NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE
ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT
BIOLOGICAL OPINION

Agency:	Bureau of Ocean Energy Management – Marine Minerals Program
Activity Considered:	New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features: In the Field Research Project **GARFO-2022-03016**
Conducted by:	National Marine Fisheries Service Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office
Date Issued:	May 15, 2023
Approved by:	ANDERSON.JENNIFER.LYNN.1365847238 Digitally signed by ANDERSON.JENNIFER.LYNN.1365847238 Date: 2023.05.15 16:42:21 -04'00'

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This constitutes NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service's (NMFS) biological opinion (Opinion) issued to the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM), as the lead federal agency, in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended, on the effects of the "New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features: In the Field" research project. This project will be carried out by Rutgers University under a contract with BOEM's Marine Minerals Program and is funded by BOEM's Marine Minerals Program. The proposed project will provide information to better understand impacts from dredging in the New York Bight. The proposed field efforts consist of six total survey efforts (Spring and Fall 2023, Spring and Fall 2024, and Spring and Fall 2025). While the results of this study will inform considerations of the potential effects of dredging in the surveyed areas, no dredging or removal of sand resources is part of the proposed action and any effects of future dredging in the area to be surveyed is not a consequence of the proposed action.

This Opinion is based on information provided in the BOEM's Biological Assessment (BA) (October 2022) and other sources of information cited herein. We will keep a complete administrative record of this consultation at the NMFS Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office (GARFO) in Gloucester, Massachusetts.

On July 5, 2022, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California issued an order vacating the 2019 regulations that were revised or added to 50 CFR part 402 in 2019 ("2019 Regulations," see 84 FR 44976, August 27, 2019) without making a finding on the merits. On September 21, 2022, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit granted a temporary stay of the district court's July 5 order. On November 14, 2022, the Northern District of California issued an order granting the government's request for voluntary remand without vacating the 2019 regulations. The District Court issued a slightly amended order two days later on November 16, 2022. As a result, the 2019 regulations remain in effect, and we are applying the 2019 regulations here. For purposes of this consultation and in an abundance of caution, we considered whether the substantive analysis and conclusions articulated in the biological opinion and incidental take statement would be any different under the pre-2019 regulations. We have determined that our analysis and conclusions would not be any different.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND CONSULTATION HISTORY

On July 7, 2022, we received a letter from BOEM requesting concurrence on their determination that the "New York Bight Fish, Fisheries and Sand Features: In the Field" project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect any species listed as threatened or endangered by us under the ESA of 1973, as amended. We issued a letter of non-concurrence on August 10, 2022, as we considered that incidental capture of ESA listed sea turtles and/or Atlantic sturgeon was a likely outcome of the proposed action. In an August 2022 teleconference with BOEM, we expressed concern that the proposed trawl surveys could result in the incidental capture of ESA listed Atlantic sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) and listed sea turtles. BOEM submitted a Biological Assessment (BA) and request for initiation of formal ESA consultation on October 24, 2022.

On November 22, 2022, we received notification from BOEM that trawl surveys associated with the proposed project had started before we confirmed that we had all necessary information to officially initiate consultation and begin preparation of a biological opinion. We were also informed of the collection of 14 Atlantic sturgeon during trawling carried out on November 22, 2022. During a teleconference on November 30, 2022, BOEM and NMFS discussed the collection of these 14 Atlantic sturgeon and BOEM and Rutgers University affirmed that they would stop trawling until the consultation is complete. At that time, we considered that we had received all of the information necessary to initiate consultation. However, during a conference call between BOEM staff and NMFS staff held on February 6, 2023, BOEM requested that we consider an additional three seasons of sampling beyond what was originally described in the project plan and October 2022 BA. BOEM made this request based on schedule changes for a dredge event that is to be overseen by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. On February 9, 2023, we received an addendum to BOEM's BA with additional clarifying information on the schedule for proposed survey activities. Additional coordination between BOEM staff and NMFS staff was ongoing through March 2023 to clarify the proposed start dates for the spring 2023 sampling season.

3.0. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

This section of the Opinion describes the proposed action for consultation as described to us by BOEM in their BA and an associated funding proposal from Rutgers University. BOEM, through the Marine Mineral Program (MMP), is proposing to fund Rutgers University to conduct field research within the New York Bight (NY Bight) in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean to assess the long-term recovery of benthic and fish communities following dredging of sand resources. BOEM's MMP informs and evaluates the use of potential sand borrow areas in federal waters. BOEM anticipates that multiple habitats and sand features may be accessed in federal waters of the NY Bight, in part to address the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' projected sand deficiency for completing federally authorized shore protection projects in the next 5 years. Dredging activities under BOEM's jurisdiction generally occur in water depths of 50 meters of less, from 3 to 9 nautical miles (nm) from shore. Since dredging on the NY Bight Outer Continental Shelf has been infrequent relative to other regions, the proposed survey work will provide field data to inform NEPA analyses that consider the potential effects of dredging in the region. Data obtained through this research effort will identify baseline information on seafloor morphology, seabed and substrate sedimentary texture, and the diversity and abundance of demersal and benthic organisms which are found on sand habitats, specifically around sand resources off the coast of New Jersey. Additionally, this work will provide a better understanding of impacts to ecosystem health and the abundance of fish and invertebrate communities after a dredge event. The research will be carried out over six seasons of sampling: Spring and Fall 2023, Spring and Fall 2024, and Spring and Fall 2025. Sampling in spring 2023 is expected to occur in May, following issuance of this Opinion.

3.1 Field Sampling Methods

BOEM's MMP and Rutgers University will implement a longitudinal survey design that includes mapping surveys, trawl surveys, and acoustic telemetry monitoring. As described in the BA, the overarching objective is to assess fish associations with sand features before and after a dredge event.

Mapping Surveys

Mapping surveys will employ an autonomous underwater vehicle (AUV) to map the physical, hydrographic, and biological environment in the project area. BOEM and Rutgers will conduct mapping surveys during spring and fall field seasons over three years. Each field season has three AUV missions/mobilizations (18 missions/days total). During each AUV mission the vehicle will move at a speed of 1.8 m/s through the water and cover a 180 meter (m) x 1.5 kilometer (km) mapping area (Figure 3.1.1). The AUV for the mapping survey missions will be deployed from the *R/V Resilience*. Transits for the *R/V Resilience* from its homeport in Tuckerton, New Jersey, will be approximately 14 nautical miles (nm) each way for each AUV mission. As described in the BA, the mapping survey activities proposed by BOEM would include the following:

- Seafloor imaging (side scan sonar) for seabed sediment classification purposes, to identify natural and man-made acoustic targets resting on the bottom as well as any anomalous features. The sonar device emits conical or fan-shaped pulses down toward the seafloor in multiple beams at a wide angle, perpendicular to the path of the sensor through the water. The acoustic return of the pulses is recorded in a series of cross-track slices, which can be joined to form an image of the sea bottom within the swath of the beam. The side scan sonar used in mapping surveys will emit a 600 kilohertz (kHz) signal at 60-m swaths.

- Fish imaging (side scan sonar) to classify and map pelagic fish species to benthic and hydrographic habitat features by matching the fish's location with the AUV's time and space-referenced sensor data (Grothues et al. 2008)

- Stereo imaging to record marine animals for identification and behavior using a camera system mounted on the AUV.

Figure 3.1.1. Survey design for AUV track



Source: BOEM 2022

Trawl Surveys

BOEM and Rutgers will conduct trawl surveys once during each of the six field seasons, beginning in May 2023. Trawl surveys will occur aboard the *F/V Dream Warrior* to assess fishes and macroinvertebrates in the project area. Transits for the *F/V Dream Warrior* from its homeport in Barnegat Light, New Jersey, will be approximately 26 nm each way for each trawl survey event. During a trawl survey event, 8-10 tows will be conducted each day for four days (up to 40 tows/season; 240 tows total).

Tows will be conducted during daylight hours (after sunrise and before sunset) for less than 30 minutes each at a speed of less than 3 knots. Tows will follow depth contours and be completed using a bottom otter trawl with a 6” mesh and 30-m (100 ft.) footrope.

Acoustic Telemetry Monitoring

Acoustic telemetry monitoring will be conducted using eight moored receivers within the project area. Acoustic telemetry surveys will consist of fish tagging efforts (summer flounder, clearnose skate, sea robins, and dogfish) during bottom trawl sampling. To assess the movements of summer flounder, clearnose skate, sea robins, and dogfish, acoustic telemetry surveys will use a combination of moored receivers and active mobile telemetry via receivers attached to the AUV and the *R/V Resilience*. Each moored receiver will have two hydrophones mounted on a weighted frame (80 lbs) which will be connected to a pyramid frame trawl-shed lander using 40 m (20 ft.) of sinking anchor rope and a chain (Figure 3.1.2). Under the proposed receiver configuration, survey instruments will be anchored to the seafloor. Mooring lines located within the water column above the hydrophones will extend approximately 2 meters to a line recovery float. Mooring lines will be low–tensile polyester Marine Rope with a 3/8" diameter. A whale-safe weak link with an average breaking strength 1,700 lbs will be positioned in the middle of the mooring line. Floats will be doubled lobster pot dobs or similar.

Figure 3.1.2. Proposed receiver configuration, with a whale-safe weak link.



Source: BOEM 2022

Survey events will consist of one field mobilization day to deploy receivers and one field demobilization day to retrieve them, approximately three months apart during each of the six field seasons (12 transit days total). Receivers for acoustic telemetry surveys will be deployed from the *R/V Arabella* from its homeport in Tuckerton, New Jersey, will be approximately 14 nm each way for each receiver deployment and retrieval.

3.2 Proposed Conditions to Protect Listed Species

There are a number of measures that BOEM is proposing to take that are designed to avoid, minimize, or monitor effects of the action on ESA listed species. For the purpose of this consultation, the mitigation and monitoring identified in the BA are considered as part of the proposed action. Measures to minimize any effects to listed species during research activities are described below.

BOEM and Rutgers field operations will:

- Abide by recommended trawling operating parameters established by NMFS (Appendix A; NMFS 2020b);
- Maintain trawl times at <30 minutes;

- Follow sturgeon and sea turtle handling protocol;
- Train all crew on the identification, avoidance, and handling of protected species
- Maintain vigilant watch for protected species during transit, including having a NMFS-approved marine mammal observer on board, and execute vessel slow down and avoidance procedures when sightings occur;
- Maintain 100-m distance from all whales, and 500-m from North Atlantic right whale (NARW);
- Subscribe to the WhaleAlert app and monitor daily to increase situational awareness of whale presence;
- Abide by Dynamic Management Areas (DMA) and Seasonal Management Areas (SMA) speed restrictions, including compliance with 10 knot speed restrictions in these areas by all survey vessels ; and
- Use whale-safe mooring lines for acoustic receivers (Figure 2).

3.3 Action Area

The action area is defined in 50 CFR 402.02 as "all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action." The action area includes an area near Brigantine Shoal that is approximately 8 km (5 miles) across and 21 km (13 miles) long (Table 1, Figure 3) where survey activities will occur. The action area also includes the vessel transit areas between the project area and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey (Figure 4) where survey vessels will transit to/from.

Table 3.3.1. Study Area Coordinates

39N22.123 74W19.075	39N22.044 74W18.024
39N21.152 74W20.532	39N20.739 74W19.880

Figure 3.3.1. Proposed study area at Brigantine Shoal between Little Egg Inlet and Absecon Inlet, NJ



Source: BOEM 2022

Figure 3.3.2: Transit corridors between study site and Barnegat Inlet, NJ (26 nm) and Tuckerton, NJ (14 nm)

Source: BOEM 2022

4.0. LISTED SPECIES AND CRITICAL HABITAT IN THE ACTION AREA

We have determined that the actions being considered in this Opinion may affect the following endangered or threatened species under our jurisdiction (Table 4.1). Note that there is no critical habitat designated in the action area.

Table 4.1. Endangered Species Act-listed endangered species that occur in the action area

Marine Mammals – Cetaceans			
Species	**ESA Status**	**Critical Habitat**	**Recovery Plan**
Fin Whale *(Balaenoptera physalus)*	E-35 FR 18319	-- --	75 FR 47538 07/2010
North Atlantic Right Whale *(Eubalaena glacialis)*	E-73 FR 12024	81 FR 4837	70 FR 32293 08/2004
Marine Reptiles			
Species	**ESA Status**	**Critical Habitat**	**Recovery Plan**
Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) – North Atlantic DPS	T – 81 FR 20057	63 FR 46693	FR Not Available 10/1991 – U.S. Atlantic
Kemp's Ridley Turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*)	E – 35 FR 18319	-- --	03/2010 – U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico 09/2011
Leatherback Turtle *(Dermochelys coriacea)*	E-35 FR 8491	44 FR 17710 and 77 FR 4170	10/1991 - U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and gulf of Mexico

			63 FR 28359 05/1998 – U.S. Pacific
Loggerhead Turtle (*Caretta caretta*) – Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS	T – 76 FR 58868	79 FR 39855	74 FR 2995 10/1991 – U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico 05/1998 – U.S. Pacific 01/2009 – Northwest Atlantic

Fish		
Species	**ESA Status**	**Critical Habitat**
Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) – Carolina DPS	E – 77 FR 5913	82 FR 39160
Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) – Chesapeake Bay DPS	E – 77 FR 5879	82 FR 39160
Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) – Gulf of Maine DPS	T – 77 FR 5879	82 FR 39160
Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) – New York Bight DPS	E – 77 FR 5879	82 FR 39160
Atlantic Sturgeon (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus*) – South Atlantic DPS	E – 77 FR 5913	82 FR 39160

4.1 Marine Mammals

4.1.1 North Atlantic Right Whale (Eubalaena glacialis)

There are three species classified as right whales (genus *Eubalaena*): North Pacific (*E. japonica*), Southern (*E. australis*), and North Atlantic (*E. glacialis*). The North Atlantic right whale is the only species of right whale that occurs in the North Atlantic Ocean (Figure 4.1.1) and, therefore, is the only species of right whale that may occur in the action area.

North Atlantic right whales occur primarily in the western North Atlantic Ocean. However, there have been acoustic detections, reports, and/or sightings of North Atlantic right whales in waters off Greenland (east/southeast), Newfoundland, northern Norway, and Iceland, as well as within Labrador Basin (Hamilton et al. 1998, Jacobsen et al. 2004, Knowlton et al. 1992, Mellinger et al. 2011). These latter sightings/detections are consistent with historic records documenting North Atlantic right whales south of Greenland, in the Denmark straits, and in eastern North Atlantic waters (Kraus et al. 2007). There is also evidence of possible historic North Atlantic right whale calving grounds in the Mediterranean Sea (Rodrigues et al. 2018), an area not currently considered as part of this species' historical range.

Figure 4.1.1. Approximate historic range and currently designated U.S. critical habitat of the North Atlantic right whale



The North Atlantic right whale is distinguished by its stocky body and lack of a dorsal fin. The species was listed as endangered on December 2, 1970. We used information available in the most recent five-year review for North Atlantic right whales (NMFS 2022), the most recent stock assessment report (Hayes et al. 2022 and Hayes et al. 2023 *draft*[1]), and the scientific literature to summarize the status of the species, as follows.

Life History

The maximum lifespan of North Atlantic right whales is unknown, but one individual reached at least 70 years of age (Hamilton et al. 1998, Kenney 2009). Previous modeling efforts suggest that in 1980, females had a life expectancy of approximately 51.8 years of age, which was twice that of males at the time (Fujiwara and Caswell 2001); however, by 1995, female life expectancy

1 NMFS considers the population estimate for North Atlantic right whales published in the draft Stock Assessment Report (Hayes et al. 2023 draft) to be part of the best available data; this is because the population estimate is developed using a peer-reviewed model and the population estimate and accompanying text has been reviewed by the Atlantic Scientific Review Group (ASRG). See, generally, https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-stock-assessments and imbedded link to the Scientific Review Groups.

was estimated to have declined to approximately 14.5 years (Fujiwara and Caswell 2001). Most recent estimates indicate that North Atlantic right whale females are only living to 45 and males to age 65 (https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/north-atlantic-right-whale). Females, ages 5+, have reduced survival relative to males, ages 5+, resulting in a decrease in female abundance relative to male abundance (Pace et al. 2017). Specifically, state-space mark-recapture model estimates show that from 2010-2015, males declined just under 4.0%, and females declined approximately 7% (Pace et al. 2017).

Gestation is estimated to be between 12 and 14 months, after which calves typically nurse for around one year (Cole et al. 2013, Kenney 2009, Kraus and Hatch 2001, Lockyer 1984). After weaning a calf, females typically undergo a 'resting' period before becoming pregnant again, presumably because they need time to recover from the energy deficit experienced during lactation (Fortune et al. 2013, Fortune et al. 2012, Pettis et al. 2017). From 1983 to 2005, annual average calving intervals ranged from 3 to 5.8 years (overall average of 4.23 years) (Kraus et al. 2007). Between 2006 and 2015, annual average calving intervals continued to vary within this range, but in 2016 and 2017 longer calving intervals were reported (6.3 to 6.6 years in 2016 and 10.2 years in 2017) (Hayes et al. 2018a, Pettis and Hamilton 2015, Pettis and Hamilton 2016, Pettis et al. 2018a, Pettis et al. 2018b, Pettis et al. 2020). There were no calves recorded in 2018. Annual average calving interval between 2019 and 2022 ranged from a low of 7 in 2019 to a high of 9.2 in 2021 (Pettis et al. 2022). The calving index is the annual percentage of reproductive females assumed alive and available to calve that was observed to produce a calf. This index averaged 47% from 2003 to 2010 but has dropped to an average of 17% since 2010 (Moore et al. 2021). The percentage of available females that had calves ranged from 11.9% to 30.5% from 2019-2022 (Pettis et al. 2022). Females have been known to give birth as young as five years old, but the mean age of a female first giving birth is 10.2 years old (n=76, range 5 to 23, SD 3.3) (Moore et al. 2021). Taken together, changes to inter-birth interval and age to first reproduction suggest that both parous (having given birth) and nulliparous (not having given birth) females are experiencing delays in calving. These calving delays correspond with the recent distribution shifts. The low reproductive rate of right whales is likely the result of several factors including nutrition (Fortune et al. 2013, Moore et al. 2021). Evidence also indicates that North Atlantic right whales are growing to shorter adult lengths than in earlier decades (Stewart et al. 2021) and are in poor body condition compared to southern right whales (Christiansen et al. 2020). As stated in the draft 2023 SAR, all these changes may result from a combination of documented regime shifts in primary feeding habitats (Meyer-Gutbrod and Greene 2014; Meyer-Gutbrod et al. 2021; Record et al. 2019), and increased energy expenditures related to non-lethal entanglements (Rolland et al. 2016; Pettis et al. 2017; van der Hoop 2017). As noted in the 2022 Five-Year Review (NMFS 2022), poor body condition, arrested growth, and maternal body length have led to reduced reproductive success and are contributors to low birth rates for the population over the past decade (Christiansen et al. 2020; Reed et al. 2022; Stewart et al. 2021; Stewart et al. 2022).

Pregnant North Atlantic right whales migrate south, through the mid-Atlantic region of the U.S., to low latitudes during late fall where they overwinter and give birth in shallow, coastal waters (Kenney 2009, Krzystan et al. 2018). During spring, these females and new calves migrate to high latitude foraging grounds where they feed on large concentrations of copepods, primarily *C.*

finmarchicus (Mayo et al. 2018, NMFS 2017). Some non-reproductive North Atlantic right whales (males, juveniles, non-reproducing females) also migrate south, although at more variable times throughout the winter. Others appear to not migrate south and remain in the northern feeding grounds year round or go elsewhere (Bort et al. 2015, Mayo et al. 2018, Morano et al. 2012, NMFS 2017, Stone et al. 2017). Nonetheless, calving females arrive to the southern calving grounds earlier and stay in the area more than twice as long as other demographics (Krzystan et al. 2018). Little is known about North Atlantic right whale habitat use in the mid-Atlantic, but recent acoustic data indicate near year round presence of at least some whales off the coasts of New Jersey, Virginia, and North Carolina (Davis et al. 2017, Hodge et al. 2015, Salisbury et al. 2016, Whitt et al. 2013). While it is generally not known where North Atlantic right whales mate, some evidence suggests that mating may occur in the northern feeding grounds (Cole et al. 2013, Matthews et al. 2014).

Population Dynamics

Today, North Atlantic right whales are primarily found in the western North Atlantic, from their calving grounds in lower latitudes off the coast of the southeastern United States to their feeding grounds in higher latitudes off the coast of New England and Nova Scotia (Hayes et al. 2018a). Beginning in 2010, a change in seasonal residency patterns has been documented through visual and acoustic monitoring with declines in presence in the Bay of Fundy, Gulf of Maine, and Great South Channel, and more animals being observed in Cape Cod Bay, the Gulf of Saint Lawrence, the mid-Atlantic, and south of Nantucket, Massachusetts (Daoust et al. 2018, Davies et al. 2019, Davis et al. 2017, Hayes et al. 2018a, Hayes et al. 2019, Meyer-Gutbrod et al. 2018, Moore et al. 2021, Pace et al. 2017, Quintana-Rizzo et al. 2021). Right whales have been observed nearly year round in the area south of Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket, with highest sightings rates between December and May (Leiter et al., 2017, Stone et al. 2017, Quintana-Rizzo et al. 2021, O'Brien et al. 2022). Increased detections of right whales in the Gulf of St. Lawrence have been documented from late spring through the fall (Cole et al. 2016, Simard et al. 2019, DFO 2020).

There are two recognized populations of North Atlantic right whales, an eastern, and a western population. Very few individuals likely make up the population in the eastern Atlantic, which is thought to be functionally extinct (Best et al. 2001). However, in recent years, a few known individuals from the western population have been seen in the eastern Atlantic, suggesting some individuals may have wider ranges than previously thought (Kenney 2009). Specifically, there have been acoustic detections, reports, and/or sightings of North Atlantic right whales in waters off Greenland (east/southeast), Newfoundland, northern Norway, and Iceland, as well as within Labrador Basin (Jacobsen et al. 2004, Knowlton et al. 1992, Mellinger et al. 2011). It is estimated that the North Atlantic historically (i.e., pre-whaling) supported between 9,000 and 21,000 right whales (Monsarrat et al. 2016). The western population may have numbered fewer than 100 individuals by 1935, when international protection for right whales came into effect (Kenney et al. 1995).

Genetic analyses, based upon mitochondrial and nuclear DNA analyses, have consistently revealed an extremely low level of genetic diversity in the North Atlantic right whale population (Hayes et al. 2018a, Malik et al. 2000, McLeod and White 2010, Schaeff et al. 1997). Waldick et al. (2002) concluded that the principal loss of genetic diversity occurred prior to the 18th century, with more recent studies hypothesizing that the loss of genetic diversity may have occurred prior to the onset of Basque whaling during the 16th and 17th century (Mcleod et al. 2008, Rastogi et al. 2004, Reeves et al. 2007, Waldick et al. 2002). The persistence of low genetic diversity in the North Atlantic right whale population might indicate inbreeding; however, based on available data, no definitive conclusions can be reached at this time (Hayes et al. 2019, Radvan 2019, Schaeff et al. 1997). By combining 25 years of field data (1980-2005) with high-resolution genetic data, Frasier et al. (2013) found that North Atlantic right whale calves born between 1980 and 2005 had higher levels of microsatellite (nuclear) heterozygosity than would be expected from this species' gene pool. The authors concluded that this level of heterozygosity is due to postcopulatory selection of genetically dissimilar gametes and that this mechanism is a natural means to mitigate the loss of genetic diversity, over time, in small populations (Frasier et al. 2013).

In the western North Atlantic, North Atlantic right whale abundance was estimated to be 270 animals in 1990 (Pace et al. 2017). From 1990 to 2011, right whale abundance increased by approximately 2.8% per year, despite a decline in 1993 and no growth between 1997 and 2000 (Pace et al. 2017). However, since 2011, when the abundance peaked at 481 animals, the population has been in decline, with a 99.99% probability of a decline of just under 1% per year (Pace et al. 2017). Between 1990 and 2015, survival rates appeared relatively stable, but differed between the sexes, with males having higher survivorship than females (males: 0.985 ± 0.0038; females: 0.968 ± 0.0073) leading to a male-biased sex ratio (approximately 1.46 males per female) (Pace et al. 2017).

As reported in the most recent final SAR (Hayes et al. 2022), the western North Atlantic right whale stock size is estimated based on a published state-space model of the sighting histories of individual whales identified using photo-identification techniques (Pace et al. 2017; Pace 2021). Sightings histories were constructed from the photo-ID recapture database as it existed in January 2021, and included photographic information up through November 2019. Using a hierarchical, state-space Bayesian open population model of these histories produced a median abundance value (N_{est}) as of November 30, 2019 of 368 individuals (95% Credible Interval (CI): 356–378). The draft 2022 SAR (Hayes et al. 2023 draft) uses data from the photo-ID database as it existed in December 2021 and included photographic information up through November 2020. Using the hierarchical, state-space Bayesian open population model of these histories produced a median abundance value (N_{est}) as of November 30, 2020 of 338 individuals (95%CI: 325–350) and a minimum population estimate of 332.

Each year, scientists at NMFS' Northeast Fisheries Science Center estimate the right whale population abundance and share that estimate at the North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium's annual meeting in a "Report Card." This estimate is considered preliminary and undergoes further review before being included in the draft North Atlantic Right Whale Stock Assessment Report. Each draft stock assessment report is peer-reviewed by one of three regional Scientific Review Groups, revised after a public comment period, and published. The 2022 "Report Card" (Pettis et al. 2022) data reports a preliminary population estimate for 2021 using data as of August 30, 2022 is 340 (+/- 7). Pettis et al. (2022) also report that fifteen mother calf pairs were sighted in 2022, down from 18 in 2021. There were no first time mothers sighted in 2022.

Initial analyses detected at least 16 new entanglements in 2022: five whales seen with gear and 11 with new scarring from entanglements. Additionally, there was one non-fatal vessel strike detected. No carcasses were detected. Of the 15 calves born in 2022, one is known to have died and another is thought likely to have died.

In addition to finding an overall decline in the North Atlantic right whale population, Pace et al. (2017) also found that between 1990 and 2015, the survival of age 5+ females relative to 5+ males has been reduced; this has resulted in diverging trajectories for male and female abundance. Specifically, there was an estimated 142 males (95% CI=143-152) and 123 females (95% CI=116-128) in 1990; however, by 2015, model estimates show the species was comprised of 272 males (95% CI=261-282) and 186 females (95% CI=174-195; Pace et al. 2017). Calving rates also varied substantially between 1990 and 2015 (i.e., 0.3% to 9.5%), with low calving rates coinciding with three periods (1993-1995, 1998-2000, and 2012-2015) of decline or no growth (Pace et al. 2017). Using generalized linear models, Corkeron et al. (2018) found that between 1992 and 2016, North Atlantic right whale calf counts increased at a rate of 1.98% per year. Using the highest annual estimates of survival recorded over the time series from Pace et al. (2017), and an assumed calving interval of approximately four years, Corkeron et al. (2018) suggests that the North Atlantic right whale population could potentially increase at a rate of at least 4% per year if there was no anthropogenic mortality.[2] This rate is approximately twice that observed, and the analysis indicates that adult female mortality is the main factor influencing this rate (Corkeron et al. 2018). Right whale births remain significantly below what is expected and the average inter-birth interval remains high (Pettis et al. 2022). Additionally, there were no first-time mothers in 2022, underscoring recent research findings that fewer adult, nulliparous females are becoming reproductively active (Reed et al., 2022).

Status

The North Atlantic right whale is listed under the ESA as endangered. Anthropogenic mortality and sub-lethal stressors (i.e., entanglement) that affect reproductive success are currently affecting the ability of the species to recover (Corkeron et al. 2018, Stewart et al. 2021), currently, none of the species recovery goals (see below) have been met. With whaling now prohibited, the two major known human causes of mortality are vessel strikes and entanglement in fishing gear (Hayes et al. 2018a). Estimates of total annual anthropogenic mortality (i.e., ship strike and entanglement in fishing gear), as well as the number of undetected anthropogenic mortalities for North Atlantic right whales are presented in the annual stock assessment reports. These anthropogenic threats appear to be worsening (Hayes et al. 2018a).

On June 7, 2017, NMFS declared an Unusual Mortality Event (UME) for the North Atlantic right whale, as a result of 17 observed right whale mortalities in the U.S. and Canada. Under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, a UME is defined as "a stranding that is unexpected; involves a

---

2 Based on information in the North Atlantic Right Whale Catalog, the mean calving interval is 4.69 years (P. Hamilton 2018, unpublished, in Corkeron et al. 2018). Corkeron et al. (2018) assumed a 4 year calving interval as the approximate mid-point between the North Atlantic Right Whale Catalog calving interval and observed calving intervals for southern right whales (i.e., 3.16 years for South Africa, 3.42 years for Argentina, 3.31 years for Auckland Islands, and 3.3 years for Australia).

significant die-off of any marine mammal population; and demands immediate response." As of February 2023, there are 35 confirmed mortalities for the UME, 22 serious injuries, and 36 sublethal injuries or illness (for more information on UMEs, see https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-unusual-mortality-events). Mortalities are recorded as vessel strike (11), entanglement (9), perinatal (2), unknown/undetermined (3), or not examined (10).[3]

The North Atlantic right whale population continues to decline. As noted above, between 1990 to 2011, right whale abundance increased by approximately 2.8% per year; however, since 2011 the population has been in decline (Pace et al. 2017). The draft 2023 SAR reports an overall abundance decline between 2011 and 2020 of 29.7% (Hayes et al. 2023 draft). Recent modeling efforts indicate that low female survival, a male biased sex ratio, and low calving success are contributing to the population's current decline (Pace et al. 2017). For instance, five new calves were documented in 2017 calving season, zero in 2018, and seven in 2019 (Pettis et al. 2018a, Pettis et al. 2018b, Pettis et al. 2020), these numbers of births are well below the number needed to compensate for expected mortalities. More recently, there were 10 calves in the 2020 calving season, 18 calves in 2021, and 15 in 2022. Two of the 2020 calves and one of the 2021 calves died or were seriously injured due to vessel strikes. Two additional calves were reported in the 2021 season, but were not seen as a mother/calf pair. One animal stranded dead with no evidence of human interaction and initial results suggest the calf died during birth or shortly thereafter. The second animal was an anecdotal report of a calf off the Canary Islands. Two calves in 2022 are suspected to have died, with the causes of death unknown. As of March 26, 2023, 11 mother-calf pairs have been sighted in the 2022-2023 calving season[4].

Long-term photographic identification data indicate new calves rarely go undetected (Kraus et al. 2007, Pace et al. 2017). While there are likely a multitude of factors involved, low calving has been linked to poor female health (Rolland et al. 2016) and reduced prey availability (Devine et al. 2017, Johnson et al. 2017, Meyer-Gutbrod and Green 2014, Meyer-Gutbrod and Greene 2018, Meyer-Gutbrod et al. 2018). A recent study comparing North Atlantic right whales to other right whale species found that juvenile, adult, and lactating female North Atlantic right whales all had lower body condition scores compared to the southern right whale populations, with lactating females showing the largest difference; however, North Atlantic right whale calves were in good condition (Christiansen et al. 2020). While some of the difference could be the result of genetic isolation and adaptations to local environmental conditions, the authors suggest that the magnitude indicates that North Atlantic right whale females are in poor condition, which could be suppressing their growth, survival, age of sexual maturation and calving rates. In addition, they conclude that the observed differences are most likely a result of differences in the exposure to anthropogenic factors (Christiansen et al. 2020). Furthermore, entanglement in fishing gear appears to have substantial health and energetic costs that affect both survival and reproduction (Hayes et al. 2018a, Hunt et al. 2016, Lysiak et al. 2018, Pettis et al. 2017, Robbins et al. 2015, Rolland et al. 2017, van der Hoop et al. 2017).

---

3 https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/2017-2023-north-atlantic-right-whale-unusual-mortality-event; last accessed February 12, 2023

4 https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/endangered-species-conservation/north-atlantic-right-whale-calving-season-2023

Kenney et al. (2018) projected that if all other known or suspected impacts (e.g., vessel strikes, calving declines, climate change, resource limitation, sublethal entanglement effects, disease, predation, and ocean noise) on the population remained the same between 1990 and 2016, and none of the observed fishery related mortality and serious injury occurred, the projected population in 2016 would be 12.2% higher (506 individuals). Furthermore, if the actual mortality resulting from fishing gear is double the observed rate (as estimated in Pace et al. 2017), eliminating all mortalities (observed and unobserved) could have resulted in a 2016 population increase of 24.6% (562 individuals) and possibly over 600 in 2018 (Kenney 2018).

Given the above information, North Atlantic right whales' resilience to future perturbations affecting health, reproduction, and survival is expected to be very low (Hayes et al. 2018a). The observed (and clearly biased low) human-caused mortality and serious injury was 7.7 right whales per year from 2015 through 2019 (Hayes et al. 2022). Using the refined methods of Pace et al. (2021), the estimated annual rate of total mortality for the period 2014–2018 was 27.4, which is 3.4 times larger than the 8.15 total derived from reported mortality and serious injury for the same period (Hayes et al. 2022). The 2023 draft SAR reports the observed human-caused mortality and serious injury was 8.1 right whales per year from 2016 through 2020 (Hayes et al. 2023 draft). Using the refined methods of Pace et al. (2021), the estimated annual rate of total mortality for the period 2015–2019 was 31.2, which is 4.1 times larger than the 7.7 total derived from reported mortality and serious injury for the same period. Using a matrix population projection model, it is estimated that by 2029 the population will decline from 160 females to the 1990 estimate of 123 females if the current rate of decline is not altered (Hayes et al. 2018a).

Climate change poses a significant threat to the recovery of North Atlantic right whales. The information presented here is summarized from a more complete description of this threat in the 2022 5-Year Review (NMFS 2022). The documented shift in North Atlantic right whale summer habitat from the Gulf of Maine to waters further north in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the early 2010s is considered to be related to an oceanographic regime shift in Gulf of Maine waters linked to a northward shift of the Gulf Stream which caused the availability of the primary North Atlantic right whale prey, the copepod *Calanus finmarchicus*, to decline locally, forcing North Atlantic right whales to forage in areas further north (Meyer-Gutbrod et al. 2021; Record et al. 2019; Sorochan et al. 2019). The shift of North Atlantic right whale distribution into waters further north also created policy challenges for the Canadian government, which had to implement new regulations in areas that were not protected because they were not documented as right whale habitat in the past (Davies and Brillant 2019; Meyer-Gutbrod et al. 2018; Record et al. 2019).

When prey availability is low, North Atlantic right whale calving rates decline, a well-documented phenomenon through periods of low prey availability in the 1990s and the 2010s; without increased prey availability in the future, low population growth is predicted (Meyer-Gutbrod and Greene 2018). Prey densities in the Gulf of St. Lawrence have fluctuated irregularly in the past decade, limiting suitable foraging habitat for North Atlantic right whales in some years and further limiting reproductive rates (Bishop et al. 2022; Gavrilchuck et al. 2020; Gavrilchuck et al. 2021; Lehoux et al. 2020).

Recent studies have investigated the spatial and temporal role of oceanography on copepod availability and distribution and resulting effects on foraging North Atlantic right whales. Changes in seasonal current patterns have an effect on the density of *Calanus* species in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which may lead to further temporal variations over time (Sorochan et al. 2021a). Brennan et al. (2019) developed a model to estimate seasonal fluctuations in C. finmarchicus availability in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, which is highest in summer and fall, aligning with North Atlantic right whale distribution during those seasons. Pendleton et al. (2022) found that the date of maximum occupancy of North Atlantic right whales in Cape Cod Bay shifted 18.1 days later between 1998 and 2018 and was inversely related to the spring thermal transition date, when the regional ocean temperature surpasses the mean annual temperature for that location, which has trended towards moving earlier each year as an effect of climate change. This inverse relationship may be due to a 'waiting room' effect, where North Atlantic right whales wait and forage on adequate prey in the waters of Cape Cod Bay while richer prey develops in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and then migrate directly there rather than following migratory pathways used previously (Pendleton et al. 2022; Ganley et al. 2022). Although the date of maximum occupancy in Cape Cod Bay has shifted to later in the spring, initial sightings of individual North Atlantic right whales have started earlier, indicating that they may be using regional water temperature as a cue for migratory movements between habitats (Ganley et al. 2022).

North Atlantic right whales rely on late stage or diapause copepods, which are more energy-rich, for prey; diving behavior is highly reliant on where in the vertical strata *C. finmarchicus* is distributed (Baumgartner et al. 2017). There is evidence that *C. finmarchicus* are reaching the diapause phase at deeper depths to account for warming water on the Newfoundland Slope and Scotian Shelf, forcing North Atlantic right whales to forage deeper and further from shore (Krumhansl et al. 2018; Sorochan et al. 2021a).

Several studies have already used the link between *Calanus* distribution and North Atlantic right whale distribution to determine suitable habitat, both currently and in the future (Gavrilchuk et al. 2020; Pershing et al. 2021; Silber et al. 2017; Sorochan et al. 2021b). Plourde et al. (2019) used suitable habitat modeling using *Calanus* density to confirm new North Atlantic right whale hot spots for summer feeding in Roseway Basin and Grand Manan and identified other potential aggregation areas further out on the Scotian Shelf. Gavrilchuk et al. (2021) determined suitable habitat for reproductive females in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, finding declines in foraging habitat over a 12- year period and indicating that the prey biomass in the area may become insufficient to sustain successful reproduction over time. Ross et al. (2021) used suitable habitat modeling to predict that the Gulf of Maine habitat would continue to decline in suitability until 2050 under a range of climate change scenarios. Similarly, models of future copepod density in the Gulf of Maine have predicted declines of up to 50 percent under high greenhouse gas emission scenarios by 2080- 2100 (Grieve et al. 2017). It is clear that climate change does and will continue to have an impact on the availability, supply, aggregation, and distribution of *C. finmarchicus*, and North Atlantic right whale abundance and distribution will continue to vary based on those impacts; however, more research must be done to better understand these factors and associated impacts (Sorochan et al. 2021b). Climate change will likely have other secondary effects on North

Atlantic right whales, such as an increase in harmful algal blooms of the toxic dinoflagellate *Alexandrium catenella* due to warming waters, increasing the risk of North Atlantic right whale exposure to neurotoxins (Boivin-Rioux et al. 2021; Pershing et al. 2021).

Factors Outside the Action Area Affecting the Status of the Right Whale: Fishery Interactions and Vessel Strikes in Canadian Waters

In Canada, right whales are protected under the Species at Risk Act (SARA) and the Fisheries Act. The right whale was considered a single species and designated as endangered in 1980. SARA includes provisions against the killing, harming, harassing, capturing, taking, possessing, collecting, buying, selling, or trading of individuals or its parts (SARA section 32) and damage or destruction of its residence (SARA section 33). In 2003, the species was split to allow separate designation of the North Atlantic right whale, which was listed as endangered under SARA in May 2003. All marine mammals are subject to the provisions of the marine mammal regulations under the Fisheries Act. These include requirements related to approach, disturbance, and reporting. In the St. Lawrence estuary and the Saguenay River, the maximum approach distance for threatened or endangered whales is 1,312 ft. (400 m).

North Atlantic right whales have died or been seriously injured in Canadian waters by vessel strikes and entanglement in fishing gear (DFO 2014). Serious injury and mortality events are rarely observed where the initial entanglement occurs. After an event, live whales or carcasses may travel hundreds of miles before ever being observed, including into U.S. waters given prevailing currents. It is unknown exactly how many serious injuries and mortalities have occurred in Canadian waters historically. However, at least 14 right whale carcasses and 20 injured right whales were sighted in Canadian waters between 1988 and 2014 (Davies and Brillant 2019); 25 right whale carcasses were first sighted in Canadian waters or attributed to Canadian fishing gear from 2015 through 2019. In the sections to follow, information is provided on the fishing and shipping industry in Canadian waters, as well as measures the Canadian government is taking (or will be taking) to reduce the level of serious injuries and mortalities to North Atlantic rights resulting from incidental entanglement in fishing gear or vessel strikes.

Fishery Interactions in Canadian Waters

There are numerous fisheries operating in Canadian waters. Rock and toad crab fisheries, as well as fixed gear fisheries for cod, Atlantic halibut, Greenland halibut, winter flounder, and herring have historically had few interactions. While these fisheries deploy gear that pose some risk, this analysis focuses on fisheries that have demonstrated interactions with ESA-listed species (i.e., lobster, snow crab, mackerel, and whelk). Based on information provided by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), a brief summary of these fisheries is provided below.

The American lobster fishery is DFO's largest fishery, by landings. It is managed under regional management plans with 41 Lobster Fisheries Areas (Figure 5.1.2); in which 10,000 licensed harvesters across Atlantic Canada and Quebec participate.[5] In addition to the one permanent

5 Of the 41 Lobster Fisheries Areas, one is for the offshore fishery, and one is closed for conservation.

closure in Lobster Fishery Area 40 (Figure 4.1.2), fisheries are generally closed during the summer to protect molts. Lobster fishing is most active in the Gulf of Maine, Bay of Fundy, Southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, and coastal Nova Scotia. Most fisheries take place in shallow waters less than 130 ft. (40 m) deep and within 8 nm (15 km) of shore, although some fisheries will fish much farther out and in waters up to 660 ft. (200 m) deep. Management measures are tailored to each Area and include limits on the number of licenses issued, limits on the number of traps, limited and staggered fishing seasons, limits on minimum and maximum carapace size (which differs depending on the Area), protection of egg-bearing females (females must be notched and released alive), and ongoing monitoring and enforcement of fishing regulations and license conditions. The Canadian lobster fisheries use trap/pot gear consistent with the gear used in the American lobster fishery in the U.S. While both Canada and the U.S. lobster fisheries employ similar gears, the two nations employ different management strategies that result in divergent prosecution of the fisheries.

Figure 4.1.2. Lobster fishing areas in Atlantic Canada (https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fisheries-peches/commercial-commerciale/atl-arc/lobster-homard-eng.html)



The snow crab fishery is DFO's second largest fishery, by landings. It is managed under regional management plans with approximately 60 Snow Crab Management Areas in Canada spanning four regions (Scotia-Fundy, Southern Gulf of St. Lawrence, Northern Gulf of St. Lawrence, and Newfoundland and Labrador). Approximately 4,000 crab fishery licenses are issued annually[6]. The management of the snow crab fishery is based on annual total allowable

6 https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/stats/commercial/licences-permis/licences-permis-atl-eng.htm#Species; Last accessed February 12, 2023

catch, individual quotas, trap and mesh restrictions, minimum legal size, mandatory release of female crabs, minimum mesh size of traps, limited seasons, and areas. Protocols are in place to close grids when a percentage of soft-shell crabs in catches is reached. Harvesters use baited conical traps and pots set on muddy or sand-mud bottoms usually at depths of 230-460 ft. (70-140 m). Annual permit conditions have been used since 2017 to minimize the impacts to North Atlantic right whales, as described below.

DFO manages the Atlantic mackerel fishery under one Atlantic management plan, established in 2007. Management measures include fishing seasons, total allowable catch, gear, Safety at Sea fishing areas, licensing, minimum size, fishing gear restrictions, and monitoring. The plan allows the use of the following gear: gillnet, handline, trap net, seine, and weir. When established, the DFO issued 17,182 licenses across four regions, with over 50% of these licenses using gillnet gear. In 2020, DFO issued 7,812 licenses; no gear information was available. Commercial harvest is timed with the migration of mackerel into and out of Canadian waters. In Nova Scotia, the gillnet and trap fisheries for mackerel take place primarily in June and July. Mackerel generally arrive in southwestern Nova Scotia in May and Cape Breton in June. Migration out of the Gulf of St. Lawrence begins in September, and the fishery can continue into October or early November. They may enter the Gulf of St. Lawrence, depending on temperature conditions. The gillnet fishery in the Gulf of St. Lawrence also occurs in June and July. Most nets are fixed, except for a drift fishery in Chaleurs Bay and the part of the Gulf between New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and the Magdalen Islands.

