 2003-069. Rep. from Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, for U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv., Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.
- Tyack, P.L., M.P. Johnson, P.T. Madsen, P.J. Miller, and J. Lynch. 2006a. Biological significance of acoustic impacts on marine mammals: examples using an acoustic recording tag to define acoustic exposure of sperm whales, *Physeter catodon*, exposed to airgun sounds in controlled exposure experiments. **Eos**, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union 87(36), Joint Assembly Suppl., Abstract OS42A-02. 23-26 May, Baltimore, MD.
- Tyack, P.L., M. Johnson, N. Aguilar Soto, A. Sturlese, and P.T. Madsen. 2006b. Extreme diving of beaked whales. **J. Exp. Biol.** 209(21):4238-4253.
- Urick, R.J. 1983. Principles of Underwater Sound. 3rd ed. Peninsula Publ., Los Altos, CA. 423 p.
- van der Woude, S. 2007. Assessing effects of an acoustic marine geophysical survey on the behaviour of bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus*. *In*: Abstr. 17th Bienn. Conf. Biol. Mar. Mamm., 29 Nov.–3 Dec., Cape Town, South Africa.
- Wartzok, D., A.N. Popper, J. Gordon, and J. Merrill. 2004. Factors affecting the responses of marine mammals to acoustic disturbance. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):6-15.
- Watkins, W.A. 1977. Acoustic behavior of sperm whales. **Oceanus** 20(2):50-58.
- Watkins, W.A. 1986. Whale reactions to human activities in Cape Cod waters. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 2(4):251-262.
- Watkins, W.A. and W.E. Schevill. 1975. Sperm whales (*Physeter catodon*) react to pingers. **Deep-Sea Res.** 22(3):123-129.
- Watkins, W.A., K.E. Moore, and P. Tyack. 1985. Sperm whale acoustic behaviors in the southeast Caribbean. **Cetology** 49:1-15.
- Weilgart, L.S. 2007. A brief review of known effects of noise on marine mammals. **Intern. J. Comp. Psychol.** 20:159-168.
- Weir, C.R. 2008a. Overt responses of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*), sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), and Atlantic spotted dolphins (*Stenella frontalis*) to seismic exploration off Angola. **Aquat. Mamm.** 34(1):71-83.
- Weir, C.R. 2008b. Short-finned pilot whales (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*) respond to an airgun ramp-up procedure off Gabon. **Aquat. Mamm.** 34(3):349-354.
- Weller, D.W., Y.V. Ivashchenko, G.A. Tsidulko, A.M. Burdin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2002. Influence of seismic surveys on western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia in 2001. Paper SC/54/BRG14, IWC, Western Gray Whale Working Group Meet., 22-25 Oct., Ulsan, South Korea. 12 p.
- Weller, D.W., S.H. Rickards, A.L. Bradford, A.M. Burdin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 2006a. The influence of 1997 seismic surveys on the behavior of western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia. Paper SC/58/E4 presented to the IWC Scient. Commit., IWC Annu. Meet., 1-13 June, St. Kitts.
- Weller, D.W., G.A. Tsidulko, Y.V. Ivashchenko, A.M. Burdin and R.L. Brownell Jr. 2006b. A re-evaluation of the influence of 2001 seismic surveys on western gray whales off Sakhalin Island, Russia. Paper SC/58/E5 presented to the IWC Scient. Commit., IWC Annu. Meet., 1-13 June, St. Kitts.
- Wieting, D. 2004. Background on development and intended use of criteria. p. 20 *In*: S. Orenstein, L. Langstaff, L. Manning, and R. Maund (eds.), Advisory Committee on Acoustic Impacts on Marine Mammals, Final Meet. Summary. Second Meet., April 28-30, 2004, Arlington, VA. Sponsored by the Mar. Mamm. Commis., 10 Aug.
- Winsor, M.H. and B.R. Mate. 2006. Seismic survey activity and the proximity of satellite tagged sperm whales. Working Pap. SC/58/E16. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 8 p.
- Wright, A.J. and S. Kuczaj. 2007. Noise-related stress and marine mammals: An Introduction. **Intern. J. Comp. Psychol.** 20(2-3):iii-viii.
- Wright, A.J., N. Aguilar Soto, A.L. Baldwin, M. Bateson, C.M. Beale, C. Clark, T. Deak, E.F. Edwards, A. Fernández, A. Godinho, L.T. Hatch, A. Kakuschke, D. Lusseau, D. Martineau, L.M. Romero, L.S. Weilgart, B.A. Wintle, G. Notarbartolo-di-Sciara, and V. Martin. 2007a. Do marine mammals experience stress related to anthropogenic noise? **Intern. J. Comp. Psychol.** 20(2-3):274-316.

- Wright, A.J., N. Aguilar Soto, A.L. Baldwin, M. Bateson, C.M. Beale, C. Clark, T. Deak, E.F. Edwards, A. Fernández, A. Godinho, L.T. Hatch, A. Kakuschke, D. Lusseau, D. Martineau, L.M. Romero, L.S. Weilgart, B.A. Wintle, G. Notarbartolo-di-Sciara and V. Martin. 2007b. Anthropogenic noise as a stressor in animals: A multidisciplinary perspective. **Intern. J. Comp. Psychol.** 20(2-3): 250-273.
- Wright, A.J., T. Deak and E.C.M. Parsons. 2009. Concerns related to chronic stress in marine mammals. Working Pap. SC/61/E16. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 7 p.
- Würsig, B., S.K. Lynn, T.A. Jefferson, and K.D. Mullin. 1998. Behaviour of cetaceans in the northern Gulf of Mexico relative to survey ships and aircraft. **Aquat. Mamm.** 24(1):41-50.
- Würsig, B.G., D.W. Weller, A.M. Burdin, S.H. Reeve, A.L. Bradford, S.A. Blokhin, and R.L. Brownell, Jr. 1999. Gray whales summering off Sakhalin Island, Far East Russia: July-October 1997. A joint U.S.-Russian scientific investigation. Final Report. Rep. from Texas A&M Univ., College Station, TX, and Kamchatka Inst. Ecol. & Nature Manage., Russian Acad. Sci., Kamchatka, Russia, for Sakhalin Energy Investment Co. Ltd and Exxon Neftegaz Ltd, Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia. 101 p.
- Yazvenko, S.B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, S.K. Meier, H.R. Melton, M.W. Newcomer, R.M. Nielson, V.L. Vladimirov, and P.W. Wainwright. 2007a. Distribution and abundance of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assessm.** 134(1-3):45-73.
- Yazvenko, S. B., T.L. McDonald, S.A. Blokhin, S.R. Johnson, H.R. Melton, and M.W. Newcomer. 2007b. Feeding activity of western gray whales during a seismic survey near Sakhalin Island, Russia. **Environ. Monit. Assessm.** 134(1-3):93-106.
- Yoder, J.A. 2002. Declaration James A. Yoder in opposition to plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order, 28 October 2002. Civ. No. 02-05065-JL. U.S. District Court, Northern District of Calif., San Francisco Div.

APPENDIX B:

REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON SEA TURTLES¹⁰

The following subsections review relevant information concerning the potential effects of airgun sounds on sea turtles. This information is included here as background. Much of this information has also been included in varying formats in other reviews, assessments, and regulatory applications prepared by LGL Ltd.

1. Sea Turtle Hearing

Although there have been a limited number of studies on sea turtle hearing (see review by Southwood et al. 2008), the available data are not very comprehensive. However, these data demonstrate that sea turtles appear to be low-frequency specialists (see Table B-1).

Sea turtle auditory perception occurs through a combination of both bone and water conduction rather than air conduction (Lenhardt 1982; Lenhardt and Harkins 1983). Detailed descriptions of sea turtle ear anatomy are found in Ridgway et al. (1969), Lenhardt et al. (1985), and Bartol and Musick (2003). Sea turtles do not have external ears, but the middle ear is well adapted as a peripheral component of a bone conduction system. The thick tympanum is disadvantageous as an aerial receptor, but enhances low-frequency bone conduction hearing (Lenhardt et al. 1985; Bartol et al. 1999; Bartol and Musick 2003). A layer of subtympantal fat emerging from the middle ear is fused to the tympanum (Ketten et al. 2006; Bartol 2004, 2008). A cartilaginous disk, the extracolumella, is found under the tympanic membrane and is attached to the columella (Bartol 2004, 2008). The columella is a long rod that expands to form the stapes, and fibrous strands connect the stapes to the sacculle (Bartol 2004, 2008). When the tympanum is depressed, the vibrations are conveyed via the fibrous stapedo-saccular strands to the sacculle (Lenhardt et al. 1985). This arrangement of fat deposits and bone enables sea turtles to hear low-frequency sounds while underwater and makes them relatively insensitive to sound above water. Vibrations, however, can be conducted through the bones of the carapace to reach the middle ear.

A variety of audiometric methods are available to assess hearing abilities. Electrophysiological measures of hearing (e.g., auditory brainstem response or ABR) provide good information about relative sensitivity to different frequencies. However, this approach may underestimate the frequency range to which the animal is sensitive and may be imprecise at determining absolute hearing thresholds (e.g., Wolski et al. 2003). Nevertheless, when time is critical and only untrained animals are available, this method can provide useful information on sea turtle hearing (e.g., Wolski et al. 2003).

Ridgway et al. (1969) obtained the first direct measurements of sea turtle hearing sensitivity (Table B-1). They used an electrophysiological technique (cochlear potentials) to determine the response of green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) to aerial- and vibrational-stimuli consisting of tones with frequencies 30 to 700 Hz. They found that green turtles exhibit maximum hearing sensitivity between 300 and 500 Hz, and speculated that the turtles had a useful hearing range of 60–1000 Hz. (However, there was some response to strong vibrational signals at frequencies down to the lowest one tested — 30 Hz.)

TABLE B-1. Hearing capabilities of sea turtles as measured using behavioral and electro-physiological

¹⁰ By **Valerie D. Moulton and W. John Richardson**, with subsequent updates (to Feb. 2010) by Mari A. Smultea and Meike Holst, all of LGL Ltd., environmental research associates.

techniques. ABR: auditory brainstem response; NA: no empirical data available.

Sea Turtle Species	Hearing		Technique	Source
	Range (Hz)	Highest Sensitivity (Hz)		
Green	60-1000	300-500	Cochlear Potentials ^a	Ridgway et al. 1969
	100-800	600-700 (juveniles) 200-400 (subadults)	ABR ^w	Bartol & Ketten 2006; Ketten & Bartol 2006
	50-1600	50-400	ABR ^{a,w}	Dow et al. 2008
Hawksbill	NA	NA	NA	NA
Loggerhead	250-1000	250	ABR ^a	Bartol et al. 1999
Olive ridley	NA	NA	NA	NA
Kemp's ridley	100-500	100-200	ABR ^w	Bartol & Ketten 2006; Ketten & Bartol 2006
Leatherback	NA	NA	NA	NA
Flatback	NA	NA	NA	NA

^a measured in air; ^w measured underwater

Bartol et al. (1999) tested the in-air hearing of juvenile loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* (Table B-1). The authors used ABR to determine the response of the sea turtle ear to two types of vibrational stimuli: (1) brief, low-frequency broadband clicks, and (2) brief tone bursts at four frequencies from 250 to 1000 Hz. They demonstrated that loggerhead sea turtles hear well between 250 and 1000 Hz; within that frequency range the turtles were most sensitive at 250 Hz. The authors did not measure hearing sensitivity below 250 Hz or above 1000 Hz. There was an extreme decrease in response to stimuli above 1000 Hz, and the vibrational intensities required to elicit a response may have damaged the turtle's ear. The signals used in this study were very brief — 0.6 ms for the clicks and 0.8–5.5 ms for the tone bursts. In other animals, auditory thresholds decrease with increasing signal duration up to ~100–200 ms. Thus, sea turtles probably could hear weaker signals than demonstrated in the study if the signal duration were longer.

Lenhardt (2002) exposed loggerhead turtles while they were near the bottom of holding tanks at a depth of 1 m to tones from 35 to 1000 Hz. The turtles exhibited startle responses (neck contractions) to these tones. The lowest thresholds were in the 400–500 Hz range (106 dB SPL re 1 μ Pa), and thresholds in the 100–200 Hz range were ~124 dB (Lenhardt 2002). Thresholds at 735 and 100 Hz were 117 and 156 dB, respectively (Lenhardt 2002). Diving behaviour occurred at 30 Hz and 164 dB.

More recently, ABR techniques have been used to determine the underwater hearing capabilities of six subadult green turtles, two juvenile green turtles, and two juvenile Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) turtles (Ketten and Bartol 2006; Bartol and Ketten 2006; Table B-1). The turtles were physically restrained in a small box tank with their ears below the water surface and the top of the head exposed above the surface. Pure-tone acoustic stimuli were presented to the animals, though the exact frequencies of these tones were not indicated. The six subadult green turtles detected sound at frequencies 100–500 Hz, with the most sensitive hearing at 200–400 Hz. In contrast, the two juvenile green turtles exhibited a slightly expanded overall hearing range of 100–800 Hz, with their most sensitive hearing occurring at

600–700 Hz. The most restricted range of sensitive hearing (100–200 Hz) was found in the two juvenile Kemp’s ridleys turtles, whose overall frequency range was 100–500 Hz.

Preliminary data from a similar study of a trained, captive green turtle indicate that the animal heard and responded behaviorally to underwater tones ranging in frequency from 100 to 500 Hz. At 200 Hz, the threshold was between 107 and 119 dB, and at 400 Hz the threshold was between 121 and 131 dB [reference units not provided] (Streeter 2003; ONR N.D.).

In summary, the limited available data indicate that the frequency range of best hearing sensitivity of sea turtles extends from ~200 to 700 Hz. Sensitivity deteriorates as one moves away from this range to either lower or higher frequencies. However, there is some sensitivity to frequencies as low as 60 Hz, and probably as low as 30 Hz (Ridgway et al. 1969). Thus, there is substantial overlap in the frequencies that sea turtles detect vs. the dominant frequencies in airgun pulses. Given that, plus the high energy levels of airgun pulses, sea turtles undoubtedly hear airgun sounds. We are not aware of measurements of the absolute hearing thresholds of any sea turtle to waterborne sounds similar to airgun pulses. Given the high source levels of airgun pulses and the substantial received levels even at distances many km away from the source, sea turtles probably can also hear distant seismic vessels. However, in the absence of relevant absolute threshold data, we cannot estimate how far away an airgun array might be audible to a sea turtle.