Conservation harvesting plans are used to manage waved whelk in Canadian waters, which are harvested in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Quebec, Maritimes, and Newfoundland and Labrador regions. The fishery is managed using quotas, fishing gear requirements, dockside monitoring, traps limits, seasons, tagging, and area requirements. In 2017, there were 240 whelk license holders in Quebec; however, only 81 of them were active. Whelk traps are typically weighted at the bottom with cement or other means and a rope or other mechanism is positioned in the center of the trap to secure the bait. Between 50 and 175 traps are authorized per license. The total number of authorized traps for all licenses in each fishing area varies between 550 and 6,400 traps, while the number of used or active traps is lower, with 200 to 1,700 traps per fishing area. Since 2017, the Government of Canada has implemented measures to protect right whales from entanglement. These measures have included seasonal and dynamic closures for fixed gear fisheries, changes to the fishing season for snow crab, reductions in traps in the mid-shore fishery in Crab Fishing Area 12, and license conditions to reduce the amount of rope in the water. Measures to better track gear, require reporting of gear loss, require reporting of interactions with marine mammals, and increased surveillance for right whales have also been implemented. Measures to reduce interactions with fishing gear are adjusted annually. In 2021, mandatory closures for non-tended fixed gear fisheries, including lobster and crab, will be put in place for 15 days when right whales are sighted. If a whale is detected in days 9-15 of the closure, the closure will be extended. In the Bay of Fundy and the critical habitats in the Roseway and Grand Manan basins, this extension will be for an additional 15 days. If a right whale is detected in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the closure will be season-long (until November 15, 2021). Outside the dynamic area, closures are considered on a case-by-case basis. There are also gear marking and reporting requirements for all fixed gear fisheries. The Government of

Canada will also continue to support industry trials of innovative fishing technologies and methods to prevent and mitigate whale entanglement. This includes authorizing ropeless gear trials in closed areas in 2021. Measures to implement weak rope or weak-breaking points were delayed and will be implemented by 2024. Measures related to maximum rope diameters, sinking rope between traps and reductions in vertical and floating rope will be implemented after 2022. More information on these measures is available at https://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/fisheries-peches/commercial-commerciale/atl-arc/narw-bnan/management-gestion-eng.html.
In August 2016, NMFS published the MMPA Import Provisions Rule (81 FR 54389, August 15, 2016), which established criteria for evaluating a harvesting nation's regulatory program for reducing marine mammal bycatch and the procedures for obtaining authorization to import fish and fish products into the United States. Specifically, to continue in the international trade of seafood products with the United States, other nations must demonstrate that their marine mammal mitigation measures for commercial fisheries are, at a minimum, equivalent to those in place in the United States. A five-year exemption period (beginning January 1, 2017) was created in this process to allow foreign harvesting nations time to develop, as appropriate, regulatory programs comparable in effectiveness to U.S. programs at reducing marine mammal bycatch. To comply with its requirements, it is essential that these interactions are reported, documented, and quantified. To guarantee that fish products have access to the U.S. markets, DFO must implement procedures to reliably certify that the level of mortality caused by fisheries does not exceed U.S. standards. DFO must also demonstrate that the regulations in place to reduce accidental death of marine mammals are comparable to those of the United States.

Vessel Strikes in Canadian Waters
Vessel strikes are a threat to right whales throughout their range. In Canadian waters where rights whales are present, vessels include recreational and commercial vessels, small and large vessels, and sail, and power vessels. Vessel categories include oil and gas exploration, fishing and aquaculture, cruise ships, offshore excursions (whale and bird watching), tug/tow, dredge, cargo, and military vessels. At the time of development of the Gulf of St. Lawrence management plan, approximately 6,400 commercial vessels transited the Cabot Strait and the Strait of Belle Isle annually. This represents a subset of the vessels in this area as it only includes commercial vessels (DFO 2013). To address vessel strikes in Canadian waters, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) amended the Traffic Separation Scheme in the Bay of Fundy to reroute vessels around high use areas. In 2007, IMO adopted and Canada implemented a voluntary seasonal Area to Be Avoided (ATBA) in Roseway Basin to further reduce the risk of vessel strike (DFO 2020). In addition, Canada has implemented seasonal speed restrictions and developed a proposed action plan to identify specific measures needed to address threats and achieve recovery (DFO 2020).

The Government of Canada has also implemented measures to mitigate vessel strikes in Canadian waters. Each year since August 2017, the Government has implemented seasonal speed restrictions (maximum 10 knots) for vessels 20 meters or longer in the western Gulf of St. Lawrence. In 2019, the area was adjusted and the restriction was expanded to apply to vessels greater than 13 m. Smaller vessels are encouraged to respect the limit. Dynamic area management has also been used in recent years. Currently, there are two shipping lanes, south and north of Anticosti Island, where dynamic speed restrictions (mandatory slowdown to 10 knots) can be activated when right whales are present. In 2020 and 2021, the Government of Canada also implemented a trial voluntary speed restriction zone from Cabot Strait to the eastern edge of the dynamic shipping zone at the beginning and end of the season and a mandatory restricted area in or near Shediac Valley mid-season. More information is available at https://www.tc.gc.ca/en/services/marine/navigation-marine-conditions/protecting-north-atlantic-right-whales-collisions-ships-gulf-st-lawrence.html. Modifications to measures in 2021 include refining the size, location, and duration of the mandatory restricted area in and near Shediac Valley and expanding the speed limit exemption in waters less than 20 fathoms to all commercial fishing vessels. In 2022, a variety of measures were in place to reduce the risk of vessel strike including vessel speed limits and restricted access areas.

Critical Habitat
Critical habitat for North Atlantic right whales has been designated in U.S. waters as described in section 4.0 of this Opinion.

Recovery Goals
Recovery is the process of restoring endangered and threatened species to the point where they no longer require the safeguards of the Endangered Species Act. A recovery plan serves as a road map for species recovery—the plan outlines the path and tasks required to restore and secure self-sustaining wild populations. It is a non-regulatory document that describes, justifies, and schedules the research and management actions necessary to support recovery of a species. The goal of the 2005 Recovery Plan for the North Atlantic right whale (NMFS, 2005) is to promote the recovery of North Atlantic right whales to a level sufficient to warrant their removal from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants under the ESA. The intermediate recovery goal is to reclassify the species from endangered to threatened. The recovery strategy identified in the Recovery Plan focuses on reducing or eliminating deaths and injuries from anthropogenic activities, namely shipping and commercial fishing operations; developing demographically-based recovery criteria; the characterization, monitoring, and protection of important habitat; identification and monitoring of the status, trends, distribution and health of the species; conducting studies on the effects of other potential threats and ensuring that they are addressed, and conducting genetic studies to assess population structure and diversity. The plan also recognizes the need to work closely with State, other Federal, international and private entities to ensure that research and recovery efforts are coordinated. The recovery plan includes the following downlisting criteria, the achievement of which would demonstrate significant progress toward full recovery:

> North Atlantic right whales may be considered for reclassifying to threatened when all of the following have been met: 1) The population ecology (range, distribution, age structure, and gender ratios, etc.) and vital rates (age-specific survival, age-specific reproduction, and lifetime reproductive success) of right whales are indicative of an increasing population; 2) The population has increased for a period of 35 years at an average rate of increase equal to or greater than 2% per year; 3) None of the known threats to North Atlantic right whales (summarized in the five listing factors) are known to limit the population's growth rate; and 4) Given current and projected threats and

environmental conditions, the right whale population has no more than a 1% chance of quasi-extinction in 100 years.

Specific criteria for delisting North Atlantic right whales are not included in the recovery plan; as described in the recovery plan, conditions related to delisting are too distant and hypothetical to realistically develop specific criteria. The current abundance of North Atlantic right whales is currently an order of magnitude less than an abundance at which NMFS would even consider delisting the species. The current dynamics indicate that the North Atlantic right whale population is in decline, rather than recovering, and decades of population growth at rates considered typical for large whales would be required before the population could attain an abundance that may suggest that delisting was appropriate to consider. Specific criteria for delisting North Atlantic right whales will be included in a future revision of the recovery plan well before the population is at a level when delisting becomes a reasonable decision (NMFS 2005).

The most recent five-year review for right whales was completed in 2022 (NMFS 2022). The recommendation in that plan was for the status to remain as endangered. As described in the report, the North Atlantic right whale faces continued threat of human-caused mortality due to lethal interactions with commercial fisheries and vessel traffic. As stated in the 5-Year Review, there is also uncertainty regarding the effect of long-term sublethal entanglements, emerging environmental stressors including climate change, and the compounding effects of multiple continuous stressors that may be limiting North Atlantic right whale calving and recovery. In addition, the North Atlantic right whale population has been in a state of decline since 2010. Management measures in the United States have been in place for an extended period of time and continued modifications are underway/anticipated, and measures in Canada since 2017 also suggest continued progress toward implementing conservation regulations. Despite these efforts to reduce the decline and promote recovery, progress toward right whale recovery has continued to regress.

4.1.2 Fin Whale (Balaenoptera physalus)

Globally there is one species of fin whale, *Balaenoptera physalus*. Fin whales occur in all major oceans of the Northern and Southern Hemispheres (NMFS 2010a) (Figure 4.1.3). Within this range, three subspecies of fin whales are recognized: *B. p. physalus* in the Northern Hemisphere, and *B. p. quoyi* and *B. p. patachonica* (a pygmy form) in the Southern Hemisphere (NMFS 2010a). For management purposes in the northern Hemisphere, the United States divides, *B. p. physalus,* into four stocks: Hawaii, California/Oregon/Washington, Alaska (Northeast Pacific), and Western North Atlantic (Hayes et al. 2019, NMFS 2010a).

Figure 4.1.3. Range of the fin whale



Fin whales are distinguishable from other whales by a sleek, streamlined body, with a V-shaped head, a tall hooked dorsal fin, and a distinctive color pattern of a black or dark brownish-gray body and sides with a white ventral surface. The lower jaw is gray or black on the left side and creamy white on the right side. The fin whale was listed as endangered on December 2, 1970 (35 FR 18319).

Information available from the recovery plan (NMFS 2010a), recent stock assessment reports (Carretta et al. 2019a, Hayes et al. 2022, Muto et al. 2019a), the five-year status review (NMFS 2019b), as well as the recent International Union for the Conservation of Nature's (IUCN) fin whale assessment (Cooke 2018b) were used to summarize the life history, population dynamics and status of the species as follows.

Life History

Fin whales can live, on average, 80 to 90 years. They have a gestation period of less than one year, and calves nurse for six to seven months. Sexual maturity is reached between 6 and 10 years of age with an average calving interval of two to three years. They mostly inhabit deep, offshore waters of all major oceans. They winter at low latitudes, where they calve and nurse, and summer at high latitudes, where they feed, although some fin whales appear to be residential to certain areas.

Population Dynamics

The pre-exploitation estimate for the fin whale population in the entire North Atlantic was approximately 30,000-50,000 animals (NMFS 2010a), and for the entire North Pacific Ocean, approximately 42,000 to 45,000 animals (Ohsumi and Wada 1974). In the Southern Hemisphere, prior to exploitation, the fin whale population was approximately 40,000 whales (Mizroch et al. 1984b). In the North Atlantic Ocean, fin whales were heavily exploited from 1864 to the 1980s; over this timeframe, approximately 98,000 to 115,000 fin whales were killed (IWC 2017). Between 1910-1975, approximately 76,000 fin whales were recorded taken by modern whaling in the North Pacific; this number is likely higher as many whales killed were not identified to species or while killed, were not successfully landed (Allison 2017). Over 725,000 fin whales were killed in the Southern Hemisphere from 1905 to 1976 (Allison 2017).

In the North Atlantic Ocean, the IWC has defined seven management stocks of fin whales: (1) North Norway (2) East Greenland and West Iceland (EGI); (3) West Norway and the Faroes; (4) British Isles, Spain and Portugal; (5) West Greenland and (6) Nova Scotia, (7) Newfoundland and Labrador (Donovan 1991, NMFS 2010a). Based on three decades of survey data in various portions of the North Atlantic, the IWC estimates that there are approximately 79,000 fin whales in this region. Under the present IWC scheme, fin whales off the eastern United States, Nova Scotia and the southeastern coast of Newfoundland are believed to constitute a single stock; in U.S. waters, NMFS classifies these fin whales as the Western North Atlantic stock (Donovan 1991, Hayes et al. 2019, NMFS 2010a). NMFS' best estimate of abundance for the Western North Atlantic Stock of fin whales is 6,802 individuals (N_{min}=5,573); this estimate is the sum of the 2016 NOAA shipboard and aerial surveys and the 2016 Canadian Northwest Atlantic International Sightings Survey (Hayes et al. 2022). Currently, there is no population estimate for the entire fin whale population in the North Pacific (Cooke 2018b). However, abundance estimates for three stocks in U.S. Pacific Ocean waters do exist: Northeast Pacific (N= 3,168; N_{min}=2,554), Hawaii (N=154; N_{min}=75), and California/Oregon/Washington (N= 9,029; N_{min}=8,127) (Nadeem et al. 2016). Abundance data for the Southern Hemisphere stock remain highly uncertain; however, available information suggests a substantial increase in the population has occurred (Thomas et al. 2016).

In the North Atlantic, estimates of annual growth rate for the entire fin whale population in this region is not available (Cooke 2018b). However, in U.S. Atlantic waters NMFS has determined that until additional data are available, the cetacean maximum theoretical net productivity rate of 4.0% will be used for the Western North Atlantic stock (Hayes et al. 2019). In the North Pacific, estimates of annual growth rate for the entire fin whale population in this region is not available (Cooke 2018b). However, in U.S. Pacific waters, NMFS has determined that until additional data are available, the cetacean maximum theoretical net productivity rate of 4.0% will be used for the Northeast Pacific stock (Muto et al. 2019b, NMFS 2016b). Overall population growth rates and total abundance estimates for the Hawaii stock of fin whales are not available at this time (Carretta et al. 2018). Based on line transect studies between 1991-2014, there was estimated a 7.5% increase in mean annual abundance in fin whales occurring in waters off California, Oregon, and Washington; to date, this represents the best available information on the current population trend for the overall California/Oregon/Washington stock of fin whales (Carretta et al. 2019a, Nadeem et al. 2016).[7] For Southern Hemisphere fin whales, as noted above, overall information suggests a substantial increase in the population; however, the rate of increase remains poorly quantified (Cooke 2018b).

Archer et al. (2013) examined the genetic structure and diversity of fin whales globally. Full sequencing of the mitochondrial DNA genome for 154 fin whales sampled in the North Atlantic Ocean, North Pacific Ocean, and Southern Hemisphere, resulted in 136 haplotypes, none of which were shared among ocean basins suggesting differentiation at least at this geographic scale. However, North Atlantic fin whales appear to be more closely related to the Southern Hemisphere population, as compared to fin whales in the North Pacific Ocean, which may

[7] Since 2005, the fin whale abundance increase has been driven by increases off northern California, Oregon, and Washington; numbers off Central and Southern California have remained stable (Carretta et al. 2020, Nadeem et al. 2016).

indicate a revision of the subspecies delineations is warranted. Generally, haplotype diversity was found to be high both within and across ocean basins (Archer et al. 2013). Such high genetic diversity and lack of differentiation within ocean basins may indicate that despite some populations having small abundance estimates, the species may persist long-term and be somewhat protected from substantial environmental variance and catastrophes. Archer et al. 2019 suggests that within the Northern Hemisphere, populations in the North Pacific and North Atlantic oceans can be considered at least different subspecies, if not different species.

Status
The fin whale is endangered because of past commercial whaling. Prior to commercial whaling, hundreds of thousands of fin whales existed. Fin whales may be killed under "aboriginal subsistence whaling" in Greenland, under Japan's scientific whaling program, and Iceland's formal objection to the IWC's ban on commercial whaling. Additional threats include vessel strikes, reduced prey availability due to overfishing or climate change, and sound. The species' overall large population size may provide some resilience to current threats, but trends are largely unknown. The total annual estimated average human-caused mortality and serious injury for the western North Atlantic fin whale for the period 2015−2019 is 1.85 (1.45 incidental fishery interactions and 0.40 vessel collisions) (Henry et al. 2022). Hayes et al. 2022 notes that these represent a minimum estimate of human-caused mortality, which is, almost certainly biased low.

Critical Habitat
No critical habitat has been designated for the fin whale.

Recovery Goals
The goal of the 2010 Recovery Plan for the fin whale (NMFS 2010a) is to promote the recovery of fin whales to the point at which they can be downlisted from endangered to threatened status, and ultimately to remove them from the list of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, under the provisions of the ESA. The intermediate goal is to reclassify the species from endangered to threatened. The recovery plan also includes downlisting and delisting criteria. Key elements for the recovery program for fin whales are:

1. Coordinate state, federal, and international actions to implement recovery actions and maintain international regulation of whaling for fin whales;
2. Determine population discreteness and population structure of fin whales;
3. Develop and apply methods to estimate population size and monitor trends in abundance;
4. Conduct risk analysis;
5. Identify, characterize, protect, and monitor habitat important to fin whale populations in U.S. waters and elsewhere;
6. Investigate causes and reduce the frequency and severity of human-caused injury and mortality;
7. Determine and minimize any detrimental effects of anthropogenic noise in the oceans;

8. Maximize efforts to acquire scientific information from dead, stranded, and/or entrapped fin whales; and,
9. Develop post-delisting monitoring plan.

In February 2019, NMFS published a Five-Year Review for fin whales. This 5-year review indicates that, based on a review of the best available scientific and commercial information, that the fin whale should be downlisted from endangered to threatened. The review also recommended that NMFS consider whether listing at the subspecies or distinct population segment level is appropriate in terms of potential conservation benefits and the use of limited agency resources (NMFS 2019). To date, no changes to the listing for fin whales have been proposed.

4.2 Sea Turtles

Kemp's ridley and leatherback sea turtles are currently listed under the ESA at the species level; green and loggerhead sea turtles are listed at the DPS level. Therefore, we include information on the range-wide status of Kemp's ridley and leatherback sea turtles to provide the overall status of each species. Information on the status of loggerhead and green sea turtles is for the DPS affected by this action.

4.2.1 Green Sea Turtle (Chelonia mydas, North Atlantic DPS)

The green sea turtle has a circumglobal distribution, occurring throughout tropical, subtropical and, to a lesser extent, temperate waters. They commonly inhabit nearshore and inshore waters. It is the largest of the hardshell marine turtles, growing to a weight of approximately 350 lbs. (159 kg) and a straight carapace length of greater than 3.3 ft. (1 m). The species was listed under the ESA on July 28, 1978 (43 FR 32800) as endangered for breeding populations in Florida and the Pacific coast of Mexico and threatened in all other areas throughout its range. On April 6, 2016, NMFS listed 11 DPSs of green sea turtles as threatened or endangered under the ESA (81 FR 20057). The North Atlantic DPS of green turtle is found in the North Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico (Figure 4.2.1) and is listed as threatened. Green turtles from the North Atlantic DPS range from the boundary of South and Central America (7.5° N, 77° W) in the south, throughout the Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the U.S. Atlantic coast to New Brunswick, Canada (48° N, 77° W) in the north. The range of the DPS then extends due east along latitudes 48° N and 19° N to the western coasts of Europe and Africa.

Figure 4.2.1. Range of the North Atlantic distinct population segment green turtle (1), with location and abundance of nesting females (Seminoff et al. 2015).



We used information available in the 2015 Status Review (Seminoff et al. 2015), relevant literature, and recent nesting data from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWRI) to summarize the life history, population dynamics and status of the species, as follows.

Life History

Costa Rica (Tortuguero), Mexico (Campeche, Yucatan, Quintana Roo), United States (Florida) and Cuba support nesting concentrations of particular interest in the North Atlantic DPS (Seminoff et al. 2015). The largest nesting site in the North Atlantic DPS is in Tortuguero, Costa Rica, which hosts 79% of nesting females for the DPS (Seminoff et al. 2015). In the southeastern United States, females generally nest between May and September (Seminoff et al. 2015, Witherington et al. 2006). Green sea turtles lay an average of three nests per season with an average of one hundred eggs per nest (Hirth 1997, Seminoff et al. 2015). The remigration interval (period between nesting seasons) is two to five years (Hirth 1997, Seminoff et al. 2015). Nesting occurs primarily on beaches with intact dune structure, native vegetation, and appropriate incubation temperatures during the summer months.

Sea turtles are long-lived animals. Size and age at sexual maturity have been estimated using several methods, including mark-recapture, skeletochronology, and marked known-aged individuals. Skeletochronology analyzes growth marks in bones to obtain growth rates and age at sexual maturity estimates. Estimates vary widely among studies and populations, and methods continue to be developed and refined (Avens and Snover 2013). Early mark-recapture studies in Florida estimated the age at sexual maturity 18-30 years (Frazer and Ehrhart 1985, Goshe et al. 2010, Mendonça 1981). More recent estimates of age at sexual maturity are as high as 35–50 years (Avens and Snover 2013, Goshe et al. 2010), with lower ranges reported from known age (15–19 years) turtles from the Cayman Islands (Bell et al. 2005) and Caribbean Mexico (12–20 years) (Zurita et al. 2012). A study of green turtles that use waters of the southeastern United States as developmental habitat found the age at sexual maturity likely ranges from 30 to 44 years (Goshe et al. 2010). Green turtles in the Northwestern Atlantic mature at 2.8-33+ ft. (85–100+ cm) straight carapace lengths (SCL) (Avens and Snover 2013).

Adult turtles exhibit site fidelity and migrate hundreds to thousands of kilometers from nesting beaches to foraging areas. Green sea turtles spend the majority of their lives in coastal foraging grounds, which include open coastlines and protected bays and lagoons. Adult green turtles feed primarily on seagrasses and algae, although they also eat other invertebrate prey (Seminoff et al. 2015).

Population Dynamics

The North Atlantic DPS has a globally unique haplotype, which was a factor in defining the discreteness of the DPS. Evidence from mitochondrial DNA studies indicates that there are at least four independent nesting subpopulations in Florida, Cuba, Mexico, and Costa Rica (Seminoff et al. 2015). More recent genetic analysis indicates that designating a new western Gulf of Mexico management unit might be appropriate (Shamblin et al. 2016).

Compared to other DPSs, the North Atlantic DPS exhibits the highest nester abundance, with approximately 167,424 females at seventy-three nesting sites (using data through 2012), and available data indicated an increasing trend in nesting (Seminoff et al. 2015). Counts of nests and nesting females are commonly used as an index of abundance and population trends, even though there are doubts about the ability to estimate the overall population size.

There are no reliable estimates of population growth rate for the DPS as a whole, but estimates have been developed at a localized level. The status review for green sea turtles assessed population trends for seven nesting sites with more than10 years of data collection in the North Atlantic DPS. The results were variable with some sites showing no trend and others increasing. However, all major nesting populations (using data through 2011-2012) demonstrated increases in abundance (Seminoff et al. 2015)).

Recent data is available for the southeastern United States. The FWRI monitors sea turtle nesting through the Statewide Nesting Beach Survey (SNBS) and Index Nesting Beach Survey (INBS). Since 1979, the SNBS has surveyed approximately 215 beaches to collect information on the distribution, seasonality, and abundance of sea turtle nesting in Florida. Since 1989, the INBS has been conducted on a subset of SNBS beaches to monitor trends through consistent effort and specialized training of surveyors. The INBS data uses a standardized data-collection protocol to allow for comparisons between years and is presented for green, loggerhead, and leatherback sea turtles. The index counts represent 27 core index beaches and do not represent Florida's total annual nest counts because they are collected only on a subset of Florida's beaches (27 out of 224 beaches) and only during a 109-day time window (15 May through 31 August). The index nest counts represent approximately 67% of known green turtle nesting in Florida (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/).

Green turtle nest counts have increased eightyfold since standardized nest counts began in 1989. In 2021, green turtle nest counts on the 27-core index beaches reached more than 24,000 nests recorded. Nesting green turtles tend to follow a two-year reproductive cycle and, typically, there are wide year-to-year fluctuations in the number of nests recorded. Green turtles set record highs in 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017, and 2019. The nest count in 2021 did not set another record high but was only marginally higher than 2020, an unusually high "low year." FWRI reports that changes in the typical two-year cycle have been documented in the past as well (e.g., 2010-2011) and are not reason of concern.

Figure 4.2.2. Number of green sea turtle nests counted on core index beaches in Florida from 1989-2021 (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/)



Status

Historically, green sea turtles in the North Atlantic DPS were hunted for food, which was the principal cause of the population's decline. Apparent increases in nester abundance for the North Atlantic DPS in recent years are encouraging but must be viewed cautiously, as the datasets represent a fraction of a green sea turtle generation, which is between 30 and 40 years (Seminoff et al. 2015). While the threats of pollution, habitat loss through coastal development, beachfront lighting, and fisheries bycatch continue, the North Atlantic DPS appears to be somewhat resilient to future perturbations.

Critical Habitat

Critical habitat for the North Atlantic DPS of green sea turtles surrounds Culebra Island, Puerto Rico (66 FR 20058, April 6, 2016), which is outside the action area.

Recovery Goals
The most recent Recovery Plan for the U.S. population of green sea turtles in the Atlantic was published in 1991. The goal of the 1991 Recovery Plan is to delist the species once the recovery criteria are met (NMFS and U.S.FWS 1991). The recovery plan includes criteria for delisting related to nesting activity, nesting habitat protection, and reduction in mortality.

Priority actions to meet the recovery goals include:

1. Providing long-term protection to important nesting beaches.
2. Ensuring at least a 60% hatch rate success on major nesting beaches.
3. Implementing effective lighting ordinances/plans on nesting beaches.
4. Determining distribution and seasonal movements of all life stages in the marine environment.
5. Minimizing commercial fishing mortality.
6. Reducing threat to the population and foraging habitat from marine pollution.

4.2.2 Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle (Lepidochelys kempii)
The range of Kemp's ridley sea turtles extends from the Gulf of Mexico to the Atlantic coast (Figure 4.2.3). They have occasionally been found in the Mediterranean Sea, which may be due to migration expansion or increased hatchling production (Tomás and Raga 2008). They are the smallest of all sea turtle species, with a nearly circular top shell and a pale yellowish bottom shell. The species was first listed under the Endangered Species Conservation Act (35 FR 18319, December 2, 1970) in 1970. The species has been listed as endangered under the ESA since 1973.

We used information available in the revised recovery plan (NMFS et al. 2011), the five-year review (NMFS and USFWS 2015), and published literature to summarize the life history, population dynamics and status of the species, as follows.

Figure 4.2.3. Range of the Kemp's ridley sea turtle



Life History
Kemp's ridley nesting is essentially limited to the western Gulf of Mexico. Approximately 97% of the global population's nesting activity occurs on a 90-mile (146-km) stretch of beach that includes Rancho Nuevo in Mexico (Wibbels and Bevan 2019). In the United States, nesting occurs primarily in Texas and occasionally in Florida, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina (NMFS and USFWS 2015). Nesting occurs from April to July in large arribadas (synchronized large-scale nesting). The average remigration interval is two years, although intervals of 1 and 3 years are not uncommon (NMFS et al. 2011, TEWG 1998, 2000). Females lay an average of 2.5 clutches per season (NMFS et al. 2011). The annual average clutch size is 95 to 112 eggs per nest (NMFS and USFWS 2015). The nesting location may be particularly important because hatchlings can more easily migrate to foraging grounds in deeper oceanic waters, where they remain for approximately two years before returning to nearshore coastal habitats (Epperly et al. 2013, NMFS and USFWS 2015, Snover et al. 2007). Modeling indicates that oceanic-stage Kemp's ridley turtles are likely distributed throughout the Gulf of Mexico into the northwestern Atlantic (Putman et al. 2013). Kemp's ridley nearing the age when recruitment to nearshore waters occurs are more likely to be distributed in the northern Gulf of Mexico, eastern Gulf of Mexico, and the western Atlantic (Putman et al. 2013).

Several studies, including those of captive turtles, recaptured turtles of known age, mark-recapture data, and skeletochronology, have estimated the average age at sexual maturity for Kemp's ridleys between 5 to 12 years (captive only) (Bjorndal et al. 2014), 10 to 16 years (Chaloupka and Zug 1997, Schmid and Witzell 1997, Schmid and Woodhead 2000, Zug et al. 1997), 9.9 to 16.7 years (Snover et al. 2007), 10 and 18 years (Shaver and Wibbels 2007), 6.8 to 21.8 years (mean 12.9 years) (Avens et al. 2017).

During spring and summer, juvenile Kemp's ridleys generally occur in the shallow coastal waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico from south Texas to north Florida and along the U.S. Atlantic coast from southern Florida to the Mid-Atlantic and New England. The NEFSC caught a juvenile Kemp's ridley during a research project in deep water south of Georges Bank (NEFSC, unpublished data). In the fall, most Kemp's ridleys migrate to deeper or more southern, warmer waters and remain there through the winter. As adults, many turtles remain in the Gulf of Mexico, with only occasional occurrence in the Atlantic Ocean (NMFS et al. 2011). Adult habitat largely consists of sandy and muddy areas in shallow, nearshore waters less than 120 feet (37 meters) deep (Seney and Landry 2008, Shaver et al. 2005, Shaver and Rubio 2008), although they can also be found in deeper offshore waters. As larger juveniles and adults, Kemp's ridleys forage on swimming crabs, fish, mollusks, and tunicates (NMFS et al. 2011).

Population Dynamics

Of the sea turtles species in the world, the Kemp's ridley has declined to the lowest population level. Nesting aggregations at a single location (Rancho Nuevo, Mexico) were estimated at 40,000 females in 1947. By the mid-1980s, the population had declined to an estimated 300 nesting females. From 1980 to 2003, the number of nests at three primary nesting beaches (Rancho Nuevo, Tepehuajes, and Playa Dos) increased at 15% annually (Heppell et al. 2005). However, due to recent declines in nest counts, decreased survival of immature and adult sea turtles, and updated population modeling, this rate is not expected to continue and the overall trend is unclear (Caillouet et al. 2018, NMFS and USFWS 2015). In 2019, there were 11,090 nests, a 37.61% decrease from 2018, and a 54.89% decrease from 2017, which had the highest number (24,587) of nests (Figure 4.2.4; unpublished data). The reason for this recent decline is uncertain. In 2021, 198 Kemp's ridley nests were found in Texas – the largest number recorded in Texas since 1978 was in 2017, when 353 nests were documented.

Using the standard IUCN protocol for sea turtle assessments, the number of mature individuals was recently estimated at 22,341 (Wibbels and Bevan 2019). The calculation took into account the average annual nests from 2016-2018 (21,156), a clutch frequency of 2.5 per year, a remigration interval of 2 years, and a sex ratio of 3.17 females: 1 male. Based on the data in their analysis, the assessment concluded the current population trend is unknown (Wibbels and Bevan 2019). Genetic variability in Kemp's ridley turtles is considered to be high, as measured by nuclear DNA analyses (i.e., microsatellites) (NMFS et al. 2011). If this holds true, rapid increases in population over one or two generations would likely prevent any negative consequences in the genetic variability of the species (NMFS et al. 2011). Additional analysis of the mtDNA taken from samples of Kemp's ridley turtles at Padre Island, Texas, showed six distinct haplotypes, with one found at both Padre Island and Rancho Nuevo (Dutton et al. 2006).

Status

The Kemp's ridley was listed as endangered in response to a severe population decline, primarily the result of egg collection. In 1973, legal ordinances in Mexico prohibited the harvest of sea turtles from May to August, and in 1990, the harvest of all sea turtles was prohibited by presidential decree. In 2002, Rancho Nuevo was declared a Sanctuary. Nesting beaches in Texas have been re-established. Fishery interactions are the main threat to the species. Other threats include habitat destruction, oil spills, dredging, disease, cold stunning, and climate change. The current population trend is uncertain. While the population has increased, recent nesting numbers have been variable. In addition, the species' limited range and low global abundance make it vulnerable to new sources of mortality as well as demographic and environmental randomness, all of which are often difficult to predict with any certainty. Therefore, its resilience to future perturbation affecting survival and nesting success is low.

Figure 4.2.4. Kemp's ridley nest totals from Mexican beaches (Gladys Porter Zoo nesting database 2019)



Critical Habitat
Critical habitat has not been designated for Kemp's ridley sea turtles.

Recovery Goals
As with other recovery plans, the goal of the 2011 Kemp's ridley recovery plan (NMFS, USFWS, and SEMARNAT 2011) is to conserve and protect the species so that the listing is no longer necessary. The recovery criteria relate to the number of nesting females, hatchling recruitment, habitat protection, social and/or economic initiatives compatible with conservation, reduction of predation, TED or other protective measures in trawl gear, and improved information available to ensure recovery. In 2015, the bi-national recovery team published a number of recommendations including four critical actions (NMFS and USFWS 2015). These include: (a) continue funding by the major funding institutions at a level of support needed to run the successful turtle camps in the State of Tamaulipas, Mexico, in order to continue the high level of hatchling production and nesting female protection; (b) increase turtle excluder device (TED) compliance in U.S. and MX shrimp fisheries; 3 (c) require TEDs in U.S. skimmer trawl

fisheries and other trawl fisheries in coastal waters where fishing overlaps with the distribution of Kemp's ridleys; (d) assess bycatch in gillnets in the Northern Gulf of Mexico and State of Tamaulipas, Mexico, to determine whether modifications to gear or fishing practices are needed.

The most recent Five-Year Review was completed in 2015 (NMFS and USFWS 2015) with a recommendation that the status of Kemp's ridley sea turtles should remain as endangered. In the Plan, the Services recommend that efforts continue towards achieving the major recovery actions in the 2015 plan with a priority for actions to address recent declines in the annual number of nests.

4.2.3 Loggerhead Sea Turtle (Caretta caretta, Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS)

Loggerhead sea turtles are circumglobal and are found in the temperate and tropical regions of the Indian, Pacific, and Atlantic Oceans. The loggerhead sea turtle is distinguished from other turtles by its reddish-brown carapace, large head and powerful jaws. The species was first listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act in 1978 (43 FR 32800, July 28, 1978). On September 22, 2011, the NMFS and USFWS designated nine distinct population segments of loggerhead sea turtles, with the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS listed as threatened (76 FR 58868). The Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS of loggerheads is found along eastern North America, Central America, and northern South America (Figure 4.2.5).

Figure 4.2.5. Range of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS of loggerhead sea turtles



We used information available in the 2009 Status Review (Conant et al. 2009), the final listing rule (76 FR 58868, September 22, 2011), the relevant literature, and recent nesting data from the FWRI to summarize the life history, population dynamics and status of the species, as follows.

Life History

Nesting occurs on beaches where warm, humid sand temperatures incubate the eggs. Northwest Atlantic females lay an average of five clutches per year. The annual average clutch size is 115 eggs per nest. Females do not nest every year. The average remigration interval is three years. There is a 54% emergence success rate (Conant et al. 2009). As with other sea turtles, temperature determines the sex of the turtle during the middle of the incubation period. Turtles spend the post-hatchling stage in pelagic waters. The juvenile stage is spent first in the oceanic zone and later in coastal waters. Some juveniles may periodically move between the oceanic zone and coastal waters (Bolten 2003, Conant et al. 2009, Mansfield 2006, Morreale and Standora 2005, Witzell 2002). Coastal waters provide important foraging, inter-nesting, and migratory habitats for adult loggerheads. In both the oceanic zone and coastal waters, loggerheads are primarily carnivorous, although they do consume some plant matter as well (Conant et al. 2009). Loggerheads have been documented to feed on crustaceans, mollusks, jellyfish and salps, and algae (Bjorndal 1997, Donaton et al. 2019, Seney and Musick 2007). Avens et al. (2015) used three approaches to estimate age at maturation. Mean age predictions associated with minimum and mean maturation straight carapace lengths were 22.5-25 and 36-38 years for females and 26-28 and 37-42 years for males. Male and female sea turtles have similar post-maturation longevity, ranging from 4 to 46 (mean 19) years (Avens et al. 2015).

Loggerhead hatchlings from the western Atlantic disperse widely, most likely using the Gulf Stream to drift throughout the Atlantic Ocean. MtDNA evidence demonstrates that juvenile loggerheads from southern Florida nesting beaches comprise the vast majority (71%-88%) of individuals found in foraging grounds throughout the western and eastern Atlantic: Nicaragua, Panama, Azores and Madeira, Canary Islands and Andalusia, Gulf of Mexico, and Brazil (Masuda 2010). LaCasalla et al. (2013) found that loggerheads, primarily juveniles, caught within the Northeast Distant (NED) waters of the North Atlantic mostly originated from nesting populations in the southeast United States and, in particular, Florida. They found that nearly all loggerheads caught in the NED came from the Northwest Atlantic DPS (mean = 99.2%), primarily from the large eastern Florida rookeries. There was little evidence of contributions from the South Atlantic, Northeast Atlantic, or Mediterranean DPSs (LaCasella et al. 2013). A more recent analysis assessed sea turtles captured in fisheries in the Northwest Atlantic and included samples from 850 (including 24 turtles caught during fisheries research) turtles caught from 2000-2013 in coastal and oceanic habitats (Stewart et al. 2019). The turtles were primarily captured in pelagic longline and bottom otter trawls. Other gears included bottom longline, hook and line, gillnet, dredge, and dip net. Turtles were identified from 19 distinct management units; the western Atlantic nesting populations were the main contributors with little representation from the Northeast Atlantic, Mediterranean, or South Atlantic DPSs (Stewart et al. 2019). There was a significant split in the distribution of small (≤ 2 ft. (63 cm) SCL) and large (> 2 ft. (63 cm) SCL) loggerheads north and south of Cape Hatteras, North Carolina. North of Cape Hatteras, large turtles came mainly from southeast Florida (44%±15%) and the northern United States management units (33%±16%); small turtles came from central east Florida (64%±14%). South of Cape Hatteras, large turtles came mainly from central east Florida (52%±20%) and southeast Florida (41%±20%); small turtles came from southeast Florida (56%±25%). The authors concluded that bycatch in the western North Atlantic would affect the Northwest Atlantic DPS almost exclusively (Stewart et al. 2019).

Population Dynamics
A number of stock assessments and similar reviews (Conant et al. 2009, Heppell et al. 2005, NMFS SEFSC 2001, 2009, Richards et al. 2011, TEWG 1998, 2000, 2009) have examined the stock status of loggerheads in the Atlantic Ocean, but none has been able to develop a reliable estimate of absolute population size. As with other species, counts of nests and nesting females are commonly used as an index of abundance and population trends, even though there are doubts about the ability to estimate the overall population size.

Based on genetic analysis of nesting subpopulations, the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS is divided into five recovery units: Northern, Peninsular Florida, Dry Tortugas, Northern Gulf of Mexico, and Greater Caribbean (Conant et al. 2009). A more recent analysis using expanded mtDNA sequences revealed that rookeries from the Gulf and Atlantic coasts of Florida are genetically distinct (Shamblin et al. 2014). The recent genetic analyses suggest that the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS should be considered as ten management units: (1) South Carolina and Georgia, (2) central eastern Florida, (3) southeastern Florida, (4) Cay Sal, Bahamas, (5) Dry Tortugas, Florida, (6) southwestern Cuba, (7) Quintana Roo, Mexico, (8) southwestern Florida, (9) central western Florida, and (10) northwestern Florida (Shamblin et al. 2012).
The Northwest Atlantic Ocean's loggerhead nesting aggregation is considered the largest in the world (Casale and Tucker 2017). Using data from 2004-2008, the adult female population size of the DPS was estimated at 20,000 to 40,000 females (NMFS SEFSC 2009). More recently, Ceriani and Meylan (2017) reported a 5-year average (2009-2013) of more than 83,717 nests per year in the southeast United States and Mexico (excluding Cancun (Quintana Roo, Mexico). These estimates included sites without long-term (≥10 years) datasets. When they used data from 86 index sites (representing 63.4% of the estimated nests for the whole DPS with long-term datasets, they reported 53,043 nests per year. Trends at the different index nesting beaches ranged from negative to positive. In a trend analysis of the 86 index sites, the overall trend for the Northwest Atlantic DPS was positive (+2%) (Ceriani and Meylan 2017). Uncertainties in this analysis include, among others, using nesting females as proxies for overall population abundance and trends, demographic parameters, monitoring methodologies, and evaluation methods involving simple comparisons of early and later 5-year average annual nest counts. However, the authors concluded that the subpopulation is well monitored and the data evaluated represents 63.4 % of the total estimated annual nests of the subpopulation and, therefore, are representative of the overall trend (Ceriani and Meylan 2017).

About 80% of loggerhead nesting in the southeast United States occurs in six Florida counties (NMFS and USFWS 2008). The Peninsula Florida Recovery Unit and the Northern Recovery Unit represent approximately 87% and 10%, respectively of all nesting effort in the Northwest Atlantic DPS (Ceriani and Meylan 2017, NMFS and USFWS 2008). As described above, FWRI's INBS collects standardized nesting data. The index nest counts for loggerheads represent approximately 53% of known nesting in Florida. There have been three distinct intervals observed: increasing (1989-1998), decreasing (1998-2007), and increasing (2007-2021). At core index beaches in Florida, nesting totaled a minimum of 28,876 nests in 2007 and a maximum of 65,807 nests in 2016 (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/). In 2019, more than 53,000 nests were documented. In 2020, loggerhead turtles had another successful nesting season with more than 49,100 nests documented. The nest counts in Figure 5.2.6 represent peninsular Florida and do not include an additional set of beaches in the Florida Panhandle and southwest coast that were added to the program in 1997. Nest counts at these Florida Panhandle index beaches have an upward trend since 2010 (Figure 4.2.7).

Figure 4.2.6. Annual nest counts of loggerhead sea turtles on Florida core index beaches in peninsular Florida, 1989-2021 (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/)



Figure 4.2.7. Annual nest counts of loggerhead sea turtles on index beaches in the Florida Panhandle, 1997-2021 (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/)



The annual nest counts on Florida's index beaches fluctuate widely, and we do not fully understand what drives these fluctuations. In assessing the population, Ceriani and Meylan (2017) and Bolten et al. (2019) looked at trends by recovery unit. Trends by recovery unit were variable.

The Peninsular Florida Recovery Unit extends from the Georgia-Florida border south and then north (excluding the islands west of Key West, Florida) through Pinellas County on the west coast of Florida. Annual nest counts from 1989 to 2018 ranged from a low of 28,876 in 2007 to a high of 65,807 in 1998 (Bolten et al. 2019). More recently (2008-2018), counts have ranged from 33,532 in 2009 to 65,807 in 2016 (Bolten et al. 2019). Nest counts taken at index beaches in Peninsular Florida showed a significant decline in loggerhead nesting from 1989 to 2007, most likely attributed to mortality of oceanic-stage loggerheads caused by fisheries bycatch (Witherington et al. 2009). Trend analyses have been completed for various periods. From 2009 through 2013, a 2% decrease for this recovery unit was reported (Ceriani and Meylan 2017). Using a longer time series from 1989-2018, there was no significant change in the number of annual nests (Bolten et al. 2019). It is important to recognize that an increase in the number of nests has been observed since 2007. The recovery team cautions that using short term trends in nesting abundance can be misleading and trends should be considered in the context of one generation (50 years for loggerheads) (Bolten et al. 2019).

The Northern Recovery Unit, ranging from the Florida-Georgia border through southern Virginia, is the second largest nesting aggregation in the DPS. Annual nest totals for this recovery unit from 1983 to 2019 have ranged from a low of 520 in 2004 to a high of 5,555 in 2019 (Bolten et al. 2019). From 2008 to 2019, counts have ranged from 1,289 nests in 2014 to 5,555 nests in 2019 (Bolten et al. 2019). Nest counts at loggerhead nesting beaches in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia declined at 1.9% annually from 1983 to 2005 (NMFS and USFWS 2008). Recently, the trend has been increasing. Ceriani and Meylan (2017) reported a 35% increase for this recovery unit from 2009 through 2013. A longer-term trend analysis based on data from 1983 to 2019 indicates that the annual rate of increase is 1.3% (Bolten et al. 2019). The Dry Tortugas Recovery Unit includes all islands west of Key West, Florida. A census on Key West from 1995 to 2004 (excluding 2002) estimated a mean of 246 nests per year, or about 60 nesting females (NMFS and USFWS 2008). No trend analysis is available because there was not an adequate time series to evaluate the Dry Tortugas recovery unit (Ceriani et al. 2019, Ceriani and Meylan 2017), which accounts for less than 1% of the Northwest Atlantic DPS (Ceriani and Meylan 2017).

The Northern Gulf of Mexico Recovery Unit is defined as loggerheads originating from beaches in Franklin County on the northwest Gulf coast of Florida through Texas. From 1995 to 2007, there were an average of 906 nests per year on approximately 300 km of beach in Alabama and Florida, which equates to about 221 females nesting per year (NMFS and USFWS 2008). Annual nest totals for this recovery unit from 1997-2018 have ranged from a low of 72 in 2010 to a high of 283 in 2016 (Bolten et al. 2019). Evaluation of long-term nesting trends for the Northern Gulf of Mexico Recovery Unit is difficult because of changed and expanded beach coverage. However, there are now over 20 years of Florida index nesting beach survey data. A number of trend analyses have been conducted. From 1995 to 2005, the recovery unit exhibited a significant declining trend (Conant et al. 2009, NMFS, and USFWS 2008). Nest numbers have increased in recent years (Bolten et al. 2019) (see https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/). In the 2009-2013 trend analysis by Ceriani and Meylan (2017), a 1% decrease for this recovery unit was reported, likely due to diminished nesting on beaches in Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. A longer-term analysis from 1997-2018 found that there has been a non-significant increase of 1.7% (Bolten et al. 2019).

The Greater Caribbean Recovery Unit encompasses nesting subpopulations in Mexico to French Guiana, the Bahamas, and the lesser and Greater Antilles. The majority of nesting for this recovery unit occurs on the Yucatán Peninsula, in Quintana Roo, Mexico, with 903 to 2,331 nests annually (Zurita et al. 2003). Other significant nesting sites are found throughout the Caribbean, including Cuba, with approximately 250 to 300 nests annually (Ehrhart et al. 2003), and over 100 nests annually in Cay Sal in the Bahamas (NMFS and USFWS 2008). In the trend analysis by Ceriani and Meylan (2017), a 53% increase for this Recovery Unit was reported from 2009 through 2013.

Status
Fisheries bycatch is the highest threat to the Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerhead sea turtles (Conant et al. 2009). Other threats include boat strikes, marine debris, coastal development, habitat loss, contaminants, disease, and climate change. Nesting trends for each of the loggerhead sea turtle recovery units in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS are variable. Overall, short-term trends have shown increases, however, over the long-term the DPS is considered stable.

Critical Habitat
Critical habitat for the Northwest Atlantic DPS was designated in 2014 (see section 4).

Recovery Goals
The recovery goal for the Northwest Atlantic loggerhead is to ensure that each recovery unit meets its recovery criteria, alleviating threats to the species so that protection under the ESA is not needed. The recovery criteria relate to the number of nests and nesting females, trends in abundance on the foraging grounds, and trends in neritic strandings relative to in-water abundance. The 2008 Final Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of Loggerheads includes the complete downlisting/delisting criteria (NMFS and U.S. FWS 2008). The recovery objectives to meet these goals include:

1. Ensure that the number of nests in each recovery unit is increasing and that this increase corresponds to an increase in the number of nesting females.

2. Ensure the in-water abundance of juveniles in both neritic and oceanic habitats is increasing and is increasing at a greater rate than strandings of similar age classes.

3. Manage sufficient nesting beach habitat to ensure successful nesting.

4. Manage sufficient feeding, migratory and internesting marine habitats to ensure successful growth and reproduction.

5. Eliminate legal harvest.

6. Implement scientifically based nest management plans.

7. Minimize nest predation.

8. Recognize and respond to mass/unusual mortality or disease events appropriately.
9. Develop and implement local, state, federal and international legislation to ensure long-term protection of loggerheads and their terrestrial and marine habitats.
10. Minimize bycatch in domestic and international commercial and artisanal fisheries.
11. Minimize trophic changes from fishery harvest and habitat alteration.
12. Minimize marine debris ingestion and entanglement.
13. Minimize vessel strike mortality.

4.2.4 Leatherback Sea Turtle (Deromchelys coriacea)

The leatherback sea turtle is unique among sea turtles for its large size, wide distribution (due to thermoregulatory systems and behavior), and lack of a hard, bony carapace. It ranges from tropical to subpolar latitudes, worldwide (Figure 5.2.8).

Figure 4.2.8. Range of the leatherback sea turtle



Leatherbacks are the largest living turtle, reaching lengths of six feet long, and weighing up to one ton. Leatherback sea turtles have a distinct black leathery skin covering their carapace with pinkish white skin on their plastron. The species was first listed under the Endangered Species Conservation Act (35 FR 8491, June 2, 1970) and has been listed as endangered under the ESA since 1973. In 2020, seven leatherback populations that met the discreteness and significance criteria of the distinct population segment policy were identified (NMFS and USFWS 2020). The population found within the action area is the Northwest Atlantic population segment (NW Atlantic) (Figure 4.2.9). NMFS and USFWS concluded that the seven populations, which met the criteria for DPSs, all met the definition of an endangered species. However, NMFS and USFWS determined that the listing of DPSs was not warranted; leatherbacks continue to be listed at the global level (85 FR 48332, August 10, 2020). Therefore, information is presented on the range-wide status. We used information available in the five-year review (NMFS and

USFWS 2013), the critical habitat designation (44 FR 17710, March 23, 1979), the most recent status review (NMFS and USFWS 2020), relevant literature, and recent nesting data from the Florida FWRI to summarize the life history, population dynamics and status of the species, as follows.

Figure 4.2.9. Leatherback sea turtle DPSs and nesting beaches (NMFS and USFWS 2020)



Life History

Leatherbacks are a long-lived species. Preferred nesting grounds are in the tropics; though, nests span latitudes from 34 °S in western Cape, South Africa to 38 °N in Maryland (Eckert et al. 2012, Eckert et al. 2015). Females lay an average of five to seven clutches (range: 1-14 clutches) per season, with 20 to over 100 eggs per clutch (Eckert et al. 2012, Reina et al. 2002, Wallace et al. 2007). The average clutch frequency for the NW Atlantic population segment is 5.5 clutches per season (NMFS and USFWS 2020). In the western Atlantic, leatherbacks lay about 82 eggs per clutch (Sotherland et al. 2015). Remigration intervals are 2-4 years for most populations (range 1-11 years) (Eckert et al. 2015, NMFS and USFWS 2020); the remigration interval for the

NW Atlantic population segment is approximately 3 years (NMFS and USFWS 2020). The number of leatherback hatchlings that make it out of the nest on to the beach (i.e., emergence success) is approximately 50% worldwide (Eckert et al. 2012).

Age at sexual maturity has been challenging to obtain given the species physiology and habitat use (Avens et al. 2019). Past estimates ranged from 5-29 years (Avens et al. 2009, Spotila et al. 1996). More recently, Avens et al. (2020) used refined skeletochronology to assess the age at sexual maturity for leatherback sea turtles in the Atlantic and the Pacific. In the Atlantic, the mean age at sexual maturity was 19 years (range 13-28) and the mean size at sexual maturity was 4.2 ft. (129.2 cm) CCL (range (3.7-5 ft. (112.8-153.8 cm)). In the Pacific, the mean age at sexual maturity was 17 years (range 12-28) and the mean size at sexual maturity was 4.2 ft. (129.3 cm) CCL (range 3.6- 5 ft. (110.7-152.3 cm)) (Avens et al. 2019).

Leatherbacks have a greater tolerance for colder waters compared to all other sea turtle species due to their thermoregulatory capabilities (Paladino et al. 1990, Shoop and Kenney 1992, Wallace and Jones 2008). Evidence from tag returns, satellite telemetry, and strandings in the western Atlantic suggests that adult leatherback sea turtles engage in routine migrations between temperate/boreal and tropical waters (Bond and James 2017, Dodge et al. 2015, Eckert et al. 2006, Fossette et al. 2014, James et al. 2005a, James et al. 2005b, James et al. 2005c, NMFS and USFWS 1992). Tagging studies collectively show a clear separation of leatherback movements between the North and South Atlantic Oceans (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Leatherback sea turtles migrate long, transoceanic distances between their tropical nesting beaches and the highly productive temperate waters where they forage, primarily on jellyfish and tunicates. These gelatinous prey are relatively nutrient-poor, such that leatherbacks must consume large quantities to support their body weight. Leatherbacks weigh about 33% more on their foraging grounds than at nesting, indicating that they probably catabolize fat reserves to fuel migration and subsequent reproduction (James et al. 2005c, Wallace et al. 2006). Studies on the foraging ecology of leatherbacks in the North Atlantic show that leatherbacks off Massachusetts primarily consumed lion's mane, sea nettles, and ctenophores (Dodge et al. 2011). Juvenile and small sub-adult leatherbacks may spend more time in oligotrophic (relatively low plant nutrient usually accompanied by high dissolved oxygen) open ocean waters where prey is more difficult to find (Dodge et al. 2011). Sea turtles must meet an energy threshold before returning to nesting beaches. Therefore, their remigration intervals are dependent upon foraging success and duration (Hays 2000, Price et al. 2004).

Population Dynamics
The distribution is global, with nesting beaches in the Pacific, Atlantic, and Indian Oceans. Leatherbacks occur throughout marine waters, from nearshore habitats to oceanic environments (NMFS and USFWS 2020, Shoop and Kenney 1992). Movements are largely dependent upon reproductive and feeding cycles and the oceanographic features that concentrate prey, such as frontal systems, eddy features, current boundaries, and coastal retention areas (Benson et al. 2011).

Analyses of mtDNA from leatherback sea turtles indicates a low level of genetic diversity (Dutton et al. 1999). Further analysis of samples taken from individuals from rookeries in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans suggest that each of the rookeries represent demographically independent populations (NMFS and USFWS 2013). Using genetic data,, combined with nesting, tagging, and tracking data, researchers identified seven global regional management units (RMU) or subpopulations: Northwest Atlantic, Southeast Atlantic, Southwest Atlantic, Northwest Indian, Southwest Indian, East Pacific, and West Pacific (Wallace et al. 2010). The status review concluded that the RMUs identified by Wallace et al. (2010) are discrete populations and, then, evaluated whether any other populations exhibit this level of genetic discontinuity (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

To evaluate the RMUs and fine-scale structure in the Atlantic, Dutton et al. (2013) conducted a comprehensive genetic re-analysis of rookery stock structure. Samples from eight nesting sites in the Atlantic and one in the southwest Indian Ocean identified seven management units in the Atlantic and revealed fine scale genetic differentiation among neighboring populations. The mtDNA analysis failed to find significant differentiation between Florida and Costa Rica or between Trinidad and French Guiana/Suriname (Dutton et al. 2013). While Dutton et al. (2013) identified fine-scale genetic partitioning in the Atlantic Ocean, the differences did not rise to the level of marked separation or discreteness (NMFS and USFWS 2020). Other genetic analyses corroborate the conclusions of Dutton et al. (2013). These studies analyzed nesting sites in French Guiana (Molfetti et al. 2013), nesting and foraging areas in Brazil (Vargas et al. 2019), and nesting beaches in the Caribbean (Carreras et al. 2013). These studies all support three discrete populations in the Atlantic (NMFS and USFWS 2020). While these studies detected fine-scale genetic differentiation in the NW, SW, and SE Atlantic populations, the status review team determined that none indicated that the genetic differences were sufficient to be considered marked separation (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Population growth rates for leatherback sea turtles vary by ocean basin. An assessment of leatherback populations through 2010 found a global decline overall (Wallace et al. 2013). Using datasets with abundance data series that are 10 years or greater, they estimated that leatherback populations have declined from 90,599 nests per year to 54,262 nests per year over three generations ending in 2010 (Wallace et al. 2013).

Several more recent assessments have been conducted. The Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group was formed to compile nesting abundance data, analyze regional trends, and provide conservation recommendations. The most recent, published IUCN Red List assessment for the NW Atlantic Ocean subpopulation estimated 20,000 mature individuals and approximately 23,000 nests per year (estimate to 2017) (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2019). Annual nest counts show high inter-annual variability within and across nesting sites (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). Using data from 24 nesting sites in 10 nations within the NW Atlantic population segment, the leatherback status review estimated that the total index of nesting female abundance for the NW Atlantic population segment is 20,659 females (NMFS and USFWS 2020). This estimate only includes nesting data from recently and consistently monitored nesting beaches. An index (rather than a census) was developed given that the estimate is based on the number of nests on main nesting beaches with recent and consistent data and assumes a 3-year remigration interval. This index provides a minimum estimate of nesting female abundance (NMFS and USFWS 2020). This index of nesting female abundance is similar to other estimates. The TEWG estimated approximately 18,700 (range 10,000 to 31,000) adult females using nesting data from 2004 and 2005 (TEWG 2007). As described above, the IUCN Red List Assessment estimated 20,000 mature individuals (male and female). The estimate in the status review is higher than the estimate for the IUCN Red List assessment, likely due to a different remigration interval, which has been increasing in recent years (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Previous assessments of leatherbacks concluded that the Northwest Atlantic population was stable or increasing (TEWG 2007, Tiwari et al. 2013b). However, based on more recent analyses, leatherback nesting in the Northwest Atlantic is showing an overall negative trend, with the most notable decrease occurring during the most recent period of 2008-2017 (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). The analyses for the IUCN Red List assessment indicate that the overall regional, abundance-weighted trends are negative (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018, 2019). The dataset for trend analyses included 23 sites across 14 countries/territories. Three periods were used for the trend analysis: long-term (1990-2017), intermediate (1998-2017), and recent (2008-2017) trends. Overall, regional, abundance-weighted trends were negative across the periods and became more negative as the time-series became shorter. At the stock level, the Working Group evaluated the NW Atlantic – Guianas-Trinidad, Florida, Northern Caribbean, and the Western Caribbean. The NW Atlantic – Guianas-Trinidad stock is the largest stock and declined significantly across all periods, which was attributed to an exponential decline in abundance at Awala-Yalimapo, French Guiana as well as declines in Guyana, Suriname, Cayenne, and Matura. Declines in Awala-Yalimapo were attributed, in part, due to beach erosion and a loss of nesting habitat (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). The Florida stock increased significantly over the long-term, but declined from 2008-2017. The Northern Caribbean and Western Caribbean stocks also declined over all three periods. The Working Group report also includes trends at the site-level, which varied depending on the site and time period, but were generally negative especially in the recent time period. The Working Group identified anthropogenic sources (fishery bycatch, vessel strikes), habitat loss, and changes in life history parameters as possible drivers of nesting abundance declines (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). Fisheries bycatch is a well-documented threat to leatherback turtles. The Working Group discussed entanglement in vertical line fisheries off New England and Canada as potentially important mortality sinks. They also noted that vessel strikes result in mortality annually in feeding habitats off New England. Off nesting beaches in Trinidad and the Guianas, net fisheries take leatherbacks in high numbers (~3,000/yr.) (Eckert 2013, Lum 2006, Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018).

Similarly, the leatherback status review concluded that the NW Atlantic population segment exhibits decreasing nest trends at nesting aggregations with the greatest indices of nesting female abundance. Significant declines have been observed at nesting beaches with the greatest historical or current nesting female abundance, most notably in Trinidad and Tobago, Suriname, and French Guiana. Though some nesting aggregations (see status review document for information on specific nesting aggregations) indicated increasing trends, most of the largest ones are declining. The declining trend is considered to be representative of the population segment (NMFS and USFWS 2020). The status review found that fisheries bycatch is the primary threat to the NW Atlantic population (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Leatherback sea turtles nest in the southeastern United States. From 1989-2019, leatherback nests at core index beaches in Florida have varied from a minimum of 30 nests in 1990 to a maximum of 657 in 2014 (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/). Leatherback nest numbers reached a peak in 2014 followed by a steep decline (2015-2017) and a promising increase (2018-2021) (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/) (Figure 5.2.10). The status review found that the median trend for Florida from 2008-2017 was a decrease of 2.1% annually (NMFS and USFWS 2020). Surveyors counted 435 leatherback nests on the 27 core index beaches in 2021. These counts do not include leatherback nesting at the beginning of the season (before May 15), nor do they represent all the beaches in Florida where leatherbacks nest; however, the index provided by these counts remains a representative reflection of trends. However, while green turtle nest numbers on Florida's index beaches continue to rise, Florida hosts only a few hundred nests annually and leatherbacks can lay as many as 11 clutches during a nesting season. Thus, fluctuations in nest count may be the result of a small change in number of females. More years of standardized nest counts are needed to understand whether the fluctuation is natural or warrants concern.

Figure 4.2.10. Number of leatherback sea turtle nests on core index beaches in Florida from 1989-2021 (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/)



For the SW Atlantic population segment, the status review estimates the total index of nesting female abundance at approximately 27 females (NMFS and USFWS 2020). This is similar to the IUCN Red List assessment that estimated 35 mature individuals (male and female) using nesting data since 2010. Nesting has increased since 2010 overall, though the 2014-2017 estimates were lower than the previous three years. The trend is increasing, though variable (NMFS and USFWS 2020). The SE Atlantic population segment has an index of nesting female abundance of 9,198 females and demonstrates a declining nest trend at the largest nesting aggregation (NMFS and USFWS 2020). The SE population segment exhibits a declining nest trend (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Populations in the Pacific have shown dramatic declines at many nesting sites (Mazaris et al. 2017, Santidrián Tomillo et al. 2017, Santidrián Tomillo et al. 2007, Sarti Martínez et al. 2007, Tapilatu et al. 2013). For an IUCN Red List evaluation, datasets for nesting at all index beaches for the West Pacific population were compiled (Tiwari et al. 2013a). This assessment estimated the number of total mature individuals (males and females) at Jamursba-Medi and Wermon beaches to be 1,438 turtles (Tiwari et al. 2013a). Counts of leatherbacks at nesting beaches in the western Pacific indicate that the subpopulation declined at a rate of almost 6% per year from 1984 to 2011 (Tapilatu et al. 2013). More recently, the leatherback status review estimated the total index of nesting female abundance of the West Pacific population segment at 1,277 females, and the population exhibits low hatchling success (NMFS and USFWS 2020). The total index of nesting female abundance for the East Pacific population segment is 755 nesting females. It has exhibited a decreasing trend since monitoring began with a 97.4% decline since the 1980s or 1990s, depending on nesting beach (Wallace et al. 2013). The low productivity parameters, drastic reductions in nesting female abundance, and current declines in nesting place the population segment at risk (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Population abundance in the Indian Ocean is difficult to assess due to lack of data and inconsistent reporting. Available data from southern Mozambique show that approximately 10 females nest per year from 1994 to 2004, and about 296 nests per year were counted in South Africa (NMFS and USFWS 2013). A 5-year status review in 2013 found that, in the southwest Indian Ocean, populations in South Africa are stable (NMFS and USFWS 2013). More recently, the 2020 status review estimated that the total index of nesting female abundance for the SW Indian population segment is 149 females and that the population is exhibiting a slight decreasing nest trend (NMFS and USFWS 2020). While data on nesting in the NE Indian Ocean populations segment is limited, the poulation is estimated at 109 females. This population has exhibited a drastic population decline with extirpation of the largest nesting aggregation in Malaysia (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Status

The leatherback sea turtle is an endangered species whose once large nesting populations have experienced steep declines in recent decades. There has been a global decline overall. For all population segments, including the NW Atlantic population, fisheries bycatch is the primary threat to the species (NMFS and USFWS 2020). Leatherback turtle nesting in the Northwest Atlantic showed an overall negative trend through 2017, with the most notable decrease occurring during the most recent time frame of 2008 to 2017 (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). Though some nesting aggregations indicated increasing trends, most of the largest ones are declining. Therefore, the leatherback status review in 2020 concluded that the NW Atlantic population exhibits an overall decreasing trend in annual nesting activity (NMFS and USFWS 2020). Threats to leatherback sea turtles include loss of nesting habitat, fisheries bycatch, vessel strikes, harvest of eggs, and marine debris, among others (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). Because of the threats, once large nesting areas in the Indian and Pacific Oceans are now functionally extinct (Tiwari et al. 2013a) and there have been range-wide reductions in population abundance. The species' resilience to additional perturbation both within the NW Atlantic and worldwide is low.

Critical Habitat

Critical habitat has been designated for leatherback sea turtles in the waters adjacent to Sandy Point, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands (44 FR 17710, March 23, 1979) and along the U.S. West Coast (77 FR 4170, January 26, 2012), both of which are outside the action area.

Recovery Goals

There are separate recovery plans for the U.S. Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and Atlantic (NMFS and USFWS 1992) and the U.S. Pacific (NMFS and USFWS 1998) populations of leatherback sea turtles. Neither plan has been recently updated. As with other sea turtle species, the recovery plans for leatherbacks include criteria for considering delisting. These criteria relate to increases in the populations, nesting trends, nesting beach and habitat protection, and implementation of priority actions. Criteria for delisting in the recovery plan for the U.S. Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and Atlantic are described here.

Delisting criteria

1. Adult female population increases for 25 years after publication of the recovery plan, as evidenced by a statistically significant trend in nest numbers at Culebra, Puerto Rico; St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands; and the east coast of Florida.
2. Nesting habitat encompassing at least 75% of nesting activity in the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Florida is in public ownership.
3. All priority-one tasks have been successfully implemented (see the recovery plan for a list of priority one tasks).

Major recovery actions in the U.S. Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and Atlantic include actions to:

1. Protect and manage terrestrial and marine habitats.
2. Protect and manage the population.
3. Inform and educate the public.
4. Develop and implement international agreements.

The 2013 Five-Year Review (NMFS and USFWS 2013) concluded that the leatherback turtle should not be delisted or reclassified and notes that the 1991 and 1998 recovery plans are dated and do not address the major, emerging threat of climate change.

4.3 Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus)

An estuarine-dependent anadromous species, Atlantic sturgeon occupy ocean and estuarine waters, including sounds, bays, and tidal-affected rivers from Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, Canada, to Cape Canaveral, Florida (ASSRT 2007) (Figure 4.3.1). On February 6, 2012, NMFS listed five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon under the ESA: Gulf of Maine (GOM), New York Bight (NYB), Chesapeake Bay (CB), Carolina, and South Atlantic (77 FR 5880 and 77 FR 5914). The Gulf of Maine DPS is listed as threatened, and the New York Bight, Chesapeake Bay, Carolina, and South Atlantic DPSs are listed as endangered.

Figure 4.3.1. U.S. range of Atlantic sturgeon DPSs



Information available from the 2007 Atlantic sturgeon status review (ASSRT 2007), 2017 ASMFC benchmark stock assessment (ASMFC 2017), final listing rules (77 FR 5880 and 77 FR 5914; February 6, 2012), material supporting the designation of Atlantic sturgeon critical habitat (NMFS 2017a), and Five-Year Reviews completed for the Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, and Chesapeake Bay DPSs (NMFS 2022a, b, c) were used to summarize the life history, population dynamics, and status of the species.

Life History

Atlantic sturgeon are a late maturing, anadromous species (ASSRT 2007, Balazik et al. 2010, Hilton et al. 2016, Sulak and Randall 2002). Sexual maturity is reached between the ages of 5 to 34 years. Sturgeon originating from rivers in lower latitudes (e.g., South Carolina rivers) mature faster than those originating from rivers located in higher latitudes (e.g., Saint Lawrence River) (NMFS 2017a).

Atlantic sturgeon spawn in freshwater (ASSRT 2007, NMFS 2017b) at sites with flowing water and hard bottom substrate (Bain et al. 2000, Balazik et al. 2012b, Gilbert 1989, Greene et al. 2009, Hatin et al. 2002, Mohler 2003, Smith and Clugston 1997, Vladykov and Greeley 1963). Water depths of spawning sites are highly variable, but may be up to 88.5 ft. (27 m) (Bain et al. 2000, Crance 1987, Leland 1968, Scott and Crossman 1973). Based on tagging records, Atlantic sturgeon return to their natal rivers to spawn (ASSRT 2007), with spawning intervals ranging from one to five years in males (Caron et al. 2002, Collins et al. 2000b, Smith 1985) and two to five years in females (Stevenson and Secor 1999, Van Eenennaam et al. 1996, Vladykov and

Greeley 1963). Some Atlantic sturgeon river populations may have up to two spawning seasons comprised of different spawning adults (Balazik and Musick 2015, Collins et al. 2000b), although the majority likely have just one, either in the spring or fall.[8] There is evidence of spring and fall spawning for the South Atlantic DPS (77 FR 5914, February 6, 2012, Collins et al. 2000b, NMFS and USFWS 1998b) (Collins et al. 2000b, NMFS and USFWS 1998), spring spawning for the Gulf of Maine and New York Bight DPSs (NMFS 2017a), and fall spawning for the Chesapeake and Carolina DPSs (Balazik et al. 2012a, Smith et al. 1984). While spawning has not been confirmed in the James River (Chesapeake Bay DPS), telemetry and empirical data suggest that there may be two potential spawning runs: a spring run from late March to early May and a fall run around September after an extended staging period in the lower river (Balazik et al. 2012a, Balazik and Musick 2015).

Following spawning, males move downriver to the lower estuary and remain there until outmigration in the fall (Bain 1997, Bain et al. 2000, Balazik et al. 2012a, Breece et al. 2013, Dovel and Berggren 1983a, Greene et al. 2009, Hatin et al. 2002, Ingram et al. 2019, Smith 1985, Smith et al. 1982). Females move downriver and may leave the estuary and travel to other coastal estuaries until outmigration to marine waters in the fall (Bain 1997, Bain et al. 2000, Balazik et al. 2012a, Breece et al. 2013, Dovel and Berggren 1983a, Greene et al. 2009, Hatin et al. 2002, NMFS 2017a, Smith 1985, Smith et al. 1982). Atlantic sturgeon deposit eggs on hard bottom substrate. They hatch into the yolk sac larval stage approximately 94 to 140 hours after deposition (Mohler 2003, Murawski and Pacheco 1977, Smith et al. 1980, Van Den Avyle 1984, Vladykov and Greeley 1963). Once the yolk sac is absorbed (eight to twelve days post-hatching), sturgeon are larvae. Shortly after, they become young of year and then juveniles. The juvenile stage can last months to years in the brackish waters of the natal estuary (ASSRT 2007, Calvo et al. 2010, Collins et al. 2000a, Dadswell 2006, Dovel and Berggren 1983b, Greene et al. 2009, Hatin et al. 2007, Holland and Yelverton 1973, Kynard and Horgan 2002, Mohler 2003, Schueller and Peterson 2010, Secor et al. 2000, Waldman et al. 1996). Upon reaching the sub-adult phase, individuals enter the marine environment, mixing with adults and sub-adults from other river systems (Bain 1997, Dovel and Berggren 1983a, Hatin et al. 2007, McCord et al. 2007) (NMFS 2017a). Once sub-adult Atlantic sturgeon have reached maturity/the adult stage, they will remain in marine or estuarine waters, only returning far upstream to the spawning areas when they are ready to spawn (ASSRT 2007, Bain 1997, Breece et al. 2016, Dunton et al. 2012, Dunton et al. 2015, Savoy and Pacileo 2003).

The life history of Atlantic sturgeon can be divided up into seven general categories as described in Table 4.3.1 below (adapted from ASSRT 2007).

Table 4.3.1. Descriptions of Atlantic sturgeon life history stages

8 Although referred to as spring spawning and fall spawning, the actual time of Atlantic sturgeon spawning may not occur during the astronomical spring or fall season (Balazik and Musick 2015).

Age Class	Size	Duration	Description
Egg	~2 mm – 3 mm diameter (Van Eenennaam et al. 1996)(p. 773)	Hatching occurs ~3-6 days after egg deposition and fertilization (ASSRT 2007)(p. 4))	Fertilized or unfertilized
Yolk-sac larvae (YSL)	~6mm – 14 mm (Bath et al. 1981)(pp. 714-715))	8-12 days post hatch (ASSRT 2007)(p. 4))	Negative photo-taxic, nourished by yolk sac
Post yolk-sac larvae (PYSL)	~14mm – 37mm (Bath et al. 1981)(pp. 714-715))	12-40 days post hatch	Free swimming; feeding; Silt/sand bottom, deep channel; fresh water
Young of Year (YOY)	0.3 grams <410mm TL	From 40 days to 1 year	Fish that are > 40 days and < one year; capable of capturing and consuming live food
Juveniles	>410mm and <760mm TL	1 year to time at which first coastal migration is made	Fish that are at least age 1 and are not sexually mature and do not make coastal migrations.
Subadults	>760 mm and <1500 mm TL	From first coastal migration to sexual maturity	Fish that are not sexually mature but make coastal migrations
Adults	>1500 mm TL	Post-maturation	Sexually mature fish

Population Dynamics
A population estimate was derived from the NEAMAP trawl surveys.[9] For this Opinion, we are relying on the population estimates derived from the NEAMAP swept area biomass assuming a 50% catchability (i.e., net efficiency x availability) rate. We consider that the NEAMAP surveys sample an area utilized by Atlantic sturgeon but do not sample all the locations and times where Atlantic sturgeon are present. We also consider that the trawl net captures some, but likely not all, of the Atlantic sturgeon present in the sampling area. Therefore, we assume that net efficiency and the fraction of the population exposed to the NEAMAP surveys in combination result in a 50% catchability (NMFS 2013). The 50% catchability assumption reasonably accounts for the robust, yet not complete, sampling of the Atlantic sturgeon oceanic temporal and spatial ranges and the documented high rates of encounter with NEAMAP survey gear. As these estimates are derived directly from empirical data with fewer assumptions than have been required to model Atlantic sturgeon populations to date, we believe these estimates continue to serve as the best available information. Based on the above approach, the overall abundance of

9 Since fall 2007, NEAMAP trawl surveys (spring and fall) have been conducted from Cape Cod, Massachusetts to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina in nearshore waters at depths up to 60 ft. (18.3 m). Each survey employs a spatially stratified random design with a total of 35 strata and 150 stations.

Atlantic sturgeon in U.S. Atlantic waters is estimated to be 67,776 fish (see table16 in Kocik et al. 2013). Based on genetic frequencies of occurrence in the sampled area, this overall population estimate was subsequently partitioned by DPS (Table 4.3.2). Given the proportion of adults to sub-adults in the NMFS NEFSC observer data (approximate ratio of 1:3), we have also estimated the number of adults and sub-adults originating from each DPS. However, this cannot be considered an estimate of the total number of sub-adults because it only considers those sub-adults that are of a size that are present and vulnerable to capture in commercial trawl and gillnet gear in the marine environment.

It is important to note, the NEAMAP-based estimates do not include young-of-the-year (YOY) fish and juveniles in the rivers; therefore, the NEAMAP-based estimates underestimate the total population size as they do not account for multiple year classes of Atlantic sturgeon that do not occur in the marine environment where the NEAMAP surveys take place. The NEAMAP surveys are conducted in waters that include the preferred depth ranges of sub-adult and adult Atlantic sturgeon and take place during seasons that coincide with known Atlantic sturgeon coastal migration patterns in the ocean. However, the estimated number of sub-adults in marine waters is a minimum count because it only considers those sub-adults that are captured in a portion of the action area and are present in the marine environment, which is only a fraction of the total number of sub-adults. In regards to adult Atlantic sturgeon, the estimated population in marine waters is also a minimum count as the NEAMAP surveys sample only a portion of the action area, and therefore a portion of the Atlantic sturgeon's range.

Table 4.3.2. Calculated population estimates based upon the NEAMAP survey swept area model, assuming 50% efficiency

DPS	Estimated Ocean Population Abundance	Estimated Ocean Population of Adults	Estimated Ocean Population of Sub-adults (of size vulnerable to capture in fisheries)
GOM	7,455	1,864	5,591
NYB	34,566	8,642	25,925
CB	8,811	2,203	6,608
Carolina	1,356	339	1,017
SA	14,911	3,728	11,183
Canada	678	170	509

Precise estimates of population growth rate (intrinsic rates) are unknown for the five listed DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon due to a lack of long-term abundance data. The Commission's 2017 stock assessment referenced a population viability assessment (PVA) that was done to determine population growth rates for the five DPSs based on a few long-term survey programs, but most results were statistically insignificant or utilized a model for which the available did not or poorly fit. In any event, the population growth rates reported from that PVA ranged from -1.8% to 4.9% (ASMFC 2017).

The genetic diversity of Atlantic sturgeon throughout its range has been well-documented (ASSRT 2007, Bowen and Avise 1990, O'Leary et al. 2014, Ong et al. 1996, Waldman et al. 1996, Waldman and Wirgin 1998). Overall, these studies have consistently found populations to be genetically diverse, and the majority can be readily differentiated. Relatively low rates of gene flow reported in population genetic studies (Fritts et al. 2016, Savoy et al. 2017, Wirgin et al. 2002) indicate that Atlantic sturgeon return to their natal river to spawn, despite extensive mixing in coastal waters.

The marine range of U.S. Atlantic sturgeon extends from Labrador, Canada, to Cape Canaveral, Florida. As Atlantic sturgeon travel long distances in these waters, all five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon have the potential to be anywhere in this marine range. Based on a recent genetic mixed stock analysis (Kazyak et al. 2021), we expect Atlantic sturgeon in the portions of the action area north of Cape Hatteras to originate from the five DPSs at the following frequencies: New York Bight (55.3%), Chesapeake (22.9%), South Atlantic (13.6%), Carolina (5.8%), Gulf of Maine (1.6%), and Gulf of Maine (1.6%) DPSs. It is possible that a small fraction (0.7%) of Atlantic sturgeon in the area may be Canadian origin (Kazyak et al. 2021); Canadian-origin Atlantic sturgeon are not listed under the ESA. This represents the best available information on the likely genetic makeup of individuals occurring in the lease area, the cable routes and vessel transit routes north of Cape Hatteras. The portion of the action area south of Cape Hatteras falls with the "SOUTH" region described in Kazyak et al. 2021; Atlantic sturgeon in this portion of the action area are expected to be nearly all from the South Atlantic DPS (91.2%) and the Carolina DPS (6.2%), with few individuals from the Chesapeake Bay and New York Bight DPSs.

Based on fishery-independent, fishery dependent, tracking, and tagging data, Atlantic sturgeon appear to primarily occur inshore of the 164 ft. (50 m) depth contour (Dunton et al. 2012, Dunton et al. 2010, Erickson et al. 2011, Laney et al. 2007, O'Leary et al. 2014, Stein et al. 2004a, b, Waldman et al. 2013, Wirgin et al. 2015a, Wirgin et al. 2015b). However, they are not restricted to these depths and excursions into deeper (e.g., 250 ft. (75 m)) continental shelf waters have been documented (Colette and Klein-MacPhee 2002, Collins and Smith 1997, Erickson et al. 2011, Stein et al. 2004b, Timoshkin 1968). Data from fishery-independent surveys and tagging and tracking studies also indicate that some Atlantic sturgeon may undertake seasonal movements along the coast (Dunton et al. 2010, Erickson et al. 2011, Hilton et al. 2016, Oliver et al. 2013, Post et al. 2014, Wippelhauser 2012). For instance, studies found that satellite-tagged adult sturgeon from the Hudson River concentrated in the southern part of the Mid-Atlantic Bight, at depths greater than 66 ft. (20 m), during winter and spring; while, in the summer and fall, Atlantic sturgeon concentrations shifted to the northern portion of the Mid-Atlantic Bight at depths less than 66 ft. (20 m) (Erickson et al. 2011).

In the marine range, several marine aggregation areas occur adjacent to estuaries and/or coastal features formed by bay mouths and inlets along the U.S. eastern seaboard (i.e., waters off North Carolina; Chesapeake Bay; Delaware Bay; New York Bight; Massachusetts Bay; Long Island Sound; and Connecticut and Kennebec River Estuaries). Depths in these areas are generally no greater than 82 ft. (25 m) (Bain et al. 2000, Dunton et al. 2010, Erickson et al. 2011, Laney et al. 2007, O'Leary et al. 2014, Oliver et al. 2013, Savoy and Pacileo 2003, Stein et al. 2004b, Waldman et al. 2013, Wippelhauser 2012, Wippelhauser and Squiers 2015). Although additional studies are still needed to clarify why Atlantic sturgeon aggregate at these sites, there is some indication that they may serve as thermal refugia, wintering sites, or marine foraging areas (Dunton et al. 2010, Erickson et al. 2011, Stein et al. 2004b).

Status
Atlantic sturgeon were once present in 38 river systems and, of these, spawned in 35 of them. Individuals are currently present in 36 rivers, and spawning occurs in at least 20 of these (ASSRT 2007). The decline in abundance of Atlantic sturgeon has been attributed primarily to the large U.S. commercial fishery which existed for the Atlantic sturgeon from the 1870s through the mid 1990s in some states. Based on management recommendations in the interstate fishery management plan (ISFMP), adopted by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission (the Commission) in 1990, commercial harvest in Atlantic coastal states was severely restricted and ultimately eliminated from all states (ASMFC 1998). In 1998, the Commission placed a 20-40 year moratorium on a coastwide basis to allow 20 consecutive cohorts of females to reach sexual maturity and spawn, which will facilitate restoration of the age structure. The 20- to 40-year moratorium was put in place because they considered the median maturity of female Atlantic sturgeon to be about age 18 and, therefore, it was expected that it could take up to 38 years before 20 subsequent year classes of adult females is established (ASMFC 1980). In 1999, NMFS closed the Exclusive Economic Zone to Atlantic sturgeon retention, pursuant to the Atlantic Coastal Act (64 FR 9449; February 26, 1999). However, all state fisheries for sturgeon were closed prior to this.

The most significant threats to Atlantic sturgeon are vessel strikes, bycatch in commercial fisheries, habitat changes, impeded access to historical habitat by dams and reservoirs in the south, degraded water quality; and reduced water quantity. A first-of-its-kind climate vulnerability assessment, conducted on 82 fish and invertebrate species in the Northeast U.S. Shelf, concluded that Atlantic sturgeon from all five DPSs were among the most vulnerable species to global climate change (Hare *et al.* 2016).

The Commission completed an Atlantic sturgeon benchmark stock assessment in 2017 that considered the status of each DPS individually, as well as all five DPSs collectively as a single unit (ASMFC 2017). The assessment concluded all five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon, as well as each individual DPS remain depleted relative to historic abundance. The assessment also concluded that the population of all five DPSs together appears to be recovering slowly since implementation of a complete moratorium on directed fishing and retention in 1998. However, there were only two individual DPSs, the New York Bight DPS and Carolina DPS, for which there was a relatively high probability that abundance of the DPS has increased since the implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium. There was considerable uncertainty expressed in the stock assessment and in its peer review report. For example, new information suggests that these conclusions about the New York Bight DPS primarily reflect the status and trend of only the DPS's Hudson River spawning population. In addition, there was a relatively high probability that mortality for animals of the Gulf of Maine DPS and the Carolina DPS exceeded the mortality threshold used for the assessment. Yet, the stock assessment notes that it was not clear if: (1) the percent probability for the trend in abundance for the Gulf of Maine DPS is a reflection of the actual trend in abundance or of the underlying data quality for the DPS; and (2) the percent probability that the Gulf of Maine DPS exceeds the mortality threshold actually reflects lower survival or was due to increased tagging model uncertainty owing to low sample sizes and potential emigration. Therefore, while Atlantic sturgeon populations may be showing signs of slow recovery since the 1998 and 1999 moratoriums when all five DPSs are considered collectively, these trends are not necessarily reflected with individual DPSs and there is considerable uncertainty related to population trends (ASMFC 2017).

4.3.1 Gulf of Maine DPS

The Gulf of Maine DPS includes the following: all anadromous Atlantic sturgeons that are spawned in the watersheds from the Maine/Canadian border and, extending southward, all watersheds draining into the Gulf of Maine as far south as Chatham, MA. Within this range, Atlantic sturgeon historically spawned in the Androscoggin, Kennebec, Merrimack, Penobscot, and Sheepscot Rivers (ASSRT, 2007). Spawning occurs in the Kennebec River. The capture of a larval Atlantic sturgeon in the Androscoggin River below the Brunswick Dam in the spring of 2011 indicates spawning may also occur in that river. Despite the presence of suitable spawning habitat in a number of other rivers, there is no evidence of recent spawning in the remaining rivers. Atlantic sturgeons that are spawned elsewhere continue to use habitats within all of these rivers as part of their overall marine range (ASSRT, 2007). The movement of subadult and adult sturgeon between rivers, including to and from the Kennebec River and the Penobscot River, demonstrates that coastal and marine migrations are key elements of Atlantic sturgeon life history for the Gulf of Maine DPS (ASSRT, 2007; Fernandes, *et al.*, 2010).

The current status of the Gulf of Maine DPS is affected by historical and modern fisheries dating as far back as the 1800s (Squiers *et al.*, 1979; Stein *et al.*, 2004; ASMFC 2007). Incidental capture of Atlantic sturgeon in state and Federal fisheries continues today. As explained above, we have estimates of the number of subadults and adults that are killed as a result of bycatch in fisheries authorized under Northeast Fishery Management Plans. At this time, we are not able to quantify the impacts from other threats or estimate the number of individuals killed as a result of other anthropogenic threats. Habitat disturbance and direct mortality from anthropogenic sources are the primary concerns.

Some of the impacts from the threats that contributed to the decline of the Gulf of Maine DPS have been removed (e.g., directed fishing), or reduced as a result of improvements in water quality and removal of dams (e.g., the Edwards Dam on the Kennebec River in 1999, the Veazie Dam on the Penobscot River). There are strict regulations on the use of fishing gear in Maine state waters that incidentally catch sturgeon. In addition, there have been reductions in fishing effort in state and federal waters, which most likely would result in a reduction in bycatch mortality of Atlantic sturgeon. A significant amount of fishing in the Gulf of Maine is conducted using trawl gear, which is known to have a much lower mortality rate for Atlantic sturgeon caught in the gear compared to sink gillnet gear (ASMFC, 2007). Atlantic sturgeon from the GOM DPS are not commonly taken as bycatch in areas south of Chatham, MA, with only 8% (e.g., 7 of the 84 fish) of interactions observed in the Mid Atlantic/Carolina region being assigned to the Gulf of Maine DPS (Wirgin and King, 2011). Tagging results also indicate that Gulf of Maine DPS fish tend to remain within the waters of the Gulf of Maine and only occasionally venture to points south. However, data on Atlantic sturgeon incidentally caught in trawls and intertidal fish weirs fished in the Minas Basin area of the Bay of Fundy (Canada) indicate that approximately 35 percent originated from the Gulf of Maine DPS (Wirgin *et al.*, in draft).

As noted previously, studies have shown that in order to rebuild, Atlantic sturgeon can only sustain low levels of bycatch and other anthropogenic mortality (Boreman, 1997; ASMFC, 2007; Kahnle *et al.*, 2007; Brown and Murphy, 2010). NMFS has determined that the Gulf of Maine DPS is at risk of becoming endangered in the foreseeable future throughout all of its range (i.e., is a threatened species) based on the following: (1) significant declines in population sizes and the protracted period during which sturgeon populations have been depressed; (2) the limited amount of current spawning; and, (3) the impacts and threats that have and will continue to affect recovery.

In 2018, we announced the initiation of a 5-year review for the Gulf of Maine DPS. We reviewed and considered new information for the Gulf of Maine DPS that has become available since this DPS was listed as threatened in February 2012. We completed the 5-year review for the Gulf of Maine DPS in February 2022 (NMFS 2022a). Based on the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of the review, we concluded that no change to the listing status is warranted.

4.3.2 New York Bight DPS

The New York Bight DPS includes the following: all anadromous Atlantic sturgeon spawned in the watersheds that drain into coastal waters from Chatham, MA to the Delaware-Maryland border on Fenwick Island. Within this range, Atlantic sturgeon historically spawned in the Connecticut, Delaware, Hudson, and Taunton Rivers (Murawski and Pacheco, 1977; Secor, 2002; ASSRT, 2007). Spawning still occurs in the Delaware and Hudson Rivers. There is no recent evidence (within the last 15 years) of spawning in the Taunton River (ASSRT, 2007). Atlantic sturgeon that are spawned elsewhere continue to use habitats within the Connecticut and Taunton Rivers as part of their overall marine range (ASSRT, 2007; Savoy, 2007; Wirgin and King, 2011).

In 2014, several presumed age-0 Atlantic sturgeon were captured in the Connecticut River; the available information indicates that successful spawning took place in 2013 by a small number of adults. Genetic analysis of the juveniles indicates that the adults were likely migrants from the South Atlantic DPS (Savoy et al. 2017). As noted by the authors, this conclusion is counter to prevailing information regarding straying of adult Atlantic sturgeon. As these captures represent the only contemporary records of possible natal Atlantic sturgeon in the Connecticut River and the genetic analysis is unexpected, more information is needed to establish the frequency of spawning in the Connecticut River and whether there is a unique Connecticut River population of Atlantic sturgeon.

The abundance of the Hudson River Atlantic sturgeon riverine population prior to the onset of expanded exploitation in the 1800s is unknown but has been conservatively estimated at 10,000 adult females (Secor, 2002). Current abundance is likely at least one order of magnitude smaller than historical levels (Secor, 2002; ASSRT, 2007; Kahnle *et al.*, 2007). As described above, an estimate of the mean annual number of mature adults (863 total; 596 males and 267 females) was calculated for the Hudson River riverine population based on fishery-dependent data collected from 1985-1995 (Kahnle *et al.*, 2007). Kahnle *et al.* (1998; 2007) also showed that the level of fishing mortality from the Hudson River Atlantic sturgeon fishery during the period of 1985-1995 exceeded the estimated sustainable level of fishing mortality for the riverine population and may have led to reduced recruitment. A decline in the abundance of young Atlantic sturgeon appeared to occur in the mid to late 1970s followed by a secondary drop in the late 1980s (Kahnle *et al.*, 1998; Sweka *et al.*, 2007; ASMFC, 2010). At the time of listing, catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) data suggested that recruitment remained depressed relative to catches of juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the estuary during the mid-late 1980s (Sweka *et al.*, 2007; ASMFC, 2010). In examining the CPUE data from 1985-2007, there are significant fluctuations during this time. There appears to be a decline in the number of juveniles between the late 1980s and early 1990s while the CPUE is generally higher in the 2000s as compared to the 1990s. Given the significant annual fluctuation, it is difficult to discern any trend. Despite the CPUEs from 2000-2007 being generally higher than those from 1990-1999, they are low compared to the late 1980s. Standardized mean catch per net set from the NYSDEC juvenile Atlantic sturgeon survey have had a general increasing trend from 2006 – 2015, with the exception of a dip in 2013.