2. Effects of Airgun Pulses on Behavior and Movement

The effects of exposure to airgun pulses on the behavior and distribution of various marine animals have been studied over the past three decades. Most such studies have concerned marine mammals (e.g., see reviews by Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Southall et al. 2007), but also fish (e.g., reviewed by Thomson et al. 2001; Herata 2007; Payne et al. 2008). There have been far fewer studies on the effects of airgun noise (or indeed any type of noise) on sea turtles, and little is known about the sound levels that will or will not elicit various types of behavioral reactions. There have been four directed studies that focused on short-term behavioral responses of sea turtles in enclosures to single airguns. However, comparisons of results among studies are difficult because experimental designs and reporting procedures have varied greatly, and few studies provided specific information about the levels of the airgun pulses received by the turtles. Although monitoring studies are now providing some information on responses (or lack of responses) of free-ranging sea turtles to seismic surveys, we are not aware of any directed studies on responses of free-ranging sea turtles to seismic sounds or on the long-term effects of seismic or other sounds on sea turtles.

Directed Studies.—The most recent of the studies of caged sea turtles exposed to airgun pulses was a study by McCauley et al. (2000a,b) off Western Australia. The authors exposed caged green and loggerhead sea turtles (one of each) to pulses from an approaching and then receding 20 in³ airgun operating at 1500 psi and a 5-m airgun depth. The single airgun fired every 10 s. There were two trials separated by two days; the first trial involved ~2 h of airgun exposure and the second ~1 h. The results from the two trials showed that, above a received level of 166 dB re 1 μ Pa (rms)¹¹, the turtles noticeably increased their swim speed relative to periods when no airguns were operating. The behavior of the sea

¹¹ rms = root mean square. This measure represents the average received sound pressure over the duration of the pulse, with duration being defined in a specific way (from the time when 5% of the pulse energy has been received to the time when 95% of the energy has been received). The rms received level of a seismic pulse is typically about 10 dB less than its peak level, and about 16 dB less than its peak-to-peak level (Greene et al. 1997, 2000; McCauley et al. 1998, 2000a,b).

turtles became more erratic when received levels exceeded 175 dB re 1 μ Pa rms. The authors suggested that the erratic behavior exhibited by the caged sea turtles would likely, in unrestrained turtles, be expressed as an avoidance response (McCauley et al. 2000a,b).

O'Hara and Wilcox (1990) tested the reactions to airguns by loggerhead sea turtles held in a 300×45 m area of a canal in Florida with a bottom depth of 10 m. Nine turtles were tested at different times. The sound source consisted of one 10 in³ airgun plus two 0.8 in³ "poppers" operating at 2000 psi¹² and an airgun-depth of 2 m for prolonged periods of 20–36 h. The turtles maintained a standoff range of about 30 m when exposed to airgun pulses every 15 or 7.5 s. Some turtles may have remained on the bottom of the enclosure when exposed to airgun pulses. O'Hara and Wilcox (1990) did not measure the received airgun sound levels. McCauley et al. (2000a,b) estimated that "the level at which O'Hara saw avoidance was around 175–176 dB re 1 μ Pa rms." The levels received by the turtles in the Florida study probably were actually a few dB less than 175–176 dB because the calculations by McCauley et al. apparently did not allow for the shallow 2-m airgun depth in the Florida study. The effective source level of airguns is less when they are at a depth of 2 m vs. 5 m (Greene et al. 2000).

Moein et al. (1994) investigated the avoidance behavior and physiological responses of loggerhead turtles exposed to an operating airgun, as well as the effects on their hearing. The turtles were held in a netted enclosure ~18 m by 61 m by 3.6 m deep, with an airgun of unspecified size at each end. Only one airgun was operated at any one time; the firing rate was one shot every 5–6 s. Ten turtles were tested individually, and seven of these were retested several days later. The airgun was initially discharged when the turtles were near the center of the enclosure and the subsequent movements of the turtles were documented. The turtles exhibited avoidance during the first presentation of airgun sounds at a mean range of 24 m, but the avoidance response waned quickly. Additional trials conducted on the same turtles several days later did not show statistically significant avoidance reactions. However, there was an indication of slight initial avoidance followed by rapid waning of the avoidance response which the authors described as "habituation". Their auditory study indicated that exposure to the airgun pulses may have resulted in temporary threshold shift (TTS; see later section). Reduced hearing sensitivity may also have contributed to the waning response upon continued exposure. Based on physiological measurements, there was some evidence of increased stress in the sea turtles, but this stress could also have resulted from handling of the turtles.

Inconsistencies in reporting procedures and experimental design prevent direct comparison of this study with either McCauley et al. (2000a,b) or O'Hara and Wilcox (1990). Moein et al. (1994) stated, without further details, that "three different decibel levels (175, 177, 179) were utilized" during each test. These figures probably are received levels in dB re 1 μ Pa, and probably relate to the initial exposure distance (mean 24 m), but these details were not specified. Also, it was not specified whether these values were measured or estimated, or whether they are expressed in peak-peak, peak, rms, SEL, or some other units. Given the shallow water in the enclosure (3.6 m), any estimates based on simple assumptions about propagation would be suspect.

Lenhardt (2002) exposed captive loggerhead sea turtles while underwater to seismic airgun (Bolt 600) sounds in a large net enclosure. At received levels of 151–161 dB, turtles were found to increase

¹² There was no significant reaction by five turtles during an initial series of tests with the airguns operating at the unusually low pressure of 1000 psi. The source and received levels of airgun sounds would have been substantially lower when the air pressure was only 1000 psi than when it was at the more typical operating pressure of 2000 psi.

swimming speeds. Similar to the McCauley et al. studies (2000a,b--see above), near a received level of ~175 dB, an avoidance reaction was common in initial trials, but habituation then appeared to occur. Based on ABRs measured pre- and post-airgun exposures, a TTS of over 15 dB was found in one animal, with recovery two weeks later. Lenhardt (2002) suggested that exposure of sea turtles to airguns at water depths >10 m may result in exposure to more energy in the low frequencies with unknown biological effects.

Despite the problems in comparing these studies, they are consistent in showing that, at some received level, sea turtles show avoidance of an operating airgun. McCauley et al. (2000a,b) found evidence of behavioral responses when the received level from a single small airgun was 166 dB re 1 μ Pa rms and avoidance responses at 175 dB re 1 μ Pa rms. Based on these data, McCauley et al. estimated that, for a typical airgun array (2678 in³, 12-elements) operating in 100–120 m water depth, sea turtles may exhibit behavioral changes at ~2 km and avoidance around 1 km. These estimates are subject to great variation, depending on the seismic source and local propagation conditions.

A further potential complication is that sea turtles on or near the bottom may receive sediment-borne “headwave” signals from the airguns (McCauley et al. 2000a,b). As previously discussed, it is believed that sea turtles use bone conduction to hear. It is unknown how sea turtles might respond to the headwave component of an airgun impulse or to bottom vibrations.

Related studies involving stimuli other than airguns may also be relevant. (1) Two loggerhead turtles resting on the bottom of shallow tanks responded repeatedly to low-frequency (20–80 Hz) tones by becoming active and swimming to the surface. They remained at the surface or only slightly submerged for the remainder of the 1-min trial (Lenhardt 1994). Although no detailed data on sound levels at the bottom vs. surface were reported, the surfacing response probably reduced the levels of underwater sound to which the turtles were exposed. (2) In a separate study, a loggerhead and a Kemp’s ridley sea turtle responded similarly when vibratory stimuli at 250 or 500 Hz were applied to the head for 1 s (Lenhardt et al. 1983). There appeared to be rapid habituation to these vibratory stimuli. (3) Turtles in tanks showed agitated behaviour when exposed to simulated boat noise and recordings from the U.S. Navy’s Low Frequency Active (LFA) sonar (Samuel et al. 2005, 2006). The tones and vibratory stimuli used in these two studies were quite different from airgun pulses. However, it is possible that resting sea turtles may exhibit a similar “alarm” response, possibly including surfacing or alternatively diving, when exposed to any audible noise, regardless of whether it is a pulsed sound or tone.

Monitoring Results.—Data on sea turtle behavior near airgun operations have also been collected during marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring and mitigation programs associated with various seismic operations around the world. Although the primary objectives concerned marine mammals, sea turtle sightings have also been documented in some of monitoring projects. Results suggest that some sea turtles exhibit behavioral changes and/or avoidance within an area of unknown size near a seismic vessel. However, avoidance of approaching seismic vessels is sufficiently limited and small-scale such that sea turtles are often seen from operating seismic vessels. Also, average distances from the airguns to these sea turtles are usually not greatly increased when the airguns are operating as compared with times when airguns are silent.

For example, during six large-source (10–20 airguns; 3050–8760 in³) and small-source (up to six airguns or three GI guns; 75–1350 in³) surveys conducted by L-DEO during 2003–2005, the mean closest point of approach (CPA) for turtles was closer during non-seismic than seismic periods: 139 m vs. 228 m and 120 m vs. 285 m, respectively (Holst et al. 2006). During a large-source L-DEO seismic survey off the Pacific coast of Central America in 2008, the turtle sighting rate during non-seismic periods was seven times greater than that during seismic periods (Holst and Smultea 2008). In addition, distances of

turtles seen from the seismic vessel were significantly farther from the airgun array when it was operating (mean 159 m, $n = 77$) than when the airguns were off (mean 118 m, $n = 69$; Mann-Whitney U test, $P < 0.001$) (Holst and Smultea 2008). During another L-DEO survey in the Eastern Tropical Pacific in 2008, the turtle sighting rate during non-seismic periods was 1.5 times greater than that during seismic periods; however, turtles tended to be seen closer to the airgun array when it was operating, but this difference was not statistically significant (Hauser et al. 2008).

Weir (2007) reported on the behavior of sea turtles near seismic exploration operations off Angola, West Africa. A total of 240 sea turtles were seen during 676 h of vessel-based monitoring, mainly for associated marine mammals mitigation and monitoring observations. Airgun arrays with total volumes of 5085 and 3147 in^3 were used at different times during the seismic program. Sea turtles tended to be seen slightly closer to the seismic source, and at sighting rates twice as high, during non-seismic vs. seismic periods (Weir 2007). However, there was no significant difference in the median distance of turtle sightings from the array during non-seismic vs. seismic periods, with means of 743 m ($n = 112$) and 779 m ($n = 57$).

Off northeastern Brazil, 46 sea turtles were seen during 2028 h of vessel-based monitoring of seismic exploration using 4–8 GI airguns (Parente et al. 2006). There were no apparent differences in turtle sighting rates during seismic and non-seismic periods, but detailed behavioral data during seismic operations were lacking (Parente et al. 2006).

Behavioral responses of marine mammals and fish to seismic surveys sometimes vary depending on species, time of year, activity of the animal, and other unknown factors. The same species may show different responses at different times of year or even on different days (e.g., Richardson et al. 1995; Thomson et al. 2001). Sea turtles of different ages vary in size, behavior, feeding habits, and preferred water depths. Nothing specific is known about the ways in which these factors may be related to airgun sound effects in sea turtles. However, it is reasonable to expect lesser effects in young turtles concentrated near the surface (where levels of airgun sounds are attenuated) as compared with older turtles that spend more time at depth where airgun sounds are generally stronger.

3. Possible Effects of Airgun Sounds on Distribution

In captive enclosures, sea turtles generally respond to seismic noise by startling, increasing swimming speed, and/or swimming away from the noise source. Animals resting on the bottom often become active and move toward the surface where received sound levels normally will be reduced, although some turtles dive upon exposure. Unfortunately, quantitative data for free-ranging sea turtles exposed to seismic pulses are very limited, and potential long-term behavioral effects of seismic exposure have not been investigated. The paucity of data precludes clear predictions of sea turtle responses to seismic noise. Available evidence suggests that localized behavioral and distributional effects on sea turtles are likely during seismic operations, including responses to the seismic vessel, airguns, and other gear (e.g., McCauley 1994; Pendoley 1997; Weir 2007). Pendoley (1997) summarized potential effects of seismic operations on the behavior and distribution of sea turtles and identified biological periods and habitats considered most sensitive to potential disturbance. The possible responses of free-ranging sea turtles to seismic pulses could include

- avoiding the entire seismic survey area to the extent that turtles move to less preferred habitat;
- avoiding only the immediate area around the active seismic vessel (i.e., local avoidance of the source vessel but remain in the general area); and
- exhibiting no appreciable avoidance, although short-term behavioral reactions are likely.

Complete avoidance of an area, if it occurred, could exclude sea turtles from their preferred foraging area and could displace them to areas where foraging is sub-optimal. Avoidance of a preferred foraging area may prevent sea turtles from obtaining preferred prey species and hence could impact their nutritional status. The potential alteration of a migration route might also have negative impacts. However, it is not known whether avoidance by sea turtles would ever be on a sufficient geographic scale, or be sufficiently prolonged, to prevent turtles from reaching an important destination.

Available evidence suggests that the zone of avoidance around seismic sources is not likely to exceed a few kilometers (McCauley et al. 2000a,b). Avoidance reactions on that scale could prevent sea turtles from using an important coastal area or bay if there was a prolonged seismic operation in the area, particularly in shallow waters (e.g., Pendoley 1997). Sea turtles might be excluded from the area for the duration of the seismic operation, or they might remain but exhibit abnormal behavioral patterns (e.g., lingering longer than normal at the surface where received sound levels are lower). Whether those that were displaced would return quickly after the seismic operation ended is unknown.