In addition to capture in fisheries operating in Federal waters, bycatch and mortality also occur in state fisheries; however, the primary fishery (shad) that impacted juvenile sturgeon in the Hudson River, has now been closed and there is no indication that it will reopen soon. In the Hudson River, sources of potential mortality include vessel strikes and entrainment in dredges. Impingement at water intakes, including the Danskammer, Roseton, and Indian Point power plants has been documented in the past; all three of these facilities have recently shut down. Recent information from surveys of juveniles (see above) indicates that the number of young Atlantic sturgeon in the Hudson River is increasing compared to recent years, but is still low compared to the 1970s. There is currently not enough information regarding any life stage to establish a trend for the entire Hudson River population.

There is no abundance estimate for the Delaware River population of Atlantic sturgeon. Harvest records from the 1800s indicate that this was historically a large population with an estimated 180,000 adult females prior to 1890 (Secor and Waldman, 1999; Secor, 2002). Sampling in 2009 to target young-of- the year (YOY) Atlantic sturgeon in the Delaware River (i.e., natal sturgeon) resulted in the capture of 34 YOY, ranging in size from 178 to 349 mm TL (Fisher, 2009) and the collection of 32 YOY Atlantic sturgeon in a separate study (Brundage and O'Herron in Calvo *et al.*, 2010). Genetics information collected from 33 of the 2009-year class YOY indicates that at least three females successfully contributed to the 2009-year class (Fisher, 2011). Therefore, while the capture of YOY in 2009 provides evidence that successful spawning is still occurring in the Delaware River, the relatively low numbers suggest the existing riverine population is limited in size.

Some of the impact from the threats that contributed to the decline of the New York Bight DPS have been removed (e.g., directed fishing) or reduced as a result of improvements in water quality since passage of the Clean Water Act (CWA). In addition, there have been reductions in fishing effort in state and federal waters, which may result in a reduction in bycatch mortality of Atlantic sturgeon. Nevertheless, areas with persistent, degraded water quality, habitat impacts from dredging, continued bycatch in state and federally managed fisheries, and vessel strikes remain significant threats to the New York Bight DPS.

In the marine range, New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon are incidentally captured in federal and state managed fisheries, reducing survivorship of subadult and adult Atlantic sturgeon (Stein *et al.*, 2004; ASMFC 2007). As explained above, currently available estimates indicate that at least 4% of adults may be killed as a result of bycatch in fisheries authorized under federal Northeast FMPs. Based on mixed stock analysis results presented by Wirgin and King (2011), over 40 percent of the Atlantic sturgeon bycatch interactions in the Mid Atlantic Bight region were sturgeon from the New York Bight DPS. Individual-based assignment and mixed stock analysis of samples collected from sturgeon captured in Canadian fisheries in the Bay of Fundy indicated that approximately 1-2% were from the New York Bight DPS. At this time, we are not able to quantify the impacts from other threats or estimate the number of individuals killed as a result of other anthropogenic threats.

Riverine habitat may be impacted by dredging and other in-water activities, disturbing spawning habitat, and altering the benthic forage base. Both the Hudson and Delaware rivers have navigation channels that are maintained by dredging. Dredging is also used to maintain channels in the nearshore marine environment. Dredging outside of Federal channels and in-water construction occurs throughout the New York Bight region. While some dredging projects operate with observers present to document fish mortalities many do not. We have reports of one Atlantic sturgeon entrained during hopper dredging operations in Ambrose Channel, New Jersey, and a number of Atlantic sturgeon have been killed during Delaware River channel maintenance and deepening activities.

In the Hudson and Delaware Rivers, dams do not block access to historical habitat. The Holyoke Dam on the Connecticut River blocks further upstream passage; however, the extent that Atlantic sturgeon would historically have used habitat upstream of Holyoke is unknown. Connectivity may be disrupted by the presence of dams on several smaller rivers in the New York Bight region. Because no Atlantic sturgeon occur upstream of any hydroelectric projects in the New York Bight region, passage over hydroelectric dams or through hydroelectric turbines is not a source of injury or mortality in this area.

New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon may also be affected by degraded water quality. In general, water quality has improved in the Hudson and Delaware over the past decades (Lichter *et al.* 2006; EPA, 2008). Both the Hudson and Delaware rivers, as well as other rivers in the New York Bight region, were heavily polluted in the past from industrial and sanitary sewer discharges. While water quality has improved and most discharges are limited through regulations, many pollutants persist in the benthic environment. This can be particularly problematic if pollutants are present on spawning and nursery grounds as developing eggs and larvae are particularly susceptible to exposure to contaminants.

Vessel strikes occur in the Delaware and Hudson rivers. Delaware State University (DSU) collaborated with the Delaware Division of Fish and Wildlife (DDFW) in an effort to document vessel strikes in 2005. Approximately 200 reported carcasses with over half being attributed to vessel strikes based on a gross examination of wounds have been documented through 2019 (DiJohnson 2019). One hundred thirty-eight (138) sturgeon carcasses were observed on the Hudson River and reported to the NYSDEC between 2007 and 2015. Of these, 69 are suspected of having been killed by vessel strike. Genetic analysis has not been completed on any of these individuals to date, given that the majority of Atlantic sturgeon in the Hudson River belong to the New York Bight DPS; we assume that the majority of the dead sturgeon reported to NYSDEC belonged to the New York Bight DPS. Given the time of year in which the fish were observed (predominantly May through July), it is likely that many of the adults were migrating through the river to the spawning grounds.

Studies have shown that to rebuild, Atlantic sturgeon can only sustain low levels of anthropogenic mortality (Boreman, 1997; ASMFC, 2007; Kahnle *et al.*, 2007; Brown and Murphy, 2010). There are no empirical abundance estimates of the number of Atlantic sturgeon in the New York Bight DPS. We determined that the New York Bight DPS is currently at risk of extinction due to: (1) precipitous declines in population sizes and the protracted period in which sturgeon populations have been depressed; (2) the limited amount of current spawning; and (3) the impacts and threats that have and will continue to affect population recovery.

In 2018, we announced the initiation of a 5-year review for the New York Bight DPS. We reviewed and considered new information for the New York Bight DPS that has become available since this DPS was listed as endangered in February 2012. We completed the 5-year review for the DPS in February 2022 (NMFS 2022b). Based on the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of the review, we concluded that no change to the listing status is warranted.

4.3.3 Chesapeake Bay DPS

The Chesapeake Bay (CB) DPS includes the following: all anadromous Atlantic sturgeon that spawn or are spawned in the watersheds that drain into the Chesapeake Bay and into coastal waters from the Delaware-Maryland border on Fenwick Island to Cape Henry, Virginia. The marine range of Atlantic sturgeon from the CB DPS extends from Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, Canada, to Cape Canaveral, Florida. The riverine range of the CB DPS and the adjacent portion of the marine range are shown in Figure 5.3.1. Within this range, Atlantic sturgeon historically spawned in the Susquehanna, Potomac, James, York, Rappahannock, and Nottoway Rivers (ASSRT 2007). Based on the review by Oakley (2003), 100% of Atlantic sturgeon habitat is currently accessible in these rivers since most of the barriers to passage (i.e., dams) are located upriver of where spawning is expected to have historically occurred (ASSRT 2007).

At the time of listing, the James River was the only known spawning river for the Chesapeake Bay DPS (ASSRT, 2007; Hager, 2011; Balazik et al., 2012). Since the listing, evidence has been provided of both spring and fall spawning populations for the James River, as well as fall spawning in the Pamunkey River, a tributary of the York River, and fall spawning in Marshyhope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River (Hager et al., 2014; Kahn et al., 2014; Balazik and Musick, 2015; Richardson and Secor, 2016). Detections of acoustically-tagged adult Atlantic sturgeon along with historical evidence suggests that Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS may be spawning in the Mattaponi and Rappahannock rivers as well (Hilton et al. 2016; ASMFC 2017a; Kahn et al. 2019). However, information for these populations is limited and the research is ongoing.

Several threats play a role in shaping the current status of CB DPS Atlantic sturgeon. Historical records provide evidence of the large-scale commercial exploitation of Atlantic sturgeon from the James River and Chesapeake Bay in the 19th century (Hildebrand and Schroeder 1928; Vladykov and Greeley 1963; ASMFC 1998b; Secor 2002; Bushnoe *et al.* 2005; ASSRT 2007) as well as subsistence fishing and attempts at commercial fisheries as early as the 17th century (Secor 2002; Bushnoe *et al.* 2005; ASSRT 2007; Balazik *et al.* 2010). Habitat disturbance caused by in-river work, such as dredging for navigational purposes, is thought to have reduced available spawning habitat in the James River (Holton and Walsh 1995; Bushnoe *et al.* 2005; ASSRT 2007). At this time, we do not have information to quantify this loss of spawning habitat.

Decreased water quality also threatens Atlantic sturgeon of the CB DPS, especially since the Chesapeake Bay system is vulnerable to the effects of nutrient enrichment due to a relatively low tidal exchange and flushing rate, large surface-to-volume ratio, and strong stratification during the spring and summer months (Pyzik *et al.* 2004; ASMFC 1998a; ASSRT 2007; EPA 2008). These conditions contribute to reductions in dissolved oxygen levels throughout the Bay. The availability of nursery habitat, in particular, may be limited given the recurrent hypoxia (low dissolved oxygen) conditions within the Bay (Niklitschek and Secor 2005, 2010). Heavy industrial development during the 20th century in rivers inhabited by sturgeon impaired water quality and impeded these species' recovery.

Although there have been improvements in some areas of the Bay's health, the ecosystem remains in poor condition. At this time, we do not have sufficient information to quantify the extent that degraded water quality affects habitat or individuals in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

More than 100 Atlantic sturgeon carcasses have been salvaged in the James River since 2007 and additional carcasses were reported but could not be salvaged (Greenlee et al. 2019). Many of the salvaged carcasses had evidence of a fatal vessel strike. In addition, vessel struck Atlantic sturgeon have been found in other parts of the Chesapeake Bay DPS's range including in the York and Nanticoke river estuaries, within Chesapeake Bay, and near the mouth of the Bay since the DPS was listed as endangered (NMFS Sturgeon Salvage Permit Reporting; Secor et al. 2021).

In the marine and coastal range of the CB DPS from Canada to Florida, fisheries bycatch in federally and state-managed fisheries poses a threat to the DPS, reducing survivorship of subadults and adults and potentially causing an overall reduction in the spawning population (Stein *et al.* 2004b; ASMFC TC 2007; ASSRT 2007).

Areas with persistent, degraded water quality, habitat impacts from dredging, continued bycatch in U.S. state and federally managed fisheries, Canadian fisheries, and vessel strikes remain significant threats to the CB DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. Of the 35% of Atlantic sturgeon incidentally caught in the Bay of Fundy, about 1% were CB DPS fish (Wirgin *et al.* 2012). Studies have shown that Atlantic sturgeon can only sustain low levels of bycatch mortality (Boreman 1997; ASMFC TC 2007; Kahnle *et al.* 2007). The CB DPS is currently at risk of extinction given (1) precipitous declines in population sizes and the protracted period in which sturgeon populations have been depressed; (2) the limited amount of current spawning; and, (3) the impacts and threats that have and will continue to affect the potential for population recovery.

In 2018, we announced the initiation of a 5-year review for the Chesapeake Bay DPS. We reviewed and considered new information for the Chesapeake Bay DPS that has become available since this DPS was listed as endangered in February 2012. We completed the 5-year review for the Chesapeake Bay DPS in February 2022 (NMFS 2022c). Based on the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of the review, we concluded that no change to the listing status is warranted.

4.3.4 Carolina DPS

The Carolina DPS includes all Atlantic sturgeon that spawn or are spawned in the watersheds (including all rivers and tributaries) from Albemarle Sound southward along the southern Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina coastal areas to Charleston Harbor. The marine range of Atlantic sturgeon from the Carolina DPS extends from the Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, Canada, to Cape Canaveral, Florida.

Rivers in the Carolina DPS considered to be spawning rivers include the Neuse, Roanoke, Tar-Pamlico, Cape Fear, and Northeast Cape Fear rivers, and the Santee-Cooper and Pee Dee river (Waccamaw and Pee Dee rivers) systems. Historically, both the Sampit and Ashley Rivers were documented to have spawning populations at one time. However, the spawning population in the Sampit River is believed to be extirpated and the current status of the spawning population in the Ashley River is unknown. We have no information, current or historical, of Atlantic sturgeon using the Chowan and New Rivers in North Carolina. Recent telemetry work by Post et al. (2014) indicates that Atlantic sturgeon do not use the Sampit, Ashley, Ashepoo, and Broad-Coosawhatchie Rivers in South Carolina. These rivers are short, coastal plains rivers that most likely do not contain suitable habitat for Atlantic sturgeon. Fish from the Carolina DPS likely use other river systems than those listed here for their specific life functions.

Historical landings data indicate that between 7,000 and 10,500 adult female Atlantic sturgeon were present in North Carolina prior to 1890 (Armstrong and Hightower 2002, Secor 2002). Secor (2002) estimates that 8,000 adult females were present in South Carolina during that same period. Reductions from the commercial fishery and ongoing threats have drastically reduced the numbers of Atlantic sturgeon within the Carolina DPS. Currently, the Atlantic sturgeon spawning population in at least one river system within the Carolina DPS has been extirpated, with a potential extirpation in an additional system. The ASSRT estimated the remaining river populations within the DPS to have fewer than 300 spawning adults; this is thought to be a small fraction of historic population sizes (ASSRT 2007).

The Carolina DPS was listed as endangered under the ESA as a result of a combination of habitat curtailment and modification, overutilization (i.e., being taken as bycatch) in commercial fisheries, and the inadequacy of regulatory mechanisms in ameliorating these impacts and threats.

The modification and curtailment of Atlantic sturgeon habitat resulting from dams, dredging, and degraded water quality is contributing to the status of the Carolina DPS. Dams have curtailed Atlantic sturgeon spawning and juvenile developmental habitat by blocking over 60 percent of the historical sturgeon habitat upstream of the dams in the Cape Fear and Santee-Cooper River systems. Water quality (velocity, temperature, and dissolved oxygen (DO)) downstream of these dams, as well as on the Roanoke River, has been reduced, which modifies and curtails the extent of spawning and nursery habitat for the Carolina DPS. Dredging in spawning and nursery grounds modifies the quality of the habitat and is further curtailing the extent of available habitat in the Cape Fear and Cooper Rivers, where Atlantic sturgeon habitat has already been modified and curtailed by the presence of dams. Reductions in water quality from terrestrial activities have modified habitat utilized by the Carolina DPS. In the Pamlico and Neuse systems, nutrient-loading and seasonal anoxia are occurring, associated in part with concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs). Heavy industrial development and CAFOs have degraded water quality in the Cape Fear River. Water quality in the Waccamaw and Pee Dee rivers have been affected by industrialization and riverine sediment samples contain high levels of various toxins, including dioxins. Additional stressors arising from water allocation and climate change threaten to exacerbate water quality problems that are already present throughout the range of the Carolina DPS. The removal of large amounts of water from the system will alter flows, temperature, and DO. Existing water allocation issues will likely be compounded by population growth and potentially, by climate change. Climate change is also predicted to elevate water temperatures and exacerbate nutrient-loading, pollution inputs, and lower DO, all of which are current stressors to the Carolina DPS.

Overutilization of Atlantic sturgeon from directed fishing caused initial severe declines in Atlantic sturgeon populations in the Southeast, from which they have never rebounded. Further, continued overutilization of Atlantic sturgeon as bycatch in commercial fisheries is an ongoing impact to the Carolina DPS. Little data exists on bycatch in the Southeast and high levels of bycatch underreporting are suspected. Stress or injury to Atlantic sturgeon taken as bycatch but released alive may result in increased susceptibility to other threats, such as poor water quality (e.g., exposure to toxins and low DO). This may result in reduced ability to perform major life functions, such as foraging and spawning, or even post-capture mortality.

As a wide-ranging anadromous species, Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon are subject to numerous Federal (U.S. and Canadian), state and provincial, and inter-jurisdictional laws, regulations, and agency activities. While these mechanisms have addressed impacts to Atlantic sturgeon through directed fisheries, there are currently no mechanisms in place to address the significant risk posed to Atlantic sturgeon from commercial bycatch. Though statutory and regulatory mechanisms exist that authorize reducing the impact of dams on riverine and anadromous species, such as Atlantic sturgeon, and their habitat, these mechanisms have proven inadequate for preventing dams from blocking access to habitat upstream and degrading habitat downstream. Further, water quality continues to be a problem in the Carolina DPS, even with existing controls on some pollution sources. Current regulatory regimes are not necessarily effective in controlling water allocation issues (e.g., no restrictions on interbasin water transfers in South Carolina, the lack of ability to regulate non-point source pollution, etc.)

4.3.5 South Atlantic DPS

The South Atlantic DPS includes all Atlantic sturgeon that spawn or are spawned in the watersheds (including all rivers and tributaries) of the Ashepoo, Combahee, and Edisto Rivers (ACE) Basin southward along the South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida coastal areas to the St. Johns River, Florida.

Rivers known to have current spawning populations within the range of the South Atlantic DPS include the Combahee, Edisto, Savannah, Ogeechee, Altamaha, St. Marys, and Satilla Rivers. Recent telemetry work by Post et al. (2014) indicates that Atlantic sturgeon do not use the Sampit, Ashley, Ashepoo, and Broad-Coosawhatchie Rivers in South Carolina. These rivers are short, coastal plains rivers that most likely do not contain suitable habitat for Atlantic sturgeon. Post et al. (2014) also found Atlantic sturgeon only use the portion of the Waccamaw River downstream of Bull Creek. Due to manmade structures and alterations, spawning areas in the St. Johns River are not accessible and therefore do not support a reproducing population.

Secor (2002) estimates that 8,000 adult females were present in South Carolina prior to 1890. Prior to the collapse of the fishery in the late 1800s, the sturgeon fishery was the third largest fishery in Georgia. Secor (2002) estimated from U.S. Fish Commission landing reports that approximately 11,000 spawning females were likely present in the state prior to 1890. Reductions from the commercial fishery and ongoing threats have drastically reduced the numbers of Atlantic sturgeon within the South Atlantic DPS. Currently, the Atlantic sturgeon spawning population in at least one river system within the South Atlantic DPS has been extirpated. The Altamaha River population of Atlantic sturgeon, with an estimated 343 adults spawning annually, is believed to be the largest population in the Southeast, yet is estimated to be only 6 percent of its historical population size. The ASSRT estimated the abundances of the remaining river populations within the DPS, each estimated to have fewer than 300 spawning adults, to be less than 1 percent of what they were historically (ASSRT 2007).

The South Atlantic DPS was listed as endangered under the ESA as a result of a combination of habitat curtailment and modification, overutilization (i.e., being taken as bycatch) in commercial fisheries, and the inadequacy of regulatory mechanisms in ameliorating these impacts and threats.

The modification and curtailment of Atlantic sturgeon habitat resulting from dredging and degraded water quality is contributing to the status of the South Atlantic DPS. Maintenance dredging is currently modifying Atlantic sturgeon nursery habitat in the Savannah River and modeling indicates that the proposed deepening of the navigation channel will result in reduced DO and upriver movement of the salt wedge, curtailing spawning habitat. Dredging is also modifying nursery and foraging habitat in the St. Johns River. Reductions in water quality from terrestrial activities have modified habitat utilized by the South Atlantic DPS Non-point source inputs are causing low DO in the Ogeechee River and in the St. Marys River, which completely eliminates juvenile nursery habitat in summer. Low DO has also been observed in the St. Johns River in the summer. Sturgeon are more sensitive to low DO and the negative (metabolic, growth, and feeding) effects caused by low DO increase when water temperatures are concurrently high, as they are within the range of the South Atlantic DPS. Additional stressors arising from water allocation and climate change threaten to exacerbate water quality problems that are already present throughout the range of the South Atlantic DPS. Large withdrawals of over 240 million gallons per day (mgd) of water occur in the Savannah River for power generation and municipal uses. However, users withdrawing less than 100,000 gallons per day (gpd) are not required to get permits, so actual water withdrawals from the Savannah and other rivers within the range of the South Atlantic DPS are likely much higher. The removal of large amounts of water from the system will alter flows, temperature, and DO. Water shortages and "water wars" are already occurring in the rivers occupied by the South Atlantic DPS and will likely be compounded in the future by population growth and potentially by climate change. Climate change is also predicted to elevate water temperatures and exacerbate nutrient-loading, pollution inputs, and lower DO, all of which are current stressors to the South Atlantic DPS.

Overutilization of Atlantic sturgeon from directed fishing caused initial severe declines in Atlantic sturgeon populations in the Southeast, from which they have never rebounded. Further, continued overutilization of Atlantic sturgeon as bycatch in commercial fisheries is an ongoing impact to the South Atlantic DPS. The loss of large subadults and adults as a result of bycatch impacts Atlantic sturgeon populations because they are a long-lived species, have an older age at maturity, have lower maximum fecundity values, and a large percentage of egg production occurs later in life. Little data exist on bycatch in the Southeast and high levels of bycatch underreporting are suspected. Further, a total population abundance for the DPS is not available, and it is therefore not possible to calculate the percentage of the DPS subject to bycatch mortality based on the available bycatch mortality rates for individual fisheries. However, fisheries known to incidentally catch Atlantic sturgeon occur throughout the marine range of the species and in some riverine waters as well. Because Atlantic sturgeon mix extensively in marine waters and may access multiple river systems, they are subject to being caught in multiple fisheries throughout their range. In addition, stress or injury to Atlantic sturgeon taken as bycatch but released alive may result in increased susceptibility to other threats, such as poor water quality (e.g., exposure to toxins and low DO). This may result in reduced ability to perform major life functions, such as foraging and spawning, or even post-capture mortality.

As a wide-ranging anadromous species, Atlantic sturgeon are subject to numerous Federal (U.S. and Canadian), state and provincial, and inter-jurisdictional laws, regulations, and agency activities. While these mechanisms have addressed impacts to Atlantic sturgeon through directed fisheries, there are currently no mechanisms in place to address the significant risk posed to Atlantic sturgeon from commercial bycatch. Though statutory and regulatory mechanisms exist that authorize reducing the impact of dams on riverine and anadromous species, such as Atlantic sturgeon, and their habitat, these mechanisms have proven inadequate for preventing dams from blocking access to habitat upstream and degrading habitat downstream. Further, water quality continues to be a problem in the South Atlantic DPS, even with existing controls on some pollution sources. Current regulatory regimes are not necessarily effective in controlling water allocation issues (e.g., no permit requirements for water withdrawals under 100,000 gpd in Georgia, no restrictions on interbasin water transfers in South Carolina, the lack of ability to regulate non-point source pollution.)

Recovery Goals

A Recovery Plan has not been completed for any DPS of Atlantic sturgeon. In 2018, NMFS published a Recovery Outline[10] to serve as an initial recovery-planning document. In this, the recovery vision is stated, "Subpopulations of all five Atlantic sturgeon DPSs must be present across the historical range. These subpopulations must be of sufficient size and genetic diversity to support successful reproduction and recovery from mortality events. The recruitment of juveniles to the sub-adult and adult life stages must also increase and that increased recruitment must be maintained over many years. Recovery of these DPSs will require conservation of the riverine and marine habitats used for spawning, development, foraging, and growth by abating threats to ensure a high probability of survival into the future." The Outline also includes steps that are expected to serve as an initial recovery action plan. These include protecting extant subpopulations and the species' habitat through reduction of threats; gathering information through research and monitoring on current distribution and abundance; and addressing vessel strikes in rivers, the effects of climate change and bycatch.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

The "environmental baseline" refers to the condition of the listed species or its designated critical habitat in the action area, without the consequences to the listed species or designated critical habitat caused by the proposed action. The environmental baseline includes the past and present impacts of all Federal, State, or private actions and other human activities in the action area, the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in the action area that have already undergone formal or early section 7 consultation, and the impact of State or private actions which are contemporaneous with the consultation in process. (50 C.F.R. §402.02).

There are a number of existing activities that regularly occur in various portions of the action area, including operation of vessels and federal and state authorized fisheries. Other activities that occur occasionally or intermittently include scientific research, military activities, and geophysical and geotechnical surveys. There are also environmental conditions caused or exacerbated by human activities (i.e., water quality and noise) that may affect listed species in the action area. Some of these stressors result in mortality or serious injury to individual animals (e.g., vessel strike, fisheries), whereas others result in non-lethal impacts or impacts that are indirect. For all of the listed species considered here, given their extensive movements in and out of the action area and throughout their range as well as the similarities of stressors throughout the action area and other parts of their range the status of the species in the action area is the same as the rangewide status presented in the *Status of the Species* section of this

10 https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/ats_recovery_outline.pdf; last accessed March 26, 2023.

Opinion. Below, we describe the conditions of the action area, present a summary of the best available information on the use of the action area by listed species, and address the impacts to listed species of federal, state, and private activities in the action area that meet the definition of "environmental baseline."

As described above in Section 3.3, the action area includes the area near Brigantine Shoal where survey activities will occur and the vessel transit areas between the project area and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. The action area is located within multiple defined marine areas. The broadest area, the U.S. Northeast Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem, extends from the Gulf of Maine to Cape Hatteras, North Carolina (Kaplan 2011). The project area and vessel transit routes are located within the Southern Mid-Atlantic Bight sub-region of the U.S. Northeast Shelf Ecosystem, which is distinct from other regions based on differences in productivity, species assemblages and structure, and habitat features (Cook and Auster 2007). The physical oceanography of this region is influenced by the seafloor, freshwater input from multiple rivers and estuaries, large-scale weather patterns, and tropical or winter coastal storm events. Weather-driven surface currents, tidal mixing, and estuarine outflow all contribute to driving water movement through the area (Kaplan 2011).

In areas off the coast of southern New Jersey, including the action area, sea surface temperatures vary seasonally from 36°F (2°C) in winter to 79°F (26°C) in summer (NJDEP 2010, NMFS 2023). Seasonally, the Mid-Atlantic region experiences one of the largest transitions in stratification in any part of the ocean around the world, from the cold, well-mixed conditions in winter months to one of the largest top-to-bottom temperature differences in the summer (Castelao et al. 2010, Houghton et al. 1982, Miles et al. 2021). From spring through early summer, a strong thermocline develops across the length of the Mid-Atlantic Bight, isolating a continuous mid-shelf "cold pool" of water that extends from Nantucket to Cape Hatteras (Houghton et al. 1982, Kaplan 2011, Miles 2021). Through summer, the thermocline strengthens and the cold pool becomes more stable as a result of surface heating and freshwater runoff (Castelao et al. 2010). The stable summer cold pool is a relatively slow-moving feature, which moves back and forth between the coast and shelf in response to surface wind forcing during periods of upwelling and downwelling. During the fall, more frequent strong wind events and decreasing surface heat over increasingly shorter daily daylight hours shifts the balance between heat input and vertical mixing. This results in reduced stratification, which ultimately breaks down the cold pool (Bigelow 1933, Castelao et al 2010, Gong et al 2010, Lentz 2017, Lentz et al 2003, Miles et al 2021). These cold pool "seasons" of spring setup, summer stability, and fall breakdown are associated with and drivers of important biological and ecological processes, such as foraging and migration amongst marine vertebrates (Scales et al 2014).

Shelf currents in the project area generally flow in a southerly direction (WHOI 2016). These bottom currents are influenced by local bathymetry and regional density gradients. Prominent bottom features of the Mid-Atlantic Bight include a series of ridges and troughs. On the OCS off the coast of New Jersey, the largest slopes are associated with sand ridges that are generally parallel to the shoreline and are actively modified by ocean currents (Goff et al 2005). The project area contains several shoals characterized by fine, unconsolidated, medium sand of geologic origin (Pickens et al. 2020, BOEM 2022). Water depths range from 9-18 m in the project area.

5.1 Summary of Information on Listed Large Whale Presence in the Action Area

North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis)

North Atlantic right whale presence and behavior in the action area is best understood in the context of their range. North Atlantic right whales occur in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean from calving grounds in coastal waters of the southeastern United States to feeding grounds in New England waters into Canadian waters and the Canadian Bay of Fundy, Scotian Shelf, and Gulf of St. Lawrence (Hayes et al. 2021). In the late fall months (e.g., October), pregnant female right whales move south to their calving grounds off Georgia and Florida, while the majority of the population likely remains on the feeding grounds or disperses along the eastern seaboard. There is at least one case of a calf apparently being born in the Gulf of Maine (Patrician et al. 2009), and another newborn was detected in Cape Cod Bay in 2013 (CCS, unpublished data, as cited in Hayes et al. 2020). A review of visual and passive acoustic monitoring data in the western North Atlantic demonstrated nearly continuous year-round presence across their entire habitat range (for at least some individuals), including in waters previously thought to be used only seasonally by individuals migrating along the coast (e.g., off New Jersey and Virginia). This suggests that not all of the population undergoes a consistent annual migration (Bort et al. 2015, Cole et al. 2013, Davis et al. 2017, Hayes et al. 2020, Leiter et al. 2017, Morano et al. 2012, Whitt et al. 2013). Several recent studies (Meyer-Gutbrod et al. 2015, 2021, Davis et al. 2017, Davies et al. 2019, Gowan et al. 2019, Simard et al. 2019) suggest spatiotemporal habitat-use patterns are in flux both with regards to a shift northward (Meyer-Gutbrod et al. 2021), changing migration patterns (Gowan et al. 2019), as well as changing numbers in existing known high-use areas e.g., Davis et al. (2017, 2019, 2020) suggest increased distribution in waters of the mid-Atlantic.

North Atlantic right whales have been observed in or near state and federal waters off New Jersey during all four seasons; however, they are most common in spring when they are migrating north and in fall during their southbound migration (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa 2010, Roberts et al. 2016). In the past, occurrences of North Atlantic right whales in or near state and federal waters off New Jersey were known only from broader regional studies, opportunistic sightings, stranding records, and fine-scale studies in adjacent waters (e.g., CETAP 1982, Bowman et al. 2001, Knowlton et al. 2002, Biedron et al. 2009). Whitt et al. (2013) presents findings from the United States' first Ecological Baseline Study (EBS) specific to offshore wind planning for the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP; GMI 2010); vessel and aerial surveys were carried out from the coast to 37km offshore between January 2008 and December 2009. The area surveyed included the project area at Brigantine Shoal between Little Egg Inlet and Absecon Inlet, NJ. Whitt et al. (2013) reports on the North Atlantic right whale sighting and aerial survey data collected in that study. In the two-year study period, four individual or 2 pairs of North Atlantic right whales were observed, including one cow-calf pair. North Atlantic right whales were sighted in January (two juveniles), May (cow/calf pair), November, and December. Acoustic detections were also recorded during the study period. Sightings occurred in water depths ranging from 17 to 26 m (mean: 22.5 m) and distances from shore ranged from 19.9 to 31.9 km (mean: 23.7 km; the survey transects went out to 37 km from shore). Initial sightings of females in November and December, and subsequent confirmations of these same individuals in southern calving grounds, illustrate that these waters are used for migration (Whitt et al. 2013). Whitt et al. (2013) reported behaviors for two juveniles that were sighted together exhibiting skim-feeding behavior (for approximately 1.5 hours) offshore of Barnegat Bay in January. Although feeding could not be confirmed as there was no evidence of prey patches and no prey sampling was conducted, the authors suggest that this observation indicates that at least occasional foraging in or near the action area may occur when suitable prey in suitable densities is present. However, the action area is not known to support aggregations of foraging right whales or sustained foraging over extended periods (i.e., days or weeks).

The best available information regarding marine mammal densities in the project area is provided by habitat-based density models produced by the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory (Roberts et al., 2016, 2017, 2018, 2021a, 2021b, 2022). We used this data used to develop mean monthly density estimates for North Atlantic right whales for the action area; the mean density for each month was determined by calculating the unweighted mean of all 5- by 5-km grid cells partially or fully within the analysis polygon.

Table 5.1. Mean Monthly Density Estimates for North Atlantic right whales within project area

Species	Monthly Densities (animals per 100 km^2)												Annual Mean Density
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	
North Atlantic right whale	0.097	0.086	0.041	0.017	0.004	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.014	0.053	0.027

Sources: Roberts et al. 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2018, 2021a, 2021b

Table 5.2. Density Estimate Ranges for North Atlantic right whales along vessel transit routes to and from the survey area.

Species/Port	Monthly Densities (animals per 100 km^2)											
North Atlantic right whale	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Barnegat Light, NJ	0.063-0.16	0.04-0.16	0.025-0.063	0-0.025	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0-0.025	0.025-0.1
Tuckerton, NJ	0.063-0.16	0.04-0.1	0.016-0.063	0-0.04	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0-0.025	0.025-0.1

Source: Roberts et al. 2022

Density estimates indicate that January is the month with the highest density of right whales in the project area and along the anticipated vessel transit routes to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ and that overall, North Atlantic right whales are most likely to occur in and around the project area and along these vessel transit routes from December through March, with the highest probability of occurrence extending from January through February. The planned survey periods are during the time of year when right whale presence is least likely in the action area.

In summary, we anticipate individual North Atlantic right whales to occur year round in the action area. We expect these individuals to be moving throughout the action area, making seasonal migrations, and possibly foraging when copepod patches of sufficient density to trigger feeding behavior are present.

Western North Atlantic stock of fin whales (Balaenoptera physalus)
In the action area, fin whales are present in the project area and may be present along the vessel transit routes. Fin whale presence and behavior in the action area is best understood in the context of their range. Fin whale presence in the North Atlantic is limited to waters north of Cape Hatteras, NC. In general, fin whales off the eastern United States are centered along the 100-m isobath but with sightings well spread out over shallower and deeper water, including submarine canyons along the shelf break (Kenney and Winn 1987; Hain et al. 1992).

Fin whales occurring in the Mid-Atlantic belong to the western North Atlantic stock (Hayes et al. 2019). Fin whales are migratory, moving seasonally into and out of feeding areas, but the overall migration pattern is complex and specific routes are unknown (NMFS 2018a). Fin whales are believed to use the North Atlantic water primarily for feeding and more southern waters for calving. Movement of fin whales from the Labrador/Newfoundland region south into the West Indies during the fall have been reported (Clark 1995). Neonate strandings along the U.S. Mid-Atlantic coast from October through January indicate a possible offshore calving area (Hain et al. 1992). The species occur year-round in a wide range of latitudes and longitudes, but the density of individuals in any one area changes seasonally. Thus, their movements overall are patterned and consistent, but distribution of individuals in a given year may vary according to their energetic and reproductive condition, and climatic factors (NMFS 2010).

The northern Mid-Atlantic Bight represents a major feeding ground for fin whales as the physical and biological oceanographic structure of the area aggregates prey. This feeding area extends in a zone east from Montauk, Long Island, New York, to south of Nantucket (LaBrecque et al. 2015, Kenney and Vigness-Raposa 2010; NMFS 2010a) and is a location where fin whales congregate in dense aggregations and sightings frequently occur (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa 2010). Fin whales in this area feed on krill (*Meganyctiphanes norvegica* and *Thysanoessa inermis*) and schooling fish such as capelin (*Mallotus villosus*), herring (*Clupea harengus*), and sand lance (*Ammodytes* spp.) (Borobia et al. 1995) by skimming the water or lunge feeding. Several studies suggest that distribution and movements of fin whales along the east coast of the United States is influenced by the availability of sand lance (Kenney and Winn 1986, Payne 1990). This area is used extensively by feeding fin whales from March to October. This known foraging area is outside of the project area, but given the geographic proximity to the project area this area is informative of potential presence of fin whales in the vicinity of the project area and along vessel transit routes.

Acoustic studies in Estabrook et al. (2019, 2020) detected fin whales in the New York Bight every month of the year in their study period from 2017 to 2019. The results of these acoustic studies are consistent with the observations in Zoidis et al. (2021) where fin whales were sighted at least once in each month of the calendar year across the 3 years and in each survey season, throughout the study area across all habitat zones. While these studies were north of the project area, given the geographic proximity to the project area they are informative of potential presence of fin whales in the vicinity of the project area and along vessel transit routes. Based on the occurrence of a cow-calf pair observed in August 2008, results from the EBS provide support for the possibility of nearshore waters off New Jersey serving as nursery habitat (NJDEP 2010, Whitt et al. 2015). Ten fin whales are reported to have stranded along the New Jersey coast from 2008 to 2017 (Hayes et al. 2020; Henry et al. 2020). Of these, nine were determined to be the result of vessel strikes and one ruled an entanglement.

Sightings data from the EBS (NJDEP 2010, Whitt et al. 2015) in state and federal waters off New Jersey indicate that fin whales occur in and near the project area during all seasons. AMAPPS surveys detected fin whales in New Jersey coastal waters in the fall 2012 aerial, spring 2013 aerial, spring 2014 aerial, spring and summer 2017 aerial, winter 2018 aerial, and summer 2016 shipboard surveys (NEFSC and SEFSC 2012, 2013, 2014, 2016, 2018, 2019, 2022).

Mean monthly density estimates of fin whales in the project area were derived using the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Laboratory model results (Roberts et al. 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2018, 2021a, 2021b). Model results indicate that fin whale density in the project area is considerably variable between months with peaks in January and April with densities ranging from 0.001 to 0.016 individuals per 100 km^2 throughout the year.
In summary, we anticipate individual fin whales to occur in the project area year-round, with the possibility that monthly density peaks will vary inter-annually. We expect these individuals to be making seasonal coastal migrations, and to be foraging during spring and summer months. Fin whales occur year-round in a wide range of latitudes and longitudes, thus they may be present along the vessel transit routes to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ year round.

5.2 Summary of Information on Listed Sea Turtles in the Action Area

Four ESA-listed species of sea turtles (Leatherback sea turtles, North Atlantic DPS of green sea turtles, Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS of loggerhead sea turtles, Kemp’s ridley sea turtles) make seasonal migrations into the U.S. Mid-Atlantic. Individuals from all four species are seasonally present in the project area, typically from late spring/early summer through the fall; these species are also seasonally present in the coastal and oceanic waters that may be transited by project vessels traveling to marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

The four species of sea turtles considered here are highly migratory. One of the main factors influencing sea turtle presence in mid-Atlantic waters and north is seasonal temperature patterns (Ruben and Morreale 1999) as waters in these areas are not warm enough to support sea turtle presence year round. In general, sea turtles move up the U.S. Atlantic coast from southern wintering areas to foraging grounds as water temperatures warm in the spring. The trend is reversed in the fall as water temperatures cool. By December, sea turtles have passed Cape Hatteras, returning to more southern waters for the winter (Braun-McNeill and Epperly 2002, Ceriani et al. 2012, Griffin et al. 2013, James et al. 2005b, Mansfield et al. 2009, Morreale and Standora 2005, Morreale and Standora 1998, NEFSC and SEFSC 2011, Shoop and Kenney

1992, TEWG 2009, Winton et al. 2018). Water temperatures too low or too high may affect feeding rates and physiological functioning (Milton and Lutz 2003); metabolic rates may be suppressed when a sea turtle is exposed for a prolonged period to temperatures below 8-10°C (George 1997, Milton and Lutz 2003, Morreale et al. 1992). That said, loggerhead sea turtles have been found in waters as low as 7.1-8°C (Braun-McNeill et al. 2008, Smolowitz et al. 2015, Weeks et al. 2010). However, in assessing critical habitat for loggerhead sea turtles, the review team considered the water-temperature habitat range for loggerheads to be above 10° C (NMFS 2013). Sea turtles are most likely to occur in the action area when water temperatures are above this temperature, although depending on seasonal weather patterns and prey availability, they could be also present in months when water temperatures are cooler (as evidenced by fall and winter cold stunning records as well as year round stranding records). Given the warmer water temperatures, sea turtles are present in waters off the U.S. south Atlantic year round.

AMAPPS aerial abundance surveys in summer 2021 indicate that loggerhead and leatherback turtles are relatively common in waters of the southern Mid-Atlantic Bight while Kemp's ridley turtles and green turtles are less common (NEFSC and SEFSC 2022). Sea turtle nesting does not occur in New Jersey, and there are no nesting beaches or other critical habitats in the vicinity of the project area (GARFO 2021). For this reason, sea turtles in the project area are adults or juveniles; due to the distance from any nesting beaches, no hatchlings occur in the project area.

Sea turtles feed on a variety of both pelagic and benthic prey, and change diets through different life stages. Adult loggerhead and Kemp's ridley sea turtles are carnivores that feed on crustaceans, mollusks, and occasionally fish, green sea turtles are herbivores and feed primarily on algae, seagrass, and seaweed, and leatherback sea turtles are pelagic feeders that forage throughout the water column primarily on gelatinivores. As juveniles, loggerhead and green sea turtles are omnivores (Wallace et al. 2009, Dodge et al. 2011, BA - Eckert et al. 2012, https://www.seeturtles.org/sea-turtle-diet, Murray et al 2013, Patel et al. 2016). The distribution of pelagic and benthic prey resources is primarily associated with dynamic oceanographic processes, which ultimately affect where sea turtles forage (Polovina et al. 2006). During late-spring, summer, and early-fall months when water temperatures are suitable, the physical and biological structure of both the pelagic and benthic environment in the action area provide habitat for both the four species of sea turtles in the region as well as their prey.

Additional species-specific information is presented below. It is important to note that most of these data sources report sightings data that is not corrected for the percentage of sea turtles that were unobservable due to being under the surface. As such, many of these sources represent a minimum estimate of sea turtles in the area.

Leatherback sea turtles

Leatherbacks are a predominantly pelagic species that ranges into cooler waters at higher latitudes than other sea turtles, and their large body size makes the species easier to observe in aerial and shipboard surveys. The CETAP regularly documented leatherback sea turtles on the OCS between Cape Hatteras and Nova Scotia during summer months in aerial and shipboard surveys conducted from 1978 through 1988. The greatest concentrations were observed between Long Island and the Gulf of Maine (Shoop and Kenney 1992). AMAPPS surveys conducted from 2010 through 2021 routinely documented leatherbacks in the project area and surrounding areas during summer months (NEFSC and SEFSC 2018, 2022; Palka 2021).

During NJDEP (2010) aerial and shipboard surveys for marine mammals and sea turtles, sightings included a total of 12 leatherback sea turtles in waters ranging from 59 to 98 feet (18 to 30 meters) deep, with a mean depth of 79 feet (24 meters). Sightings were recorded from 6.4 to 22.5 miles (5.6 to 19.6 nm, 10.3 to 36.2 km) from shore, with a mean distance of 17.8 miles (15.5 nm, 28.6 km). The sea surface temperatures associated with leatherback sea turtle sightings ranged from 64.6 to 68.5°F (18.1 to 20.3°C), with a mean temperature of 66.2°F (19.0°C). Migrating leatherback sea turtles usually start arriving along the New Jersey coast in late spring/early summer (Shoop and Kenney 1992; James et al. 2006).

Key foraging destinations include, among others, the eastern coast of the United States (Eckert et al. 1998, 2012). Satellite tagging studies provide information on leatherback sea turtle behavior and movement in the action area. These studies show that leatherback sea turtles move throughout most of the North Atlantic from the equator to high latitudes. Based on tracking data for leatherbacks tagged off North Carolina (n=21), many of the tagged leatherbacks spent time in shelf waters from North Carolina, up the Mid-Atlantic shelf and into southern New England and the Gulf of Maine. After coastal residency, some leatherbacks undertook long migrations while tagged. Some migrated far offshore of the Mid-Atlantic, past Bermuda, even as far as the Mid-Atlantic Trench region. Others went towards Florida, the Caribbean, or Central America (Palka et al. 2021). This data indicates that leatherbacks are present throughout the action area at all depths of the water column and may be present along the vessel transit routes to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

The Marine Mammal Stranding Center (MMSC) in New Jersey rescued 177 leatherback turtles between 1995 and 2005 and another 10 between 2013 and 2018 (MMSC 2023). Of the turtles rescued in this time interval, 14 percent had been struck by boat propellers, 8 percent had an interaction with fishing gear, and 2 percent had been struck by a boat (Schoelkopf 2006). From 2010 through 2020, the Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network (STSSN) reported 12 offshore and 6 inshore leatherback sea turtle strandings within Zone 39, which encompasses southern New Jersey (NMFS 2021b).

Based on the information presented here, we anticipate leatherback sea turtles to occur in the project area during the warmer months, typically between May and November. Leatherbacks are also expected along the vessel transit routes used by survey vessels transiting to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

Northwest Atlantic DPS of Loggerhead sea turtles

The loggerhead sea turtle is commonly found throughout the North Atlantic including the Gulf of Mexico, the northern Caribbean, the Bahamas archipelago (Dow et al. 2007), and eastward to West Africa, the western Mediterranean, and the west coast of Europe (NMFS and USFWS 2008). The range of the Northwest Atlantic DPS is the Northwest Atlantic Ocean north of the equator, south of 60° N. Lat., and west of 40° W. Long. Northwest Atlantic DPS loggerheads occur in the project area as well as in coastal and oceanic waters that may be transited by project vessels traveling to marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

Extensive tagging results suggest that tagged loggerheads occur on the continental shelf along the United States Atlantic from Florida to North Carolina year-round but also highlight the importance of summer foraging areas on the Mid-Atlantic shelf, which includes the project area (Winton et al. 2018). In the shelf waters off of New Jersey, loggerhead sea turtles can be found seasonally, primarily in the summer and autumn months when surface temperatures range from 44.6ºF to 86ºF (7ºC to 30ºC) (Kenney and Vigness-Raposa 2010; Shoop and Kenney 1992). The NJDEP (2010) aerial and shipboard surveys recorded a total of 615 loggerhead sea turtle sightings between January 2008 and December 2009. The loggerhead sea turtle was the second most frequently sighted species during the survey, and the vast majority of sightings were during the summer (NJDEP 2010).