It is unclear whether exclusion from a particular nesting beach by seismic operations, if it occurred, would prevent or decrease reproductive success. It is believed that females migrate to the region of their birth and select a nesting beach (Miller 1997). However, the degree of site fidelity varies between species and also intra-seasonally by individuals. If a sea turtle is excluded from a particular beach, it may select a more distant, undisturbed nesting site in the general area (Miller 1997). For instance, Bjorndal et al. (1983) reported a maximal intra-seasonal distance between nesting sites of 290 km, indicating that turtles use multiple nesting sites spaced up to a few hundred kilometers apart. Also, it is uncertain whether a turtle that failed to go ashore because of seismic survey activity would abandon the area for that full breeding cycle, or would simply delay going ashore until the seismic vessel moved to a different area.

Shallow coastal waters can contain relatively high densities of sea turtles during nesting, hatching, and foraging periods. Thus, seismic operations in these areas could correspondingly impact a relatively higher number of individual turtles during sensitive biological periods. Samuel et al. (2005) noted that anthropogenic noise in vital sea turtle habitats, such as a major coastal foraging area off Long Island, NY, could affect sea turtle behaviour and ecology. There are no specific data that demonstrate the consequences to sea turtles if seismic operations with large or small arrays of airguns occur in important areas at biologically important times of year. However, a number of mitigation measures can, on a case-by-case basis, be considered for application in areas important to sea turtles (e.g., Pendoley 1997).

4. Possible Impacts of Airgun Sounds on Hearing

Noise-induced hearing damage can be either temporary or permanent. In general, the received sound must be strong for either to occur, and must be especially strong and/or prolonged for permanent impairment to occur.

Few studies have directly investigated hearing or noise-induced hearing loss in sea turtles. Moein et al. (1994) used an evoked potential method to test the hearing of loggerhead sea turtles exposed to a few hundred pulses from a single airgun. Turtle hearing was tested before, within 24 h after, and two weeks after exposure to pulses of airgun sound. Levels of airgun sound to which the turtles were exposed were not specifically reported. The authors concluded that five turtles exhibited some change in their hearing when tested within 24 h after exposure relative to pre-exposure hearing, and that hearing had reverted to normal when tested two weeks after exposure. The results are consistent with the occurrence of TTS upon exposure of the turtles to airgun pulses. Unfortunately, the report did not state the size of the airgun used, or the received sound levels at various distances. The distances of the turtles from the airgun were also variable during the tests; the turtle was about 30 m from the airgun at the start of each trial, but

it could then either approach the airgun or move away to a maximum of about 65 m during subsequent airgun pulses. Thus, the levels of airgun sounds that apparently elicited TTS are not known. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that there was evidence of TTS from exposure to pulses from a single airgun. However, the turtles were confined and unable to move more than about 65 m away. Similarly, Lenhardt (2002) exposed loggerhead turtles in a large net enclosure to airgun pulses. A TTS of >15 dB was evident for one loggerhead turtle, with recovery occurring in two weeks. Turtles in the open sea might have moved away from an airgun operating at a fixed location, and in the more typical case of a towed airgun or airgun array, very few shots would occur at or around one location. Thus, exposure to underwater sound during net-enclosure experiments was not typical of that expected during an operational seismic survey.

Studies with terrestrial reptiles have demonstrated that exposure to airborne impulse noise can cause hearing loss. For example, desert tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii*) exhibited TTS after exposure to repeated high-intensity sonic booms (Bowles et al. 1999). Recovery from these temporary hearing losses was usually rapid (<1 h), which suggested that tortoises can tolerate these exposures without permanent injury (Bowles et al. 1999).

The results from captive, restrained sea turtles exposed repeatedly to seismic sounds in enclosed areas indicate that TTS is possible under these artificial conditions. However, there are no data to indicate whether there are any plausible field situations in which exposure to repeated airgun pulses at close range could cause permanent threshold shift (PTS) or hearing impairment in sea turtles. Hearing impairment (whether temporary or permanent) from seismic sounds is considered unlikely to occur at sea; turtles are unlikely to be exposed to more than a few strong pulses close to the sound source, as individuals are mobile and the vessel travels relatively quickly compared to the swimming speed of a sea turtle. However, in the absence of specific information on received levels of impulse sound necessary to elicit TTS and PTS in sea turtles, it is uncertain whether there are circumstances where these effects could occur in the field. If sea turtles exhibit little or no behavioral avoidance, or if they acclimate to seismic noise to the extent that avoidance reactions cease, sea turtles might sustain hearing loss if they are close enough to seismic sources. Similarly, in the absence of quantitative data on behavioral responses, it is unclear whether turtles in the area of seismic operations prior to start-up move out of the area when standard ramp-up (=soft-start) procedures are in effect. It has been proposed that sea turtles require a longer ramp-up period because of their relatively slow swimming speeds (Eckert 2000). However, it is unclear at what distance (if any) from a seismic source sea turtles could sustain hearing impairment, and whether there would ever be a possibility of exposure to sufficiently high levels for a sufficiently long period to cause permanent hearing damage.

In theory, a reduction in hearing sensitivity, either temporary or permanent, may be harmful for sea turtles. However, very little is known about the role of sound perception in the sea turtle's normal activities. While it is not possible to estimate how much of a problem it would be for a turtle to have either temporary or permanent hearing impairment, there is some evidence indicating that hearing plays an important role in sea turtle survival. (1) It has been suggested (Eckert et al. 1998; Eckert 2000) that sea turtles may use passive reception of acoustic signals to detect the hunting sonar of killer whales (*Orcinus orca*), a known predator of leatherback sea turtles *Dermochelys coriacea* (Fertl and Fulling 2007). Further investigation is needed before this hypothesis can be accepted. Some communication calls of killer whales include components at frequencies low enough to overlap the frequency range where sea turtles hear. However, the echolocation signals of killer whales are at considerably higher frequencies and may be inaudible to sea turtles (e.g., Simon et al. 2007). (2) Hearing impairment, either temporary or permanent, might inhibit a turtle's ability to avoid injury from vessels. A recent study found that green sea turtles often responded behaviorally to close, oncoming small vessels and that the nature of the

response was related to vessel speed, with fewer turtles displaying a flee response as vessel speed increased (Hazel et al. 2007). However, Hazel et al. (2007) suggested that a turtles' ability to detect an approaching vessel was vision-dependent. (3) Hearing may play a role in navigation. For example, it has been proposed that sea turtles may identify their breeding beaches by their acoustic signature (Lenhardt et al. 1983). However, available evidence suggests that visual, wave, and magnetic cues are the main navigational cues used by sea turtles, at least in the case of hatchlings and juveniles (Lohmann et al. 1997, 2001; Lohmann and Lohmann 1998).

5. Other Physical Effects

Other potential direct physical effects to sea turtles during seismic operations include entanglement with seismic gear (e.g., cables, buoys, streamers, etc.) and ship strikes (Pendoley 1997; Ketos Ecology 2007; Weir 2007; Hazel et al. 2007). Entanglement of sea turtles with marine debris, fishing gear, and other equipment has been documented; turtles can become entangled in cables, lines, nets, or other objects suspended in the water column and can become injured or fatally wounded, drowned, or suffocated (e.g., Lutcavage et al. 1997). Seismic-survey personnel have reported that sea turtles (number unspecified) became fatally entrapped between gaps in tail-buoys associated with industrial seismic vessel gear deployed off West Africa in 2003 (Weir 2007). However, no incidents of entanglement of sea turtles have been documented during NSF-funded seismic surveys, which since 2003 have included dedicated ship-based monitoring by trained biological observers, in some cases in areas with many sea turtles (e.g., Holst et al. 2005a,b; Holst and Smultea 2008; Hauser et al. 2008).

6. Conclusions

Based on available data concerning sea turtles and other marine animals, it is likely that some sea turtles exhibit behavioral changes and/or avoidance within an area of unknown size near an operating seismic survey vessel. There is also the possibility of temporary hearing impairment or perhaps even permanent hearing damage to turtles close to the airguns. However, there are very few data on temporary hearing loss and no data on permanent hearing loss in sea turtles exposed to airgun pulses. Although some information is available about effects of exposure to sounds from a single airgun on captive sea turtles, the long term acoustic effects (if any) of a full-scale marine seismic operation on free-ranging sea turtles are unknown. Entanglement of turtles in seismic gear and vessel strikes during seismic survey operations are also possible but do not seem to be common. The greatest impact is likely to occur if seismic operations occur in or near areas where turtles concentrate, and at seasons when turtles are concentrated there. However, there are no specific data that demonstrate the consequences of such seismic operations to sea turtles. Until more data become available, it would be prudent to avoid seismic operations near important nesting beaches or in areas of known concentrated feeding during times of year when those areas are in use by many sea turtles.

7. Literature Cited

- Bartol, S.M. 2004. Sea turtle hearing and sensitivity to acoustic impact. Appendix H *In*: Geophysical and geophysical exploration for mineral resources on the Gulf of Mexico outer continental shelf. OCS EIS/EA MMS 2004-054. U.S. Minerals Manage. Serv. Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA.
- Bartol, S.M. 2008. A review of auditory function of sea turtles. **Bioacoustics** 17(1-3):57-59.
- Bartol, S.M. and D.R. Ketten. 2006. Turtle and tuna hearing. p. 98-103 *In*: Y. Swimmer and R. Brill (eds.), *Sea Turtle and Pelagic Fish Sensory Biology: Developing Techniques to Reduce Sea Turtle Bycatch in Longline Fisheries*. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-PIFSC-7.

- Bartol, S.M. and J. A. Musick. 2003. Sensory biology of sea turtles. p. 79-102 *In*: P.L. Lutz, J.A. Musick and J. Wyneken (eds.), *The Biology of Sea Turtles, Volume 2*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. 455 p.
- Bartol, S.M., J.A. Musick, and M.L. Lenhardt. 1999. Auditory evoked potentials of the loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*). **Copeia** 1999(3):836-840.
- Bjorndal K.A., A.B. Meylan, and B.J. Turner. 1983. Sea turtles nesting at Melbourne Beach, Florida, I. Size, growth and reproduction. **Biol. Conserv.** 26(1):65-77.
- Bowles, A.E., S. Eckert, L. Starke, E. Berg, L. Wolski, and J. Matesic, Jr. 1999. Effects of flight noise from jet aircraft and sonic booms on hearing, behavior, heart rate, and oxygen consumption of desert tortoises (*Gopherus agassizii*). U.S. Air Force Res. Lab., Wright-Patterson AFB, OH. 131 p.
- Dow, W.E., D.A. Mann, T.T. Jones, S.A. Eckert, and C.A. Harms. 2008. In-water and in-air hearing sensitivity of the green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). Abstract, Acoustic Communication by Animals, 2nd Intern. Conf., 12-15 August 2008, Corvallis, OR.
- Eckert, S.A. 2000. Letter to M. James, Nova Scotia Leatherback Turtle Working Group, re: possible impacts of seismic exploration off Nova Scotia on sea turtles. Hubbs-Sea World Res. Inst., San Diego, CA. 4 p.
- Eckert, S.A., A. Bowles, and E. Berg. 1998. The effect of seismic airgun surveys on leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) during the nesting season. Rep. from Hubbs-Sea World Res. Inst., San Diego, CA, for BHP Petroleum (Trinidad) Ltd. 67 p.
- Fertl, D. and G.L. Fulling. 2007. Interactions between marine mammals and sea turtles. **Mar. Turtle Newsl.** 115:4-8.
- Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M.P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. 2004. A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):16-34.
- Greene, C.R., Jr., with J.S. Hanna and R.W. Blaylock. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. p. 3-1 to 3-63 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), *Northstar marine mammal monitoring program, 1996: marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of a seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea*. LGL Rep. 2121-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Explor. (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 245 p.
- Greene, C.R., Jr. and W.C. Burgess, with R. Norman and R.W. Blaylock. 2000. Physical acoustics measurements, 1999. p. 3-1 to 3-45 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), *Marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of Western Geophysical's open-water seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea, 1999*. LGL Rep. TA2313-4. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for Western Geophysical, Houston, TX, and U.S. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 155 p.
- Hauser, D.D.W., M Holst, and V.M. Moulton. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, April – August 2008. LGL Rep. TA4656/7-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., St. John's, Nfld, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 98 p.
- Hazel, J., I.R. Lawler, H. Marsh, and S. Robson. 2007. Vessel speed increases collision risk for the green turtle *Chelonia mydas*. **Endang. Species Res.** 3:105-113.
- Herata, H. (ed.). 2007. International workshop, Impacts of Seismic Survey Activities on Whales and Other Marine Biota. Dessau, Germany, Sept. 2006.

- Holst, M. and M.A. Smultea. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off Central America, February – April 2008. LGL Rep. TA4342-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 133 p.
- Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005a. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean off Central America, November–December 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-30. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD.
- Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005b. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off the Northern Yucatán Peninsula in the Southern Gulf of Mexico, January–February 2005. LGL Rep. TA2822-31. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and NMFS, Silver Spring, MD. 110 p.
- Holst, M., W.J. Richardson, W.R. Koski, M.A. Smultea, B. Haley, M.W. Fitzgerald, and M. Rawson. 2006. Effects of large and small-source seismic surveys on marine mammals and sea turtles. Abstract. Presented at Am. Geophys. Union - Soc. Explor. Geophys. Joint Assembly on Environ. Impacts from Marine Geophys. & Geological Studies - Recent Advances from Academic & Industry Res. Progr., Baltimore, MD, May 2006.
- Ketos Ecology. 2007. Reducing the fatal entrapment of marine turtles in towed seismic survey equipment. Ketos Ecology report. Available at www.ketosecology.co.uk/KE2007.pdf. 11 p.
- Ketten, D.R. and S.M. Bartol. 2006. Functional measures of sea turtle hearing, ONR Award No: N00014-02-1-0510. Rep. from Woods Hole Oceanogr. Inst., Woods Hole, MA, and Virginia Inst. Mar. Sci., Gloucester, VA, for Office of Naval Res., Arlington, VA. 5 p.
- Ketten, D.R., I. Fischer, S. Cramer, S.M. Bartol, and J. O'Malley. 2006. Water, fats, and acoustic impedance: soft tissue adaptations for underwater hearing in turtles, seabirds and marine mammals. p. 162 *In*: N.J. Pilcher (ed.), Proc. 23rd Symp. on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-536. 283 p.
- Lenhardt, M.L. 1982. Bone conduction hearing in turtles. **J. Aud. Res.** 22(3):153-160.
- Lenhardt, M.L. 1994. Seismic and very low frequency sound induced behaviors in captive loggerhead marine turtles (*Caretta caretta*). p. 238-241 *In*: K.A. Bjorndal, A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson and P.J. Eliazar (eds.), Proc. 14th Symp. on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-351. 323 p.
- Lenhardt, M. 2002. Sea turtle auditory behavior. **J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.** 112(5, Pt. 2):2314 (Abstract).
- Lenhardt, M.L. and S.W. Harkins. 1983. Turtle shell as an auditory receptor. **J. Aud. Res.** 23(4):251-260.
- Lenhardt, M.L., S. Bellmund, R.A. Byles, S.W. Harkins, and J.A. Musick. 1983. Marine turtle reception of bone-conducted sound. **J. Aud. Res.** 23(2):119-125.
- Lenhardt, M.L., R.C. Klinger, and J.A. Musick. 1985. Marine turtle middle-ear anatomy. **J. Aud. Res.** 25(1):66-72.
- Lohmann, K.J. and C.M.F. Lohmann. 1998. Migratory guidance mechanisms in marine turtles. **J. Avian Biol.** 29(4):585-596.
- Lohmann, K.J., B.E. Witherington, C.M.F. Lohmann, and M. Salmon. 1997. Orientation, navigation, and natal beach homing in sea turtles. p. 107-135 *In*: P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick (eds.), The biology of sea turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. 432 p.
- Lohmann, K.J., S.D. Cain, S.A. Dodge, and C.M.F. Lohmann. 2001. Regional magnetic fields as navigational markers for sea turtles. **Science** 294(5541):364-366.

- Lutcavage, M.E., P. Plotkin, B. Witherington, and P.L. Lutz. 1997. Human impacts on sea turtle survival. p. 387-409 *In*: P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick (eds.), The biology of sea turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. 432 p.
- McCauley, R.D. 1994. The environmental implications of offshore oil and gas development in Australia – seismic surveys. p. 19-122 *In*: M. Swan, J.M. Neff and P.C. Young (eds.), Environmental Implications of Offshore Oil and Gas Development in Australia - The Findings of an Independent Scientific Review. Australian Petroleum Explor. Assoc. and Energy Research and Developm. Corp., Sydney, N.S.W.
- McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. **APPEA J.** 38:692-707.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. **APPEA J.** 40:692-708.
- McCauley, R. D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys: Analysis and propagation of air-gun signals; and effects of air-gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Curtin Univ. Technol., Centre for Mar. Sci. and Technol., Bentley, Australia.
- Miller, J.D. 1997. Reproduction in sea turtles. p. 51-81 *In*: P.L. Lutz and J.A. Musick (eds.), The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL. 432 p.
- Moein, S.E., J.A. Musick, J.A. Keinath, D.E. Barnard, M. Lenhardt, and R. George. 1994. Evaluation of seismic sources for repelling sea turtles from hopper dredges. Rep. from Virginia Inst. Mar. Sci. [Gloucester Point], VA, for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 33 p.
- National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2007. Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation, Biological Opinion: Issuance of License to Neptune LNG by MARAD to Construct, Own, and Operate an LNG Deepwater Port, FINE W2006104000. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Region, Gloucester, MA.
- Nowacek, D.P., L.H. Thorne, D.W. Johnston, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. **Mammal Rev.** 37(2):81-115.
- O'Hara, J. and J.R. Wilcox. 1990. Avoidance responses of loggerhead turtles, *Caretta caretta*, to low frequency sound. **Copeia** 1990(2):564-567.
- ONR (Office of Naval Research). N.D. Science and Technology Focus, Oceanography, Ocean Life: Green sea turtle – Current research. <http://www.onr.navy.mil/focus/ocean/life/turtle4.htm>. Last update not indicated. Accessed 3 March 2009.
- Parente, C.L., J.D. Lontra, and M.E. de Araújo. 2006. Occurrence of sea turtles during seismic surveys in Northeastern Brazil. **Biota Neotropica** 6(1). Available at <http://www.biotaneotropica.org.br/>
- Payne, J.F., C. Andrews, L. Fancey, D. White, and J. Christian. 2008. Potential effects of seismic energy on fish and shellfish: An update since 2003. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2008/060. Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada. www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/CSAS/Csas/Publications/ResDocs-DocRech/2008/2008_060_e.htm. Lasted updated 26 November 2008. Accessed 3 March 2009.
- Pendoley, K. 1997. Sea turtles and management of marine seismic programs in Western Australia. **Petrol. Expl. Soc. Austral. J.** 25:8-16.

- Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 576 p.
- Ridgway, S.H., E.G. Wever, J.G. McCormick, J. Palin, and J.H. Anderson. 1969. Hearing in the giant sea turtle, *Chelonia mydas*. **Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.** 64(2):884-890.
- Samuel, Y., S.J. Morreale, C.W. Clark, C.H. Greene, and M.E. Richmond. 2005. Underwater, low-frequency noise in a coastal sea turtle habitat. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 117(3):1465-1472.
- Samuel, Y., S.J. Morreale, C.W. Clark, M.E. Richmond, and C.H. Greene. 2006. Underwater noise and anthropogenic disturbance in critical sea turtle habitats. p. 93 *In*: N.J. Pilcher (ed.), Proc. 23rd Symp. on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-536. 283 p.
- Simon, M., M. Wahlberg, and L.E. Miller. 2007. Echolocation clicks from killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) feeding on herring (*Clupea harengus*) (L). **J. Acoust. Soc. Amer.** 121(2):749-752.
- Southall, B.L., A.E. Bowles, W.T. Ellison, J.J. Finneran, R.L. Gentry, C.R. Greene Jr., D. Kastak, D.R. Ketten, J.H. Miller, P.E. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, J.A. Thomas, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. **Aquat. Mamm.** 33(4):411-522.
- Southwood, A., K. Fritsches, R. Brill, and Y. Swimmer. 2008. Sound, chemical, and light detection in sea turtles and pelagic fishes: sensory-based approaches to bycatch reduction in longling fisheries. **Endang. Species Res.** 5:225-238.
- Streeter, K. 2003. Studying the hearing capabilities of a green sea turtle. Abstract. Presented at Environmental Consequences of Underwater Sound (ECOUS) Symposium. San Antonio, TX, May 2003.
- Thomson, D.H., J.W. Lawson, and A. Muecke. 2001. Proceedings of a workshop to develop methodologies for conducting research on the effects of seismic exploration on the Canadian east coast fishery, Halifax, Nova Scotia, 7-8 September 2000. ESRF Rep. 139. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds, Calgary, AB. 75 p.
- Weir, C.R. 2007. Observations of marine turtles in relation to seismic airgun sound off Angola. **Mar. Turtle Newsl.** 116:17-20.
- Wolski, L.F., R.C. Anderson, A.E. Bowles, and P.K. Yochem. 2003. Measuring hearing in the harbor seal (*Phoca vitulina*): Comparison of behavioral and auditory brainstem response techniques. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 113(1):629-637.

APPENDIX C:

REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON FISHES¹³

Here we review literature about the effects of airgun sounds on fishes during seismic surveys. The potential effect of seismic sounds on fish has been studied with a variety of taxa, including marine, freshwater, and anadromous species (reviewed by Fay and Popper 2000; Ladich and Popper 2004; Hastings and Popper 2005; Popper and Hastings 2009a,b).

It is sometimes difficult to interpret studies on the effects of underwater sound on marine animals because authors often do not provide enough information, including received sound levels, source sound levels, and specific characteristics of the sound. Specific characteristics of the sound include units and references, whether the sound is continuous or impulsive, and its frequency range. Underwater sound pressure levels are typically reported as a number of decibels referenced to a reference level, usually 1 micro-Pascal (μPa). However, the sound pressure dB number can represent multiple types of measurements, including “zero to peak”, “peak to peak”, or averaged (“rms”). Sound exposure levels (SEL) may also be reported as dB. The SEL is the integration of all the acoustic energy contained within a single sound event. Unless precise measurement types are reported, it can be impossible to directly compare results from two or more independent studies.

1. Acoustic Capabilities

Sensory systems – like those that allow for hearing – provide information about an animal’s physical, biological, and social environments, in both air and water. Extensive work has been done to understand the structures, mechanisms, and functions of animal sensory systems in aquatic environments (Atema et al. 1988; Kapoor and Hara 2001; Collin and Marshall 2003). All fish species have hearing and skin-based mechanosensory systems (inner ear and lateral line systems, respectively) that provide information about their surroundings (Fay and Popper 2000). Fay (2009) and some others refer to the ambient sounds to which fishes are exposed as ‘underwater soundscapes’. Anthropogenic sounds can have important negative consequences for fish survival and reproduction if they disrupt an individual’s ability to sense its soundscape, which often tells of predation risk, prey items, or mating opportunities. Potential negative effects include masking of key environmental sounds or social signals, displacement of fish from their habitat, or interference with sensory orientation and navigation.

Fish hearing via the inner ear is typically restricted to low frequencies. As with other vertebrates, fish hearing involves a mechanism whereby the beds of hair cells (Howard et al. 1988; Hudspeth and Markin 1994) located in the inner ear are mechanically affected and cause a neural discharge (Popper and Fay 1999). At least two major pathways for sound transmittance between sound source and the inner ear have been identified for fishes. The most primitive pathway involves direct transmission to the inner ear’s otolith, a calcium carbonate mass enveloped by sensory hairs. The inertial difference between the dense otolith and the less-dense inner ear causes the otolith to stimulate the surrounding sensory hair cells. This motion differential is interpreted by the central nervous system as sound.

The second transmission pathway between sound source and the inner ear of fishes is via the swim bladder, a gas-filled structure that is much less dense than the rest of the fish’s body. The swim bladder, being more compressible and expandable than either water or fish tissue, will differentially contract and expand relative to the rest of the fish in a sound field. The pulsating swim bladder transmits this

¹³ By **John R. Christian and R.C. Bocking**, LGL Ltd., environmental research associates (rev. Feb. 2010)

mechanical disturbance directly to the inner ear (discussed below). Such a secondary source of sound detection may be more or less effective at stimulating the inner ear depending on the amplitude and frequency of the pulsation, and the distance and mechanical coupling between the swim bladder and the inner ear (Popper and Fay 1993).

A recent paper by Popper and Fay (2010) discusses the designation of fishes based on sound detection capabilities. They suggest that the designations ‘hearing specialist’ and ‘hearing generalist’ no longer be used for fishes because of their vague and sometimes contradictory definitions, and that there is instead a range of hearing capabilities across species that is more like a continuum, presumably based on the relative contributions of pressure to the overall hearing capabilities of a species.

According to Popper and Fay (2010), one end of this continuum is represented by fishes that only detect particle motion because they lack pressure-sensitive gas bubbles (e.g., swim bladder). These species include elasmobranchs (e.g., sharks) and jawless fishes, and some teleosts including flatfishes. Fishes at this end of the continuum are typically capable of detecting sound frequencies below 1500 Hz.

The other end of the fish hearing continuum is represented by fishes with highly specialized otophysic connections between pressure receptive organs, such as the swim bladder, and the inner ear. These fishes include some squirrelfish, mormyrids, herrings, and otophysan fishes (freshwater fishes with Weberian apparatus, an articulated series of small bones that extend from the swim bladder to the inner ear). Rather than being limited to 1.5 kHz or less in hearing, these fishes can typically hear up to several kHz. One group of fish in the anadromous herring sub-family Alosinae (shads and menhaden) can detect sounds to well over 180 kHz (Mann et al. 1997, 1998, 2001). This may be the widest hearing range of any vertebrate that has been studied to date. While the specific reason for this very high frequency hearing is not totally clear, there is strong evidence that this capability evolved for the detection of the ultrasonic sounds produced by echolocating dolphins to enable the fish to detect, and avoid, predation (Mann et al. 1997; Plachta and Popper 2003).

All other fishes have hearing capabilities that fall somewhere between these two extremes of the continuum. Some have unconnected swim bladders located relatively far from the inner ear (e.g., salmonids, tuna) while others have unconnected swim bladders located relatively close to the inner ear (e.g., Atlantic cod, *Gadus morhua*). There has also been the suggestion that Atlantic cod can detect 38 kHz (Astrup and Møhl 1993). However, the general consensus was that this was not hearing with the ear; probably the fish were responding to exceedingly high pressure signals from the 38-kHz source through some other receptor in the skin, such as touch receptors (Astrup and Møhl 1998).

It is important to recognize that the swim bladder itself is not a sensory end organ, but rather an intermediate part of the sound pathway between sound source and the inner ear of some fishes. The inner ear of fishes is ultimately the organ that translates the particle displacement component into neural signals for the brain to interpret as sound.

A third mechanosensory pathway found in most bony fishes and elasmobranchs (i.e., cartilaginous fishes) involves the lateral line system. It too relies on sensitivity to water particle motion. The basic sensory unit of the lateral line system is the neuromast, a bundle of sensory and supporting cells whose projecting cilia, similar to those in the ears, are encased in a gelatinous cap. Neuromasts detect distorted sound waves in the immediate vicinity of fishes. Generally, fishes use the lateral line system to detect the particle displacement component of low frequency acoustic signals (up to 160 to 200 Hz) over a distance of one to two body lengths. The lateral line is used in conjunction with other sensory systems, including hearing (Sand 1981; Coombs and Montgomery 1999).

2. Potential Effects on Fishes

Review papers on the effects of anthropogenic sources of underwater sound on fishes have been published recently (Popper 2009; Popper and Hastings 2009a,b). These papers consider various sources of anthropogenic sound, including seismic airguns. For the purposes of this review, only the effects of seismic airgun sound are considered.