During the CETAP surveys, one of the largest observed aggregations of loggerheads was documented in shallow shelf waters northeast of Long Island (Shoop and Kenney 1992), north of the action area; however, this data is informative of loggerhead habitat use in the action area. Loggerheads were most frequently observed in areas ranging from 72 to 160 feet (22 and 49 m) deep. Over 80% of all sightings were in waters less than 262 feet (80 m), suggesting a preference for relatively shallow OCS habitats (Shoop and Kenney 1992). Juvenile loggerheads are prevalent in the nearshore waters of Long Island from July through mid-October (Morreale et al. 1992; Morreale and Standora 1998), accounting for more than 50% of live strandings and incidental captures (Morreale and Standora 1998).

In the summer of 2010, as part of the AMAPPS project, the NEFSC and SEFSC estimated the abundance of juvenile and adult loggerhead sea turtles in the portion of the northwestern Atlantic continental shelf between Cape Canaveral, Florida and the mouth of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada (NMFS 2011b). The abundance estimates were based on data collected from an aerial line-transect sighting survey as well as satellite tagged loggerheads. The preliminary regional abundance estimate was about 588,000 individuals (approximate inter-quartile range of 382,000-817,000) based on only the positively identified loggerhead sightings, and about 801,000 individuals (approximate inter-quartile range of 521,000-1,111,000) when based on the positively identified loggerheads and a portion of the unidentified sea turtle sightings (NMFS 2011b). The loggerhead was the most frequently observed sea turtle species in 2010 to 2017 AMAPPS aerial surveys of the Atlantic continental shelf. Large concentrations were regularly observed in proximity to the NJ WEA (Palka et al. 2021).

Barco et al. (2018) estimated loggerhead sea turtle abundance and density in the southern portion of the Mid-Atlantic Bight and Chesapeake Bay using data from 2011-2012. During aerial surveys off Virginia and Maryland, loggerhead sea turtles were the most common turtle species detected, followed by greens and leatherbacks, with few Kemp's ridleys documented. Density varied both spatially and temporally. Loggerhead abundance and density estimates in the ocean were higher in the spring (May-June) than the summer (July-August) or fall (September-October). Ocean abundance estimates of loggerheads ranged from highs of 27,508-80,503 in the spring months of May-June to lows of 3,005-17,962 in the fall months of September-October (Barco et al. 2018).

AMAPPS data, along with other sources, have been used in recent modelling studies. Winton et al. (2018) modelled the spatial distribution of satellite-tagged loggerhead sea turtles in the Western North Atlantic. The Mid-Atlantic Bight was identified as an important summer foraging area and the results suggest that the area may support a larger proportion of the population, over 50% of the predicted relative density of loggerheads north of Cape Hatteras from June to October (NMFS 2019a, Winton et al. 2018). Using satellite telemetry observations from 271 large juvenile and adult sea turtles collected from 2004 to 2016, the models predicted that overall densities were greatest in the shelf waters of the U.S. Atlantic coast from Florida to North Carolina. Tagged loggerheads primarily occupied the continental shelf from Long Island, New York to Florida, with some moving offshore. Monthly variation in the Mid-Atlantic Bight indicated migration north to the foraging grounds from March to May and migration south from November to December. In late spring and summer, predicted densities were highest in the shelf waters from Maryland to New Jersey. In the cooler months, the predicted densities in the Mid-Atlantic Bight were higher offshore (Winton et al. 2018). South of Cape Hatteras, there was less seasonal variability and predicted densities were high in all months. Many of the individuals tagged in this area remained in the general vicinity of the tagging location. The authors did caution that the model was driven, at least in part, by the weighting scheme chosen, is reflective only of the tagged population, and has biases associated with the non-random tag deployment. Most loggerheads tagged in the Mid-Atlantic Bight were tagged in offshore shelf waters north of Chesapeake Bay in the spring. Thus, loggerheads in the nearshore areas of the Mid-Atlantic Bight may have been under-represented (Winton et al. 2018).

To better understand loggerhead behavior on the Mid-Atlantic foraging grounds, Patel et al. (2016) used a remotely operated vehicle (ROV) to document the feeding habitats (and prey availability), buoyancy control, and water column use of 73 loggerheads recorded from 2008-2014. When the mouth and face were in view, loggerheads spent 13% of the time feeding on non-gelatinous prey and 2% feeding on gelatinous prey. Feeding on gelatinous prey occurred near the surface to depths of 52.5 ft. (16 m). Non-gelatinous prey were consumed on the bottom. Turtles spent approximately 7% of their time on the surface (associated with breathing), 42% in the near surface region, 44% in the water column, 0.4% near bottom, and 6% on bottom. When diving to depth, turtles displayed negative buoyancy, making staying at the bottom easier (Patel et al. 2016).

Patel et al. (2018) evaluated temperature-depth data from 162 satellite tags deployed on loggerhead sea turtles from 2009 to 2017 when the water column is highly stratified (June 1 – October 4). Turtles arrived in the Mid-Atlantic Bight in late May as the Cold Pool formed and departed in early October when the Cold Pool started to dissipate. The Cold Pool is an oceanographic feature that forms annually in late May. During the highly stratified season, tagged turtles were documented throughout the water column from June through September. Fewer bottom dives occurred north of Hudson Canyon early (June) and late (September) in the foraging season (Patel et al. 2018).

The MMSC in New Jersey rescued an average of 47 loggerhead turtles each year between 1995 and 2005 and another 138 between 2013 and 2018 (MMSC 2023). Of the loggerhead turtles rescued between 1995 and 2005, 16 percent had been struck by propellers, 3.9 percent had evidence of boat collisions, and 3.7 percent had evidence of fisheries interactions (Schoelkopf 2006). From 2010 through 2020, STSSN reported 139 offshore and 74 inshore loggerhead sea turtle strandings within Zone 39, which encompasses southern New Jersey (NMFS 2021b). Loggerheads are stranded far more often than other sea turtles in New Jersey (NMFS 2021b), as they have a higher relative abundance.

Based on the information presented here, we anticipate loggerheads from the Northwest Atlantic DPS to occur in the project area during the warmer months, typically between May and November. Loggerheads are also expected along the vessel transit routes used by research vessels transiting to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

Kemp's ridley sea turtles

Kemp's ridleys are distributed throughout the Gulf of Mexico and U.S. Atlantic coastal waters, from Florida to New England. A few records exist for Kemp's ridleys near the Azores, waters off Morocco, and within the Mediterranean Sea and they are occasionally found in other areas around the Atlantic Basin. As adults, many turtles remain in the Gulf of Mexico, with only occasional occurrence in the Atlantic Ocean (NMFS, USFWS, and SEAMARNAT 2011). Adult habitat largely consists of sandy and muddy areas in shallow, nearshore waters less than 120 feet (37 m) deep (Landry and Seney 2008; Shaver et al. 2005; Shaver and Rubio 2008), although they can also be found in deeper offshore waters.

Juvenile and subadult Kemp's ridley sea turtles are known to travel as far north as Long Island Sound and Cape Cod Bay during summer and autumn foraging (NMFS, USFWS and SEAMARNAT 2011); the range of these migrating turtles would overlap with the action area. Visual sighting data are limited because this small species is difficult to observe using aerial survey methods (Kraus et al. 2016), and most surveys do not cover its preferred shallow bay and estuary habitats. The MMSC in New Jersey rescued an average of 45 Kemp's ridley turtles each year between 1995 and 2005, of which 18% had become impinged on power plant grates, 4% had been struck by boat propellers, and 20% showed signs of other impacts (NJDEP 2006). From 2010 through 2020, the STSSN reported 11 offshore and 5 inshore Kemp's ridley sea turtle strandings within Zone 39, which encompasses southern New Jersey (NMFS 2021b).

Based on the information presented here, we anticipate Kemp's ridley turtles to occur in the project area during the warmer months, typically between May and November. Kemp's ridleys are also expected along the vessel transit routes used by research vessels transiting to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

North Atlantic DPS of Green sea turtles

Most green turtles spend the majority of their lives in coastal foraging grounds. These areas include fairly shallow waters both open coastline and protected bays and lagoons. In addition to coastal foraging areas, oceanic habitats are used by oceanic-stage juveniles, migrating adults, and, on some occasions, by green turtles that reside in the oceanic zone for foraging. Because of their association with warm waters, green sea turtles are only found in New Jersey waters during the summer, foraging on marine algae and marine grasses (CWFNJ 2021).

Five green turtle sightings were recorded off the Long Island shoreline in aerial surveys conducted from 2010 to 2013 (NEFSC and SEFSC 2018). Green sea turtles were also positively identified in 2010 to 2017 AMAPPS aerial surveys of the Atlantic continental shelf. Large concentrations were regularly observed in proximity to the NJ coastal areas, with most sightings occurring during summer between North Carolina and New York, along the continental shelf (Palka et al. 2021).

The STSSN rescued eight green sea turtles between 1995 and 2005, of which six had evidence of human interactions with fishing activities, boat strikes, and impingement on a power plant grate (NJDEP 2006). From 2010 to 2020, the STSSN reported seven offshore and two inshore green sea turtle strandings within Zone 39, which encompasses southern New Jersey (NMFS 2021b).These and other sources of information indicate that green sea turtles occur periodically in shallow nearshore waters of Mid-Atlantic Bight.

Based on the information presented here, we anticipate green sea turtles to occur in the project area during the warmer months, typically between May and November. Green sea turtles are also expected along the vessel transit routes used by research vessels transiting to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

5.3 Summary of Information on Listed Marine Fish in the Action Area

Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus)

Adult and subadult (less than 150cm in total length, not sexually mature, but have left their natal rivers) Atlantic sturgeon from all five DPSs undertake seasonal, nearshore (i.e., typically depths less than 50 meters), coastal marine migrations along the United States eastern coastline including in waters of southern New England (Dunton et al. 2010, Erickson et al. 2011). Given their anticipated distribution in depths primarily 50 m and less, Atlantic sturgeon may occur in the project area and along the transit routes to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

Atlantic sturgeon demonstrate strong spawning habitat fidelity and extensive migratory behavior (Savoy et al. 2017). Adults and subadults migrate extensively along the Atlantic coastal shelf (Erickson et al. 2011; Savoy et al. 2017), and use the coastal nearshore zone to migrate between river systems (ASSRT 2007; Eyler et al. 2004). Erickson et al. (2011) found that adults remain in nearshore and shelf habitats ranging from 6 to 125 feet (2 to 38 m) in depth, preferring shallower waters in the summer and autumn and deeper waters in the winter and spring. Data from capture records, tagging studies, and other research efforts (Damon-Randall et al. 2013; Dunton et al. 2010; Stein et al. 2004a, 2004b; Zollett 2009) indicate the potential for occurrence in the action area during all months of the year. Individuals from every Atlantic sturgeon DPS have been captured in the Virginian marine ecoregion (Cook and Auster 2007; Wirgin et al. 2015a, 2015b), which extends from Cape Cod, Massachusetts, to Cape Lookout, North Carolina.

Based on tag data, sturgeon migrate to southern waters (e.g. off the coast of North Carolina and Virginia) during the fall, and migrate to more northern waters (e.g. off the coast of New York, southern New England, as far north as the Bay of Fundy) during the spring (Dunton et al. 2010, Erickson et al. 2011, Wippelhauser et al. 2017). In areas with gravel, sand and/or silt bottom habitats and relatively shallow depths (primarily <50 meters), sturgeon may also be foraging during these trips on prey including mollusks, gastropods, amphipods, annelids, decapods, isopods, and fish such as sand lance (Stein et al. 2004b, Dadswell 2006, Dunton et al. 2010, Erickson et al. 2011).

Atlantic sturgeon aggregate in several distinct areas along the Mid-Atlantic coastline; Atlantic sturgeon are most likely to occur in areas adjacent to estuaries and/or coastal features formed by bay mouths and inlets (Stein *et al.* 2004a; Laney *et. al* 2007; Erickson *et al*. 2011; Dunton *et al*. 2010). These aggregation areas are located within the coastal waters off North Carolina; waters between the Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay; the southern New Jersey coast near the mouth of Delaware Bay; and the southwest shores of Long Island (Laney *et. al* 2007; Erickson *et al*. 2011; Dunton *et al*. 2010). These aggregation areas are believed to be where Atlantic sturgeon overwinter and/or forage (Laney *et. al* 2007; Erickson *et al*. 2011; Dunton *et al*. 2010). Based on five fishery-independent surveys, Dunton *et al*. (2010) identified several "hotspots" for Atlantic sturgeon captures, all located in depths of less than 20 m adjacent to estuaries including the Hudson River/NY Bight, Delaware Bay, Chesapeake Bay, Cape Hatteras, and Kennebec River. These "hotspots" are aggregation areas that are most often used during the spring, summer, and fall months (Erickson *et al*. 2011; Dunton *et al*. 2010). Areas between these sites are used by sturgeon migrating to and from these areas, as well as to spawning grounds found within natal rivers. Adult sturgeon return to their natal river to spawn in the spring. The nearest river to the project area that is known to regularly support Atlantic sturgeon spawning is the Delaware River.

Dunton et al. (2015) caught sturgeon as bycatch in waters less than 50 feet deep during the New York summer flounder fishery; this study reports Atlantic sturgeon occurred along eastern Long Island in all seasons except for the winter, with the highest frequency in the spring and fall. The species migrates along coastal New York from April to June and from October to November (Dunton et al. 2015). Ingram et al. (2019) studied Atlantic sturgeon distribution using acoustic tags and determined peak seasonal occurrence in the offshore waters of the OCS from November through January, whereas tagged individuals were uncommon or absent from July to September. The authors reported that the transition from coastal to offshore areas, predictably associated with photoperiod and river temperature, typically occurred in the autumn and winter months. While the areas studied by Dunton and Ingram are outside the action area, the proximity provides useful information on the likely seasonal distribution of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

Migratory adults and sub-adults have been collected in shallow nearshore areas of the continental shelf (32.9–164 feet [10–50 m]) on any variety of bottom types (silt, sand, gravel, or clay). Evidence suggests that Atlantic sturgeon orient to specific coastal features that provide foraging opportunities linked to depth-specific concentrations of fauna. Concentration areas of Atlantic sturgeon near Chesapeake Bay and North Carolina were strongly correlated with the coastal features formed by the bay mouth, inlets, and the physical and biological features produced by outflow plumes (Kingsford and Suthers 1994, as cited in Stein et al. 2004a). They are also known to commonly aggregate in areas that presumably provide optimal foraging opportunities, such as the Bay of Fundy, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Delaware Bay (Dovel and Berggren 1983; Johnson et al. 1997; Rochard et al. 1997; Kynard et al. 2000; Eyler et al. 2004; Stein et al. 2004a; Dadswell 2006, as cited in ASSRT 2007).

Stein et al. (2004a, 2004b) reviewed 21 years of sturgeon bycatch records in the Mid-Atlantic OCS to identify regional patterns of habitat use and association with specific habitat types. Atlantic sturgeon were routinely captured in waters within and in immediate proximity to the action area, most commonly in waters ranging from 33 to 164 feet (10–50 m) deep. Sturgeon in this area were most frequently associated with coarse gravel substrates within a narrow depth range, presumably associated with depth-specific concentrations of preferred prey fauna.

A number of surveys occur regularly in the action area that are designed to characterize the fish community and use sampling gear that is expected to collect Atlantic sturgeon if they were present in the area. One such survey is the Northeast Area Monitoring and Assessment Program (NEAMAP), which samples from Cape Cod, MA south to Cape Hatteras, NC and targets both juvenile and adult fishes; NEAMAP samples near shore water to a depth of 60 feet and includes the sounds to 120 feet. Atlantic sturgeon are regularly captured in this survey. The area is also sampled in the NEFSC bottom trawl surveys, which surveys from Cape Hatteras to the Western Scotian Shelf. Presence has been confirmed by the collection of Atlantic sturgeon in several sampling programs off the New Jersey coast (Stein et al. 2004b; Eyler et al. 2009; Dunton et al. 2010; Erickson et al. 2011). Dunton et al. (2010) analyzed data from surveys covering the northwest Atlantic Ocean from Cape Hatteras to the Gulf of Maine conducted by five agencies. The catch per unit of effort for Atlantic sturgeon off New Jersey, from New York Harbor south to the entrance of Delaware Bay (Delaware), was second only to catch per unit of effort from the entrance of New York Harbor to Montauk Point, New York. About 95% of all Atlantic sturgeon captured in the sampling off New Jersey occurred in depths less than 66 feet (20 meters) with the highest catch per unit of effort at depths of 33 to 49 feet (10 to 15 meters) (Dunton et al. 2010).

Spawning, juvenile growth and development, and overwintering are not known to occur in the project area. In the project area, the majority of individuals will be from the New York Bight DPSs (Kazyak et al. 2021). Considering the action area as whole, individuals from all five DPSs may be present.

In summary, we anticipate Atlantic sturgeon to occur in the project area during the spring, summer, and fall. Atlantic sturgeon are also expected in nearshore (less than 50 m depth) waters transited by project vessels moving to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, NJ and Tuckerton, NJ.

5.4 Consideration of Federal, State, and Private Activities in the Action Area

Project vessels are expected to use the Barnegat Inlet and the Little Egg Inlet respectively to transit to and from the project area. In addition to fishing activity and vessel traffic, portions of these areas have navigation channels that are maintained by dredging, and are affected by routine in-water construction activities such as dock, pier, and wharf maintenance and construction.

The construction and maintenance of federal navigation channels and sand mining ("borrow") areas to aid in beach nourishment activities may result in the capture, injury, and/or mortality of sea turtles and Atlantic sturgeon. There are several dredge types used in the action area. Most dredging and dredged material placement projects in the action area are authorized or carried out by the USACE.   We have no records of incidental take of ESA listed species during dredging activities in the action area.

Fishing Activity in the Action Area

Commercial and recreational fishing occurs throughout the action area. The project area and vessel transit routes occupy a portion of NMFS statistical area 614 (see, https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/map/greater-atlantic-region-statistical-areas). Commercial fishing in the U.S. EEZ portion of the action area is authorized by the individual states or by NMFS under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Fisheries that operate pursuant to the MSFCMA have undergone consultation pursuant to section 7 of the ESA. These biological opinions are available online (available at: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/new-england-mid-atlantic/consultations/section-7-biological-opinions-greater-atlantic-region).

Given that fisheries occurring in the action area are known to interact with large whales, the past and ongoing risk of entanglement in the action area is considered here. The degree of risk in the future may change in association with fishing practices and accompanying regulations. It is important to note that in nearly all cases, the location where a whale first encountered entangling gear is unknown and the location reported is the location where the entangled whale was first sighted. The risk of entanglement in fishing gear to fin whales in the action area appears to be low given the low interaction rates in the U.S. EEZ as a whole.

We have reviewed the most recent data available on reported entanglements for the ESA listed whale stocks that occur in the action area (Hayes et al. 2020, Hayes et al. 2022, Henry et al. 2022). As reported in Hayes et al. 2022, for the most recent 5-year period of review (2015-2019) in the U.S. Atlantic, the minimum rate of serious injury or mortality resulting from fishery interactions as 5.7/year for right whales and 1.45/year for fin whales. No confirmed fishery-related mortalities or serious injuries of fin whales have been reported in the NMFS Sea Sampling bycatch database and a review of the records of stranded, floating, or injured fin whales for the period 2015 through 2019 with substantial evidence of fishery interactions causing injury or mortality are captured in the total observed incidental fishery interaction rate reported above (Hayes et al. 2022).

We also reviewed available data that post-dates the information presented in the most recent stock assessment reports. As explained in the Status of the Species section of this Opinion, there is an active UME for North Atlantic right whales[11]. Of the 95 right whales in the UME, 9 mortalities are attributed to entanglement as well as 20 serious injuries and 30 sublethal injuries. None of the whales recorded as part of the UME were first documented in the action area[12]. We reviewed information on serious injury and mortalities reported in Henry et al. 2022. Two live

[11] Information in this paragraph related to the UME is available at: *https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-life-distress/2017-2021-north-atlantic-right-whale-unusual-mortality-event*; last accessed on February 13, 2023

[12] https://noaa.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e502f7daf4af43ffa9776c17c2aff3ea; last accessed February 13, 2023

right whales were first documented as entangled in waters off the coast of New Jersey; right whale 3405 was documented as entangled in netting on December 4, 2016 approximately 3.5 nm east of Sandy Hook, right whale 4680 was documented as entangled in unknown gear on October 11, 2020 approximately 2.7 nm east of Sea Bright, NJ. It is unknown where either of these entanglements actually occurred. Henry et al. 2022 includes no records of entangled fin whales first reported in waters off New Jersey. Note that entanglement or capture of right and fin whales in trawl fisheries is not known to occur.

Given the co-occurrence of fisheries and large whales in the action area, it is assumed that there have been entanglements in the action area in the past and that this risk will persist at some level throughout the six field sampling seasons for the project. However, it is important to note a number of initiatives with the goal of reducing risk of fisheries operations on ESA-listed whales including ongoing implementation of the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan (ALWTRP). The goal of the ALWTRP is to reduce injuries and deaths of large whales due to incidental entanglement in fishing gear. The ALWTRP is an evolving plan that changes as NMFS learns more about why whales become entangled and how fishing practices might be modified to reduce the risk of entanglement. It has several components including restrictions on where and how gear can be set; research into whale populations and whale behavior, as well as fishing gear interactions and modifications; outreach to inform and collaborate with fishermen and other stakeholders; and a large whale disentanglement program that seeks to safely remove entangling gear from large whales whenever possible. While there have been delays to implementation of some recently developed ALWTRP measures, the risk of entanglement within the action area is expected to decrease over the life of the action due to compliance of state and federal fisheries with new ALWTRP measures. New Jersey has codified the ALWTRP measures into their state fishery regulations.

Atlantic sturgeon are captured as bycatch in trawl and gillnet fisheries. An analysis of the NEFOP/ASM bycatch data from 2000-2015 (ASMFC 2017) found that most trips that encountered Atlantic sturgeon were in depths less than 20 meters and water temperatures between 45-60°F. Average mortality in bottom otter trawls was 4% and mortality averaged 30% in gillnets (ASMFC 2017). The most recent five years of data in the NMFS NEFOP and ASM database were queried for the number of reports of Atlantic sturgeon bycatch in the statistical area that overlaps with the action area (614[13]). The NEFOP program samples a percentage of trips from the Gulf of Maine to Cape Hatteras while the ASM program provides additive coverage for the New England ground fish fisheries, extending from Maine to New York. For the most recent five-year period that data are available (2016-2020), a total of 77 Atlantic sturgeon were reported as bycatch in statistical area 614, this represents approximately 5% of the total bycatch of Atlantic sturgeon in the Maine to Cape Hatteras area where the NEFOP, and Maine to New York area where the ASM program, operates. Incidental capture of Atlantic sturgeon is expected to continue in the action area at a similar rate throughout the six field sampling seasons for the project. While the rate of encounter is low and survival is relatively

[13] Map available at:
https://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/educational_resources/gis/gallery/gafostatisticalareas.html

high (96% in otter trawls and 70% in gillnets), bycatch is expected to be the primary source of mortality of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

Sea turtles are vulnerable to capture in trawls as well as entanglement in gillnets and vertical lines. Using the same data source as for Atlantic sturgeon, from 2012-2020 there were a total of 4 incidents of observed sea turtle bycatch in fisheries in area 614 (3 loggerheads, 1 Kemp's ridley); the most recent record was from 2017 and all four turtles were captured in otter trawls. Leatherback sea turtles are particularly vulnerable to entanglement in vertical lines. Since 2005, 379 leatherbacks have been reported entangled in vertical lines in the Northeast Region. In response to high numbers of leatherback sea turtles found entangled in the vertical lines of fixed gear in the Northeast Region, NMFS established the Northeast Atlantic Coast Sea Turtle Disentanglement Network (STDN). Formally established in 2002, the STDN is an important component of the National Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network. The STDN works to reduce serious injuries and mortalities caused by entanglements and is active throughout the action area responding to reports of entanglements. Where possible, turtles are disentangled and may be brought back to rehabilitation facilities for treatment and recovery. This helps to reduce the rate of death from entanglement. For all fisheries for which there is a fishery management plan (FMP) or for which any federal action is taken to manage that fishery, the impacts have been evaluated via section 7 consultation. Past consultations have addressed the effects of federally permitted fisheries on ESA-listed species, sought to minimize the adverse impacts of the action on ESA-listed species, and, when appropriate, have authorized the incidental taking of these species. Incidental capture and entanglement of sea turtles is expected to continue in the action area at a similar rate throughout the six field sampling seasons for the project. Safe release and disentanglement protocols help to reduce the severity of impacts of these interactions and these efforts are expected to continue over the life of the project.

Vessel Operations

The action area is used by a variety of vessels ranging from small recreational fishing vessels to large commercial tug/tow vessels. Commercial vessel traffic in the action area includes research, tug/barge, and search-and-rescue vessels, and commercial fishing vessels.

Information from the USCG's Draft Port Access Route Study for the Seacoast of New Jersey (NJPARS) helps to establish the baseline vessel traffic in the project area. USCG's NJPARS analyzed Automatic Identification System (AIS) data along the seacoast of New Jersey and found 74,352 annual transits through the study area by 6,704 unique vessels in 2019 (Figure 5.4.1). The study concluded that vessel activity in the study area was largely commercial fishing. Commercial fishing vessels that currently transit the project area primarily transit across the Absecon Inlet and the Barnegat Inlet. Fishing vessels account for 40.1 percent of all transits across the Absecon Inlet and 42.9 percent of all transits across the Barnegat Inlet.

Figure 5.4.1. Number of Vessel Transits and Unique Vessels by Vessel Type in the NJPARS Study Area, 2019



The draft NJPARS includes a comprehensive vessel traffic survey in the study area using automatic identification system (AIS) data from 2017, 2018, and 2019 (Figure 5.4.2 and 5.4.3). AIS is required only for vessels 65' or larger and is optional for smaller vessels. According to AIS data, the area in and around the project area is heavily trafficked by vessels transiting along the coast of the United States (DNV GL 2021). The data include nine vessel classes: cargo/carrier, fishing, other, unidentified, passenger, recreational, tanker, military, and tug and service. Based on AIS data, the coastal traffic in the project area is predominantly pleasure and fishing vessels. Deep draft vessels are not expected to enter the project area. As described in the BA, the action area also includes the vessel transit areas between the project area and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. These research vessels will use the Barnegat Inlet and the Little Egg Inlet respectively to transit to and from the project area. Based on the Passage Line Analysis included in the draft NJPARS, between 2017 and 2019, fishing vessels were the predominant vessel type to cross Barnegat Inlet and tugs and recreational vessels were the two primary vessel types to cross the Little Egg Inlet (Figures 5.4.4 and 5.4.5).

Figure 5.4.2. Traffic Densities for the NJ PARS in 2019



Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

Figure 5.4.3. Enlarged image of Traffic Densities for the NJ PARS in 2019



Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

Figure 5.4.4. Barnegat Inlet Passage Line Crossings



	Cargo	Military	Tanker	Not Available	Passenger	Tug Tow	Pleasure Craft/Sailing	Other	Fishing
2017	0	0	0	368	367	167	337	336	2140
2018	0	0	0	3	77	257	296	920	313
2019	0	0	0	2	74	109	343	191	428
% of Total	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	5.54%	7.70%	7.92%	14.51%	21.51%	42.82%

Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

Figure 5.4.5. Little Egg Inlet Passage Line Crossings



	Cargo	Military	Tanker	Not Available	Other	Fishing	Passenger	Pleasure Craft/Sailing	Tug Tow
2017	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	5	0
2018	0	0	0	0	2	9	72	82	223
2019	0	0	0	0	6	15	2	91	2
% of Total	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.39%	2.14%	4.66%	14.56%	34.56%	43.69%

Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

The major commercial fishing ports closest to the project area is Atlantic City. Fishing vessel tracks captured in the AIS data show the highest number of tracks adjacent to the coast (DNV GL 2021, Figures 5.4.6 and 5.4.7). The data also show transits to apparent fishing grounds to the northeast of the project area. Commercial fishing vessel activity is generally recognized as not fully captured in AIS data. A significant portion of commercial fishing vessels do not fall under the AIS carriage requirements.

Figure 5.4.6. Fishing Traffic Densities for 2019 NJPARS



Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

Note: AIS track counts for fishing and pleasure vessels underrepresent these vessel types, as not all of these vessel types are required to have AIS on board per USCG regulations.

Figure 5.4.7. Enlarged image of Fishing Traffic Densities for 2019 NJPARS



Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

AIS data suggests that there are countless recreational vessels located along the New Jersey Atlantic shore at marinas scattered along numerous inlets with ocean access, and the majority of these recreational vessels transit across or in the vicinity of the project area (Figures 5.4.8 and 5.4.9). Recreational vessels cruising along the East Coast generally fall into two categories, dependent on their size and seakeeping ability. Smaller coastal cruisers, sail and especially motor, will cruise along the shore, usually within a few miles from the coast, taking advantage of the ability to visually navigate and often day cruising from port to port. Vessels of greater seakeeping ability and underway on long distance transits may spend two or more days at sea between port calls. When traveling north-south along the East Coast of the United States, these vessels may travel a direct route, often further offshore.

Figure 5.4.8. Recreational Vessel Traffic Densities for 2019 NJPARS



Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

Note: AIS track counts for fishing and pleasure vessels underrepresent these vessel types, as not all of these vessel types are required to have AIS on board per USCG regulations.

Figure 5.4.9. Enlarged image of Recreational Vessel Traffic Densities for 2019 NJPARS



Source: 2020 Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware (NJ PARS)

To comply with the Ship Strike Reduction Rule (50 CFR 224.105), all vessels greater than or equal to 65 ft. (19.8 m) in overall length and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and all vessels greater than or equal to 65 ft. in overall length entering or departing a port or place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States must slow to speeds of 10 knots or less in seasonal management areas (SMA). Mid-Atlantic SMAs in the vicinity of the project area include the ports of New York/New Jersey and the entrance to the Delaware Bay. All vessels 65 feet or longer that transit the SMAs from November 1 – April 30 each year (the period when right whale abundance is greatest) must operate at 10 knots or less. Mandatory speed restrictions of 10 knots or less are required in all of the SMAs along the U.S. East Coast during times when right whales are likely to be present; a number of these SMAs overlap with the portion of the action area that may be used by project vessels. The purpose of this regulation is to reduce the likelihood of deaths and serious injuries to these endangered whales that result from collisions with ships. On August 1, 2022, NMFS published proposed amendments to the North Atlantic vessel strike reduction rule (87 FR 46921). The proposed rule would: (1) modify the spatial and temporal boundaries of current speed restriction areas referred to as Seasonal Management Areas (SMAs), (2) include most vessels greater than or equal to 35 ft. (10.7 m) and less than 65 ft. (19.8 m) in length in the size class subject to speed restriction, (3) create a Dynamic Speed Zone framework to implement mandatory speed restrictions when whales are known to be present outside active SMAs, and (4) update the speed rule's safety deviation provision. Changes to the speed regulations are proposed to reduce vessel strike risk based on a coast-wide collision mortality risk assessment and updated information on right whale distribution, vessel traffic patterns, and vessel strike mortality and serious injury events. To date, the rule has not been finalized.

Restrictions are in place on how close vessels can approach right whales to reduce vessel-related impacts, including disturbance. NMFS rulemaking (62 FR 6729, February 13, 1997) restricts vessel approach to right whales to a distance of 500 yards. This rule is expected to reduce the potential for vessel collisions and other adverse vessel-related effects in the environmental baseline. The Mandatory Ship Reporting System (MSR) requires ships entering the northeast and southeast MSR boundaries to report the vessel identity, date, time, course, speed, destination, and other relevant information. In return, the vessel receives an automated reply with the most recent right whale sightings or management areas and information on precautionary measures to take while in the vicinity of right whales.

SMAs are supplemented by Dynamic Management Areas (DMAs) that are implemented for 15-day periods in areas in which right whales are sighted outside of SMA boundaries (73 FR 60173; October 10, 2008). DMAs can be designated anywhere along the U.S. eastern seaboard, including the action area, when NOAA aerial surveys or other reliable sources report aggregations of three or more right whales in a density that indicates the whales are likely to persist in the area. DMAs are put in place for two weeks in an area that encompass an area commensurate to the number of whales present. Mariners are notified of DMAs via email, the internet, Broadcast Notice to Mariners (BNM), NOAA Weather Radio, and the Mandatory Ship Reporting system (MSR). NOAA requests that mariners navigate around these zones or transit through them at 10 knots or less. In 2021, NMFS supplemented the DMA program with a new Slow Zone program, which identifies areas for recommended 10-knot speed reductions based on acoustic detection of right whales. Together, these zones are established around areas where right whales have been recently seen or heard, and the program provides maps and coordinates to vessel operators indicating areas where they have been detected. Compliance with these zones is voluntary.

Atlantic sturgeon, sea turtles, and ESA listed whales are all vulnerable to vessel strike, although the risk factors and areas of concern are different. Vessels have the potential to affect animals through strikes, sound, and disturbance by their physical presence.

As reported in Hayes et al. 2022, for the most recent 5-year period of review (2015-2019) in the North Atlantic, the minimum rate of serious injury or mortality resulting from vessel interactions is 2.0/year for right whales and 0.40/year for fin whales. A review of available data on serious injury and mortality determinations for fin and right whales for 2000-2020 (Henry et al. 2022, UME website as cited above), includes one fin whale documented on the bow of a ship in Elberon, NJ (June 2020). While this individual was reported as fresh dead, there is no indication of where the whale was actually hit. A similar rate of strike is expected to continue in the action area throughout the six field sampling seasons for the project and we expect vessel strike will continue to be a source of mortality for right and fin whales in the action area. As outlined above, there are a number of measures that are in place to reduce the risk of vessel strikes to large whales that apply to vessels that operate in the action area.

NMFS' Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network (STSSN) database provides information on records of stranded sea turtles in the region. The STSSN database was queried for records of stranded sea turtles with evidence of vessel strike throughout the waters of New Jersey to overlap with the area where the majority of project vessel traffic will occur. Out of the 451 recovered stranded sea turtles in New Jersey waters from 2013 through 2022 (10 years), there were 115 definitively recorded sea turtle vessel strikes and 49 recorded blunt force traumas which are likely vessel strikes, primarily between the months of August and November. The majority of strikes and blunt force traumas were of loggerheads with a smaller number of leatherbacks, Kemp's ridleys, and green turtles. A similar rate of strike is expected to continue in the action area throughout the six field sampling seasons for the project and that vessel strike will continue to be a source of mortality for sea turtles in the action area.

Atlantic sturgeon are struck and killed by vessels in at least some portions of their range. There are no records of vessel strike in the Atlantic Ocean. Risk is thought to be highest in areas with reduced opportunity for escape and from vessels operating at a high rate of speed or with propellers large enough to entrain sturgeon. A summary of information on vessel strikes of Atlantic sturgeon in the NY Bight region is provided in the *Status of the Species* section of this Opinion. We are not aware of any records of Atlantic sturgeon being struck by vessels in the action area.

Other Activities in the Action Area

Other activities that occur in the action area that may affect listed species include scientific research and geophysical and geotechnical surveys.

Scientific Surveys

Numerous scientific surveys, including fisheries and ecosystem surveys carried out by NMFS operate in the action area. Regulations issued to implement section 10(a) (1)(A) of the ESA allow issuance of permits authorizing take of ESA-listed species for the purposes of scientific research. Prior to the issuance of such a permit, an ESA section 7 consultation must take place. No permit can be issued unless the proposed research is determined to be not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species. Scientific research permits are issued by NMFS for ESA listed whales and Atlantic sturgeon; the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is the permitting authority for ESA listed sea turtles.

Marine mammals, sea turtles, and Atlantic sturgeon have been the subject of field studies for decades. The primary objective of most of these field studies has generally been monitoring populations or gathering data for behavioral and ecological studies. Research on ESA listed whales, sea turtles, and Atlantic sturgeon has occurred in the action area in the past and is expected to continue over the life of the proposed action. Authorized research on ESA-listed whales includes close vessel and aerial approaches, photographic identification, photogrammetry, biopsy sampling, tagging, ultrasound, exposure to acoustic activities, breath sampling, behavioral observations, passive acoustic recording, and underwater observation. No lethal interactions are anticipated in association with any of the permitted research. ESA-listed sea turtle research includes approach, capture, handling, restraint, tagging, biopsy, blood or tissue sampling, lavage, ultrasound, imaging, antibiotic (tetracycline) injections, laparoscopy, and captive experiments. Most authorized take is sub-lethal with limited amounts of incidental mortality authorized in some permits (i.e., no more than one or two incidents per permit and only a few individuals overall). Authorized research for Atlantic sturgeon includes capture, collection, handling, restraint, internal and external tagging, blood or tissue sampling, gastric lavage, and collection of morphometric information. Most authorized take of Atlantic sturgeon for research activities is sub-lethal with small amounts of incidental mortality authorized (i.e., no more than one or two incidents per permit and only a few individuals overall).

Noise

The project area lies within a dynamic ambient noise environment, with natural background noise contributed by natural wind and wave action, a diverse community of vocalizing cetaceans, and other organisms. The ESA-listed species that occur in the action area are also regularly exposed to several sources of anthropogenic sounds in the action area. The major source of anthropogenic noise in the action area are vessels. Other sources are minor and temporary including short-term dredging, construction, and research activities. Typically, military training exercises occur in deeper offshore waters southeast of the project area, and while military operations can be a significant source of underwater noise that is not the case in the action area. ESA-listed species may be impacted by either increased levels of anthropogenic-induced background sound or high intensity, short- term anthropogenic sounds.

Other Factors

Whales, sea turtles, and Atlantic sturgeon are exposed to a number of other stressors in the action area that are widespread and not unique to the action area which makes it difficult to determine to what extent these species may be affected by past, present, and future exposure within the action area. These stressors include water quality and marine debris. Marine debris in some form is present in nearly all parts of the world's oceans, including the action area. While the action area is not known to aggregate marine debris as occurs in some parts of the world (e.g., The Great Pacific garbage patch, also described as the Pacific trash vortex, a gyre of marine debris particles in the north central Pacific Ocean), marine debris, including plastics that can be ingested and cause health problems in whales and sea turtles is expected to occur in the action area.

The project area is located in offshore marine waters where available water quality data are limited. Broadly speaking, ambient water quality in these areas is expected to be generally representative of the regional ocean environment and subject to constant oceanic circulation that disperses, dilutes, and biodegrades anthropogenic pollutants from upland and shoreline sources (BOEM 2013).

The NJDEP conducts annual assessments of the state's waterways for water quality parameters. Five sampling sites within Barnegat Bay were in non-attainment for turbidity and considered impaired for this parameter as defined under the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) program. Water quality in Manahawkin Bay, Upper Little Egg Harbor, and Lower Little Egg Harbor Bay was designated as fully supporting recreation and shellfish but not supporting wildlife, due, in part, to increased turbidity (Ocean Wind 2022).

Ocean waters beyond 3 miles (4.8 km) offshore typically have low concentrations of suspended particles and low turbidity. Waters along the Northeast Coast average 5.6 milligrams per liter (mg/L) of TSS, which is considered low. There are notable exceptions, including estuaries that average 27.4 mg/L, although TSS sampling throughout nine assessment units in and around Barnegat Bay did not record TSS levels above 16 mg/L (EPA 2012; Ocean Wind 2022). While most ocean waters had TSS concentrations under 10 mg/L, which is the 90th percentile of all measured values, most estuarine waters (65.7% of the Northeast Coast area) had TSS concentrations above this level. Near-bottom TSS concentrations were similar to those near the water surface, averaging 6.9 mg/L. All coastal ocean stations had near-bottom levels of TSS less than or equal to 16.3 mg/L (EPA 2012).

A study conducted by the EPA evaluated over 1,100 coastal locations in 2010, as reported in their National Coastal Condition Assessment (EPA 2015). The EPA used a Water Quality Index (WQI) to determine the quality of various coastal areas including the northeast coast from Virginia to Maine and assigned three condition levels for a number of constituents: good, fair, and poor. A number of the sample locations overlap with the action area. Chlorophyll a concentrations, an indicator of primary productivity, levels in northeastern coastal waters were generally rated as fair (45%) to good (51%) condition, and stations in the action area were all also fair to good (EPA 2015). Nitrogen and phosphorous levels in northeastern coastal waters generally rated as fair to good (13% fair and 82% good for nitrogen and 62% and 26% good for phosphorous); stations in the action area were all also fair to good (EPA 2015). Dissolved oxygen levels in northeastern coastal waters are generally rated as fair (14%) to good (80%) condition, with consistent results for the sampling locations in the action area. Based on the available information, water quality in the action area appears to be consistent with surrounding areas. We are not aware of any discharges to the action area that would be expected to result in adverse effects to listed species or their prey. Outside of conditions related to climate change, discussed in section 6.2.5, water quality is not anticipated to negatively affect negative listed species that may occur in the action area.

6.0 EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

This section of the biological opinion assesses the effects of the proposed action on threatened or endangered species. Effects of the action are all consequences to listed species or critical habitat that are caused by the proposed action, including the consequences of other activities that are caused by the proposed action. A consequence is caused by the proposed action if it would not occur but for the proposed action and it is reasonably certain to occur. Effects of the action may occur later in time and may include consequences occurring outside the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR §402.02 and § 402.17).

The activities associated with the proposed action include the survey activities and the use of project vessels to carry out those surveys. Here, we examine the activities associated with the proposed action and determine what the consequences of the proposed action are to listed species. As noted above, there is no critical habitat in the action area. A consequence is caused by the proposed action if it would not occur but for the proposed action and it is reasonably certain to occur. In analyzing effects, we evaluate whether a source of impacts is "likely to adversely affect" listed species/critical habitat or "not likely to adversely affect" listed species/critical habitat. A "not likely to adversely affect" determination is appropriate when an effect is expected to be discountable, insignificant, or completely beneficial. As discussed in the FWS-NMFS Joint Section 7 Consultation Handbook (1998), "[b]eneficial effects are contemporaneous positive effects without any adverse effects to the species. Insignificant effects relate to the size of the impact and should never reach the scale where take occurs. Discountable effects are those extremely unlikely to occur. Based on best judgment, a person would not: (1) be able to meaningfully measure, detect, or evaluate insignificant effects; or (2) expect discountable effects to occur. If an effect is beneficial, discountable, or insignificant it is not considered adverse and thus cannot cause "take" of any listed species. "Take" means "to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect or attempt to engage in any such conduct" (ESA §3(19)).

6.1 Effects of Project Vessels

There will be limited vessel traffic associated with the field sampling. As explained above, vessels would originate from Tuckerton, NJ and Barnegat Light, NJ and travel directly to the survey site. Vessel use will be limited to the survey days over the study period. The associated vessel trips to execute surveys and monitoring for the Project would include, over the three-year study period:

- 18 trips to deploy the AUV (three trips in the spring and fall of the three years); 6 trips to carry out the trawl surveys (one trip in the spring and fall of the three study years); and 12 trips to deploy and retrieve the telemetry buoys. This is a total of 36 round trips from the marinas in coastal New Jersey to the study area over a three-year period. Note that for each trawl survey period, the vessel will remain at the survey site for up to four days; thus while there are 24 trawl sampling days there are only 6 transits to/from the survey area.

- As described in the BA, vessels used during surveys will include lengths of 7.6 m, 13 m, and 14.6 m. Transit speed to the project site will be approximately 25 knots for the 7.6-m vessel (unless traveling in a SMA or DMA), 8 knots for the 13-m vessel, and 10 knots for the 14.6-m vessel. During survey activities, vessels are expected to be moving slowly at speeds of 3 knots or less.
- The acoustic telemetry surveys are composed of eight separate monitoring stations. Vessel traffic for these surveys was analyzed based on the number of field mobilizations to deploy receivers and the number of field demobilizations to retrieve them.
- 240 separate trawls with less than 30-minute tows over a 3-year period with an approximately 52-nm (96-kilometer) round-trip vessel transit to the site for each seasonal survey event(
- 18 separate AUV mobilizations over a 3-year period with an approximately 28-nm (52-kilometer) round-trip vessel transit per mobilization

6.1.1 Minimization and Monitoring Measures for Vessel Operations

There are a number of measures that BOEM is proposing to take that are designed to avoid, minimize, or monitor effects of the action on ESA-listed species throughout the six field sampling seasons of the project. These measures can be grouped into two main categories: vessel speed reductions and increased vigilance/animal avoidance. Specific measures related to vessel speed reduction include that all vessels regardless of size will travel at 10 knots or less within any SMAs and DMAs, including acoustically triggered Slow Zones. Additionally, at all times of the year regardless of vessel size, visual observers must monitor a vessel strike avoidance zone and if an animal is spotted, the vessel must slow down and take action to transit safely away from or around the animal. Monitoring measures will also include the integration of sighting communication tools such as Whale Alert to establish a situational awareness network for marine mammal and sea turtle detections. To minimize risk to whales, the vessel operator will maintain a distance of 100-m from all whales, and 500-m from North Atlantic right whales. These measures are all considered part of the proposed action.