2.1 Marine Fishes

Evidence for airgun-induced damage to fish ears has come from studies using pink snapper *Pagrus auratus* (McCauley et al. 2000a,b, 2003). In these experiments, fish were caged and exposed to the sound of a single moving seismic airgun every 10 s over a period of 1 h and 41 min. The source SPL at 1 m was about 223 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{\text{p-p}}$, and the received SPLs ranged from 165 to 209 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{p-p}}$. The sound energy was highest over the 20–70 Hz frequency range. The pink snapper were exposed to more than 600 airgun discharges during the study. In some individual fish, the sensory epithelium of the inner ear sustained extensive damage as indicated by ablated hair cells. Damage was more extensive in fish examined 58 days post-exposure compared to those examined 18 h post-exposure. There was no evidence of repair or replacement of damaged sensory cells up to 58 days post-exposure. McCauley et al. (2000a,b, 2003) included the following caveats in the study reports: (1) fish were caged and unable to swim away from the seismic source, (2) only one species of fish was examined, (3) the impact on the ultimate survival of the fish is unclear, and (4) airgun exposure specifics required to cause the observed damage were not obtained (i.e., a few high SPL signals or the cumulative effect of many low to moderate SPL signals).

The fish exposed to sound from a single airgun in this study also exhibited startle responses to short range start up and high-level airgun signals (i.e., with received SPLs of 182 to 195 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ (McCauley et al. 2000a,b). Smaller fish were more likely to display a startle response. Responses were observed above received SPLs of 156 to 161 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. The occurrence of both startle response (classic C-turn response) and alarm responses (e.g., darting movements, flash school expansion, fast swimming) decreased over time. Other observations included downward distributional shift that was restricted by the 10 m x 6 m x 3 m cages, increase in swimming speed, and the formation of denser aggregations. Fish behavior appeared to return to pre-exposure state 15–30 min after cessation of seismic firing.

Pearson et al. (1992) investigated the effects of seismic airgun sound on the behavior of captive rockfishes (*Sebastes* sp.) exposed to the sound of a single stationary airgun at a variety of distances. The airgun used in the study had a source SPL at 1 m of 223 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-\text{p}}$, and measured received SPLs ranged from 137 to 206 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{0-\text{p}}$. The authors reported that rockfishes reacted to the airgun sounds by exhibiting varying degrees of startle and alarm responses, depending on the species of rockfish and the received SPL. Startle responses were observed at a minimum received SPL of 200 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{0-\text{p}}$, and alarm responses occurred at a minimum received SPL of 177 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{0-\text{p}}$. Other observed behavioral changes included the tightening of schools, downward distributional shift, and random movement and orientation. Some fishes ascended in the water column and commenced to mill (i.e., “eddy”) at increased speed, while others descended to the bottom of the enclosure and remained motionless. Pre-exposure behavior was reestablished from 20 to 60 min after cessation of seismic airgun discharge. Pearson et al. (1992) concluded that received SPL thresholds for overt rockfish behavioral response and more subtle rockfish behavioral response are 180 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{0-\text{p}}$ and 161 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{0-\text{p}}$, respectively.

Using an experimental hook and line fishery approach, Skalski et al. (1992) studied the potential effects of seismic airgun sound on the distribution and catchability of rockfishes. The source SPL of the

single airgun used in the study was 223 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$, and the received SPLs at the bases of the rockfish aggregations ranged from 186 to 191 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . Characteristics of the fish aggregations were assessed using echosounders. During long-term stationary seismic airgun discharge, there was an overall downward shift in fish distribution. The authors also observed a significant decline in total catch of rockfishes during seismic discharge. It should be noted that this experimental approach was quite different from an actual seismic survey, in that duration of exposure was much longer.

In another study, caged European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) were exposed to multiple discharges from a moving seismic airgun array with a source SPL of about 256 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$ (unspecified measure type) (Santulli et al. 1999). The airguns were discharged every 25 s during a 2-h period. The minimum distance between fish and seismic source was 180 m. The authors did not indicate any observed pathological injury to the sea bass. Blood was collected from both exposed fish (6 h post-exposure) and control fish (6 h pre-exposure) and subsequently analyzed for cortisol, glucose, and lactate levels. Levels of cortisol, glucose, and lactate were significantly higher in the sera of exposed fish compared to sera of control fish. The elevated levels of all three chemicals returned to pre-exposure levels within 72 h of exposure (Santulli et al. 1999).

Santulli et al. (1999) also used underwater video cameras to monitor fish response to seismic airgun discharge. Resultant video indicated slight startle responses by some of the sea bass when the seismic airgun array discharged as far as 2.5 km from the cage. The proportion of sea bass that exhibited startle response increased as the airgun sound source approached the cage. Once the seismic array was within 180 m of the cage, the sea bass were densely packed at the middle of the enclosure, exhibiting random orientation, and appearing more active than they had been under pre-exposure conditions. Normal behavior resumed about 2 h after airgun discharge nearest the fish (Santulli et al. 1999).

Boeger et al. (2006) reported observations of coral reef fishes in field enclosures before, during and after exposure to seismic airgun sound. This Brazilian study used an array of eight airguns that was presented to the fishes as both a mobile sound source and a static sound source. Minimum distances between the sound source and the fish cage ranged from 0 to 7 m. Received sound levels were not reported by Boeger et al. (2006). Neither mortality nor external damage to the fishes was observed in any of the experimental scenarios. Most of the airgun array discharges resulted in startle responses although these behavioral changes lessened with repeated exposures, suggesting habituation.

Chapman and Hawkins (1969) investigated the reactions of free ranging whiting (silver hake), *Merluccius bilinearis*, to an intermittently discharging stationary airgun with a source SPL of 220 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$. Received SPLs were estimated to be 178 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . The whiting were monitored with an echosounder. Prior to any airgun discharge, the fish were located at a depth range of 25 to 55 m. In apparent response to the airgun sound, the fish descended, forming a compact layer at depths greater than 55 m. After an hour of exposure to the airgun sound, the fish appeared to have habituated as indicated by their return to the pre-exposure depth range, despite the continuing airgun discharge. Airgun discharge ceased for a time and upon its resumption, the fish again descended to greater depths, indicating only temporary habituation.

Hassel et al. (2003, 2004) studied the potential effects of exposure to airgun sound on the behavior of captive lesser sandeel, *Ammodytes marinus*. Depth of the study enclosure used to hold the sandeel was about 55 m. The moving airgun array had an estimated source SPL of 256 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$ (unspecified measure type). Received SPLs were not measured. Exposures were conducted over a 3-day period in a 10 km \times 10 km area with the cage at its center. The distance between airgun array and fish cage ranged from 55 m when the array was overhead to 7.5 km. No mortality attributable to exposure to the airgun sound was noted. Behavior of the fish was monitored using underwater video cameras, echosounders,

and commercial fishery data collected close to the study area. The approach of the seismic vessel appeared to cause an increase in tail-beat frequency although the sandeels still appeared to swim calmly. During seismic airgun discharge, many fish exhibited startle responses, followed by flight from the immediate area. The frequency of occurrence of startle response seemed to increase as the operating seismic array moved closer to the fish. The sandeels stopped exhibiting the startle response once the airgun discharge ceased. The sandeel tended to remain higher in the water column during the airgun discharge, and none of them were observed burying themselves in the soft substrate. The commercial fishery catch data were inconclusive with respect to behavioral effects.

Various species of demersal fishes, blue whiting, and some small pelagic fishes were exposed to a moving seismic airgun array with a source SPL of about 250 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$ (unspecified measure type) (Dalen and Knutsen 1986). Received SPLs estimated using the assumption of spherical spreading ranged from 200 to 210 dB re 1 μPa (unspecified measure type). Seismic sound exposures were conducted every 10 s during a one week period. The authors used echosounders and sonars to assess the pre- and post-exposure fish distributions. The acoustic mapping results indicated a significant decrease in abundance of demersal fish (36%) after airgun discharge but comparative trawl catches did not support this. Non-significant reductions in the abundances of blue whiting and small pelagic fish were also indicated by post-exposure acoustic mapping.

La Bella et al. (1996) studied the effects of exposure to seismic airgun sound on fish distribution using echosounder monitoring and changes in catch rate of hake by trawl, and clupeoids by gill netting. The seismic array used was composed of 16 airguns and had a source SPL of 256 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$. The shot interval was 25 s, and exposure durations ranged from 4.6 to 12 h. Horizontal distributions did not appear to change as a result of exposure to seismic discharge, but there was some indication of a downward shift in the vertical distribution. The catch rates during experimental fishing did not differ significantly between pre- and post-seismic fishing periods.

Wardle et al. (2001) used video and telemetry to make behavioral observations of marine fishes (primarily juvenile saithe, adult pollock, juvenile cod, and adult mackerel) inhabiting an inshore reef off Scotland before, during, and after exposure to discharges of a stationary airgun. The received SPLs ranged from about 195 to 218 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . Pollock did not move away from the reef in response to the seismic airgun sound, and their diurnal rhythm did not appear to be affected. However, there was an indication of a slight effect on the long-term day-to-night movements of the pollock. Video camera observations indicated that fish exhibited startle responses (“C-starts”) to all received levels. There were also indications of behavioral responses to visual stimuli. If the seismic source was visible to the fish, they fled from it. However, if the source was not visible to the fish, they often continued to move toward it.

The potential effects of exposure to seismic sound on fish abundance and distribution were also investigated by Slotte et al. (2004). Twelve days of seismic survey operations spread over a period of 1 month used a seismic airgun array with a source SPL of 222.6 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{p-p}$. The SPLs received by the fish were not measured. Acoustic surveys of the local distributions of various kinds of pelagic fish, including herring, blue whiting, and mesopelagic species, were conducted during the seismic surveys. There was no strong evidence of short-term horizontal distributional effects. With respect to vertical distribution, blue whiting and mesopelagics were distributed deeper (20 to 50 m) during the seismic survey compared to pre-exposure. The average densities of fish aggregations were lower within the seismic survey area, and fish abundances appeared to increase in accordance with increasing distance from the seismic survey area.

Fertilized capelin (*Mallotus villosus*) eggs and monkfish (*Lophius americanus*) larvae were exposed to seismic airgun sound and subsequently examined and monitored for possible effects of the exposure (Payne et al. 2009). The laboratory exposure studies involved a single airgun. Approximate received SPLs measured in the capelin egg and monkfish larvae exposures were 199 to 205 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p} and 205 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p} , respectively. The capelin eggs were exposed to either 10 or 20 airgun discharges, and the monkfish larvae were exposed to either 10 or 30 discharges. No statistical differences in mortality/morbidity between control and exposed subjects were found at 1 to 4 days post-exposure in any of the exposure trials for either the capelin eggs or the monkfish larvae.

In uncontrolled experiments, Kostyvchenko (1973) exposed the eggs of numerous fish species (anchovy, red mullet, crucian carp, blue runner) to various sound sources, including seismic airguns. With the seismic airgun discharge as close as 0.5 m from the eggs, over 75% of them survived the exposure. Egg survival rate increased to over 90% when placed 10 m from the airgun sound source. The range of received SPLs was about 215 to 233 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} .

Eggs, yolk sac larvae, post-yolk sac larvae, post-larvae, and fry of various commercially important fish species (cod, saithe, herring, turbot, and plaice) were exposed to received SPLs ranging from 220 to 242 dB re 1 μPa (unspecified measure type) (Booman et al. 1996). These received levels corresponded to exposure distances ranging from 0.75 to 6 m. The authors reported some cases of injury and mortality but most of these occurred as a result of exposures at very close range (i.e., <15 m). The rigor of anatomical and pathological assessments was questionable.

Saetre and Ona (1996) applied a “worst-case scenario” mathematical model to investigate the effects of seismic sound on fish eggs and larvae. They concluded that mortality rates caused by exposure to seismic airgun sound are so low compared to the natural mortality that the impact of seismic surveying on recruitment to a fish stock must be regarded as insignificant.

2.2 Freshwater Fishes

Popper et al. (2005) tested the hearing sensitivity of three Mackenzie River fish species after exposure to five discharges from a seismic airgun. The mean received peak SPL was 205 to 209 dB re 1 μPa per discharge, and the approximate mean received SEL was 176 to 180 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ per discharge. While the broad whitefish showed no Temporary Threshold Shift (TTS) as a result of the exposure, adult northern pike and lake chub exhibited TTSs of 10 to 15 dB, followed by complete recovery within 24 h of exposure. The same animals were also examined to determine whether there were observable effects on the sensory cells of the inner ear as a result of exposure to seismic sound (Song et al. 2008). No damage to the ears of the fishes was found, including those that exhibited TTS.

In another part of the same Mackenzie River project, Jorgenson and Gyselman (2009) investigated the behavioral responses of arctic riverine fishes to seismic airgun sound. They used hydroacoustic survey techniques to determine whether fish behavior upon exposure to airgun sound can either mitigate or enhance the potential impact of the sound. The study indicated that fish behavioral characteristics were generally unchanged by the exposure to airgun sound. The tracked fish did not exhibit herding behavior in front of the mobile airgun array and, therefore, were not exposed to sustained high sound levels.

2.3 Anadromous Fishes

In uncontrolled experiments using a very small sample of different groups of young salmonids, including Arctic cisco, fish were caged and exposed to various types of sound. One sound type was either a single firing or a series of four firings 10 to 15 s apart of a 300-in³ seismic airgun at 2000 to 2200 psi (Falk and Lawrence 1973). Swim bladder damage was reported but no mortality was observed when fish

were exposed within 1 to 2 m of an airgun source with source level, as estimated by Turnpenny and Nedwell (1994), of ~230 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$ (unspecified measure).

Thomsen (2002) exposed rainbow trout and Atlantic salmon held in aquaculture enclosures to the sounds from a small airgun array. Received SPLs were 142 to 186 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{p-p}}$. The fish were exposed to 124 pulses over a 3-day period. In addition to monitoring fish behavior with underwater video cameras, the authors also analyzed cod and haddock catch data from a longline fishing vessel operating in the immediate area. Only eight of the 124 shots appeared to evoke behavioral reactions by the salmonids, but overall impacts were minimal. No fish mortality was observed during or immediately after exposure. The author reported no significant effects on cod and haddock catch rates, and the behavioral effects were hard to differentiate from normal behavior.

Weinhold and Weaver (1972, cited in Turnpenny et al. 1994) exposed caged coho salmon smolts to impulses from 330 and 660-in³ airguns at distances ranging from 1 to 10 m, resulting in received levels estimated at ~214 to 216 dB (units not given). No lethal effects were observed.

It should be noted that, in a recent and comprehensive review, Hastings and Popper (2005) take issue with many of the authors cited above for problems with experimental design and execution, measurements, and interpretation. Hastings and Popper (2005) deal primarily with possible effects of pile-driving sounds (which, like airgun sounds, are impulsive and repetitive). However, that review provides an excellent and critical review of the impacts to fish from other underwater anthropogenic sounds.

3. Indirect Effects on Fisheries

The most comprehensive experimentation on the effects of seismic airgun sound on catchability of fishes was conducted in the Barents Sea by Engås et al. (1993, 1996). They investigated the effects of seismic airgun sound on distributions, abundances, and catch rates of cod and haddock using acoustic mapping and experimental fishing with trawls and longlines. The maximum source SPL was about 248 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$ based on back-calculations from measurements collected via a hydrophone at depth 80 m. No measurements of the received SPLs were made. Davis et al. (1998) estimated the received SPL at the sea bottom immediately below the array and at 18 km from the array to be 205 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} and 178 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} , respectively. Engås et al. (1993, 1996) concluded that there were indications of distributional change during and immediately following the seismic airgun discharge (45 to 64% decrease in acoustic density according to sonar data). The lowest densities were observed within 9.3 km of the seismic discharge area. The authors indicated that trawl catches of both cod and haddock declined after the seismic operations. While longline catches of haddock also showed decline after seismic airgun discharge, those for cod increased.

Løkkeborg (1991), Løkkeborg and Soldal (1993), and Dalen and Knutsen (1986) also examined the effects of seismic airgun sound on demersal fish catches. Løkkeborg (1991) examined the effects on cod catches. The source SPL of the airgun array used in his study was 239 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}$ (unspecified measure type), but received SPLs were not measured. Approximately 43 h of seismic airgun discharge occurred during an 11-day period, with a five-second interval between pulses. Catch rate decreases ranging from 55 to 80% within the seismic survey area were observed. This apparent effect persisted for at least 24 h within about 10 km of the survey area.

Turnpenny et al. (1994) examined results of these studies as well as the results of other studies on rockfish. They used rough estimations of received SPLs at catch locations and concluded that catchability is reduced when received SPLs exceed 160 to 180 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . They also concluded that reaction thresholds of fishes lacking a swim bladder (e.g., flatfish) would likely be about 20 dB higher. Given the

considerable variability in sound transmission loss between different geographic locations, the SPLs that were assumed in these studies were likely quite inaccurate.

Turnpenny and Nedwell (1994) also reported on the effects of seismic airgun discharge on inshore bass fisheries in shallow U.K. waters (5 to 30 m deep). The airgun array used had a source level of 250 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$. Received levels in the fishing areas were estimated to be 163–191 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . Using fish tagging and catch record methodologies, they concluded that there was not any distinguishable migration from the ensonified area, nor was there any reduction in bass catches on days when seismic airguns were discharged. The authors concluded that effects on fisheries would be smaller in shallow nearshore waters than in deep water because attenuation of sound is more rapid in shallow water.

Skalski et al. (1992) used a 100-in³ airgun with a source level of 223 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$ to examine the potential effects of airgun sound on the catchability of rockfishes. The moving airgun was discharged along transects in the study fishing area, after which a fishing vessel deployed a set line, ran three echosounder transects, and then deployed two more set lines. Each fishing experiment lasted 1 h 25 min. Received SPLs at the base of the rockfish aggregations ranged from 186 to 191 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . The catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) for rockfish declined on average by 52.4% when the airguns were operating. Skalski et al. (1992) believed that the reduction in catch resulted from a change in behavior of the fishes. The fish schools descended towards the bottom and their swimming behavior changed during airgun discharge. Although fish dispersal was not observed, the authors hypothesized that it could have occurred at a different location with a different bottom type. Skalski et al. (1992) did not continue fishing after cessation of airgun discharge. They speculated that CPUE would quickly return to normal in the experimental area, because fish behavior appeared to normalize within minutes of cessation of airgun discharge. However, in an area where exposure to airgun sound might have caused the fish to disperse, the authors suggested that a lower CPUE might persist for a longer period.

European sea bass were exposed to sound from seismic airgun arrays with a source SPL of 262 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{0-p}$ (Pickett et al. 1994). The seismic survey was conducted over a period of 4 to 5 months. The study was intended to investigate the effects of seismic airgun discharge on inshore bass fisheries. Information was collected through a tag and release program, and from the logbooks of commercial fishermen. Most of the 152 recovered fish from the tagging program were caught within 10 km of the release site, and it was suggested that most of these bass did not leave the area for a prolonged period. With respect to the commercial fishery, no significant changes in catch rate were observed (Pickett et al. 1994).

4. Literature Cited

- Atema, J., R.R. Fay, A.N. Popper, and W.N. Tavolga. 1988. The sensory biology of aquatic animals. Springer-Boeger, W.A., M.R. Pie, A. Ostrensky, and M.F. Cardoso. 2006. The effect of exposure to seismic prospecting on coral reef fishes. **Braz. J. Oceanog.** 54(4):235-239.
- Booman, C., J. Dalen, H. Leivestad, A. Levsen, T. van der Meeren, and K. Toklum. 1996. Effeter av luftkanon-skyting på egg, larver og yngel. **Fisken Og Havet** 1996(3):1-83 (Norwegian with English summary).
- Chapman, C.J. and A.D. Hawkins. 1969. The importance of sound in fish behaviour in relation to capture by trawls. **FAO Fish. Rep.** 62:717-729.
- Collin, S.P. and N.J. Marshall (eds.). 2003. Sensory processing in aquatic environments. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY. 446 p.
- Coombs, S. and J.C. Montgomery. 1999. The enigmatic lateral line system. p. 319-362 *In*: R.R. Fay and A.N. Popper (eds.), Comparative hearing: fish and amphibians. Springer Handbook of Auditory Research 11. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY. 438 p.

- Dalen, J. and G.M. Knutsen. 1986. Scaring effects in fish and harmful effects on eggs, larvae and fry by offshore seismic explorations. Symposium on Underwater Acoustics, Halifax.
- Davis, R.A., D. Thomson, and C.I. Malme. 1998. Environmental assessment of seismic exploration of the Scotian Shelf. Rep. by LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Charles I. Malme, Engineering and Scientific Services, Hingham, MA, for Mobil Oil Canada Properties Ltd., Shell Canada Ltd., and Imperial Oil Ltd.
- Engås, A., S. Løkkeborg, A.V. Soldal, and E. Ona. 1993. Comparative trials for cod and haddock using commercial trawl and longline at two different stock levels. **J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci.** 19:83-90.
- Engås, A., S. Løkkeborg, E. Ona, and A.V. Soldal. 1996. Effects of seismic shooting on local abundance and catch rates of cod (*G. morhua*) and haddock (*M. aeglefinus*). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 53(10):2238-2249.
- Falk, M.R. and M.J. Lawrence. 1973. Seismic exploration: its nature and effects on fish. Tech. Rep. Ser. CEN/T-73-9. Can. Dep. Environ., Fisheries & Marine Serv., Resource Manage. Br., Fisheries Operations Directorate, Central Region (Environment), Winnipeg, Man.
- Fay, R. 2009. Soundscapes and the sense of hearing of fishes. **Integr. Zool.** 4(1):26-32.
- Fay, R.R. and A.N. Popper. 2000. Evolution of hearing in vertebrates: The inner ears and processing. **Hearing Res.** 149(1):1-10.
- Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, S. Løkkeborg, K. Skaar, Ø. Østensen, E.K. Haugland, M. Fonn, Å. Høines, and O.A. Misund. 2003. Reaction of sandeel to seismic shooting: a field experiment and fishery statistics study. Institute of Marine Research, Bergen, Norway.
- Hassel, A., T. Knutsen, J. Dalen, K. Skaar, S. Løkkeborg, O.A. Misund, O. Ostensen, M. Fonn, and E.K. Haugland. 2004. Influence of seismic shooting on the lesser sandeel (*Ammodytes marinus*). **ICES J. Mar. Sci.** 61(7):1165-1173.
- Hastings, M.C. and A.N. Popper. 2005. Effects of sound on fish. Rep. from Jones & Stokes, Sacramento, CA, for California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, CA. 28 January.
- Howard J, W.M. Roberts, and A.J. Hudspeth. 1988. Mechanoelectrical transduction by hair cells. **Annu. Rev. Biophys. Chem.** 17:99-124.
- Hudspeth, A.J. and V.S. Markin. 1994. The ear's gears: mechanical transduction by hair cells. **Physics Today** 47(2):22-28.
- Jorgenson, J.K. and E.C. Gyselman. 2009. Hydroacoustic measurements of the behavioral response of arctic riverine fishes to seismic airguns. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 126(3):1598-1606.
- Kapoor, B.G. and T.J. Hara (eds.). 2001. Sensory biology of jawed fishes: new insights. Science Publishers, Inc., Enfield, NH. 404 p.
- Kostyvchenko, L.P. 1973. Effects of elastic waves generated in marine seismic prospecting on fish eggs in the Black Sea. **Hydrobiol. J.** 9:45-48.
- La Bella, G., S. Cannata, C. Frogia, A. Modica, S. Ratti, and G. Rivas. 1996. First assessment of effects of air-gun seismic shooting on marine resources in the Central Adriatic Sea. p. 227-238 *In: Society of Petroleum Engineers, Intern. Conf. on Health, Safety and Environ., New Orleans, LA, 9-12 June.*
- Ladich, F. and A.N. Popper. 2004. Parallel evolution in fish hearing organs. p. 95-127 *In: G.A. Manley, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay (eds.), Evolution of the vertebrate auditory system. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY. 415 p.*
- Løkkeborg, S. 1991. Effects of geophysical survey on catching success in longline fishing. Paper presented at Intern. Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Annual Science Conf. **ICES CM B** 40:1-9.
- Løkkeborg, S. and A.V. Soldal. 1993. The influence of seismic explorations on cod (*Gadus morhua*) behaviour and catch rates. **ICES Mar. Sci. Symp.** 196:62-67.
- Mann, D.A., Z. Lu, and A.N. Popper. 1997. A clupeid fish can detect ultrasound. **Nature** 389(6649):341.

- Mann, D.A., Z. Lu, M.C. Hastings, and A.N. Popper. 1998. Detection of ultrasonic tones and simulated dolphin echolocation clicks by a teleost fish, the American shad (*Alosa sapidissima*). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 104(1):562-568.
- Mann, D.A., D.M. Higgs, W.N. Tavalga, M.J. Souza, and A.N. Popper. 2001. Ultrasound detection by clupeiform fishes. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 109(6):3048-3054.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin University, Perth, WA, for Australian Petroleum Production Association, Sydney, NSW.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. **APPEA J.** 40:692-706.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, and A.N. Popper. 2003. High intensity anthropogenic sound damages fish ears. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 113(1):638-642.
- Payne, J.F., J. Coady, and D. White. 2009. Potential effects of seismic airgun discharges on monkfish eggs (*Lophius americanus*) and larvae. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 170. St. John's, NL. 35 p.
- Pearson, W.H., J.R. Skalski, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on behavior of captive rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 49(7):1343-1356.
- Pickett, G.D., D.R. Eaton, R.M.H. Seaby, and G.P. Arnold. 1994. Results of bass tagging in Poole Bay during 1992. Laboratory Leaflet Number 74. Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Directorate of Fisheries Research, Lowestoft, UK.
- Popper, A.N. 2009. Are we drowning out fish in a sea of noise? **Marine Scientist** 27:18-20.
- Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 1993. Sound detection and processing by fish: critical review and major research questions. **Brain Behav. Evol.** 41(1):14-38.
- Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 1999. The auditory periphery in fishes. p. 43-100 *In*: R.R. Fay and A.N. Popper (eds.), Comparative hearing: fish and amphibians. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY. 438 p.
- Popper, A.N. and R.R. Fay. 2010. Rethinking sound detection by fishes. **Hear. Res.** (in press) doi: 10.1016/j.heares.2009.12.023.
- Popper, A.N. and M.C. Hastings. 2009a. The effects of human-generated sound on fish. **Integr. Zool.** 4(1):43-52.
- Popper, A.N. and M.C. Hastings. 2009b. The effects of anthropogenic sources of sound on fishes. **J. Fish Biol.** 75(3):455-489.
- Popper, A.N., M.E. Smith, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, A.O. MacGillivray, M.E. Austin, and D.A. Mann. 2005. Effects of exposure to seismic airgun use on hearing of three fish species. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 117(6):3958-3971.
- Saetre, R. and E. Ona. 1996. Seismiske undersøkelser og skader på fiskeegg og -larver en vurdering av mulige effekter pa bestandsniv. [Seismic investigations and damages on fish eggs and larvae; an evaluation of possible effects on stock level] **Fisken og Havet** 1996:1-17, 1-8. (in Norwegian with English summary).
- Sand, O. 1981. The lateral line and sound reception. p. 459-478 *In*: W.N. Tavalga, A.N. Popper, and R.R. Fay (eds.), Hearing and sound communication in fishes. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Santulli, A., C. Messina, L. Ceffa, A. Curatolo, G. Rivas, G. Fabi, and V. Damelio. 1999. Biochemical responses of European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) to the stress induced by offshore experimental seismic prospecting. **Mar. Poll. Bull.** 38(12):1105-1114.
- Skalski, J.R., W.H. Pearson, and C.I. Malme. 1992. Effects of sounds from a geophysical survey device on catch-per-unit-effort in a hook-and-line fishery for rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). **Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 49(7):1357-1365.
- Slotte, A., K. Hansen, J. Dalen, and E. Ona. 2004. Acoustic mapping of pelagic fish distribution and abundance in relation to a seismic shooting area off the Norwegian west coast. **Fish. Res.** 67(2):143-150.