6.1.2 Assessment of Risk of Vessel Strike

Here, we consider the risk of vessel strike to ESA-listed species. This assessment incorporates the strike avoidance measures identified in Section 3 and summarized above, because they are considered part of the proposed action or are otherwise required by regulation. This analysis is organized by species group (i.e., Atlantic sturgeon, whales, and sea turtles) because the risk factors and effectiveness of strike avoidance measures are different for the different species groups.

ESA-Listed Whales

Project vessels will represent an extremely small portion of the vessel traffic traveling along the seacoast of New Jersey. As described in more detail in section 5.4 (Environmental Baseline), the coastal traffic in the project area is predominantly pleasure and fishing vessels, which are similar ships in size and speed to the ones that will be used during the field sampling seasons for the project. There are thousands of vessels transit the action area annually; the proposed action will consist of 12 round trips per year for three years (AUV deployment trips = 6 round trips/year; Trawling = 2 round trips/year; Telemetry trips = 4 round trips/year; 12 round trips total (this includes all 3 project vessels)).

Throughout the entire action area, co-occurrence of project vessels and individual whales is expected to be extremely unlikely; this is due to the limited occurrence of whales in the action area and their dispersed and transient distribution in the action area and the only intermittent presence of project vessels (i.e., only present 18 days per year; AUV 3 missions/season = 6 days/year; Trawling 4 days/season = 8 days/year; Telemetry 2 days/season = 4 days/year; Project vessels present 18 days/year (includes all 3 project vessels)). This alone makes vessel strike extremely unlikely to occur. The speed that vessels will travel further reduces this risk. With the exception of the 7.6-m research vessel, project vessels are expected to never operate at speeds over 10 knots. Given that the two larger research vessels (13-m and 14.6-m) will be in compliance with measures that NMFS has determined minimize the potential for ship strike at all times (i.e., operating at 10 knots or less), and that the 7.6 m vessel will comply with those speed restrictions at times and in areas where right whales are anticipated to be present (i.e., in any SMAs or DMAs that overlap with the vessels transit route), vessel speeds are extremely unlikely to increase the risk of vessel strike. Additionally, a number of measures designed to reduce the likelihood of striking marine mammals including ESA-listed large whales, particularly North Atlantic right whales, are included as part of the proposed action. These measures include vessel operators and crews receiving protected species identification and avoidance training, as well as all vessel operators and crews maintaining a vigilant watch for all marine mammals and executing slow down and avoidance procedure when sightings occur.

In summary, we expect that the extremely small and intermittent increase in vessel traffic that will result from the proposed action on only 18 days per year for three years, combined with the multi-faceted measures that will be required of all project vessels will enable the detection of any ESA-listed whale that may be in the path of a project vessel with enough time to allow for vessel operators to avoid any such whales. Combined with the already very low increased risk of vessel strike anticipated due to a limited number of project vessel transits, we expect that these measures will make it extremely unlikely that a project vessel will strike a whale.

Sea Turtles

Background Information on the Risk of Vessel Strike to Sea Turtles

While research is limited on the relationship between sea turtles, ship collisions, and ship speeds, sea turtles are at risk of vessel strike where they co-occur with vessels. Sea turtles are vulnerable to vessel collisions because they regularly surface to breathe, and often rest at or near the surface. While sea turtles, with the exception of hatchlings and pre-recruitment juveniles, spend a majority of their time submerged (Renaud and Carpenter 1994; Sasso and Witzell 2006), any of the sea turtle species found in the action area can occur at or near the surface in open-ocean and coastal areas, whether resting, feeding or periodically surfacing to breathe. Therefore, all ESA-listed sea turtles considered in the biological opinion are at risk of vessel strikes.

A sea turtle's detection of a vessel is likely based primarily on the animal's ability to see the oncoming vessel, which would provide less time to react to as vessel speed increases (Hazel et al. 2007), however, given the low vantage point of a sea turtle at the surface it is unlikely they are readily able to visually detect vessels at a distance. Hazel et al. (2007) examined vessel strike risk to green sea turtles and suggested that sea turtles may habituate to vessel sound and are more likely to respond to the sight of a vessel rather than the sound of a vessel, although both may play a role in eliciting responses (Hazel et al. 2007). Regardless of what specific stressor associated with vessels turtles are responding to, they only appear to show responses (avoidance behavior) at approximately 10 m or closer (Hazel et al. 2007). This is a concern because faster vessel speeds also have the potential to result in more serious injuries (Work et al. 2010). Although sea turtles can move quickly, Hazel et al. (2007) concluded that at vessel speeds above 4 km/hour (2.1 knots) vessel operators cannot rely on turtles to actively avoid being struck. Thus, sea turtles are not considered reliably capable of moving out of the way of vessels moving at speeds greater than 2.1 knots.

Stranding networks that keep track of sea turtles that wash up dead or injured have consistently recorded vessel propeller strikes, skeg strikes, and blunt force trauma as a cause or possible cause of death (Chaloupka et al. 2008). Vessel strikes can cause permanent injury or death from bleeding or other trauma, paralysis and subsequent drowning, infection, or inability to feed. Apart from the severity of the physical strike, the likelihood and rate of a turtle's recovery from a strike may be influenced by its age, reproductive state, and general condition at the time of injury. Much of what has been documented about recovery from vessel strikes on sea turtles has been inferred from observation of individual animals for some duration of time after a strike occurs (Hazel et al. 2007; Lutcavage et al. 1997). In the U.S., the percentage of strandings that were attributed to vessel strikes increased from approximately 10 percent in the 1980s to a record high of 20.5 percent in 2004 (USFWS 2007). In 1990, the National Research Council estimated that 50-500 loggerhead and 5-50 Kemp's ridley sea turtles were struck and killed by boats annually in waters of the U.S. (NRC 1990). The report indicates that this estimate is highly uncertain and could be a large overestimate or underestimate.

Vessel strike has been identified as a threat in recovery plans prepared for all sea turtle species in the action area. As described in the Recovery Plan for loggerhead sea turtles (NMFS and USFWS 2008), propeller and collision injuries from boats and ships are common in sea turtles. From 1997 to 2005, 14.9% of all stranded loggerheads in the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico were documented as having sustained some type of propeller or collision injuries although it is not known what proportion of these injuries were post or ante-mortem. The proportion of vessel-struck sea turtles that survive is unknown. In some cases, it is not possible to determine whether documented injuries on stranded animals resulted in death or were post-mortem injuries. However, the available data indicate that post-mortem vessel strike injuries are uncommon in stranded sea turtles. Based on data from off the coast of Florida, there is good evidence that when vessel strike injuries are observed as the principle finding for a stranded turtle, the injuries were both ante-mortem and the cause of death (Foley et al 2019). Foley et al. (2019) found that the cause of death was vessel strike or probable vessel strike in approximately 93% of stranded turtles with vessel strike injuries. Sea turtles found alive with concussive or propeller injuries are frequently brought to rehabilitation facilities; some are later released and others are deemed unfit to return to the wild and remain in captivity. Sea turtles in the wild have been documented with healed injuries so at least some sea turtles survive without human intervention. As noted in NRC 1990, the regions of greatest concern for vessel strike are outside the action area and include areas with high concentrations of recreational-boat traffic such as the eastern Florida coast, the Florida Keys, and the shallow coastal bays in the Gulf of Mexico. In general, the overall risk of strike for sea turtles in the Northwest Atlantic is considered greatest in areas with high densities of sea turtles and small, fast moving vessels such as recreational vessels (NRC 1990). This combination of factors in the action area is limited to nearshore areas along the New Jersey Atlantic shore where the vast majority of vessel traffic will occur.

We queried the NMFS' Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network (STSSN) database for records of sea turtles with injuries consistent with vessel strike (recorded as definitive vessel and blunt force trauma in the database) in New Jersey from 2013 to 2022. The results from this query are presented in Table 6.1.1.

While we recognize that some vessel strikes may be post-mortem, the available data indicate that post-mortem vessel strike injuries are uncommon in stranded sea turtles (Foley et al. 2019). Based on the findings of Foley et al. (2019) that found vessel strike was the cause of death in 93% of strandings with indications of vessel strike, to estimate the number of interactions where vessel strike was the cause of death we first added the number of "definitive vessel" and "blunt force trauma" cases and then calculated 93% of the total.

Table 6.1.1. Preliminary STSSN cases from 2013 to 2022 with evidence of propeller strike or probable vessel collision in New Jersey and estimated presumed vessel mortalities. Source STSSN **(March 2023)**

New Jersey

Sea Turtles	Total Records	Definitive Vessel	Blunt Force Trauma	Total Presumed Vessel Mortalities*
Loggerhead	344	85	41	117
Green	29	12	1	12
Leatherback	32	11	1	11
Kemp's	35	7	6	12

*93% of the total vessel plus blunt force trauma

The data in Table 6.1.1 are only based on observed stranding records, which represent only a portion of the total at-sea mortalities of sea turtles. Sea turtle carcasses typically sink upon death, and float to the surface only when enough accumulation of decomposition gasses cause the body to bloat (Epperly et al., 1996). Though floating, the body is still partially submerged and acts as a drifting object. The drift of a sea turtle carcass depends on the direction and intensity of local currents and winds. As sea turtles are vulnerable to human interactions such as fisheries bycatch and vessel strike, a number of studies have estimated at-sea mortality of marine turtles and the influence of nearshore physical oceanographic and wind regimes on sea turtle strandings. Although sea turtle stranding rates are variable, they may represent as low as five percent of total mortalities in some areas but usually do not exceed 20 percent of total mortality, as predators, scavengers, wind, and currents prevent carcasses from reaching the shore (Koch et al. 2013). Strandings of dead sea turtles from fishery interaction have been reported to represent as low as seven percent of total mortalities caused at sea (Epperly et al. 1996). Remote or difficult to access areas may further limit the amount of strandings that are observed. Because of the low probability of stranding under different conditions, determining total vessel strikes directly from raw numbers of stranded sea turtle data would vary between regions, seasons, and other factors such as currents.

To estimate unobserved vessel strike mortalities, we relied on available estimates from the literature. Based on data reviewed in Murphy and Hopkins-Murphy (1989), only six of 22 loggerhead sea turtle carcasses tagged within the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico region were reported in stranding records, indicating that stranding data represent approximately 27 percent of at-sea mortalities. In comparing estimates of at-sea fisheries induced mortalities to estimates of stranded sea turtle mortalities due to fisheries, Epperly et al. (1996) estimated that strandings represented 7 to13 percent of all at-sea mortalities.

Based on these two studies, both of which include waters of the U.S. East Coast, stranding data likely represent 7 to 27 percent of all at-sea mortalities. While there are additional estimates of the percent of at-sea mortalities likely to be observed in stranding data for locations outside the action area (e.g., Peckham et al. 2008, Koch et al. 2013), we did not rely on these since stranding rates depend heavily on beach survey effort, current patterns, weather, and seasonal factors among others, and these factors vary greatly with geographic location (Hart et al. 2006). Thus, based on the mid-point between the lower estimate provided by Epperly et al. (1996) of seven percent, and the upper estimate provided by Murphy and Hopkins-Murphy (1989) of 27 percent, we assume that the STSSN stranding data represent approximately 17 percent of all at sea mortalities. This estimate closely aligns with an analysis of drift bottle data from the Atlantic Ocean by Hart et al. (2006), which estimated that the upper limit of the proportion of sea turtle carcasses that strand is approximately 20 percent.

To estimate the annual average vessel strike mortalities corrected for unobserved vessel strike mortalities, we adjusted our calculated total presumed vessel mortality with the detection value of 17%. The resulting, adjusted number of vessel strike mortalities of each species for New Jersey are below. In using the 17 percent correction factor, we assume that all sea turtle species and at-sea mortalities are equally likely to be represented in the STSSN dataset. That is, sea turtles killed by vessel strikes are just as likely to strand or be observed at sea and be recorded in the STSSN database (i.e., 17 percent) as those killed by other activities, such as interactions with fisheries, and the likelihood of stranding once injured or killed does not vary by species.

Table 6.1.2. Adjusted estimates of sea turtles from 2013 to 2022 with evidence of propeller strike or probable vessel collision in New Jersey and estimated presumed vessel mortalities. Source STSSN (March 2023)

Sea Turtles	Presumed Vessel Mortalities*	Total (17% detection rate)	Annual Total presumed vessel mortalities
Loggerhead	117	688	34

Green	12	71	4
Leatherback	11	65	3
Kemp's ridley	12	71	4

In the BA, BOEM indicates that there will be up to 36 transits total to and from marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. These trips will occur over a 3-year period. Project vessels have the greatest chance to co-occur with sea turtles in the nearshore waters and in inlets with ocean access. As explained above in the *Environmental Baseline* section, over 74,000 vessel transits a year occur in the vicinity of the project area. Considering the potential trips to the Brigantine Shoals project area, project vessels will represent an extremely small increase above the baseline vessel traffic (i.e., less than 0.02%). If we assume a proportional increase in vessel strikes for sea turtles with an increase in vessel traffic, we would predict a less than 0.02% increase in vessel strikes as a result of the survey vessel traffic. Using the annual total presumed vessel mortalities in the table above and increasing those by 0.02% results in tiny fractions of sea turtles (e.g., for loggerheads the number of mortalities annually would increase from 34 to 34.0068). Given this extremely small and close to zero increase, we consider any increased risk of vessel strike to be insignificant and extremely unlikely to occur.

Based on this analysis, given the very small increase in vessel traffic and associated very small increase in subsequent risk, effects of this increase in traffic resulting in vessel strikes of sea turtles is extremely unlikely and the effect of adding the project vessels to the baseline cannot be meaningfully measured, detected, or evaluated; therefore, effects are also insignificant.

Atlantic Sturgeon
The distribution of Atlantic sturgeon overlaps with the entirety of the action area. The marine range of Atlantic sturgeon extends from Hamilton Inlet, Labrador, Canada, to Cape Canaveral, Florida with distribution largely from shore to the 50m depth contour (ASMFC 2006; Stein et al. 2004). Atlantic sturgeon may occur in nearshore waters (depths less than 50 m) and some inlets that may be transited by project vessels. While Atlantic sturgeon are known to be struck and killed by vessels in rivers and in estuaries adjacent to spawning rivers (i.e., Delaware Bay), we have no reports of vessel strikes in the marine environment generally or the action area specifically. We have considered whether Atlantic sturgeon are likely to be struck by project vessels. As established elsewhere in this Opinion, Atlantic sturgeon use of the action area is intermittent and disperse. The dispersed nature of Atlantic sturgeon in this area means that the potential for co-occurrence between a project vessel and an Atlantic sturgeon in time and space is extremely low.

In order to be struck by a vessel, an Atlantic sturgeon needs to co-occur with the vessel hull or propeller in the water column. Given that sturgeon typically occur at or near the bottom while in the marine environment, the potential for co-occurrence of a vessel and a sturgeon in the water column is extremely low even if a sturgeon and vessel co-occurred generally. The areas to be transited by the project vessels are free flowing with no obstructions; therefore, even in the event that a sturgeon was up in the water column such that it could be vulnerable to strike, there is ample room for a sturgeon swim deeper to avoid a vessel or to swim away from it which further reduces the potential for strike. The nearshore Tuckerton, NJ and Barnegat Light, NJ marina areas where vessels will enter shallower water and dock is not known to be used by Atlantic sturgeon; as such, co-occurrence between any Atlantic sturgeon and any project vessels in areas with shallow water or constricted waterways where the risk of vessel strike is theoretically higher, is extremely unlikely to occur. Considering this analysis, it is extremely unlikely that any project vessels operating in the action area will strike an Atlantic sturgeon during the six field sampling seasons for the project.

6.2 Effects of Field Activities

In this section we consider the effects of the project surveys and monitoring activities on listed species in the action area by assessing the risk of interactions between listed species and proposed fishing gear (i.e., bottom otter trawl) and the other sampling methodologies (AUV deployments, side scan sonar, video imagery, and acoustic telemetry), and then determine likely effects to sea turtles, listed whales, and Atlantic sturgeon. Activities will be conducted in Federal waters off the coast of New Jersey and will include: AUV mapping to document the disturbance and recovery of marine benthic habitat and communities resulting from a dredge event; mounted video to record marine animals for identification and behavior; trawl surveys to characterize fisheries resources in the project area; and acoustic surveys to track demersal fish. Activities will be conducted for a three year period. Section 3 of the Opinion describes the proposed field sampling methods for the project in detail and is not repeated here. Effects of Project vessels, including the ones that will be used for survey and monitoring activities are considered in section 6.1, above, and are not repeated here.

6.2.1 Effects of Autonomous Underwater Vehicle (AUV) Mapping

BOEM and Rutgers plan to conduct mapping surveys in the project area during each of the six field sampling seasons. Equipment planned for use includes an AUV, a side-scan sonar, and a mounted camera system. The AUV is a mobile system that operates throughout the water column. This vehicle produces virtually no self-generated noise and travels at slow operational speeds as it collects data. All noise producing survey equipment (i.e., the side scan sonar) is secured to the AUV and is only turned on when the vehicle is traveling along survey transects; thus, the area ensonified is constantly moving, making survey noise transient and intermittent. BOEM will also record marine animals for identification and behavior using a camera system mounted on the AUV.

The small size and slow operational speed (1.8 m/s) of the AUV make the risk of a collision between the system and a listed species extremely unlikely to occur. Even in the extremely unlikely event that a whale, sea turtle, or Atlantic sturgeon bumped into the AUV system, it is extremely unlikely that there would be any consequences to the individual because of the relative lightweight of the mobile system, slow operating speed, small size, and rounded shape. Additionally, we do not expect side scan sonar equipment to result in any effects to ESA-listed species in the action area. This is because the side scan sonar used in these project surveys has an operating frequency >180 kHz and is therefore outside the general hearing range of ESA-listed species that may occur in the project area (FHWG 200, Popper 2014, Navy 2017).

Based on the analysis herein, it is extremely unlikely that any ESA-listed species will interact with the AUV system; any effects to ESA-listed species because of AUV mapping surveys are extremely unlikely to occur.

6.2.2 Assessment of Risk of Interactions with Bottom Trawl Gear

BOEM and Rutgers will conduct three years of trawl surveys over six field sampling seasons to assess the finfish community in the project area. Forty tows will be conducted in the project area near Brigantine Shoals per season. Tows will be conducted two times per year (Spring and Fall), during daylight hours (after sunrise and before sunset) for less than 30 minutes each with a target tow speed of less than knots. Tows will be completed using a bottom otter trawl with a 6" mesh and 30-m (100 ft.) footrope.

6.2.2.1 ESA-Listed Whales

Factors Affecting Interactions and Existing Information on Interactions

Entanglement or capture of ESA-listed North Atlantic right and fin whales in bottom otter trawl gear is extremely unlikely. While these species may occur in the project area where survey activities will take place, bottom otter trawl gear is not expected to directly affect right and fin whales given that these large cetaceans have the speed and maneuverability to get out of the way of oncoming gear which is towed behind a slow moving vessel (less than 3 knots). There have been no observed or reported interactions of right or fin whales with bottom otter trawl gear (NEFSC observer/sea sampling database, unpublished data; GAR Marine Animal Incident database, unpublished data). The slow speed of the trawl gear being towed and the short tow times to be implemented further reduce the potential for entanglement or any other interaction. As a result, we have determined that it is extremely unlikely that any large whale would interact with the trawl survey gear.

Effects to Prey

The proposed bottom trawl survey activities will not have any effects on the availability of prey for right and fin whales. Right whales feed on copepods (Perry et al. 1999). Copepods are very small organisms that will pass through trawl gear rather than being captured in it. In addition, copepods will not be affected by turbidity created by the gear moving through the water. Fin whales feed on krill and small schooling fish (e.g., sand lance, herring, mackerel) (Aguilar 2002). The trawl gear used in the survey activities operates on or very near the bottom, while schooling fish such as herring and mackerel occur higher in the water column. Sand lance inhabit both benthic and pelagic habitats, however, they typically burry into the benthos and would not be caught in the trawl. Based on this analysis, effects to right and fin whale prey are extremely unlikely to occur.

6.2.2.2 Sea Turtles

Factors Affecting Interactions and Existing Information on Interactions

Sea turtles forcibly submerged in any type of restrictive gear can eventually suffer fatal consequences from prolonged anoxia and/or seawater infiltration of the lung (Lutcavage and Lutz 1997; Lutcavage et al. 1997). A study examining the relationship between tow time and sea turtle mortality in the shrimp trawl fishery showed that mortality was strongly dependent on trawling duration, with the proportion of dead or comatose sea turtles rising from 0% for the first 50 minutes of capture to 70% after 90 minutes of capture (Henwood and Stuntz 1987). Following the recommendations of the NRC to reexamine the association between tow times and sea turtle deaths, the data set used by Henwood and Stuntz (1987) was updated and re-analyzed (Epperly et al. 2002; Sasso and Epperly 2006). Seasonal differences in the likelihood of mortality for sea turtles caught in trawl gear were apparent. For example, the observed mortality exceeded 1% after 10 minutes of towing in the winter (defined in Sasso and Epperly (2006) as the months of December-February), while the observed mortality did not exceed 1% until after 50 minutes in the summer (defined as March-November; Sasso and Epperly 2006). In general, tows of short duration (<10 minutes) in either season have little effect on the likelihood of mortality for sea turtles caught in the trawl gear and would likely achieve a negligible mortality rate (defined by the NRC as <1%). Longer tow times (up to 200 minutes in summer and up to 150 minutes in winter) result in a rapid escalation of mortality, and eventually reach a plateau of high mortality, but will not equal 100%, as a sea turtle caught within the last hour of a long tow will likely survive (Epperly et al. 2002; Sasso and Epperly 2006). However, in both seasons, a rapid escalation in the mortality rate did not occur until after 50 minutes (Sasso and Epperly 2006) as had been found by Henwood and Stuntz (1987). Although the data used in the NRC reanalysis were specific to bottom otter trawl gear in the U.S. South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico shrimp fisheries, the authors considered the findings to be applicable to the impacts of forced submergence in general (Sasso and Epperly 2006).

Sea turtle behaviors may influence the likelihood of them being captured in bottom trawl gear. Video footage recorded by the NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC), Pascagoula Laboratory indicated that sea turtles will keep swimming in front of an advancing shrimp trawl, rather than deviating to the side, until they become fatigued and are caught by the trawl or the trawl is hauled up (NMFS 2002). Sea turtles have also been observed to dive to the bottom and hunker down when alarmed by loud noise or gear (Memo to the File, L. Lankshear, December 4, 2007), which could place them in the path of bottom gear such as a bottom otter trawl. There are very few reports of sea turtles dying during research trawls. Based on the analysis by Sasso and Epperly (2006) and Epperly et al. (2002) as well as information on captured sea turtles from past state trawl surveys and the NEAMAP and NEFSC bottom trawl surveys, tow times less than 30 minutes are expected to eliminate the risk of death from forced submergence for sea turtles caught in the beam and bottom otter trawl survey gear.

During the spring and fall bottom trawl surveys conducted by the NEFSC from 1963-2017, a total of 85 loggerhead sea turtles were captured. Only one of the 85 loggerheads suffered injuries (cracks to the carapace) causing death. All others were alive and returned to the water unharmed. One leatherback and one Kemp's ridley sea turtle have also been captured in the NEFSC bottom trawl surveys and both were released alive and uninjured. NEFSC bottom trawl survey tows are approximately 30 minutes in duration. All 20 loggerhead, 28 Kemp's ridley, and one green sea turtles captured in the NEAMAP surveys since 2007 have also been released alive and uninjured. NEAMAP surveys operate with a 20-minute tow time. Swimmer et al. (2014) indicates that there are few reliable estimates of post-release mortality for sea turtles because of the many challenges and costs associated with tracking animals released at sea. Based on the results of Sasso and Epperly (2006), we assume that post-release mortality for sea turtles in bottom otter trawl gear where tow times are short (less than 30 minutes) is minimal to non-existent unless the turtle is already compromised to begin with. In that case, however, the animal would likely be retained onboard the vessel and transported to a rehabilitation center rather than released back into the water.

Estimating Interactions with and Mortality of Sea Turtles
As the proposed trawl survey activities will use similar gear to the NEAMAP surveys which have historically overlapped the project study area, the historic NEAMAP data was used for bycatch estimation. The NEFSC and Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) have recorded all sea turtle interactions since the NEFSC and NEAMAP bottom trawl survey programs began, which allows us to predict future interactions. Data from 2008-2021 from the NEAMAP Near Shore Trawl Program – Southern Segment was used to estimate a capture rate of sea turtles per tow that was then applied to the operations of the New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features trawl survey in the project area to create an annual capture estimate. We calculate 0.686 loggerhead sea turtles, 0.6095 Kemp's ridley sea turtles, 0.019 green sea turtles, and 0 leatherback sea turtles will be incidentally caught in the trawl survey activities in the project area each year that the survey takes place.

Table 6.2.1: Incidental sea turtle capture rates from the spring and fall NEAMAP bottom trawl survey – Southern Segment 2008–2019. Species include Loggerhead (Cc), Kemp's ridley (Lk), Leatherback (Dc), and Green (Cm) turtles. Total captures, mean captures per year, mean tows per year, and capture rate are also included. Capture rate was calculated by dividing mean captures per year by the mean number of tows per year.

Year	Cc	Lk	Dc	Cm
2008	2	0	0	0
2009	0	1	0	1
2010	2	2	0	0
2011	4	2	0	0
2012	4	3	0	0
2013	0	7	0	0
2014	4	5	0	0
2015	0	1	0	0
2016	1	2	0	0
2017	3	5	0	0
2018	7	4	0	0
2019	3	0	0	0
2020	3	0	0	0
2021	3	0	0	0
Totals	36	32	0	1
Mean/year	2.57143	2.2857	0	0.071429
Mean tows/year	300	300	300	300
Capture rate	0.0085743	0.00761905	0	0.0002381

To estimate the number of captures in the NYB Fish Study bottom trawl survey which is using NEAMAP protocols, the capture rate by species was multiplied by the total number of tows per year (80), these yearly estimates were extrapolated out to the extent of the survey period (3 years) by multiplying the yearly estimates by 3 (Table 2).

Table 6.2.2: Estimated incidental sea turtle capture rates for the NYB Fish Study bottom trawl survey.

	Cc	Lk	Dc	Cm
Capture estimate/year	0.6857	0.6095	0	0.019048
Over 3 year period	2.057	1.829	0.000	0.057144

Based on the analysis by Sasso and Epperly (2006) and Epperly et al. (2002) discussed previously, as well as information on captured sea turtles from past state trawl surveys and the NEAMAP and NEFSC trawl surveys (no mortalities or serious injuries), a less than 30-minute tow time for the bottom trawl gear to be used in the proposed trawl surveys is expected to eliminate the risk of serious injury and mortality from forced submergence for sea turtles caught in the bottom trawl gear. We do not anticipate any serious injuries or mortalities of captured sea turtles.

Using the above annual estimates and the three year duration of the trawl surveys, and rounding up any fractions of sea turtles to whole animals, we estimate the following captures over the entirety of the survey period (Table 6.2.3). We anticipate that all sea turtles will be returned to the water alive and without injury.

Table 6.2.3. Estimated captures of sea turtles by species from the proposed trawl surveys over the three-year duration

Species	**Total estimated captures over the 3-year survey period**
Loggerhead	3
Kemp’s ridley	2
Green	1
Leatherback	0

Effects to Prey

Sea turtle prey items such as horseshoe crabs, other crabs, whelks, and fish may be caught in bottom trawls; however, in this case all captured animals will be returned to the water. Neritic juveniles and adults of both loggerhead and Kemp’s ridley sea turtles are known to feed on these species that may be caught as bycatch in the bottom trawls. However, all bycatch is expected to be returned to the water alive, dead, or injured to the extent that the organisms will shortly die. Injured or deceased bycatch would still be available as prey for sea turtles, particularly loggerheads, which are known to eat a variety of live prey as well as scavenge dead organisms. Leatherback sea turtles prey on jellyfish, which are not vulnerable to capture in the bottom trawl. Similarly, neritic juvenile and adult green sea turtles prey on seagrasses and sponges which are not captured in trawls. Therefore, the proposed trawl surveys will not affect the availability of prey for leatherback and green sea turtles in the action area. Given this information, any effects on loggerhead and Kemp's ridley sea turtles from collection of potential sea turtle prey in the bottom trawl gear will be so small that they cannot be meaningfully measured, detected, or evaluated and, therefore, effects are insignificant.

Atlantic Sturgeon

Factors Affecting Interactions and Existing Information on Interactions
While migrating, Atlantic sturgeon may be present throughout the water column and could interact with trawl gear while it is moving through the water column. Atlantic sturgeon interactions with bottom trawl gear are likely at times when and in areas where their distribution overlaps with the operation of the gear. Adult and subadult Atlantic sturgeon may be present in the action area year-round. In the marine environment, Atlantic sturgeon are most often captured in depths less than 50 meters. Some information suggests that captures in otter trawl gear are most likely to occur in waters with depths less than 30 meters (ASMFC TC 2007). The capture of Atlantic sturgeon in otter trawls used for commercial fisheries is well documented (see for example, Stein et al. 2004b and ASMFC TC 2007).

NEFOP data from Miller and Shepherd (2011) indicates that mortality rates of Atlantic sturgeon caught in otter trawl gear is approximately 5 percent. Atlantic sturgeon are also captured incidentally in trawls used for scientific studies, including the standard Northeast Fisheries Science Center bottom trawl surveys and both the spring and fall NEAMAP bottom trawl surveys. The shorter tow durations and careful handling of any sturgeon once on deck during fisheries research surveys is likely to result in an even lower potential for mortality, as commercial fishing trawls tend to be significantly longer in duration. None of the hundreds of Atlantic and shortnose sturgeon captured in past state ocean, estuary, and inshore trawl surveys have had any evidence of serious injury and there have been no recorded mortalities. Both the NEFSC and NEAMAP surveys have recorded the capture of hundreds of Atlantic sturgeon since the inception of each. To date, there have been no recorded serious injuries or mortalities. In the Hudson River, a trawl survey that incidentally captures shortnose and Atlantic sturgeon has been ongoing since the late 1970s. To date, no serious injuries or mortalities of any sturgeon have been recorded in those surveys.

Estimating Interactions with and Mortality of Sturgeon
As the proposed trawl survey activities will use similar gear to the NEAMAP surveys which have historically overlapped the project study area, the historic NEAMAP data was used for bycatch estimation. The NEFSC and Virginia Institute of Marine Science have recorded all Atlantic sturgeon interactions since the NEFSC and NEAMAP bottom trawl survey programs began, which allows us to predict future interactions as demonstrated in Table 6.2.2.2. Data from

2008-2021 from the NEAMAP Near Shore Trawl Program – Southern Segment was used to estimate a capture rate of sturgeon per tow that was then applied to the operations of the New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features project trawl survey to create a capture estimate. This results in an estimated capture of 26 Atlantic sturgeon over the three-year study period.

While using this data provides us with what should be a reasonable estimate of the number of Atlantic sturgeon that may be captured in the proposed trawl survey, the capture of 14 Atlantic sturgeon in two short trawl tows in this area in Fall 2022 suggests that this could be an underestimate. Therefore, we have considered other sources of information to inform our estimate.

Dunton et al. (2015) calculated catch per unit effort (CPUE; fish per minute towed) for Atlantic sturgeon captured in trawls off the south coast of Long Island; CPUE is reported for both trawls carried out in a stratified random sampling design and trawls targeting Atlantic sturgeon. The study reports catch of 149 Atlantic sturgeon for 10,380 minutes of trawling in the stratified random sampling design; this translates to 0.0144 Atlantic sturgeon/minute. CPUE from targeted trawling was 0.226 sturgeon/minute. As the proposed survey will not be targeting Atlantic sturgeon, we expect using that CPUE would result in an overestimate of Atlantic sturgeon captures. Applying the capture rate from stratified random sampling from Dunton et al. (2015; 0.0144 sturgeon/minute) to this proposed survey (7,200 minutes calculated based on 40 30-minute tows on each of 6 survey events), results in an estimate of 104 Atlantic sturgeon captured (0.0144 sturgeon/minute * 7,200 minutes = 103.68 sturgeon, rounded up to 104). While we recognize that the study area for Dunton et al. (2015) does not overlap with the BOEM study area, the habitats and time of year surveyed are similar; thus, we expect that this provides a reasonable estimate for the BOEM survey.

As explained in the *Status of Species* section, the range of all five DPSs overlaps and extends from Canada through Cape Canaveral, Florida. Atlantic sturgeon originating from all five DPSs use the area where trawl gear will be set. We have considered the best available information from a recent mixed stock analysis done by Kazyak et al. (2021) to determine from which DPSs individuals in the action area are likely to have originated. The authors used 12 microsatellite markers to characterize the stock composition of 1,704 Atlantic sturgeon encountered across the U.S. Atlantic Coast and provide estimates of the percent of Atlantic sturgeon in a number of geographic areas that belong to each DPS. The proposed survey area falls within the "MID Offshore" area described in that paper. Using that data, we expect that Atlantic sturgeon in the project area where trawl surveys will occur likely originate from the five DPSs at the following frequencies: New York Bight (55.3%), Chesapeake (22.9%), South Atlantic (13.6%), Carolina (5.8%), and Gulf of Maine (1.6%) DPSs (Table 6.2.4). It is possible that a small fraction (0.7%) of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area may be Canadian origin (Kazyak et al. 2021); Canadian-origin Atlantic sturgeon are not listed under the ESA. This represents the best available information on the likely genetic makeup of individuals occurring throughout the action area. Based on the information presented above, we do not anticipate the mortality of any Atlantic sturgeon captured in the trawl gear. The DPS breakdown for annual captures for the trawl surveys are provided in Table 6.2.2.2.

Table 6.2.4. Estimated capture of Atlantic sturgeon by DPS in the New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features project trawl survey. DPS percentages listed are the percentage values representing the genetics mixed stock analysis results (Kazyak et al. 2021). Fractions of animals are rounded up to whole animals to generate the total estimate.

Bottom Trawl	Total Estimated Captures Over Three Years
Total	104
New York Bight (55.3%)	58
Chesapeake (22.9%)	24
South Atlantic (13.6%)	14
Carolina (5.8%)	6
Gulf of Maine (1.6%)	2

Estimates derived from NEAMAP Near Shore Trawl Program – Southern Segment data

Effects to Prey

The effects of bottom trawls on benthic community structure have been the subject of a number of studies. In general, the severity of the impacts to bottom communities is a function of three variables: (1) energy of the environment, (2) type of gear used, and (3) intensity of trawling. High-energy and frequently disturbed environments are inhabited by organisms that are adapted to this stress and/or are short-lived and are unlikely to be severely affected, while stable environments with long-lived species are more likely to experience long-term and significant changes to the benthic community (Johnson 2002, Kathleen A. Mirarchi Inc. and CR Environmental Inc. 2005, Stevenson et al. 2004). While there may be some changes to the benthic communities on which Atlantic sturgeon feed as a result of bottom trawling, there is no evidence the bottom trawl activities will have a negative impact on availability of Atlantic sturgeon prey; therefore, effects to Atlantic sturgeon are extremely unlikely to occur.

6.2.3 Assessment of Effects of Acoustic Telemetry Monitoring

BOEM and Rutgers are proposing to monitor for demersal fish in the project area. Surveys would record the presence of nearby tagged animals by employing a combination of fixed hydrophone receivers anchored to the seafloor with a whale-safe weak link and approximately 2 meters of floating line. The AUV and *R/V Resilience* will also monitor telemetry detections as mobile platforms. Acoustic telemetry monitoring using moored receivers will result in the temporary presence of eight vertical lines deployed throughout the project area. Despite the general concerns about the risk of entanglement for ESA-listed species due to moored receivers, we have determined that entanglement of ESA-listed species in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers is extremely unlikely to occur. This is because the limited number of vertical lines (8 total) and the short, intermittent deployment makes it extremely unlikely that any ESA-listed species will encounter vertical lines associated with acoustic telemetry monitoring. Furthermore, moored telemetry receivers will be deployed during months with the lowest mean monthly density for right and fin whales and no other vertical lines (i.e., lobster fishing lines) are present in the action area. Risk reduction measures including the use of weak link and weak rope (engineered to break at 1,700 pounds (±10%) of pressure) for all lines used in the telemetry survey further reduce entanglement risks for ESA-listed species. Additionally, no effects to ESA-listed species are anticipated to result from monitoring associated with fixed hydrophone receivers attached to mobile platforms (i.e., the AUV and *R/V Resilience)*. This is because no listed species will be tagged and this activity only involves monitoring previously tagged summer flounder, dogfish, sea robins, and clearnose skate, and there are no effects to ESA-listed species from this type of passive monitoring.

6.2.4 Impacts to Habitat

Here we consider any effects of the proposed field sampling methods on habitat of listed species. Moored acoustic receivers will include a lander/anchor that would rest on the seafloor. However, the size of the area that would be disturbed by setting this gear is extremely small and any effects to benthic resources would be limited to temporary disturbance of the bottom in the immediate area where the gear is set. No effects to any ESA-listed species are anticipated to result from this small, temporary, intermittent, disturbance of the bottom sediments.

An assessment of fishing gear impacts found that mud, sand, and cobble features are more susceptible to disturbance by trawl gear, while granule-pebble and scattered boulder features are less susceptible (see Appendix D in NEFMC 2016, NEFMC 2020). Geological structures generally recovered more quickly from trawling on mud and sand substrates than on cobble and boulder substrates; while biological structures (i.e. sponges, corals, hydroids) recovered at similar rates across substrates. Susceptibility was defined as the percentage of habitat features encountered by the gear during a hypothetical single pass event that had their functional value reduced, and recovery was defined as the time required for the functional value to be restored (see Appendix D in NEFMC 2016, NEFMC 2020). The bottom trawl gear will also interact with the ocean floor and may affect bottom habitat in the areas surveyed. However, given the infrequent survey effort, the limited duration of the surveys, and the very small footprint (i.e., area of 8 km (5 miles) across and 21 km (13 miles) long), any effects to ESA-listed species resulting from these minor effects to benthic habitat will be so small that they cannot be meaningfully measured, evaluated, or detected.

6.2.5 Consideration of the Effects of the Action in the Context of Predicted Climate Change due to Past, Present, and Future Activities

Climate change is relevant to the Status of the Species, Environmental Baseline, Effects of the Action, and Cumulative Effects sections of this Opinion. In the Status of the Species section, climate change as it relates to the status of particular species is addressed. Rather than include partial discussion in several sections of this Opinion, we are synthesizing our consideration of the effects of the proposed action in the context of anticipated climate change here.

In general, waters in the Mid-Atlantic are warming and are expected to continue to warm over throughout the six field sampling seasons for the project. However, waters in the North Atlantic Ocean have warmed more slowly than the global average or slightly cooled. This is because of the Gulf Stream's role in the Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC). Warm water in the Gulf Stream cools, becomes dense, and sinks, eventually becoming cold, deep waters that travel back equatorward, spilling over features on the ocean floor and mixing with other deep Atlantic waters to form a southward current approximately 1500 m beneath the Gulf Stream (IPCC 2021). Globally averaged surface ocean temperatures are projected to increase by approximately 0.7 °C by 2030 and 1.4 °C by 2060 compared to the 1986-2005 average (IPCC

2014), with increases of closer to 2°C predicted for the geographic area that includes the action area. Data from the NOAA weather buoy closest to the project area (44009) collected from 1984-2008 indicate a mean temperature range from a low of 5°C in the winter to a high of 24°C in the summer, and boat based surveys in the vicinity of the project area had a minimum temperature of 2°C in the winter and a maximum of 26°C in the summer (NMFS 2023). Based on current predictions (IPCC 2014[14]), this could shift to a range of 7.9°C in the winter to 23.8°C in the summer. Ocean acidification is also expected to increase over the life of the project (Hare et al. 2016) which may affect the prey of a number of ESA listed species. Ocean acidification is contributing to reduced growth or the decline of zooplankton and other invertebrates that have calcareous shells (Pacific Marine Environmental Laboratory [PMEL] 2020).

We have considered whether it is reasonable to expect ESA listed species whose northern distribution does not currently overlap with the action area to occur in the action area over the project life due to a northward shift in distribution. We have determined that it is not reasonable to expect this to occur. This is largely because water temperature is only one factor that influences species distribution and given that the life of the proposed action is only three years, we expect little to no shifts in distribution to occur over this period. Even with warming waters we do not expect hawksbill sea turtles to occur in the action area because there will still not be any sponge beds or coral reefs that hawksbills depend on and are key to their distribution (NMFS and USFWS 2013). We also do not expect giant manta ray or oceanic whitetip shark to occur in the action area. Oceanic whitetip shark are a deep-water species (typically greater than 184 m) that occurs beyond the shelf edge on the high seas (Young et al. 2018). Giant manta ray also occur in deeper, offshore waters and occurrence in shallower nearshore waters is coincident with the presence of coral reefs that they rely on for important life history functions (Miller et al. 2017). Smalltooth sawfish do not occur north of Florida. Their life history depends on shallow estuarine habitats fringed with vegetation, usually red mangroves (Norton et al. 2012); such habitat does not occur in the action area and would not occur even with ocean warming over the course of the proposed action. As such, regardless of the extent of ocean warming that may be reasonably expected in the action area throughout the six field sampling seasons for the project, the habitat will remain inconsistent with habitats used by ESA listed species that currently occur south of the project area. Therefore, we do not anticipate that any of these species will occur in the project area over the course of the proposed action.

We have also considered whether climate change will result in changes in the use of the action area by Atlantic sturgeon or the ESA listed turtles and whales considered in this consultation. In a climate vulnerability analysis, Hare et al. (2016) concluded that Atlantic sturgeon are relatively invulnerable to distribution shifts. Given the extensive range of the species along nearly the entire U.S. Atlantic Coast and into Canada, it is unlikely that Atlantic sturgeon would shift out of the action area over the course of the project. If there were shifts in the abundance or distribution of sturgeon prey, it is possible that use of project area by foraging sturgeon could become more or less common. However, even if the frequency and abundance of use of the project area by Atlantic sturgeon increased over time, we would not expect any different effects to Atlantic

[14] (Available at: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/endangered-species-conservation/endangered-species-act-guidance-policies-and-regulations, last accessed March 2, 2023).

sturgeon than those considered based on the current distribution and abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

Use of the action area by sea turtles is driven at least in part by sea surface temperature, with sea turtles absent from the project area from the late fall through mid-spring due to colder water temperatures. An increase in water temperature could result in an expansion of the time of year that sea turtles are present in the action area and could increase the frequency and abundance of sea turtles in the action area. However, even with a 2°C increase in water temperatures, winter and early spring mean sea surface temperatures in the action area are still too cold to support sea turtles. Therefore, any expansion in annual temporal distribution in the action area is expected to be small and on the order of days or potentially weeks, but not months. Any changes in distribution of prey would also be expected to affect distribution and abundance of sea turtles and that could be a negative or positive change. It has been speculated that the nesting range of some sea turtle species may shift northward as water temperatures warm. Currently, nesting in the mid-Atlantic is extremely rare. In order for nesting to be successful, fall and winter temperatures need to be warm enough to support the successful rearing of eggs and sea temperatures must be warm enough for hatchlings to survive when they enter the water. Predicted increases in water temperatures over the life of the project are not great enough to allow successful rearing of sea turtle hatchlings in the action area. Therefore, we do not expect that over the time-period considered here, that there would be any nesting activity or hatchlings in the action area. Based on the available information, we expect that any increase in the frequency and abundance of use of the project area by sea turtles due to increases in mean sea surface temperature would be small. Regardless of this, we would not expect any different effects to sea turtles than those considered based on the current distribution and abundance of sea turtles in the action area. Further, given that any increase in frequency or abundance of sea turtles in the action area is expected to be small we do not expect there to be an increase in risk of vessel strike above what has been considered based on current known distribution and abundance.

The distribution, abundance and migration of baleen whales reflects the distribution, abundance and movements of dense prey patches (e.g., copepods, euphausiids or krill, amphipods, shrimp), which have in turn been linked to oceanographic features affected by climate change (Learmonth et al. 2006). Changes in plankton distribution, abundance, and composition are closely related to ocean climate, including temperature. Changes in conditions may directly alter where foraging occurs by disrupting conditions in areas typically used by species and can result in shifts to areas not traditionally used that have lower quality or lower abundance of prey.