- Song, J., D.A. Mann, P.A. Cott, B.W. Hanna, and A.N. Popper. 2008. The inner ears of Northern Canadian freshwater fishes following exposure to seismic air gun sounds. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 124(2):1360-1366.
- Thomsen, B. 2002. An experiment on how seismic shooting affects caged fish. Thesis, Faroese Fisheries Laboratory, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland. 16 August.
- Turnpenny, A.W.H. and J.R. Nedwell. 1994. Consultancy Report: The effects on marine fish, diving mammals and birds of underwater sound generated by seismic surveys. FCR 089/94. Rep. from Fawley Aquatic Research Laboratories Ltd. for U.K. Offshore Operators Association (UKOOA).
- Turnpenny, A.W.H., K.P. Thatcher, and J.R. Nedwell. 1994. Research report: the effects on fish and other marine animals of high-level underwater sound. FRR 127/94. Rep. from Fawley Aquatic Research Laboratories, Ltd. for the Defence Research Agency.
- Wardle, C.S., T.J. Carter, G.G. Urquhart, A.D.F. Johnstone, A.M. Ziolkowski, G. Hampson, and D. Mackie. 2001. Effects of seismic airguns on marine fish. **Cont. Shelf Res.** 21(8-10):1005-1027.

APPENDIX D:

REVIEW OF THE EFFECTS OF AIRGUN SOUNDS ON MARINE INVERTEBRATES¹⁴

This review provides a detailed summary of the limited data and available literature on the observed effects (or lack of effects) of exposure to airgun sound on marine invertebrates. Specific conditions and results of the studies, including sound exposure levels and sound thresholds of responses, are discussed when available.

Sound caused by underwater seismic survey equipment results in energy pulses with very high peak pressures (Richardson et al. 1995). This was especially true when chemical explosives were used for underwater surveys. Virtually all underwater seismic surveying conducted today uses airguns which typically have lower peak pressures and longer rise times than chemical explosives. However, sound levels from underwater airgun discharges might still be high enough to potentially injure or kill animals located close to the source. Also, there is a potential for disturbance to normal behavior upon exposure to airgun sound. The following sections provide an overview of sound production and detection in marine invertebrates, and information on the effects of exposure to sound on marine invertebrates, with an emphasis on seismic survey sound. In addition, Fisheries and Oceans Canada has published two internal documents that provide a literature review of the effects of seismic and other underwater sound on invertebrates (Moriyasu et al. 2004; Payne et al. 2008). The available information as reviewed in those documents and here includes results of studies of varying degrees of scientific rigor as well as anecdotal information.

1. Sound Production

Much of the available information on acoustic abilities of marine invertebrates pertains to crustaceans, specifically lobsters, crabs and shrimps. Other acoustic-related studies have been conducted on cephalopods. Many invertebrates are capable of producing sound, including barnacles, amphipods, shrimp, crabs, and lobsters (Au and Banks 1998; Tolstoganova 2002). Invertebrates typically produce sound by scraping or rubbing various parts of their bodies, although they also produce sound in other ways. Sounds made by marine invertebrates may be associated with territorial behavior, mating, courtship, and aggression. On the other hand, some of these sounds may be incidental and not have any biological relevance. Sounds known to be produced by marine invertebrates have frequencies ranging from 87 Hz to 200 kHz, depending on the species.

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

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

¹⁴ By **John Christian**, LGL Ltd., environmental research associates (revised Nov. 2009).

Snapping shrimp *Synalpheus parneomeris* are among the major sources of biological sound in temperate and tropical shallow-water areas (Au and Banks 1998). By rapidly closing one of its frontal chelae (claws), a snapping shrimp generates a forward jet of water and the cavitation of fast moving water produces a sound. Both the sound and the jet of water may function in feeding and territorial behaviors of alpheididae shrimp. Measured source sound pressure levels (SPLs) for snapping ship were 183–189 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa} \cdot \text{m}_{\text{p-p}}$ and extended over a frequency range of 2–200 kHz.

2. Sound Detection

There is considerable debate about the hearing capabilities of aquatic invertebrates. Whether they are able to hear or not depends on how underwater sound and underwater hearing are defined. In contrast to the situation in fish and marine mammals, no physical structures have been discovered in aquatic invertebrates that are stimulated by the pressure component of sound. However, vibrations (i.e., mechanical disturbances of the water) are also characteristic of sound waves. Rather than being pressure-sensitive, aquatic invertebrates appear to be most sensitive to the vibrational component of sound (Breithaupt 2002). Statocyst organs may provide one means of vibration detection for aquatic invertebrates.

More is known about the acoustic detection capabilities in decapod crustaceans than in any other marine invertebrate group, although cephalopod acoustic capabilities are now becoming a focus of study. Crustaceans appear to be most sensitive to sounds of low frequencies, i.e., <1000 Hz (Budelmann 1992; Popper et al. 2001). A study by Lovell et al. (2005) suggests greater sensitivity of the prawn *Palaemon serratus* to low-frequency sound than previously thought. Lovell et al. (2006) showed that *P. serratus* is capable of detecting a 500 Hz tone regardless of the prawn's body size and the related number and size of statocyst hair cells. Studies of American lobsters suggest that these crustaceans are more sensitive to higher frequency sounds than previously realized (Pye and Watson III 2004).

It is possible that statocyst hair cells of cephalopods are directionally sensitive in a way that is similar to the responses of hair cells of the vertebrate vestibular and lateral line systems (Budelmann and Williamson 1994; Budelmann 1996). Kaifu et al. (2008) provided evidence that the cephalopod *Octopus ocellatus* detects particle motion with its statocyst. Studies by Packard et al. (1990), Rawizza (1995) and Komak et al. (2005) have tested the sensitivities of various cephalopods to water-borne vibrations, some of which were generated by low-frequency sound. Using the auditory brainstem response (ABR) approach, Hu et al. (2009) showed that auditory evoked potentials can be obtained in the frequency ranges 400 to 1500 Hz for the squid *Sepiotheutis lessoniana* and 400 to 1000 Hz for the octopus *Octopus vulgaris*, higher than frequencies previously observed to be detectable by cephalopods.

In summary, only a few studies have been conducted on the sensitivity of certain invertebrate species to underwater sound. Available data suggest that they are capable of detecting vibrations but they do not appear to be capable of detecting pressure fluctuations.

3. Potential Seismic Effects

In marine invertebrates, potential effects of exposure to sound can be categorized as pathological, physiological, and behavioral. Pathological effects include lethal and sub-lethal injury to the animals, physiological effects include temporary primary and secondary stress responses, and behavioral effects refer to changes in exhibited behaviors (i.e., disturbance). The three categories should not be considered as independent of one another and are likely interrelated in complex ways.

Pathological Effects.—In water, acute injury or death of organisms as a result of exposure to sound appears to depend on two features of the sound source: (1) the received peak pressure, and (2) the time required for the pressure to rise and decay. Generally, the higher the received pressure and the less time it takes for the pressure to rise and decay, the greater the chance of acute pathological effects. Considering the peak pressure and rise/decay time characteristics of seismic airgun arrays used today, the associated pathological zone for invertebrates would be expected to be small (i.e., within a few meters of the seismic source, at most). Few studies have assessed the potential for pathological effects on invertebrates from exposure to seismic sound.

The pathological impacts of seismic survey sound on marine invertebrates were investigated in a pilot study on snow crabs *Chionoecetes opilio* (Christian et al. 2003, 2004). Under controlled field experimental conditions, captive adult male snow crabs, egg-carrying female snow crabs, and fertilized snow crab eggs were exposed to variable SPLs (191–221 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p}) and sound energy levels (SELs) (<130–187 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$). Neither acute nor chronic (12 weeks post-exposure) mortality was observed for the adult crabs. However, a significant difference in development rate was noted between the exposed and unexposed fertilized eggs/embryos. The egg mass exposed to seismic energy had a higher proportion of less-developed eggs than did the unexposed mass. It should be noted that both egg masses came from a single female and any measure of natural variability was unattainable (Christian et al. 2003, 2004).

In 2003, a collaborative study was conducted in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada, to investigate the effects of exposure to sound from a commercial seismic survey on egg-bearing female snow crabs (DFO 2004). This study had design problems that impacted interpretation of some of the results (Chadwick 2004). Caged animals were placed on the ocean bottom at a location within the survey area and at a location outside of the survey area. The maximum received SPL was ~195 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . The crabs were exposed for 132 hr of the survey, equivalent to thousands of seismic shots of varying received SPLs. The animals were retrieved and transferred to laboratories for analyses. Neither acute nor chronic lethal or sub-lethal injury to the female crabs or crab embryos was indicated. DFO (2004) reported that some exposed individuals had short-term soiling of gills, antennules and statocysts, bruising of the hepatopancreas and ovary, and detached outer membranes of oocytes. However, these differences could not be linked conclusively to exposure to seismic survey sound. Boudreau et al. (2009) presented the proceedings of a workshop held to evaluate the results of additional studies conducted to answer some questions arising from the original study discussed in DFO (2004). Proceedings of the workshop did not include any more definitive conclusions regarding the original results.

Payne et al. (2007) recently conducted a pilot study of the effects of exposure to airgun sound on various health endpoints of the American lobster. Adult lobsters were exposed either 20 to 200 times to 202 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p} or 50 times to 227 dB re 1 μPa_{p-p} , and then monitored for changes in survival, food consumption, turnover rate, serum protein level, serum enzyme levels, and serum calcium level. Observations extended over a period of a few days to several months. Results showed no delayed mortality or damage to the mechanosensory systems associated with animal equilibrium and posture (as assessed by turnover rate).

In a field study, Pearson et al. (1994) exposed Stage II larvae of the Dungeness crab *Cancer magister* to single discharges from a seven-airgun array and compared their mortality and development rates with those of unexposed larvae. No statistically significant differences were found in immediate survival, long-term survival, or time to molt between the exposed and unexposed larvae, even those exposed within 1 m of the seismic source.

In 2001 and 2003, there were two incidents of multiple strandings of the giant squid *Architeuthis dux* on the north coast of Spain, and there was speculation that the strandings were caused by exposure to

geophysical seismic survey sounds occurring at about the same time in the Bay of Biscay (Guerra et al. 2004). A total of nine giant squid, either stranded or moribund and floating at the surface, were collected at these times. However, Guerra et al. (2004) did not present any evidence that conclusively links the giant squid strandings and floaters to seismic activity in the area. Based on necropsies of seven (six females and one male) specimens, there was evidence of acute tissue damage. The authors speculated that one female with extensive tissue damage was affected by the impact of acoustic waves. However, little is known about the impact of strong airgun signals on cephalopods and the authors did not describe the seismic sources, locations, and durations of the Bay of Biscay surveys. In addition, there were no controls, the observations were circumstantial, and the examined animals had been dead long enough for commencement of tissue degradation.

McCauley et al. (2000a,b) exposed caged cephalopods to noise from a single 20-in³ airgun with maximum SPLs of >200 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . Statocysts were removed and preserved, but at the time of publication, results of the statocyst analyses were not available. No squid or cuttlefish mortalities were reported as a result of these exposures.

André et al. (2011) exposed cephalopods, primarily cuttlefish, to continuous 50–400 Hz sinusoidal wave sweeps for two hours while captive in relatively small tanks, and reported morphological and ultrastructural evidence of massive acoustic trauma (i.e., permanent and substantial alterations of statocyst sensory hair cells). The received SPL was reported as 157 ± 5 dB re 1 μPa , with peak levels at 175 dB re 1 μPa . As in the McCauley et al. (2003) paper on sensory hair cell damage in pink snapper as a result of exposure to seismic sound, the cephalopods were subjected to higher sound levels than they would be under natural conditions, and they were unable to swim away from the sound source.

Physiological Effects.—Biochemical responses by marine invertebrates to acoustic exposure have also been studied to a limited degree. Such studies of stress responses could possibly provide some indication of the physiological consequences of acoustic exposure and perhaps any subsequent chronic detrimental effects. Stress responses could potentially affect animal populations by reducing reproductive capacity and adult abundance.

Stress indicators in the haemolymph of adult male snow crabs were monitored immediately after exposure of the animals to seismic survey sound (Christian et al. 2003, 2004) and at various intervals after exposure. No significant acute or chronic differences were found between exposed and unexposed animals in which various stress indicators (e.g., proteins, enzymes, cell type count) were measured.

Payne et al. (2007), in their study of the effects of exposure of adult American lobsters to airgun sound, noted decreases in the levels of serum protein, particular serum enzymes and serum calcium, in the haemolymph of animals exposed to the sound pulses. Statistically significant differences ($P=0.05$) were noted in serum protein at 12 days post-exposure, serum enzymes at 5 days post-exposure, and serum calcium at 12 days post-exposure. During the histological analysis conducted 4 months post-exposure, Payne et al. (2007) noted more deposits of PAS-stained material, likely glycogen, in the hepatopancreas of some of the exposed lobsters. Accumulation of glycogen could be due to stress or disturbance of cellular processes.

Price (2007) found that blue mussels *Mytilus edulis* responded to a 10 kHz pure tone continuous signal by decreasing respiration. Smaller mussels did not appear to react until exposed for 30 min whereas larger mussels responded after 10 min of exposure. The oxygen uptake rate tended to be reduced to a greater degree in the larger mussels than in the smaller animals.

In general, the limited studies done to date on the effects of acoustic exposure on marine invertebrates have not demonstrated any serious pathological and physiological effects.

Behavioral Effects.—Some recent studies have focused on potential behavioral effects on marine invertebrates.

Christian et al. (2003) investigated the behavioral effects of exposure to airgun sound on snow crabs. Eight animals were equipped with ultrasonic tags, released, and monitored for multiple days prior to exposure and after exposure. Received SPL and SEL were ~ 191 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{0-p}$ and <130 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$, respectively. The crabs were exposed to 200 discharges over a 33-min period. None of the tagged animals left the immediate area after exposure to the seismic survey sound. Five animals were captured in the snow crab commercial fishery the following year, one at the release location, one 35 km from the release location, and three at intermediate distances from the release location.