Two of the significant potential prey species for fin whales in the project area are sand lance and Atlantic herring. Hare et al. (2016) concluded that climate change is likely to negatively impact sand lance and Atlantic herring but noted that there was a high degree of uncertainty in this conclusion. The authors noted that higher temperatures may decrease productivity and limit habitat availability. A reduction in small schooling fish such as sand lance and Atlantic herring in the action area could result in a decrease in the use of the area by foraging fin whales. The distribution of copepods in the North Atlantic, including in the action area, is driven by a number of factors that may be impacted by climate change. Record et al. (2019) suggests that recent changes in the distribution of North Atlantic right whales are related to recent rapid changes in climate and prey and notes that while right whales may be able to shift their distribution in response to changing oceanic conditions, the ability to forage successfully in those new habitats is also critically important. Warming in the deep waters of the Gulf of Maine is negatively impacting the abundance of *Calanus finmarchicus*, a primary prey for right whales. *C. finmarchicus* is vulnerable to the effects of global warming, particularly on the Northeast U.S. Shelf, which is in the southern portion of its range (Grieve et al. 2017). Grieve et al. (2017) used models to project *C. finmarchicus* densities into the future under different climate scenarios considering predicted changes in water temperature and salinity. Based on their results, by the 2041–2060 period, 22 – 25% decreases in *C. finmarchicus* density are predicted across all regions of the Northeast U.S. shelf. A decrease in abundance of right whale prey in the project area could be expected to result in a similar decrease in abundance of right whales in the action area over the same time scale; however, whether the predicted decline in *C. finmarchicus* density is great enough to result in a decrease in right whale presence in the action area over the course of the project is unknown.

Right whale calving occurs off the coast of the Southeastern U.S. In the final rule designating critical habitat, the following features were identified as essential to successful calving: (1) calm sea surface conditions associated with Force 4 or less on the Beaufort Scale, (2) sea surface temperatures from 7 °C through 17 °C; and, (3) water depths of 6 to 28 meters where these features simultaneously co-occur over contiguous areas of at least 231 km^2 during the months of November through April. Even with a 2°C shift in mean sea surface temperature, waters off New Jersey in the November to April period will not be warm enough to support calving. While there could be a northward shift in calving over this period, it is not reasonable to expect that over the life of the project that calving would occur in the action area. Further, given the thermal tolerances of young calves (Garrison 2007) we do not expect that the distribution of young calves would shift northward into the action area such that there would be more or younger calves in the action area.

Based on the available information, it is difficult to predict how the use of the action area by large whales may change over the course of the project; however, any changes are expected to be limited by the short duration of the project. Changes in habitat used by fin and right whales may be related to a northward shift in distribution due to warming waters and a decreased abundance of prey. However, it is also possible that reductions in prey in other areas, including the Gulf of Maine, result in persistence of foraging in the action area over time. Based on the information available at this time, it seems most likely that the use of the action area by large whales will remain stable over the three year period. As such, we do not expect any changes in abundance or distribution that would result in different effects of the action than those considered in the *Effects of the Action* section of this Opinion. To the extent new information on climate change, listed species, and their prey becomes available in the future, reinitiation of this consultation may be necessary.

7.0 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

"Cumulative effects" are those effects of future state or private activities, not involving Federal activities, that are reasonably certain to occur within the action area of the Federal action subject to consultation (50 C.F.R. §402.02). Future Federal actions that are unrelated to the proposed action are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the ESA.

This section attempts to identify the likely future environmental changes and their impact on ESA-listed species in the action area. This section is not meant to be a comprehensive socio-economic evaluation, but a brief outlook on future changes in the environment. Projections are based upon recognized organizations producing best-available information and reasonable rough-trend estimates of change stemming from these data. However, all changes are based upon projections that are subject to error and alteration by complex economic and social interactions.

We expect that those aspects described in the *Environmental Baseline* will continue to impact ESA-listed resources into the foreseeable future. We expect anthropogenic effects that include climate change, oceanic temperature regimes, vessel interactions, fisheries interactions, pollution, and scientific research and enhancement activities, to continue into the future for ESA-listed resources. An increase in these activities could result in an increased effect on ESA-listed species; however, the magnitude and significance of any anticipated effects remain unknown at this time. The best scientific and commercial data available provide little specific information on any long-term effects of these potential sources of disturbance on ESA-listed species. Therefore, NMFS expects that the levels of interactions between human activities and ESA-listed species described in the *Environmental Baseline* will continue at similar levels into the foreseeable future. Movements towards the reduction of vessel strikes and fisheries interactions or greater protections of ESA-listed species from these anthropogenic effects may aid in abating the downward trajectory of some populations and lead to recovery of other populations.

During this consultation, we searched for information on future state, tribal, local, or private (non-Federal) actions reasonably certain to occur in the action area or have effects in the action area. We did not find any information about non-Federal actions other than what has already been described in the *Environmental Baseline*. The primary non-Federal activities that will continue to have effects in the action area are: Recreational fisheries, fisheries authorized by states, use of the action area by private vessels, discharge of wastewater and associated pollutants, and coastal development authorized by state and local governments. Any coastal development that requires a Federal authorization, inclusive of a permit from the USACE, would require future section 7 consultation and would not be considered a cumulative effect. We do not have any information to indicate that effects of these activities over the six field sampling seasons for the proposed project will have different effects than those considered in the Status of the Species and Environmental Baseline sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change.

8.0 INTEGRATION AND SYNTHESIS OF EFFECTS

In the effects analysis outlined above, we considered potential effects from the proposed field survey work over three years on North Atlantic right and fin whales, five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon, the Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerhead sea turtles, North Atlantic DPS of green sea turtles, leatherback, and Kemp's ridley sea turtles. These effects include potential interactions with bottom trawl gear and vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. In addition to these gear-related effects, we considered the potential for interactions between ESA-listed species and research vessels (including the AUV), impacts to their habitats and prey, and noise effects on these species from active acoustic sources used in the studies. In Section 6, we determined that all effects of the proposed action to ESA-listed whales are extremely unlikely to occur.

We anticipate the non-lethal capture of Atlantic sturgeon and loggerhead, green, leatherback, and Kemp's ridley sea turtles during bottom trawl surveys. No injuries or mortality of Atlantic sturgeon or ESA-listed sea turtles are anticipated and all captured individuals are expected to recover from capture without any reduction in fitness or impact on survival or future reproduction. As explained in the *Effects of the Action* (Section 6), all other effects to Atlantic sturgeon and ESA-listed sea turtles, including their prey, will be insignificant or extremely unlikely.

In the discussion below, we add the *Effects of the Action* (Section 6) to the *Environmental Baseline* (Section 5) and the *Cumulative Effects* (Section 7), while also considering effects in context of climate change and the status of the species (Section 6.2.5), to formulate the agency's biological opinion as to whether the proposed action "reasonably would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of an ESA-listed species in the wild by reducing its numbers, reproduction, or distribution" (50 CFR §402.02; the definition of "jeopardize the continued existence"). The purpose of this analysis in this Opinion is to determine whether the action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species. In the NMFS/USFWS Section 7 Handbook, for the purposes of determining jeopardy, survival is defined as, "the species' persistence as listed or as a recovery unit, beyond the conditions leading to its endangerment, with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment. Said in another way, survival is the condition in which a species continues to exist into the future while retaining the potential for recovery. This condition is characterized by a species with a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring, which exists in an environment providing all requirements for completion of the species' entire life cycle, including reproduction, sustenance, and shelter." Recovery is defined as, "Improvement in the status of listed species to the point at which listing is no longer appropriate under the criteria set out in Section 4(a)(1) of the Act." Below, for the listed species that may be affected by the proposed action, we summarize the status of the species and consider whether the proposed action will result in reductions in reproduction, numbers or distribution of these species and then consider whether any reductions in reproduction, numbers or distribution resulting from the proposed action would reduce appreciably the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of these species, as those terms are defined for purposes of the federal Endangered Species Act.

8.1 Marine Mammals

Our effects analysis determined that all effects of the proposed action to right and fin whales are insignificant or extremely unlikely. We concluded that, with the incorporation of vessel strike risk reduction measures that are part of the proposed action, strike of an ESA listed whale by a project vessel is extremely unlikely. No consequences are anticipated in the extremely unlikely event of an interaction with the AUV system. We determined that exposure to noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV will have effects that are extremely unlikely. We also determined that effects to habitat and prey are also insignificant or extremely unlikely and that entanglement in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers or capture in bottom trawl gear is extremely unlikely. Because all effects to right and fin whales are insignificant or extremely unlikely, the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect right and fin whales. By definition, an action that is not likely to adversely affect a species is also not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species. Therefore, because there are no adverse effects of the action to these species, no further consideration in this section of the Opinion is necessary.

8.2 Sea Turtles

Our effects analysis determined that interactions with bottom trawl gear is likely to result in the capture of a number of individual ESA-listed sea turtles in the action area, but no serious injury or mortality is anticipated and we expect all captured individuals to be released alive with only minor, recoverable injury (i.e., scrapes, minor bruises). We expect that bottom trawl survey gear will capture no more than 3 loggerhead, 1 green, and 2 Kemp's ridley sea turtles over the 3-year survey period. We do not expect the capture of any leatherback sea turtles. We do not expect the entanglement or capture of any sea turtles in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. We concluded that effects of the very small increase in vessel traffic and associated very small increase in subsequent risk of vessel strikes to sea turtles is extremely unlikely. We also concluded that the effect of adding the project vessels to the baseline cannot be meaningfully measured, detected, or evaluated; therefore, effects are also insignificant. No consequences are anticipated in the extremely unlikely event of an interaction with the AUV system. We determined that effects from exposure to noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV are extremely unlikely. We also determined that effects to habitat and prey are insignificant or extremely unlikely.

In this section we assess the likely consequences of these effects to the sea turtles that have been exposed, the populations those individuals represent, and the species those populations comprise. Section 4.2 described current sea turtle population statuses and the threats to their survival and recovery. Most sea turtle populations have undergone significant to severe reduction by human harvesting of both eggs and sea turtles, loss of beach nesting habitats, as well as severe bycatch pressure in worldwide fishing industries. The *Environmental Baseline* identified actions expected to generally continue for the foreseeable future for each of these species of sea turtle that may affect sea turtles in the action area. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in a northward distribution of sea turtles, which could result in a small change in the abundance, and seasonal distribution of sea turtles in the action area over the six field sampling seasons for the proposed project. However, as described there, given the cool winter water temperatures in the action area and considering the amount of warming that is anticipated, any shift in seasonal distribution is expected to be small (potential additional weeks per year, not months) and any increase in abundance in the action area is expected to be small. As noted in the *Cumulative Effects* section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change.

8.2.1 Northwest Atlantic DPS of Loggerhead Sea Turtles

The Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerhead sea turtles is listed as threatened. Based on nesting data and population abundance and trends at the time, NMFS and USFWS determined in 2011 that the Northwest Atlantic DPS should be listed as threatened and not endangered based on: (1) the large size of the nesting population, (2) the overall nesting population remains widespread, (3) the trend for the nesting population appears to be stabilizing, and (4) substantial conservation efforts are underway to address threats (76 FR 58868, September 22, 2011).

It takes decades for loggerhead sea turtles to reach maturity. Once they have reached maturity, females typically lay multiple clutches of eggs within a season, but do not typically lay eggs every season (NMFS and USFWS 2008). There are many natural and anthropogenic factors affecting the survival of loggerheads prior to their reaching maturity as well as for those adults who have reached maturity. As described in the *Status of the Species*, *Environmental Baseline*, and *Cumulative Effects* sections above, loggerhead sea turtles in the action area continue to be affected by multiple anthropogenic impacts including bycatch in commercial and recreational fisheries, habitat alteration, vessel interactions, and other factors that result in mortality of individuals at all life stages. Negative impacts causing death of various age classes occur both on land and in the water. Many actions have been taken to address known negative impacts to loggerhead sea turtles. However, others remain unaddressed, have not been sufficiently addressed, or have been addressed in some manner but whose success cannot be quantified.

There are five subpopulations of loggerhead sea turtles in the western North Atlantic (recognized as recovery units in the 2008 recovery plan for the species). These subpopulations show limited evidence of interbreeding. As described in the *Status of the Species*, recent assessments have evaluated the nesting trends for each recovery unit. Nesting trends are based on nest counts or nesting females; they do not include non-nesting adult females, adult males, or juvenile males or females in the population. Nesting trends for each of the loggerhead sea turtle recovery units in the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS are variable. Overall, short-term trends have shown increases, however, over the long-term the DPS is considered stable.

Estimates of the total loggerhead population in the Atlantic are not currently available. However, there is some information available for portions of the population. From 2004-2008, the loggerhead adult female population for the Northwest Atlantic ranged from 20,000 to 40,000 or more individuals (median 30,050), with a large range of uncertainty in total population size (NMFS SEFSC 2009). The estimate of Northwest Atlantic adult loggerhead females was considered conservative for several reasons. The number of nests used for the Northwest Atlantic was based primarily on U.S. nesting beaches. Thus, the results are a slight underestimate of total nests because of the inability to collect complete nest counts for many non-U.S. nesting beaches within the DPS. In estimating the current population size for adult nesting female loggerhead sea turtles, the report simplified the number of assumptions and reduced uncertainty by using the minimum total annual nest count (i.e., 48,252 nests) over the five years. This was a particularly conservative assumption considering how the number of nests and nesting females can vary widely from year to year (e.g., the 2008 nest count was 69,668 nests, which would have increased the adult female estimate proportionately to between 30,000 and 60,000). In addition, minimal assumptions were made about the distribution of remigration intervals and nests per female parameters, which are fairly robust and well known. A loggerhead population estimate using data from 2001-2010 estimated the loggerhead adult female population in the Northwest Atlantic at 38,334 individuals (SD =2,287) (Richards et al. 2011).

The AMAPPS surveys and sea turtle telemetry studies conducted along the U.S. Atlantic coast in the summer of 2010 provided preliminary regional abundance estimate of about 588,000 loggerheads along the U.S. Atlantic coast, with an inter-quartile range of 382,000-817,000 (NMFS 2011c). The estimate increases to approximately 801,000 (inter-quartile range of 521,000-1,111,000) when based on known loggerheads and a portion of unidentified sea turtle sightings (NMFS 2011c). Although there is much uncertainty in these population estimates, they provide some context for evaluating the size of the likely population of loggerheads in the Atlantic.

In the *Effects of the Action* section above, we determined that no more than three loggerheads are likely to be captured during the bottom trawl surveys over the six field sampling seasons for the proposed project. We anticipate that all of the loggerheads will be removed from the water alive and that these individuals will be released alive with only minor, recoverable injuries (minor scrapes and abrasions). We determined that all other effects of the action would be insignificant or extremely unlikely.

Capture will temporarily prevent these sea turtles from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the turtles are returned to the water (within 30 minutes of initial capture). The capture of live loggerhead sea turtles will not reduce the numbers of loggerhead sea turtles in the action area, in any subpopulation or the species as a whole over the course of the action. As any effects to individual live loggerhead sea turtles will be minor and temporary, there are not anticipated to be any impacts to the health, reproductive capacity, or fitness of any individuals. Similarly, as the capture of live loggerhead sea turtles will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated over the course of the action. The capture of live loggerhead sea turtles will not affect the distribution of loggerhead sea turtles in the action area or affect the distribution of sea turtles throughout their range over the course of the action. Because there will be no reduction in numbers, reproduction, or distribution of loggerhead sea turtles, the project will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival (i.e., it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for recovery and eventual delisting). The actions will not affect loggerheads in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring and it will not result in effects to the environment which would prevent loggerheads from completing their entire life cycle, including reproduction, sustenance, and shelter. This is the case because: (1) there will be no mortalities; (2) there will be no change the status or trends of any recovery unit or the DPS as a whole; (3) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (4) there will be no effect on reproductive output; (5) the actions will have only a minor and temporary effect on the distribution of loggerheads in the action area limited to the 30 minute period when individuals are captured in the trawl and no effect on the distribution of the species throughout its range; and, (6) the actions will have no effect on the ability of loggerheads to shelter and only an insignificant effect on individual foraging loggerheads.

In rare instances, an action may not reduce appreciably the likelihood of a species survival (persistence) but may affect its likelihood of recovery or the rate at which recovery is expected to occur. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not reduce appreciably the likelihood that loggerhead sea turtles will survive in the wild. Here, we consider the potential for the actions to reduce the likelihood of recovery. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will affect the likelihood that the Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerheads can rebuild to a point where listing is no longer appropriate. In 2008, NMFS and the USFWS issued a recovery plan for the Northwest Atlantic population of loggerheads (NMFS and USFWS 2008). The plan includes demographic recovery criteria as well as a list of tasks that must be accomplished. Demographic recovery criteria are included for each of the five recovery units. These criteria focus on sustained increases in the number of nests laid and the number of nesting females in each recovery unit, an increase in abundance on foraging grounds, and ensuring that trends in neritic strandings are not increasing at a rate greater than trends in in-water abundance. The recovery tasks focus on protecting habitats, minimizing and managing predation and disease, and minimizing anthropogenic mortalities.

Loggerheads have a stable trend. This action will not change the status or trend of the Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerhead sea turtles. As explained above, the proposed action will not result in any mortality and no reduction in future reproductive output. Because there will be no effect on numbers or reproductive output, the action will not affect the likelihood that the population will reach the size necessary for recovery or the rate at which recovery will occur. As such, the proposed action will not affect the likelihood that the demographic criteria will be achieved or the timeline on which they will be achieved. The action area does not include nesting beaches; all effects to habitat will be insignificant or extremely unlikely; therefore, the proposed action will have no effect on the likelihood that habitat based recovery criteria will be achieved. The proposed action will also not affect the ability of any of the recovery tasks to be accomplished.

In summary, the effects of the proposed action will not hasten the extinction timeline or otherwise increase the danger of extinction; further, the action will not prevent the species from growing in a way that leads to recovery and the action will not change the rate at which recovery can occur. This is the case because while the action may result in the non-lethal capture of a number of loggerhead sea turtles, these effects will be undetectable over the long-term and the action is not expected to have long term impacts on the future growth of the population or its potential for recovery. Therefore, based on the analysis presented above, the proposed action will not reduce appreciably the likelihood that the Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerhead sea turtles can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as threatened; that is, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of the NWA DPS of loggerhead sea turtles.

Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed action is not likely to reduce appreciably the survival and recovery of the Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerhead sea turtles. These conclusions were made in consideration of the threatened status of NWA DPS loggerhead sea turtles, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental*

Baseline and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on the abundance, reproduction, and distribution of loggerhead sea turtles in the action area.

8.2.2 North Atlantic DPS of Green Sea Turtles

The North Atlantic DPS of green sea turtles is listed as threatened under the ESA. As described in the *Status of the Species*, the North Atlantic DPS of green sea turtles is the largest of the 11 green turtle DPSs with an estimated abundance of over 167,000 adult females from 73 nesting sites. All major nesting populations demonstrate long-term increases in abundance (Seminoff et al. 2015). In 2021, green turtle nest counts on the 27-core index beaches in Florida reached more than 24,000 nests recorded. Green sea turtles face numerous threats on land and in the water that affect the survival of all age classes. While the threats of pollution, habitat loss through coastal development, beachfront lighting, and fisheries bycatch continue for this DPS, the DPS appears to be somewhat resilient to future perturbations. As described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, green sea turtles in the action area are exposed to pollution and experience vessel strike and fisheries bycatch. As noted in the *Cumulative Effects* section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the Status of the Species and Environmental Baseline sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of green sea turtles in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action in the context of anticipated climate change.

There are four regions that support high nesting concentrations in the North Atlantic DPS: Costa Rica (Tortuguero), Mexico (Campeche, Yucatan, and Quintana Roo), United States (Florida), and Cuba. Using data from 48 nesting sites in the North Atlantic DPS, nester abundance was estimated at 167,528 total nesters (Seminoff et al. 2015). The years used to generate the estimate varied by nesting site but were between 2005 and 2012. The largest nesting site (Tortuguero, Costa Rica) hosts 79 percent of the estimated nesting. It should be noted that not all female turtles nest in a given year (Seminoff et al. 2015). Nesting in the area has increased considerably since the 1970s, and nest count data from 1999-2003 suggested that 17,402-37,290 females nested there per year (Seminoff et al. 2015). In 2010, an estimated 180,310 nests were laid at Tortuguero, the highest level of green sea turtle nesting estimated since the start of nesting track surveys in 1971. This equated to somewhere between 30,052 and 64,396 nesters in 2010 (Seminoff et al. 2015). Nesting sites in Cuba, Mexico, and the United States were either stable or increasing (Seminoff et al. 2015). More recent data is available for the southeastern United States. Nest counts at Florida's core index beaches have ranged from less than 300 to almost 41,000 in 2019. The Index Nesting Beach Survey (INBS) is carried out on a subset of beaches surveyed during the Statewide Nesting Beach Survey (SNBS) and is designed to measure trends in nest numbers. The nest trend in Florida shows the typical biennial peaks in abundance and has been increasing (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea- turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/). The SNBS is broader but is not appropriate for evaluating trends. In 2019, approximately 53,000 green turtle nests were recorded in the SNBS (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/). Seminoff et al. (2015) estimated total nester abundance for Florida at 8,426 turtles.

NMFS recognizes that the nest count data available for green sea turtles in the Atlantic indicates increased nesting at many sites. However, we also recognize that the nest count data, including data for green sea turtles in the Atlantic, only provides information on the number of females currently nesting, and is not necessarily a reflection of the number of mature females available to nest or the number of immature females that will reach maturity and nest in the future.

In the *Effects of the Action* section above, we determined that no more than one green sea turtle is likely to be captured during the bottom trawl surveys over the six field sampling seasons for the proposed project. We anticipate that this green sea turtle will be removed from the water alive and that this individual will be released alive with only minor, recoverable injuries (minor scrapes and abrasions). We determined that all other effects of the action would be insignificant or extremely unlikely.

Capture will temporarily prevent this sea turtle from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the turtle is returned to the water. The capture and release of a live green sea turtle will not reduce the numbers of green sea turtles in the action area, in any subpopulation or the species as a whole over the course of the action. As any effects to individual live green sea turtle will be minor and temporary; there are not anticipated to be any impacts to the health, reproductive capacity, or fitness of the individual. Similarly, as the capture of a live green sea turtle will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated over the course of the action. The capture of live green sea turtles will not affect the distribution of green sea turtles in the action area or affect the distribution of sea turtles throughout their range over the course of the action.

Based on the information provided above, the capture and release of one green sea turtles over the 3 year life of the project, will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival (i.e., it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment). The action will not affect green sea turtles in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring and it will not result in effects to the environment which would prevent green sea turtles from completing their entire life cycle, including reproduction, sustenance, and shelter. This is the case because: (1) there will be no mortality to any individual (2) the capture of 1 green sea turtles will not change the status or trends of the species as a whole; (4) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (5) there will be no effect on reproductive output of the species as a whole; (6) the action will have insignificant and temporary effects on the distribution of a single green sea turtle in the action area (limited to the 30 minutes it is captured) and no effect on its distribution throughout its range; and (7) the action will have no effect on the ability of green sea turtles to shelter and only an insignificant effect on individual foraging green sea turtles.

In rare instances, an action may not reduce appreciably the likelihood of a species survival (persistence) but may affect its likelihood of recovery or the rate at which recovery is expected to occur. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not reduce appreciably the likelihood that green sea turtles will survive in the wild. Here, we consider the potential for the actions to reduce the likelihood of recovery. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will affect the likelihood that the species can rebuild to a point where listing is no longer appropriate. A Recovery Plan for Green sea turtles was published by NMFS and USFWS in 1991. The plan outlines the steps necessary for recovery and the criteria which, once met, would ensure recovery. In order to be delisted, green sea turtles must experience sustained population growth, as measured in the number of nests laid per year, over time. Additionally, "priority one" recovery tasks must be achieved and nesting habitat must be protected (through public ownership of nesting beaches) and stage class mortality must be reduced. Here, we consider whether this proposed action will affect the population size and/or trend in a way that would affect the likelihood of recovery.

The proposed actions will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival of green sea turtles. Also, it is not expected to modify, curtail or destroy the range of the species since it will not result in a reduction in the number of green sea turtles in any geographic area and since it will not affect the overall distribution of green sea turtles other than to cause minor temporary adjustments in behaviors in the action area. As explained above, the proposed actions will not result in any mortality and is not expected to affect the persistence of green sea turtles or the species trend. The actions will not affect nesting habitat. The effects of the proposed actions will not hasten the extinction timeline or otherwise increase the danger of extinction; further, the actions will not prevent the species from growing in a way that leads to recovery, and the actions will not change the rate at which recovery can occur. This is the case because while the action may result in the non-lethal capture of one green sea turtle, these effects will be undetectable over the long-term and the action is not expected to have long term impacts on the future growth of the population or its potential for recovery. Therefore, based on the analysis presented above, the proposed actions will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that green sea turtles can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as endangered or threatened; that is, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of green sea turtles.

Despite the threats faced by individual green sea turtles inside and outside of the action area, the proposed actions will not increase the vulnerability of individual sea turtles to these additional threats and exposure to ongoing threats will not increase susceptibility to effects related to the proposed actions. We have considered the effects of the proposed actions in light of the status of the species rangewide and in the action area, the environmental baseline, cumulative effects explained above, including climate change, and have concluded that even in light of the ongoing impacts of these activities and conditions, the conclusions reached above do not change. Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed actions, resulting in the non-lethal capture of one green sea turtle over 3 years, is not likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of green sea turtles. These conclusions were made in consideration of the threatened status of green sea turtles, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on the abundance, reproduction, and distribution of green sea turtles in the action area.

8.2.3 Leatherback Sea Turtles

Leatherback sea turtles are listed as endangered under the ESA. Leatherbacks are widely distributed throughout the oceans of the world and are found in waters of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans, the Caribbean Sea, Mediterranean Sea, and the Gulf of Mexico (Ernst and Barbour 1972). Leatherback nesting occurs on beaches of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans as well as in the Caribbean (NMFS and USFWS 2013). Leatherbacks face a multitude of threats that can cause death prior to and after reaching maturity. Some activities resulting in leatherback mortality have been addressed.

The most recent published assessment, the leatherback status review, estimated that the total index of nesting female abundance for the Northwest Atlantic population of leatherbacks is 20,659 females (NMFS and USFWS 2020). This abundance estimate is similar to other estimates. The TEWG estimated approximately 18,700 (range 10,000 to 31,000) adult females using nesting data from 2004 and 2005 (TEWG 2007). The IUCN Red List assessment for the NW Atlantic Ocean subpopulation estimated 20,000 mature individuals (male and female) and approximately 23,000 nests per year (data through 2017) with high inter-annual variability in annual nest counts within and across nesting sites (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2019). The estimate in the status review is higher than the estimate for the IUCN Red List assessment, likely due to a different remigration interval, which has been increasing in recent years (NMFS and USFWS 2020). For this analysis, we found that the status review estimate of 20,659 nesting females represents the best available scientific information given that it uses the most comprehensive and recent demographic trends and nesting data.

In the 2020 status review, the authors identified seven leatherback populations that met the discreteness and significance criteria of DPSs (NMFS and USFWS 2020). These include the Northwest Atlantic, Southwest Atlantic, Southeast Atlantic, Southwest Indian, Northeast Indian, West Pacific, and East Pacific. The population found within the action area is that identified in the status review as the Northwest Atlantic DPS. While NMFS and USFWS concluded that seven populations met the criteria for DPSs, the species continues to be listed at the global level (85 FR 48332, August 10, 2020) as the agency has taken no action to list one or more DPSs. Therefore, this analysis considers the range-wide status of the species as listed.

Previous assessments of leatherbacks concluded that the Northwest Atlantic population was stable or increasing (TEWG 2007, Tiwari et al. 2013b). However, as described in the *Status of the Species,* more recent analyses indicate that the overall trends are negative (NMFS and USFWS 2020, Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018, 2019). At the stock level, the Working Group evaluated the NW Atlantic – Guianas-Trinidad, Florida, Northern Caribbean, and the Western Caribbean stocks. The NW Atlantic – Guianas-Trinidad stock is the largest stock and declined significantly across all periods evaluated, which was attributed to an exponential decline in abundance at Awala-Yalimapo, French Guiana as well as declines in Guyana; Suriname; Cayenne, French Guiana; and Matura, Trinidad. Declines in Awala-Yalimapo were attributed, in part, due to beach erosion and a loss of nesting habitat (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). The Florida stock increased significantly over the long-term, but declined from 2008-2017 (Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group 2018). Slight increases in nesting were seen in 2018 and 2019, however, nest counts remain low compared to 2008-2015 (https://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals/). The Northern Caribbean and Western Caribbean stocks have also declined. The Working Group report also includes trends at the site-level, which varied depending on the site and time period, but were generally negative especially in the recent period.

Similarly, the leatherback status review concluded that the Northwest Atlantic DPS exhibits decreasing nest trends at nesting aggregations with the greatest indices of nesting female abundance. Though some nesting aggregations indicated increasing trends, most of the largest ones are declining. This trend is considered to be representative of the DPS (NMFS and USFWS 2020). Data also indicated that the Southwest Atlantic DPS is declining (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

Populations in the Pacific have shown dramatic declines at many nesting sites (Mazaris et al. 2017, Santidrián Tomillo et al. 2017, Santidrián Tomillo et al. 2007, Sarti Martínez et al. 2007, Tapilatu et al. 2013). The IUCN Red List assessment estimated the number of total mature individuals (males and females) at Jamursba-Medi and Wermon beaches to be 1,438 turtles (Tiwari et al. 2013a). More recently, the leatherback status review estimated the total index of nesting female abundance of the West Pacific DPS at 1,277 females for the West Pacific DPS and 755 females for the East Pacific DPS (NMFS and USFWS 2020). The East Pacific DPS has exhibited a decreasing trend since monitoring began with a 97.4 percent decline since the 1980s or 1990s, depending on nesting beach (Wallace et al. 2013). Population abundance in the Indian Ocean is difficult to assess due to lack of data and inconsistent reporting. Most recently, the 2020 status review estimated that the total index of nesting female abundance for the SW Indian DPS is 149 females and that the DPS is exhibiting a slight decreasing nest trend (NMFS and USFWS 2020). While data on nesting in the Northeast Indian Ocean DPS is limited, the DPS is estimated at 109 females. This DPS has exhibited a drastic population decline with extirpation of the largest nesting aggregation in Malaysia (NMFS and USFWS 2020).

The primary threats to leatherback sea turtles include fisheries bycatch, harvest of nesting females, and egg harvesting; of these, as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, fisheries bycatch occurs in the action area. Leatherback sea turtles in the action area are also at risk of vessel strike. As noted in the Cumulative Effects section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change. As described in section 7.10, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of leatherback sea turtles in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action in the context of anticipated climate change.

We do not expect the capture of any leatherbacks in the trawl surveys and determined that all other effects of the action would be insignificant or extremely unlikely over the six field sampling seasons for the proposed project. As such, the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect leatherback sea turtles. By definition, an action that is not likely to adversely affect a species is also not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species. Therefore, because there are no adverse effects of the action to the species, no further consideration in this section of the Opinion is necessary.

8.2.4 Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtles

Kemp's ridley sea turtles are listed as a single species classified as endangered under the ESA. They occur in the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico, the only major nesting site for Kemp's ridleys is a single stretch of beach near Rancho Nuevo, Tamaulipas, Mexico (Carr 1963, NMFS and USFWS 2015, USFWS and NMFS 1992).

Nest count data provides the best available information on the number of adult females nesting each year. As is the case with other sea turtles species, nest count data must be interpreted with caution given that these estimates provide a minimum count of the number of nesting Kemp's ridley sea turtles. In addition, the estimates do not account for adult males or juveniles of either sex. Without information on the proportion of adult males to females and the age structure of the population, nest counts cannot be used to estimate the total population size (Meylan 1982, Ross 1996). Nevertheless, the nesting data does provide valuable information on the extent of Kemp's ridley nesting and the trend in the number of nests laid. It is the best proxy we have for estimating population changes.

Following a significant, unexplained one-year decline in 2010, Kemp's ridley sea turtle nests in Mexico reached a record high of 21,797 in 2012 (Gladys Porter Zoo nesting database, unpublished data). In 2013 and 2014, there was a second significant decline in Mexico nests, with only 16,385 and 11,279 nests recorded, respectively. In 2015, nesting in Mexico improved to 14,006 nests, and in 2016 overall numbers increased to 18,354 recorded nests. There was a record high nesting season in 2017, with 24,570 nests recorded (J. Pena, pers. comm. to NMFS SERO PRD, August 31, 2017 as cited in NMFS 2020(c) and decreases observed in 2018 and again in 2019 (Figure 39). In 2019, there were 11,140 nests in Mexico. It is unknown whether this decline is related to resource fluctuation, natural population variability, effects of catastrophic events like the Deepwater Horizon oil spill affecting the nesting cohort, or some other factor. A small nesting population is also emerging in the United States, primarily in Texas. From 1980-1989, there were an average of 0.2 nests/year at Padre Island National Seashore (PAIS), rising to 3.4 nests/year from 1990-1999, 44 nests/year from 2000-2009, and 110 nests per year from 2010-2019. There was a record high of 353 nests in 2017 (NPS 2020). It is worth noting that nesting in Texas has paralleled the trends observed in Mexico, characterized by a significant decline in 2010, followed by a second decline in 2013-2014, but with a rebound in 2015-2017 (NMFS 2020c) and decreases in nesting in 2018 and 2019 (NPS 2020).

Estimates of the adult female nesting population reached a low of approximately 250-300 in 1985 (NMFS and USFWS 2015, TEWG 2000). Gallaway et al. (2016) developed a stock assessment model for Kemp's ridley to evaluate the relative contributions of conservation efforts and other factors toward this species' recovery. Terminal population estimates for 2012 summed over ages 2 to 4, ages 2+, ages 5+, and ages 9+ suggest that the respective female population sizes were 78,043 (SD = 14,683), 152,357 (SD = 25,015), 74,314 (SD =10,460), and 28,113 (SD

= 2,987) (Gallaway et al. 2016). Using the standard IUCN protocol for sea turtle assessments, the number of mature individuals was recently estimated at 22,341 (Wibbels and Bevan 2019). The calculation took into account the average annual nests from 2016-2018 (21,156), a clutch frequency of 2.5 per year, a remigration interval of 2 years, and a sex ratio of 3.17 females: 1 male. Based on the data in their analysis, the assessment concluded the current population trend is unknown (Wibbels and Bevan 2019). However, some positive outlooks for the species include recent conservation actions, including the expanded TED requirements in the shrimp fishery (84 FR 70048, December 20, 2019) and a decrease in the amount of shrimping off the coast of Tamaulipas and in the Gulf of Mexico (NMFS and USFWS 2015).

Genetic variability in Kemp's ridley turtles is considered to be high, as measured by nuclear DNA analyses (i.e., microsatellites) (NMFS et al. 2011). If this holds true, then rapid increases in population over one or two generations would likely prevent any negative consequences in the genetic variability of the species (NMFS et al. 2011). Additional analysis of the mtDNA taken from samples of Kemp's ridley turtles at Padre Island, Texas, showed six distinct haplotypes, with one found at both Padre Island and Rancho Nuevo (Dutton et al. 2006).

Fishery interactions are the main threat to the species. The species' limited range and low global abundance make its resilience to future perturbation low. The status of Kemp's ridley sea turtles in the action area is the same as described in the Status of the Species. As described in the Environmental Baseline and Cumulative Effects, fisheries bycatch and vessel strike are likely to continue to occur in the action area over the life of the project. As noted in the *Cumulative Effects* section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of Kemp's ridley sea turtles in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action in the context of anticipated climate change.

In the *Effects of the Action* section above, we determined that no more than two Kemp's ridleys are likely to be captured during the bottom trawl surveys over the six field sampling seasons for the proposed project. We anticipate that all of the Kemp's ridleys will be removed from the water alive and that these individuals will be released alive with only minor, recoverable injuries (minor scrapes and abrasions). We determined that all other effects of the action would be insignificant or extremely unlikely.

Capture will temporarily prevent these sea turtles from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the turtles are returned to the water. The capture of live Kemp's ridley sea turtles will not reduce the numbers of Kemp's ridley sea turtles in the action area, in any subpopulation or the species as a whole over the course of the action. As any effects to individual live Kemp's ridley sea turtles will be minor and temporary there are not anticipated to be any impacts to the health, reproductive capacity, or fitness of any individuals. Similarly, as the capture of live Kemp's ridley sea turtles will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated over the course of the action. The capture of live Kemp's ridley sea turtles will not affect the distribution of Kemp's ridley sea turtles in the action area or affect the distribution of sea turtles throughout their range over the course of the action. As any effects to individual live Kemp's ridley sea turtles will be minor and temporary there are not anticipated to be any population level impacts.

Based on the information provided above, the capture and release of two Kemp's ridley sea turtles over 3 years will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival (i.e., it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment). The proposed action will not affect Kemp's ridleys in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring and it will not result in effects to the environment which would prevent Kemp's ridleys from completing their entire life cycle, including reproduction, sustenance, and shelter. This is the case because: (1) no mortality will occur; (2) the action will not result in any change in the status or trends of the species as a whole; (3) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (5) there will be no effect on reproductive output that the loss of this individual will not change the status or trends of the species; (5) the actions will have only a minor and temporary effect on the distribution of Kemp's ridleys in the action area and no effect on the distribution of the species throughout its range; and, (6) the actions will have no effect on the ability of Kemp's ridleys to shelter and only an insignificant effect on individual foraging Kemp's ridleys.

In rare instances, an action may not reduce appreciably the likelihood of a species survival (persistence) but may affect its likelihood of recovery or the rate at which recovery is expected to occur. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not reduce appreciably the likelihood that Kemp's ridley sea turtles will survive in the wild. Here, we consider the potential for the action to reduce the likelihood of recovery. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will affect the likelihood that Kemp's ridleys can rebuild to a point where listing is no longer appropriate. In 2011, NMFS and the USFWS issued a recovery plan for Kemp's ridleys (NMFS *et al*. 2011). The plan includes a list of criteria necessary for recovery. These include:

1. An increase in the population size, specifically in relation to nesting females[15];
2. An increase in the recruitment of hatchlings[16];
3. An increase in the number of nests at the nesting beaches;
4. Preservation and maintenance of nesting beaches (i.e. Rancho Nuevo, Tepehuajes, and Playa Dos); and,
5. Maintenance of sufficient foraging, migratory, and inter-nesting habitat.

[15] A population of at least 10,000 nesting females in a season (as measured by clutch frequency per female per season) distributed at the primary nesting beaches in Mexico (Rancho Nuevo, Tepehuajes, and Playa Dos) is attained in order for downlisting to occur; an average of 40,000 nesting females per season over a 6-year period by 2024 for delisting to occur

[16] Recruitment of at least 300,000 hatchlings to the marine environment per season at the three primary nesting beaches in Mexico (Rancho Nuevo, Tepehuajes, and Playa Dos).

Kemp's ridleys have an increasing trend. This action will not change the status or trend of the Kemp's ridley sea turtles. As explained above, the proposed action will not result in any mortality and no reduction in future reproductive output. Because there will be no effect on numbers or reproductive output, the action will not affect the likelihood that the population will reach the size necessary for recovery or the rate at which recovery will occur. As such, the proposed action will not affect the likelihood that criteria one, two or three will be achieved or the timeline on which they will be achieved. The action area does not include nesting beaches; therefore, the proposed actions will have no effect on the likelihood that recovery criteria four will be met. All effects to habitat will be insignificant or extremely unlikely to occur; therefore, the proposed actions will have no effect on the likelihood that criteria five will be met.

In summary, the effects of the proposed action will not hasten the extinction timeline or otherwise increase the danger of extinction; further, the action will not prevent the species from growing in a way that leads to recovery and the action will not change the rate at which recovery can occur. This is the case because while the action may result in the non-lethal capture of a number of Kemp's ridley sea turtles, these effects will be undetectable over the long-term and the action is not expected to have long term impacts on the future growth of the population or its potential for recovery. Therefore, based on the analysis presented above, the proposed action will not reduce appreciably the likelihood that Kemp's ridley sea turtles can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as endangered or threatened; that is; the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of Kemp's ridley sea turtles.

Despite the threats faced by individual Kemp's ridley sea turtles inside and outside of the action area, the proposed action will not increase the vulnerability of individual sea turtles to these additional threats and exposure to ongoing threats will not increase susceptibility to effects related to the proposed actions. We have considered the effects of the proposed action in light of the status of the species, Environmental Baseline and cumulative effects explained above, including climate change, and have concluded that even in light of the ongoing impacts of these activities and conditions; the conclusions reached above do not change. Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed action, resulting in the non-lethal capture of one green sea turtle over 3 years, is not likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of this species. These conclusions were made in consideration of the endangered status of Kemp's ridley sea turtles, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on the abundance and distribution of Kemp's ridleys in the action area.

8.3 Atlantic sturgeon

In the *Effects of the Action* section above, we determined that 103 Atlantic sturgeon (2 Gulf of Maine, 57 New York Bight, 24 Chesapeake Bay, 14 South Atlantic, and 6 Carolina) are likely to be captured and released alive with only minor, recoverable injuries over the three years of trawl surveys. We do not expect the entanglement or capture of any Atlantic sturgeon in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. We concluded that project vessel strikes to Atlantic sturgeon are extremely unlikely. We also concluded that the effect of adding the project vessels to the baseline cannot be meaningfully measured, detected, or evaluated; therefore, effects are also insignificant. No consequences are anticipated in the extremely unlikely event of an interaction with the AUV system. We determined that effects to hearing associated with noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV are extremely unlikely. We also determined that effects to habitat and prey are insignificant or extremely unlikely. In this section, we discuss the likely consequences of these effects to individual Atlantic sturgeon and the populations those individuals represent.

8.3.1 Gulf of Maine DPS of Atlantic sturgeon

The Gulf of Maine DPS is listed as threatened. While Atlantic sturgeon occur in several rivers in the Gulf of Maine DPS, recent spawning has only been documented in the Kennebec River. There are no abundance estimates for the Gulf of Maine DPS as a whole. The estimated effective population size of the Kennebec River is less than 70 adults, which suggests a relatively small spawning population (NMFS 2022). NMFS estimated adult and subadult abundance of the Gulf of Maine DPS based on available information for the genetic composition and the estimated abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in marine waters (Damon-Randall et al. 2013, Kocik et al. 2013) and concluded that subadult and adult abundance of the Gulf of Maine DPS was 7,455 sturgeon (NMFS 2013). This number encompasses many age classes since, across all DPSs, subadults can be as young as one year old when they first enter the marine environment, and adults can live as long as 64 years (Balazik et al. 2012a; Hilton et al. 2016).

Gulf of Maine origin Atlantic sturgeon are subject to numerous sources of human induced mortality and habitat disturbance throughout the riverine and marine portions of their range. There is currently not enough information to establish a trend for any life stage or for the DPS as a whole. The ASMFC stock assessment concluded that the abundance of the Gulf of Maine DPS is “depleted” relative to historical levels. The Commission also noted that the Gulf of Maine is particularly data poor among all five DPSs. The assessment concluded that there is a 51 percent probability that the abundance of the Gulf of Maine DPS has increased since implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium. The Commission also concluded that there is a relatively high likelihood (74 percent probability) that mortality for the Gulf of Maine DPS exceeds the mortality threshold used for the assessment (ASMFC 2017). However, the Commission noted that there was considerable uncertainty related to these numbers, particularly concerning trends data for the Gulf of Maine DPS. For example, the stock assessment notes that it was not clear if: (1) the percent probability for the trend in abundance for the Gulf of Maine DPS is a reflection of the actual trend in abundance or of the underlying data quality for the DPS; and, (2) the percent probability that the Gulf of Maine DPS exceeds the mortality threshold actually reflects lower survival or was due to increased tagging model uncertainty owing to low sample sizes and potential emigration.

As described in the 5-Year Review for the Gulf of Maine DPS (NMFS 2022), the demographic risk for the DPS is “moderate”[17] because of its low productivity (i.e., relatively few adults compared to historical levels), low abundance (i.e., only one known spawning population and low DPS abundance, overall), and limited spatial distribution (i.e., limited spawning habitat within the one river known to support spawning). There is also new information indicating

[17] 84 FR 18243; April 30, 2019 - Listing and Recovery Priority Guidelines.

genetic bottlenecks as well as low levels of inbreeding. However, the recovery potential is considered high.

The effects of the action are in addition to ongoing threats in the action area, which include incidental capture in state and federal fisheries, boat strikes, coastal development, habitat loss, contaminants, and climate change. Entanglement in fishing gear and vessel strikes as described in the *Environmental Baseline* may occur in the action area over the six field sampling seasons for the proposed project. As noted in the *Cumulative Effects* section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action due to anticipated climate change.