Another study approach used by Christian et al. (2003) involved monitoring snow crabs with a remote video camera during their exposure to airgun sound. The caged animals were placed on the ocean bottom at a depth of 50 m. Received SPL and SEL were ~ 202 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}_{0-p}$ and 150 dB re $1 \mu\text{Pa}^2 \cdot \text{s}$, respectively. The crabs were exposed to 200 discharges over a 33-min period. They did not exhibit any overt startle response during the exposure period.

Christian et al. (2003) also investigated the pre- and post-exposure catchability of snow crabs during a commercial fishery. Received SPLs and SELs were not measured directly and likely ranged widely considering the area fished. Maximum SPL and SEL were likely similar to those measured during the telemetry study. There were seven pre-exposure and six post-exposure trap sets. Unfortunately, there was considerable variability in set duration because of poor weather. Results indicated that the catch-per-unit-effort did not decrease after the crabs were exposed to seismic survey sound.

Parry and Gason (2006) statistically analyzed data related to rock lobster *Jasus edwardsii* commercial catches and seismic surveying in Australian waters from 1978 to 2004. They did not find any evidence that lobster catch rates were affected by seismic surveys.

Caged female snow crabs exposed to airgun sound associated with a recent commercial seismic survey conducted in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada, exhibited a higher rate of ‘righting’ than those crabs not exposed to seismic survey sound (J. Payne, Research Scientist, DFO, St. John’s, Nfld., pers. comm.). ‘Righting’ refers to a crab’s ability to return itself to an upright position after being placed on its back. Christian et al. (2003) made the same observation in their study.

Payne et al. (2007), in their study of the effects of exposure to airgun sound on adult American lobsters, noted a trend for increased food consumption by the animals exposed to seismic sound.

Andriguetto-Filho et al. (2005) attempted to evaluate the impact of seismic survey sound on artisanal shrimp fisheries off Brazil. Bottom trawl yields were measured before and after multiple-day shooting of an airgun array. Water depth in the experimental area ranged between 2 and 15 m. Results of the study did not indicate any significant deleterious impact on shrimp catches. Anecdotal information from Newfoundland, Canada, indicated that catch rates of snow crabs showed a significant reduction immediately following a pass by a seismic survey vessel (G. Chidley, Newfoundland fisherman, pers. comm.). Additional anecdotal information from Newfoundland indicated that a school of shrimp observed via a fishing vessel sounder shifted downwards and away from a nearby seismic airgun sound source (H. Thorne, Newfoundland fisherman, pers. comm.). This observed effect was temporary.

Caged brown shrimp *Crangon crangon* reared under different acoustical conditions exhibited differences in aggressive behavior and feeding rate (Lagardère 1982). Those exposed to a continuous sound source showed more aggression and less feeding behavior. It should be noted that behavioral responses by caged animals may differ from behavioral responses of animals in the wild.

McCauley et al. (2000a,b) provided the first evidence of the behavioral response of southern calamari squid *Sepioteuthis australis* exposed to seismic survey sound. McCauley et al. reported on the exposure of caged cephalopods (50 squid and two cuttlefish) to noise from a single 20-in³ airgun. The cephalopods were exposed to both stationary and mobile sound sources. The two-run total exposure times during the three trials ranged from 69 to 119 min. at a firing rate of once every 10–15 s. The maximum SPL was >200 dB re 1 μPa_{0-p} . Some of the squid fired their ink sacs apparently in response to the first shot of one of the trials and then moved quickly away from the airgun. In addition to the above-described startle responses, some squid also moved towards the water surface as the airgun approached. McCauley et al. (2000a,b) reported that the startle and avoidance responses occurred at a received SPL of 174 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$. They also exposed squid to a ramped approach-depart airgun signal whereby the received SPL was gradually increased over time. No strong startle response (i.e., ink discharge) was observed, but alarm responses, including increased swimming speed and movement to the surface, were observed once the received SPL reached a level in the 156–161 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$ range.

Komak et al. (2005) also reported the results of a study of cephalopod behavioral responses to local water movements. In this case, juvenile cuttlefish *Sepia officinalis* exhibited various behavioral responses to local sinusoidal water movements of different frequencies between 0.01 and 1000 Hz. These responses included body pattern changing, movement, burrowing, reorientation, and swimming. Similarly, the behavioral responses of the octopus *Octopus ocellatus* to non-impulse sound have been investigated by Kaifu et al. (2007). The sound stimuli, reported as having levels 120 dB re 1 $\mu\text{Pa}_{\text{rms}}$, were at various frequencies: 50, 100, 150, 200 and 1000 Hz. The respiratory activity of the octopus changed when exposed to sound in the 50–150 Hz range but not for sound at 200–1,000 Hz. Respiratory suppression by the octopus might have represented a means of escaping detection by a predator.

Low-frequency sound (<200 Hz) has also been used as a means of preventing settling/fouling by aquatic invertebrates such as zebra mussels *Dreissena polymorpha* (Donskoy and Ludyanskiy 1995) and balanoid barnacles *Balanus* sp. (Branscomb and Rittschof 1984). Price (2007) observed that blue mussels *Mytilus edulis* closed their valves upon exposure to 10 kHz pure tone continuous sound.

Although not demonstrated in the invertebrate literature, masking can be considered a potential effect of anthropogenic underwater sound on marine invertebrates. Some invertebrates are known to produce sounds (Au and Banks 1998; Tolstoganova 2002; Latha et al. 2005). The functionality and biological relevance of these sounds are not understood (Jeffs et al. 2003, 2005; Lovell et al. 2005; Radford et al. 2007). If some of the sounds are of biological significance to some invertebrates, then masking of those sounds or of sounds produced by predators, at least the particle displacement component, could potentially have adverse effects on marine invertebrates. However, even if masking does occur in some invertebrates, the intermittent nature of airgun sound is expected to result in less masking effect than would occur with continuous sound.

4. Literature Cited

- André, M., M. Solé, M. Lenoir, M. Durfort, C. Quero, A. Mas, A. Lombarte, M. van der Schaar, M. López-Bejar, M. Morell, S. Zaugg, and L. Houégnigan. 2011. Low-frequency sounds induce acoustic trauma in cephalopods. **Front. Ecol. Environ.** doi:10.1890/100124.
- Andriguetto-Filho, J.M., A. Ostrensky, M.R. Pie, U.A. Silva, and W.A. Boeger. 2005. Evaluating the impact of seismic prospecting on artisanal shrimp fisheries. **Cont. Shelf Res.** 25:1720-1727.
- Au, W.W.L. and K. Banks. 1998. The acoustics of snapping shrimp *Synalpheus parneomeris* in Kaneohe Bay. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 103:41-47.

- Boudreau, M., S.C. Courtenay, and K. Lee (eds.). 2009. Proceedings of a workshop held 23 January 2007 at the Gulf Fisheries Center, Potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab: An update to the September 2004 review. **Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquat. Sci.** 2836.
- Branscomb, E.S. and D. Rittschof. 1984. An investigation of low frequency sound waves as a means of inhibiting barnacle settlement. **J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.** 79:149-154.
- Breithaupt, T. 2002. Sound perception in aquatic crustaceans. p. 548-558 In: K. Wiese (ed.), The crustacean nervous system. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg, Germany. 623 p.
- Budelmann, B.U. 1992. Hearing in crustacea. p. 131-139 In: D.B. Webster, R.R. Fay, and A.N. Popper (eds.), Evolutionary biology of hearing. Springer-Verlag, New York, NY.
- Budelmann, B.U. 1996. Active marine predators: the sensory world of cephalopods. **Mar. Freshw. Behav. Physiol.** 27:59-75.
- Budelmann, B.U. and R. Williamson. 1994. Directional sensitivity of hair cell afferents in the octopus statocyst. **J. Exp. Biol.** 187:245-259.
- Chadwick, M. 2004. Proceedings of the peer review on potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab. Gulf Region, Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Science Advisory Secretariat Proceedings Series 2004/045.
- Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, D.H. Thomson, D. White, and R.A. Buchanan. 2003. Effect of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 144. Calgary, Alberta.
- Christian, J.R., A. Mathieu, and R.A. Buchanan. 2004. Chronic effects of seismic energy on snow crab (*Chionoecetes opilio*). Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 158, Calgary, Alberta.
- DFO. 2004. Potential impacts of seismic energy on snow crab. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Habitat Status Report 2004/003.
- Donskoy, D.M. and M.L. Ludyanskiy. 1995. Low frequency sound as a control measure for zebra mussel fouling. Proc. 5th Int. Zebra Mussel and Other Aquatic Nuisance Organisms Conference, February 1995, Toronto, Ont.
- Guerra, A., A.F. González, and F. Rocha. 2004. A review of the records of giant squid in the north-eastern Atlantic and severe injuries in *Architeuthis dux* stranded after acoustic explorations. Paper presented at the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Annual Science Conference, 22–25 Sept. 2004, Vigo, Spain. ICES CM 2004/CC:29.
- Henninger, H.P. and W.H. Watson, III. 2005. Mechanisms underlying the production of carapace vibrations and associated waterborne sounds in the American lobster, *Homarus americanus*. **J. Exp. Biol.** 208:3421-3429.
- Hu, M.Y., H.Y. Yan, W-S Chung, J-C Shiao, and P-P Hwang. 2009. Acoustically evoked potentials in two cephalopods inferred using the auditory brainstem response (ABR) approach. **Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A** 153:278-283.
- Jeffs, A., N. Tolimieri, and J.C. Montgomery. 2003. Crabs on cue for the coast: the use of underwater sound for orientation by pelagic crab stages. **Mar. Freshw. Res.** 54:841-845.
- Jeffs, A.G., J.C. Montgomery, and C.T. Tindle. 2005. How do spiny lobster post-larvae find the coast? **N.Z. J. Mar. Fresh. Res.** 39:605-617.
- Kaifu, K., S. Segawa, and K. Tsuchiya. 2007. Behavioral responses to underwater sound in the small benthic octopus *Octopus ocellatus*. **J. Mar. Acoust. Soc. Japan** 34:46-53.
- Kaifu, K., T. Akamatsu, and S. Segawa. 2008. Underwater sound detection by cephalopod statocyst. **Fish. Sci.** 74:781-786.
- Komak, S., J.G. Boal, L. Dickel, and B.U. Budelmann. 2005. Behavioural responses of juvenile cuttlefish (*Sepia officinalis*) to local water movements. **Mar. Freshw. Behav. Physiol.** 38:117-125.
- Lagardère, J.P. 1982. Effects of noise on growth and reproduction of *Crangon crangon* in rearing tanks. **Mar. Biol.** 71:177-186.

- Latha, G., S. Senthilvadivu, R. Venkatesan, and V. Rajendran. 2005. Sound of shallow and deep water lobsters: measurements, analysis, and characterization (L). **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 117: 2720-2723.
- Lovell, J.M., M.M. Findley, R.M. Moate, and H.Y. Yan. 2005. The hearing abilities of the prawn *Palaemon serratus*. **Comp. Biochem. Physiol. A** 140:89-100.
- Lovell, J.M., R.M. Moate, L. Christiansen, and M.M. Findlay. 2006. The relationship between body size and evoked potentials from the statocysts of the prawn *Palaemon serratus*. **J. Exp. Biol.** 209:2480-2485.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000a. Marine seismic surveys: analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin University, Perth, Western Australia, for Australian Petroleum Production Association, Sydney, NSW.
- McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000b. Marine seismic surveys – a study of environmental implications. **APPEA J.** 40:692-706.
- Moriyasu, M., R. Allain, K. Benhalima, and R. Claytor. 2004. Effects of seismic and marine noise on invertebrates: A literature review. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Science. Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2004/126.
- Packard, A., H.E. Karlsen, and O. Sand. 1990. Low frequency hearing in cephalopods. **J. Comp. Physiol. A** 166: 501-505.
- Parry, G.D. and A. Gason. 2006. The effect of seismic surveys on catch rates of rock lobsters in western Victoria, Australia. **Fish. Res.** 79:272-284.
- Payne, J.F., C.A. Andrews, L.L. Fancey, A.L. Cook, and J.R. Christian. 2007. Pilot study on the effects of seismic air gun noise on lobster (*Homarus americanus*). Can. Tech. Rep. Fish. Aquatic Sci. 2712.
- Payne, J.F., C. Andrews, L. Fancey, D. White, and J. Christian. 2008. Potential effects of seismic energy on fish and shellfish: An update since 2003. Fisheries and Oceans Canada Science, Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Research Document 2008/060.
- Pearson, W., J. Skalski, S. Sulkin, and C. Malme. 1994. Effects of seismic energy releases on the survival and development of zoeal larvae of Dungeness crab (*Cancer magister*). **Mar. Environ. Res.** 38:93-113.
- Popper, A.N., M. Salmon, and K.W. Horch. 2001. Acoustic detection and communication by decapod crustaceans. **J. Comp. Physiol. A** 187:83-89.
- Price, A. 2007. The effects of high frequency, high intensity underwater sound on the oxygen uptakes of *Mytilus edulis* (L.). B.Sc.(Hons.) Thesis, Heriot-Watt Univ., Scotland.
- Pye, H.J., and W.H. Watson, III. 2004. Sound detection and production in the American lobster, *Homarus americanus*: sensitivity range and behavioral implications. **J. Acoust. Soc. Am.** 115 (Part 2):2486.
- Radford, C.A., A.G. Jeffs, and J.C. Montgomery. 2007. Orientated swimming behavior of crab postlarvae in response to reef sound. Poster at First Intern. Conf. on Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life, Nyborg, Denmark, Aug. 2007.
- Rawizza, H.E. 1995. Hearing and associative learning in cuttlefish, *Sepia officinalis*. Hopkins Marine Station Student Paper. Stanford Univ., Palo Alto, CA.
- Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 576 p.
- Tolstoganova, L.K. 2002. Acoustical behavior in king crab (*Paralithodes camtschaticus*). p. 247-254 In: A.J. Paul, E.G. Dawe, R. Elnor, G.S. Jamieson, G.H. Kruse, R.S. Otto, B. Sainte-Marie, T.C. Shirley, and D. Woodby (eds.), Crabs in cold water regions: biology, management, and economics. University of Alaska Sea Grant, AK-SG-02-01, Fairbanks, AK.