We have considered effects of the proposed project over the six field sampling seasons in consideration of the effects already accounted for in the Environmental Baseline and in consideration of Cumulative Effects and climate change. The only adverse effects of the proposed action on Atlantic sturgeon are the non-lethal capture of two Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the bottom trawl survey. We do not anticipate any adverse effects to result from interactions with the AUV system or any noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV. We do not expect any Atlantic sturgeon to be struck by any project vessels operating between the project area and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. We do not expect the entanglement or capture of any Atlantic sturgeon in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. We do not expect the field sampling methods for the proposed project to result in any changes in the abundance, or reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area; changes in distribution will be minor and temporary as a result of the capture in the trawl. All effects to Atlantic sturgeon from impacts to habitat and prey will be insignificant.

Live sturgeon captured and released in the trawl survey may experience minor injuries (i.e., scrapes, abrasions); however, they are expected to make a complete recovery without any impairment to future fitness. Capture will temporarily prevent these individuals from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the sturgeon are returned to the water; for trawls the length of capture will be no more than the 30 minute tow time plus a short handling period on board the vessel. The capture of live sturgeon will not reduce the numbers of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or the numbers of Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon as a whole. Similarly, as the capture of live Atlantic sturgeon will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated. The capture of live Atlantic sturgeon is also not likely to affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon throughout their range. As any effects to individual live Atlantic sturgeon removed from the trawl gear will be minor and temporary without any mortality or effects on reproduction, we do not anticipate any population level impacts.

The proposed project will not result in the mortality of any Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon. As such, there will be no reduction in individual fitness and no effects on reproductive potential. The proposed action is not likely to reduce distribution, because the action will not impede Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon from accessing any seasonal aggregation areas, including foraging, spawning, or overwintering grounds.

Based on the information provided above, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival of the Gulf of Maine DPS (i.e., it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment). The action will not affect the Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring, and it will not result in consequences to the environment which would prevent Atlantic sturgeon from completing their entire life cycle or completing essential behaviors including reproducing, foraging and sheltering. This is the case because: (1) the proposed action will not result in any mortality and associated loss of potential future reproduction; (2) the proposed action will not change the status or trends of the species as a whole; (3) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (4) there will be no change to the overall distribution of Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or throughout their range; and, (5) the action will have no effect on individual foraging or sheltering Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon.

In rare instances, an action that does not appreciably reduce the likelihood of a species' survival might appreciably reduce its likelihood of recovery. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the Gulf of Maine DPS of Atlantic sturgeon will survive in the wild, which includes consideration of recovery potential. Here, we consider whether the action will appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery from the perspective of ESA Section 4. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing under Section 4(a) as "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range" (endangered) or "likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range…" (threatened) is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will appreciably reduce the likelihood that Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon can rebuild to a point where the Gulf of Maine DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is no longer likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

No Recovery Plan for the Gulf of Maine DPS has been published. The Recovery Plan will outline the steps necessary for recovery and the demographic criteria, which once attained would allow the species to be delisted. In January 2018, we published a Recovery Outline for the five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon (NMFS 2018[18]). This outline is meant to serve as an interim guidance document to direct recovery efforts, including recovery planning, until a full recovery plan is developed and approved. The outline provides a preliminary strategy for recovery of the species.

[18] Available online at: https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/ats_recovery_outline.pdf; last accessed Sept. 17, 2021

We know that in general, to recover, a listed species must have a sustained positive trend of increasing population over time. To allow that to happen for sturgeon, individuals must have access to enough habitat in suitable condition for foraging, resting and spawning. Conditions must be suitable for the successful development of early life stages. Mortality rates must be low enough to allow for recruitment to all age classes so that successful spawning can continue over time and over generations. There must be enough suitable habitat for spawning, foraging, resting, and migrations of all individuals. For Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon, habitat conditions must be suitable both in the natal river and in other rivers and estuaries where foraging by subadults and adults will occur and in the ocean where subadults and adults migrate, overwinter and forage. Habitat connectivity must also be maintained so that individuals can migrate between important habitats without delays that impact their fitness. As described in the vision statement in the Recovery Outline, subpopulations of all five Atlantic sturgeon DPSs must be present across the historical range. These subpopulations must be of sufficient size and genetic diversity to support successful reproduction and recovery from mortality events. The recruitment of juveniles to the sub-adult and adult life stages must also increase and that increased recruitment must be maintained over many years. Recovery of these DPSs will require conservation of the riverine and marine habitats used for spawning, development, foraging, and growth by abating threats to ensure a high probability of survival into the future. Here, we consider whether this proposed action will reduce the Gulf of Maine DPS likelihood of recovery.

This action will not change the status or trend of the Gulf of Maine DPS. The proposed action will not affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon across the historical range. The proposed action will not result in mortality or reduction in future reproductive output beyond what was considered in the Environmental Baseline and will not impair the species' resiliency, genetic diversity, recruitment, or year class strength. The proposed action will have only insignificant effects on habitat and forage and will not impact habitat in a way that makes additional growth of the population less likely, that is, it will not reduce the habitat's carrying capacity. This is because impacts to forage will be insignificant or extremely unlikely. For these reasons, the action will not reduce the likelihood that the Gulf of Maine DPS can recover. Therefore, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the Gulf of Maine DPS of Atlantic sturgeon can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as threatened; that is, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of the Gulf of Maine DPS. Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed action is not likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of this species. These conclusions were made in consideration of the status of the Gulf of Maine DPS of Atlantic sturgeon, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on the abundance, reproduction, and distribution of the Gulf of Maine DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

8.3.2 New York Bight DPS of Atlantic sturgeon

The New York Bight DPS is listed as endangered. While Atlantic sturgeon occur in several rivers in the New York Bight, recent spawning has only been documented in the Hudson and Delaware Rivers. The essential physical features necessary to support spawning and recruitment are also present in the Connecticut and Housatonic Rivers (82 FR 39160; August 17, 2017).

However, there is no current evidence that spawning is occurring nor are there studies underway to investigate spawning occurrence in those rivers; except one recent study where young of year (YOY) fish of were captured in the Connecticut River (Savoy *et al.* 2017). Genetic analysis suggests that the YOY belonged to the South Atlantic DPS and at this time, we do not know if these fish were the result of a single spawning event due to unique straying of the adults from the South Atlantic DPS's spawning rivers. NMFS estimated adult and subadult abundance of the New York Bight DPS based on available information for the genetic composition and the estimated abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in marine waters (Damon-Randall et al. 2013, Kocik et al. 2013) and concluded that subadult and adult abundance of the New York Bight DPS was 34,566 sturgeon (NMFS 2013). This number encompasses many age classes since, across all DPSs, subadults can be as young as one year old when they first enter the marine environment, and adults can live as long as 64 years (Balazik et al. 2012a; Hilton et al. 2016).

The 2017 ASMFC stock assessment determined that abundance of the New York Bight DPS is "depleted" relative to historical levels (ASMFC 2017). The assessment also determined there is a relatively high probability (75 percent) that the New York Bight DPS abundance has increased since the implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium, and a 31 percent probability that mortality for the New York Bight DPS exceeds the mortality threshold used for the assessment (ASMFC 2017). The Commission noted, however, there is significant uncertainty in relation to the trend data. Moreover, new information suggests that the Commission's conclusions primarily reflect the status and trend of only the DPS's Hudson River spawning population.

New York Bight DPS origin Atlantic sturgeon are subject to numerous sources of human induced mortality and habitat disturbance throughout the riverine and marine portions of their range. The largest single source of mortality appears to be capture as bycatch in commercial fisheries operating in the marine environment. Because early life stages and juveniles do not leave the river, they are not impacted by fisheries occurring in federal waters. Bycatch and mortality also occur in state fisheries; however, the primary fishery that impacted juvenile sturgeon (the shad fishery) has now been closed and there is no indication that it will reopen soon. New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon are killed as a result of other anthropogenic activities in the Hudson, Delaware, and other rivers within the New York Bight as well; sources of potential mortality include vessel strikes and entrainment in dredges.

The effects of the action are in addition to ongoing threats in the action area, which include incidental capture in state and federal fisheries, boat strikes, coastal development, habitat loss, contaminants, and climate change. Entanglement in fishing gear and vessel strikes as described in the *Environmental Baseline* may occur in the action area over the life of the proposed action. As noted in the *Cumulative Effects* section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action due to anticipated climate change.

We have considered effects of the proposed project over the six field sampling seasons in consideration of the effects already accounted for in the Environmental Baseline and in consideration of Cumulative Effects and climate change. The only adverse effects of the proposed action on Atlantic sturgeon are the non-lethal capture of 58 New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the bottom trawl survey. We do not anticipate any adverse effects to result from interactions with the AUV system or any noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV. We do not expect any Atlantic sturgeon to be struck by any project vessels operating between the project area and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. We do not expect the entanglement or capture of any Atlantic sturgeon in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. We do not expect the field sampling methods for the proposed project to result in any changes in the abundance or reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area; changes in distribution will be minor and temporary as a result of the capture in the trawl. All effects to Atlantic sturgeon from impacts to habitat and prey will be insignificant.

Live sturgeon captured and released in the trawl survey may experience minor injuries (i.e., scrapes, abrasions); however, they are expected to make a complete recovery without any impairment to future fitness. Capture will temporarily prevent these individuals from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the sturgeon are returned to the water; for trawls the length of capture will be no more than the 30 minute tow time plus a short handling period on board the vessel. The capture of live sturgeon will not reduce the numbers of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or the numbers of New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon as a whole. Similarly, as the capture of live Atlantic sturgeon will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated. The capture of live Atlantic sturgeon is also not likely to affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon throughout their range. As any effects to individual live Atlantic sturgeon removed from the trawl gear will be minor and temporary without any mortality or effects on reproduction, we do not anticipate any population level impacts.

The proposed project will not result in the mortality of any New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon. As such, there will be no reduction in individual fitness and no effects on reproductive potential. The proposed action is not likely to reduce distribution, because the action will not impede New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon from accessing any seasonal aggregation areas, including foraging, spawning, or overwintering grounds.

Based on the information provided above, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival of the New York Bight DPS (*i.e.*, it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment). The action will not affect the New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring, and it will not result in consequences to the environment which would prevent Atlantic sturgeon from completing their entire life cycle or completing essential behaviors including reproducing, foraging and sheltering. This is the case because: (1) the proposed action will not result in any mortality and the associated loss of potential future reproduction; (2) the proposed action will not change the status or trends of the species as a whole; (3) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (4) there will be no change to the overall distribution of New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or throughout their range; and, (5) the action will have no effect on individual foraging or sheltering New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon.

In rare instances, an action that does not appreciably reduce the likelihood of a species' survival might appreciably reduce its likelihood of recovery. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the New York Bight DPS of Atlantic sturgeon will survive in the wild, which includes consideration of recovery potential. Here, we consider whether the action will appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery from the perspective of ESA Section 4. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing under Section 4(a) as "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range" (endangered) or "likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range…" (threatened) is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will appreciably reduce the likelihood that New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon can rebuild to a point where the New York Bight DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is no longer in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

No Recovery Plan for the New York Bight DPS has been published. The Recovery Plan will outline the steps necessary for recovery and the demographic criteria, which once attained would allow the species to be delisted. In January 2018, we published a Recovery Outline for the five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon (NMFS 2018). This outline is meant to serve as an interim guidance document to direct recovery efforts, including recovery planning, until a full recovery plan is developed and approved. The outline provides a preliminary strategy for recovery of the species. We know that in general, to recover, a listed species must have a sustained positive trend of increasing population over time. To allow that to happen for sturgeon, individuals must have access to enough habitat in suitable condition for foraging, resting and spawning. Conditions must be suitable for the successful development of early life stages. Mortality rates must be low enough to allow for recruitment to all age classes so that successful spawning can continue over time and over generations. There must be enough suitable habitat for spawning, foraging, resting, and migrations of all individuals. For New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon, habitat conditions must be suitable both in the natal river and in other rivers and estuaries where foraging by subadults and adults will occur and in the ocean where subadults and adults migrate, overwinter and forage. Habitat connectivity must also be maintained so that individuals can migrate between important habitats without delays that impact their fitness. As described in the vision statement in the Recovery Outline, subpopulations of all five Atlantic sturgeon DPSs must be present across the historical range. These subpopulations must be of sufficient size and genetic diversity to support successful reproduction and recovery from mortality events. The recruitment of juveniles to the sub-adult and adult life stages must also increase and that increased recruitment must be maintained over many years. Recovery of these DPSs will require conservation of the riverine and marine habitats used for spawning, development, foraging, and growth by abating threats to ensure a high probability of survival into the future. Here, we consider whether this proposed action will reduce the New York Bight DPS likelihood of recovery.

This action will not change the status or trend of the New York Bight DPS. The proposed action will not affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon across the historical range. The proposed action will not result in mortality or reduction in future reproductive output beyond what was considered in the Environmental Baseline and will not impair the species' resiliency, genetic diversity, recruitment, or year class strength. The proposed action will have only insignificant effects on habitat and forage and will not impact habitat in a way that makes additional growth of the population less likely, that is, it will not reduce the habitat's carrying capacity. This is because impacts to forage will be insignificant or extremely unlikely. For these reasons, the action will not reduce the likelihood that the New York Bight DPS can recover. Therefore, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the New York Bight DPS of Atlantic sturgeon can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as endangered; that is, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of the New York Bight DPS. Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed action is not likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of this species. These conclusions were made in consideration of the status of the New York Bight DPS of Atlantic sturgeon, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on the abundance, reproduction, and distribution of the New York Bight DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

8.3.3 Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon

The Chesapeake Bay DPS is listed as endangered. While Atlantic sturgeon occur in several rivers in the Chesapeake Bay DPS, at the time of listing spawning was only known to occur in the James River. Since the listing, there is evidence of additional spawning populations in the Chesapeake Bay DPS, including the Pamunkey River, a tributary of the York River, and in Marshyhope Creek, a tributary of the Nanticoke River (Hager et al. 2014, Kahn et al. 2014, Richardson and Secor 2016, Secor et al. 2021). Detections of acoustically-tagged adult Atlantic sturgeon along with historical evidence suggests that Atlantic sturgeon belonging to the Chesapeake Bay DPS may be spawning in the Mattaponi and Rappahannock rivers as well (Hilton et al. 2016, ASMFC 2017, Kahn et al. 2019). However, information for these populations is limited and the research is ongoing.

Chesapeake Bay origin Atlantic sturgeon are affected by numerous sources of human induced mortality and habitat disturbance throughout the riverine and marine portions of their range. There is currently no census nor enough information to establish a trend, for any life stage, for the James River spawning population, or for the DPS as a whole. However, the NEAMAP data indicates that the estimated ocean population of Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon is 8,811 sub-adult and adult individuals (2,203 adults and 6,608 subadults). The ASMFC (2017) stock assessment determined that abundance of the Chesapeake Bay DPS is "depleted" relative to historical levels. The assessment, while noting significant uncertainty in trend data, also determined that there is a relatively low probability (36 percent) that abundance of the Chesapeake Bay DPS has increased since the implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium, and a 30 percent probability that mortality for the Chesapeake Bay DPS exceeds the mortality threshold used for the assessment (ASMFC 2017).

As described in the 5-Year Review for the Chesapeake Bay DPS (NMFS 2022), the demographic risk for the DPS is "High" because of its low productivity (e.g., relatively few adults compared to historical levels and irregular spawning success), low abundance (e.g., only three known spawning populations and low DPS abundance, overall), and limited spatial distribution (e.g. limited spawning habitat within each of the few known rivers that support spawning). There is also new information indicating genetic bottlenecks as well as low levels of inbreeding. However, the recovery potential is considered high.

The effects of the action are in addition to ongoing threats in the action area, which include incidental capture in state and federal fisheries, boat strikes, coastal development, habitat loss, contaminants, and climate change. Entanglement in fishing gear and vessel strikes as described in the *Environmental Baseline* may occur in the action area over the life of the proposed action. As noted in the *Cumulative Effects* section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the *Status of the Species* and *Environmental Baseline* sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action due to anticipated climate change.

We have considered effects of the proposed project over the six field sampling seasons in consideration of the effects already accounted for in the Environmental Baseline and in consideration of Cumulative Effects and climate change. The only adverse effects of the proposed action on Atlantic sturgeon are the non-lethal capture of 24 Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the bottom trawl survey. We do not anticipate any adverse effects to result from interactions with the AUV system or any noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV. We do not expect any Atlantic sturgeon to be struck by any project vessels operating between the project area and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. We do not expect the entanglement or capture of any Atlantic sturgeon in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. We do not expect the field sampling methods for the proposed project to result in any changes in the abundance or reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area; changes in distribution will be minor and temporary as a result of the capture in the trawl. All effects to Atlantic sturgeon from impacts to habitat and prey will be insignificant.

Live sturgeon captured and released in the trawl survey may experience minor injuries (i.e., scrapes, abrasions); however, they are expected to make a complete recovery without any impairment to future fitness. Capture will temporarily prevent these individuals from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the sturgeon are returned to the water; for trawls the length of capture will be no more than the 30 minute tow time plus a short handling period on board the vessel. The capture of live sturgeon will not reduce the numbers of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or the numbers of Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon as a whole. Similarly, as the capture of live Atlantic sturgeon will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated. The capture of live Atlantic sturgeon is also not likely to affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon throughout their range. As any effects to individual live Atlantic sturgeon removed from the trawl gear will be minor and temporary without any mortality or effects on reproduction, we do not anticipate any population level impacts.

The proposed project will not result in the mortality of any Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon. As such, there will be no reduction in individual fitness and no effects on reproductive potential. The proposed action is not likely to reduce distribution, because the action will not impede Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon from accessing any seasonal aggregation areas, including foraging, spawning, or overwintering grounds.

Based on the information provided above, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival of the Chesapeake Bay DPS (*i.e.*, it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment). The action will not affect the Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring, and it will not result in consequences to the environment which would prevent Atlantic sturgeon from completing their entire life cycle or completing essential behaviors including reproducing, foraging and sheltering. This is the case because: (1) the proposed action will not result in any mortality and associated loss of potential future reproduction; (2) the proposed action will not change the status or trends of the species as a whole; (3) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (4) there will be no change to the overall distribution of Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or throughout their range; and, (5) the action will have no effect on individual foraging or sheltering Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon.

In rare instances, an action that does not appreciably reduce the likelihood of a species' survival might appreciably reduce its likelihood of recovery. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon will survive in the wild, which includes consideration of recovery potential. Here, we consider whether the action will appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery from the perspective of ESA Section 4. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing under Section 4(a) as "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range" (endangered) or "likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range…" (threatened) is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will appreciably reduce the likelihood that Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon can rebuild to a point where the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is no longer in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

No Recovery Plan for the Chesapeake Bay DPS has been published. The Recovery Plan will outline the steps necessary for recovery and the demographic criteria, which once attained would allow the species to be delisted. In January 2018, we published a Recovery Outline for the five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon (NMFS 2018[19]). This outline is meant to serve as an interim guidance document to direct recovery efforts, including recovery planning, until a full recovery plan is developed and approved. The outline provides a preliminary strategy for recovery of the species. We know that in general, to recover, a listed species must have a sustained positive trend of increasing population over time. To allow that to happen for sturgeon, individuals must have access to enough habitat in suitable condition for foraging, resting and spawning. Conditions must be suitable for the successful development of early life stages. Mortality rates must be low enough to allow for recruitment to all age classes so that successful spawning can continue over time and over generations. There must be enough suitable habitat for spawning, foraging, resting, and migrations of all individuals. For Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon, habitat conditions must be suitable both in the natal river and in other rivers and estuaries where foraging by subadults and adults will occur and in the ocean where subadults and adults migrate, overwinter and forage. Habitat connectivity must also be maintained so that individuals can migrate between important habitats without delays that impact their fitness. As described in the vision statement in the Recovery Outline, subpopulations of all five Atlantic sturgeon DPSs must be present across the historical range. These subpopulations must be of sufficient size and genetic diversity to support successful reproduction and recovery from mortality events. The recruitment of juveniles to the sub-adult and adult life stages must also increase and that increased recruitment must be maintained over many years. Recovery of these DPSs will require conservation of the riverine and marine habitats used for spawning, development, foraging, and growth by abating threats to ensure a high probability of survival into the future. Here, we consider whether this proposed action will reduce the Chesapeake Bay DPS likelihood of recovery.

This action will not change the status or trend of the Chesapeake Bay DPS. The proposed action will not affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon across the historical range. The proposed action will not result in mortality or reduction in future reproductive output beyond what was considered in the Environmental Baseline and will not impair the species' resiliency, genetic diversity, recruitment, or year class strength. The proposed action will have only insignificant effects on habitat and forage and will not impact habitat in a way that makes additional growth of the population less likely, that is, it will not reduce the habitat's carrying capacity. This is because impacts to forage will be insignificant or extremely unlikely. For these reasons, the action will not reduce the likelihood that the Chesapeake Bay DPS can recover. Therefore, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as endangered; that is, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of the Chesapeake Bay DPS. Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed action is not likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of this species. These conclusions were made in consideration of the status of the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on

[19] Available online at: https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/ats_recovery_outline.pdf; last accessed Sept. 17, 2021

the abundance, reproduction, and distribution of the Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

8.3.4 Carolina DPS of Atlantic sturgeon

The Carolina DPS is listed as endangered. Atlantic sturgeon from the Carolina DPS spawn in the rivers of North Carolina south to the Cooper River, South Carolina. There are currently seven spawning subpopulations within the Carolina DPS: Roanoke River, Tar-Pamlico River, Neuse River, Northeast Cape Fear and Cape Fear Rivers, Waccamaw and Great Pee Dee Rivers, Black River, Santee and Cooper Rivers. NMFS estimated adult and subadult abundance of the Carolina DPS based on available information for the genetic composition and the estimated abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in marine waters (Damon-Randall et al. 2013, Kocik et al. 2013) and concluded that subadult and adult abundance of the Carolina DPS was 1,356 sturgeon (339 adults and 1,017 subadults) (NMFS 2013). This number encompasses many age classes since, across all DPSs, subadults can be as young as two years old when they first enter the marine environment, and adults can live as long as 64 years (Balazik et al. 2012; Hilton et al. 2016).

Very few data sets are available that cover the full potential life span of an Atlantic sturgeon. The ASMFC concluded for the Stock Assessment that it could not estimate abundance of the Carolina DPS or otherwise quantify the trend in abundance because of the limited available information. However, the Stock Assessment was a comprehensive review of the available information, and used multiple methods and analyses to assess the status of the Carolina DPS and the coast wide stock of Atlantic sturgeon. For example, the Stock Assessment Subcommittee defined a benchmark, the mortality threshold, against which mortality for the coast wide stock of Atlantic sturgeon as well as for each DPS were compared[20] to assess whether the current mortality experienced by the coast wide stock and each DPS is greater than what it can sustain. This information informs the current trend of the Carolina DPS.

In the Stock Assessment, the ASMFC concluded that abundance of the Carolina DPS is "depleted" relative to historical levels and there is a relatively low probability (36 percent) that abundance of the Carolina DPS has increased since the implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium. The ASMFC also concluded that there is a relatively low likelihood (25 percent probability) that mortality for the Carolina DPS does not exceed the mortality threshold used for the Stock Assessment (ASMFC 2017).

The effects of the action are in addition to ongoing threats in the action area, which include incidental capture in state and federal fisheries, boat strikes, coastal development, habitat loss, contaminants, and climate change. Entanglement in fishing gear and vessel strikes as described in the *Environmental Baseline*, may occur in the action area over the life of the proposed action. As noted in the *Cumulative Effects* section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the *Status of the Species* and Environmental Baseline sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may

[20]The analysis considered both a coast wide mortality threshold and a region-specific mortality threshold to evaluate the sensitivity of the model to differences in life history parameters among the different DPSs (e.g., Atlantic sturgeon in the northern region are slower growing, longer lived; Atlantic sturgeon in the southern region are faster growing, shorter lived).

contribute to climate change. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action due to anticipated climate change.

We have considered effects of the proposed project over the six field sampling seasons in consideration of the effects already accounted for in the Environmental Baseline and in consideration of Cumulative Effects and climate change. The only adverse effects of the proposed action on Atlantic sturgeon are the non-lethal capture of six Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the bottom trawl survey. We do not anticipate any adverse effects to result from interactions with the AUV system or any noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV. We do not expect any Atlantic sturgeon to be struck by any project vessels operating between the project area and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. We do not expect the entanglement or capture of any Atlantic sturgeon in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. We do not expect the field sampling methods for the proposed project to result in any changes in the abundance or reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area; changes in distribution will be minor and temporary as a result of the capture in the trawl. All effects to Atlantic sturgeon from impacts to habitat and prey will be insignificant.

Live sturgeon captured and released in the trawl survey may experience minor injuries (i.e., scrapes, abrasions); however, they are expected to make a complete recovery without any impairment to future fitness. Capture will temporarily prevent these individuals from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the sturgeon are returned to the water; for trawls the length of capture will be no more than the 30 minute tow time plus a short handling period on board the vessel. The capture of live sturgeon will not reduce the numbers of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or the numbers of Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon as a whole. Similarly, as the capture of live Atlantic sturgeon will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated. The capture of live Atlantic sturgeon is also not likely to affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon throughout their range. As any effects to individual live Atlantic sturgeon removed from the trawl gear will be minor and temporary without any mortality or effects on reproduction, we do not anticipate any population level impacts.

The proposed project will not result in the mortality of any Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon. There will be no effects on reproduction of any Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon. The proposed action is not likely to reduce distribution, because the action will not impede Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon from accessing any seasonal aggregation areas, including foraging, spawning, or overwintering grounds.

Based on the information provided above, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival of the Carolina DPS (*i.e.*, it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment). The action will not affect the Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring, and it will not result in consequences to the environment which would prevent Atlantic sturgeon from completing their entire life cycle or completing essential behaviors including reproducing, foraging and sheltering. This is the case because: (1) the proposed action will not result in any mortality and associated loss of potential future reproduction; (2) the proposed action will not change the status or trends of the species as a whole; (3) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (4) there will be no change to the overall distribution of Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or throughout their range; and, (5) the action will have no effect on individual foraging or sheltering Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon.

In rare instances, an action that does not appreciably reduce the likelihood of a species' survival might appreciably reduce its likelihood of recovery. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the Carolina DPS of Atlantic sturgeon will survive in the wild, which includes consideration of recovery potential. Here, we consider whether the action will appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery from the perspective of ESA Section 4. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing under Section 4(a) as "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range" (endangered) or "likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range…" (threatened) is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will appreciably reduce the likelihood that Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon can rebuild to a point where the Carolina DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is no longer in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

No Recovery Plan for the Carolina DPS has been published. The Recovery Plan will outline the steps necessary for recovery and the demographic criteria, which once attained would allow the species to be delisted. In January 2018, we published a Recovery Outline for the five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon (NMFS 2018). This outline is meant to serve as an interim guidance document to direct recovery efforts, including recovery planning, until a full recovery plan is developed and approved. The outline provides a preliminary strategy for recovery of the species. We know that in general, to recover, a listed species must have a sustained positive trend of increasing population over time. To allow that to happen for sturgeon, individuals must have access to enough habitat in suitable condition for foraging, resting and spawning. Conditions must be suitable for the successful development of early life stages. Mortality rates must be low enough to allow for recruitment to all age classes so that successful spawning can continue over time and over generations. There must be enough suitable habitat for spawning, foraging, resting, and migrations of all individuals. For Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon, habitat conditions must be suitable both in the natal river and in other rivers and estuaries where foraging by subadults and adults will occur and in the ocean where subadults and adults migrate, overwinter and forage. Habitat connectivity must also be maintained so that individuals can migrate between important habitats without delays that impact their fitness. As described in the vision statement in the Recovery Outline, subpopulations of all five Atlantic sturgeon DPSs must be present across the historical range. These subpopulations must be of sufficient size and genetic diversity to support successful reproduction and recovery from mortality events. The recruitment of juveniles to the sub-adult and adult life stages must also increase and that increased recruitment must be maintained over many years. Recovery of these DPSs will require conservation of the riverine and marine habitats used for spawning, development, foraging, and growth by abating threats to ensure a high probability of survival into the future. Here, we consider whether this proposed action will reduce the Carolina DPS likelihood of recovery.

This action will not change the status or trend of the Carolina DPS. The proposed action will not affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon across the historical range. The proposed action will not result in mortality or reduction in future reproductive output of the Carolina DPS and will not impair the species' resiliency, genetic diversity, recruitment, or year class strength. The proposed action will have only insignificant effects on habitat and forage and will not impact habitat in a way that makes additional growth of the population less likely, that is, it will not reduce the habitat's carrying capacity. This is because impacts to forage will be insignificant or extremely unlikely. For these reasons, the action will not reduce the likelihood that the Carolina DPS can recover. Therefore, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the Carolina DPS of Atlantic sturgeon can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as endangered; that is, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of the Carolina DPS. Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed action is not likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of this species. These conclusions were made in consideration of the status of the Carolina DPS of Atlantic sturgeon, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on the abundance, reproduction, and distribution of the Carolina DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

8.3.5 South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic sturgeon

The South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon is listed as endangered and Atlantic sturgeon originate from at least six rivers where spawning potentially still occurs. Secor (2002) estimates that 8,000 adult females were present in South Carolina prior to 1890. In Georgia, prior to the collapse of the fishery in the late 1800s, the sturgeon fishery was the third largest fishery. Secor (2002) estimated from U.S. Fish Commission landing reports that approximately 11,000 spawning females were likely present in Georgia prior to 1890. At the time of listing, only six spawning subpopulations were thought to have existed in the South Atlantic DPS: Combahee River, Edisto River, Savannah River, Ogeechee River, Altamaha River (including the Oconee and Ocmulgee tributaries), and the Satilla River. Three of the spawning subpopulations in the South Atlantic DPS are relatively robust and are considered the second (Altamaha River) and third (Combahee/Edisto River) largest spawning subpopulations across all five DPSs. Peterson *et al.* (2008) estimated the number of spawning adults in the Altamaha River was 324 (95 percent CI: 143-667) in 2004 and 386 (95 percent CI: 216-787) in 2005. Bahr and Peterson (2016) estimated the age-1 juvenile abundance in the Savannah River from 2013-2015 at 528 in 2013, 589 in 2014, and 597 in 2015. No census of the number of Atlantic sturgeon in any of the other spawning rivers or for the DPS as a whole is available. However, the NEAMAP data indicates that the estimated ocean population of South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon sub-adults and adults is 14,911 individuals (3,728 adults and 11,183 subadults).

The 2017 ASMFC stock assessment determined that abundance of the South Atlantic DPS is "depleted" relative to historical levels (ASMFC 2017). Due to a lack of suitable indices, the assessment was unable to determine the probability that the abundance of the South Atlantic DPS has increased since the implementation of the 1998 fishing moratorium. However, it was estimated that there is a 40 percent probability that mortality for the South Atlantic DPS exceeds the mortality threshold used for the assessment (ASMFC 2017). We note that the Commission expressed significant uncertainty in relation to the trends data.

The effects of the action are in addition to ongoing threats in the action area, which include incidental capture in state and federal fisheries, boat strikes, coastal development, habitat loss, contaminants, and climate change. Entanglement in fishing gear and vessel strikes as described in the *Environmental Baseline*, may occur in the action area over the life of the proposed action. This includes the mortality of no more than one South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon resulting from Ocean Wind 1 vessels transiting in the Delaware River to/from the New Jersey Wind Port. As noted in the Cumulative Effects section of this Opinion, we have not identified any cumulative effects different from those considered in the Status of the Species and Environmental Baseline sections of this Opinion, inclusive of how those activities may contribute to climate change. As described in section 6.2.5, climate change may result in changes in the distribution or abundance of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area over the life of this project; however, we have not identified any different or exacerbated effects of the action due to anticipated climate change.

We have considered effects of the proposed project over the six field sampling seasons in consideration of the effects already accounted for in the Environmental Baseline and in consideration of Cumulative Effects and climate change. The only adverse effects of the proposed action on Atlantic sturgeon are the non-lethal capture of 14 South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the bottom trawl survey. We do not anticipate any adverse effects to result from interactions with the AUV system or any noise producing survey equipment attached to the AUV. We do not expect any Atlantic sturgeon to be struck by any project vessels operating between the project areas and marinas in Barnegat Light, New Jersey and Tuckerton, New Jersey. We do not expect the entanglement or capture of any Atlantic sturgeon in vertical lines associated with moored telemetry receivers. We do not expect the field sampling methods for the proposed project to result in any changes in the abundance or reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area; changes in distribution will be minor and temporary as a result of the capture in the trawl. All effects to Atlantic sturgeon from impacts to habitat and prey will be insignificant.

Live sturgeon captured and released in the trawl survey may experience minor injuries (i.e., scrapes, abrasions); however, they are expected to make a complete recovery without any impairment to future fitness. Capture will temporarily prevent these individuals from carrying out essential behaviors such as foraging and migrating. However, these behaviors are expected to resume as soon as the sturgeon are returned to the water; for trawls the length of capture will be no more than the 30 minute tow time plus a short handling period on board the vessel. The capture of live sturgeon will not reduce the numbers of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or the numbers of South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon as a whole. Similarly, as the capture of live

Atlantic sturgeon will not affect the fitness of any individual, no effects to reproduction are anticipated. The capture of live Atlantic sturgeon is also not likely to affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon throughout their range. As any effects to individual live Atlantic sturgeon removed from the trawl gear will be minor and temporary without any mortality or effects on reproduction, we do not anticipate any population level impacts.

The proposed project will not result in the mortality of any South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon. There will be no effects on reproduction of any South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon. The proposed action is not likely to reduce distribution, because the action will not impede South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon from accessing any seasonal aggregation areas, including foraging, spawning, or overwintering grounds.

Based on the information provided above, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival of the South Atlantic DPS (*i.e.*, it will not decrease the likelihood that the species will continue to persist into the future with sufficient resilience to allow for the potential recovery from endangerment). The action will not affect the South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon in a way that prevents the species from having a sufficient population, represented by all necessary age classes, genetic heterogeneity, and number of sexually mature individuals producing viable offspring, and it will not result in consequences to the environment which would prevent Atlantic sturgeon from completing their entire life cycle or completing essential behaviors including reproducing, foraging and sheltering. This is the case because: (1) the proposed action will not result in any mortality and associated loss of potential future reproduction; (2) the proposed action will not change the status or trends of the species as a whole; (3) there will be no effect on the levels of genetic heterogeneity in the population; (4) there will be no change to the overall distribution of South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon in the action area or throughout their range; and, (5) the action will have no effect on individual foraging or sheltering South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon.

In rare instances, an action that does not appreciably reduce the likelihood of a species' survival might appreciably reduce its likelihood of recovery. As explained above, we have determined that the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic sturgeon will survive in the wild, which includes consideration of recovery potential. Here, we consider whether the action will appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery from the perspective of ESA Section 4. As noted above, recovery is defined as the improvement in status such that listing under Section 4(a) as "in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range" (endangered) or "likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range…" (threatened) is no longer appropriate. Thus, we have considered whether the proposed action will appreciably reduce the likelihood that South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon can rebuild to a point where the South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic sturgeon is no longer in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

No Recovery Plan for the South Atlantic DPS has been published. The Recovery Plan will outline the steps necessary for recovery and the demographic criteria, which once attained would allow the species to be delisted. In January 2018, we published a Recovery Outline for the five

DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon (NMFS 2018). This outline is meant to serve as an interim guidance document to direct recovery efforts, including recovery planning, until a full recovery plan is developed and approved. The outline provides a preliminary strategy for recovery of the species. We know that in general, to recover, a listed species must have a sustained positive trend of increasing population over time. To allow that to happen for sturgeon, individuals must have access to enough habitat in suitable condition for foraging, resting and spawning. Conditions must be suitable for the successful development of early life stages. Mortality rates must be low enough to allow for recruitment to all age classes so that successful spawning can continue over time and over generations. There must be enough suitable habitat for spawning, foraging, resting, and migrations of all individuals. For South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon, habitat conditions must be suitable both in the natal river and in other rivers and estuaries where foraging by subadults and adults will occur and in the ocean where subadults and adults migrate, overwinter and forage. Habitat connectivity must also be maintained so that individuals can migrate between important habitats without delays that impact their fitness. As described in the vision statement in the Recovery Outline, subpopulations of all five Atlantic sturgeon DPSs must be present across the historical range. These subpopulations must be of sufficient size and genetic diversity to support successful reproduction and recovery from mortality events. The recruitment of juveniles to the sub-adult and adult life stages must also increase and that increased recruitment must be maintained over many years. Recovery of these DPSs will require conservation of the riverine and marine habitats used for spawning, development, foraging, and growth by abating threats to ensure a high probability of survival into the future. Here, we consider whether this proposed action will reduce the South Atlantic DPS likelihood of recovery.

This action will not change the status or trend of the South Atlantic DPS. The proposed action will not affect the distribution of Atlantic sturgeon across the historical range. The proposed action will not result in mortality or reduction in future reproductive output beyond what was considered in the *Environmental Baseline* and will not impair the species' resiliency, genetic diversity, recruitment or year class strength. The proposed action will have only insignificant effects on habitat and forage and will not impact habitat in a way that makes additional growth of the population less likely, that is, it will not reduce the habitat's carrying capacity. For these reasons, the action will not reduce the likelihood that the South Atlantic DPS can recover. Therefore, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood that the South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic sturgeon can be brought to the point at which they are no longer listed as endangered; that is, the proposed action will not appreciably reduce the likelihood of recovery of the South Atlantic DPS. Based on the analysis presented herein, the proposed action is not likely to appreciably reduce the likelihood of both the survival and recovery of this species. These conclusions were made in consideration of the status of the South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic sturgeon, other stressors that individuals are exposed to within the action area as described in the *Environmental Baseline* and *Cumulative Effects*, and any anticipated effects of climate change on the abundance, reproduction, and distribution of the South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic sturgeon in the action area.

9.0 CONCLUSION

After reviewing the current status of the ESA-listed species and critical habitat, the environmental baseline within the action area, the effects of the proposed action, and cumulative effects, it is our biological opinion that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect leatherback sea turtles, fin or North Atlantic right whales and is likely to adversely affect but is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Northwest Atlantic DPS of loggerhead sea turtles, North Atlantic DPS of green sea turtles, Kemp's ridley, or any of the five DPSs of Atlantic sturgeon. No effects to any designated critical habitat are anticipated as no critical habitat occurs in the action area.

10.0 INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Section 9 of the ESA and Federal regulations pursuant to section 4(d) of the ESA prohibit the take of endangered and threatened species, respectively, without a special exemption. In the case of threatened species, section 4(d) of the ESA leaves it to the Secretary's discretion whether and to what extent to extend the statutory 9(a) ''take'' prohibitions, and directs the agency to issue regulations it considers necessary and advisable for the conservation of the species.

"Take" is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harm is further defined by regulation to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to ESA-listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. NMFS has not yet defined "harass" under the ESA in regulation, but has issued interim guidance on the term "harass," defining it as to "create the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering" (NMFS PD 02-110-19). We considered NMFS' interim definition of harassment in evaluating whether the proposed activities are likely to result in harassment of ESA-listed species. Incidental take statements serve a number of functions, including providing reinitiation triggers for all anticipated take, providing exemptions from the Section 9 prohibitions against take, and identifying reasonable and prudent measures that will minimize the impact of anticipated incidental take and monitor incidental take that occurs.

The measures described below are non-discretionary, and must be undertaken by BOEM and their contractors so that they become binding conditions for the exemption in section 7(o)(2) to apply. BOEM has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered by this Incidental Take Statement. If BOEM (1) fails to assume and implement the terms and conditions or (2) fails to require the contractors to adhere to the terms and conditions of the Incidental Take Statement through enforceable terms that are added to grants, permits and/or contracts as appropriate, the protective coverage of section 7(o)(2) may lapse. In order to monitor the impact of incidental take, BOEM must report the progress of the action and its impact on the species to the NMFS as specified in the Incidental Take Statement [50 CFR §402.14(i)(3)] (See U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service's Joint Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Handbook (1998) at 4-49).

10.1 Amount or Extent of Take

Section 7 regulations require NMFS to specify the impact of any incidental take of endangered or threatened species; that is, the amount or extent of such incidental taking on the species (50 C.F.R. §402.14(i)(1)(i)). As explained in the *Effects of the Action* section, we anticipate the capture and minor, recoverable, injury of Northwest Atlantic DPS loggerhead, North Atlantic

DPS green and Kemp's ridley sea turtles and Atlantic sturgeon from the Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, Chesapeake Bay, Carolina, and South Atlantic DPSs in trawl surveys of fisheries resources. No other sources of incidental take are anticipated. We anticipate no more than the amount and type of take described below to result from the proposed action.

We calculated the number of sea turtles and Atlantic sturgeon likely to be captured in trawl gear over the period that the surveys are planned based on available information on capture and injury/mortality rates in similar surveys. No take of any species of ESA-listed marine mammals is anticipated or exempted.

The following amount of incidental take is exempted over the 3-year duration of the planned surveys:

Species	Trawl Surveys	
	Capture, Minor Injury	Serious Injury/Mortality
Gulf of Maine DPS Atlantic sturgeon	2	None
New York Bight DPS Atlantic sturgeon	58	None
Chesapeake Bay DPS Atlantic sturgeon	24	None
South Atlantic DPS Atlantic sturgeon	14	None
Carolina DPS Atlantic sturgeon	6	None
NA DPS green sea turtle	1	None
Kemp's ridley sea turtle	2	None
Leatherback sea turtle	0	None
NWA DPS Loggerhead sea turtle	3	None

If any additional surveys are planned or the survey terms are extended, consultation would need to be reinitiated.

10.2 Effects of the Take

In this opinion, we determined that the amount or extent of anticipated take, coupled with other effects of the proposed action, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any ESA-listed species under NMFS' jurisdiction.

10.3 Reasonable and Prudent Measures

Section 7(b)(4) of the ESA requires that when a proposed agency action is found to be consistent with section 7(a)(2) of the ESA and the proposed action is likely to incidentally take individuals of ESA-listed species, NMFS will issue a statement that specifies the impact of any incidental taking of endangered or threatened species. To minimize such impacts, reasonable and prudent measures, and terms and conditions to implement the measures, must be provided. Only incidental take specified in this ITS that would not occur but for the agency actions described in this Opinion, , is exempt from the taking prohibition of section 9(a), provided that, pursuant to section 7(o) of the ESA, such taking is in compliance with the terms of the ITS. This ITS for sea turtles and sturgeon is effective upon issuance, and the action agency may receive the benefit of the sea turtle and sturgeon take exemption as long as they are complying with the relevant terms and conditions.

Reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs) are measures to minimize the impact (i.e., amount or extent) of incidental take (50 C.F.R. §402.02). The RPMs and terms and conditions are specified as required by 50 CFR 402.14 (i)(1) to minimize the impact of incidental take of ESA-listed species by the proposed action, to document and report that incidental take, and to specify the procedures to be used to handle or dispose of any individuals of a species actually taken. The RPMs and their terms and conditions are nondiscretionary for the action agency.

The RPMs identified here are necessary and appropriate to minimize impacts of incidental take that might otherwise result from the proposed action, to document and report incidental take that does occur, to specify the procedures to be used to handle or dispose of any individual listed species taken. These RPMs and terms and conditions require that all incidental take that occurs is documented and reported to NMFS in a timely manner and that any incidentally taken individual specimens are properly handled, resuscitated if necessary, transported for additional care or reporting, and/or returned to the sea.

Please note that these reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions are in addition to the measures that BOEM and Rutgers have committed to employ during the project (see the *Description of the Proposed Action*). In some cases, the RPMs and Terms and Conditions provide additional detail or clarity to measures that are part of the proposed action. A failure to implement the proposed action as identified in Section 3 of this Opinion would be a change in the action that may render the conclusions of this Opinion and the take exemption inapplicable to the activities carried out, and may necessitate reinitiation of consultation.

All of the RPMs and Terms and Conditions are reasonable and prudent and necessary and appropriate to minimize or document and report the level of incidental take associated with the proposed action. None of the RPMs or the terms and conditions that implement them alter the basic design, location, scope, duration, or timing of the action and all of them involve only minor changes (50 CFR§ 402.14(i)(2)). A copy of this ITS must be on board all survey vessels.

We have determined the following reasonable and prudent measures are necessary and appropriate to minimize, document, and report the impacts of incidental take of threatened and endangered species that occur during implementation of the proposed action:

1. BOEM must contact NMFS before biannual sampling commences and again upon completion of the sampling activity.
2. Effects to ESA-listed species must be minimized during survey activities. Sea turtles and Atlantic sturgeon caught during the surveys must be handled and resuscitated according to established procedures.
3. Effects to, or interactions with, ESA-listed species must be documented during all phases of the proposed action, and all incidental take must be reported to NMFS GARFO.
4. On-site observation and inspection must be conducted as necessary to gather information on the effectiveness and implementation of measures to minimize and monitor incidental take during activities described in this Opinion, including its Incidental Take Statement.

10.4 Terms and Conditions

To be exempt from the prohibitions of section 9 of the ESA, BOEM and Rutgers must comply with the following terms and conditions, which implement the RPMs above. These include the take minimization, monitoring, and reporting measures required by the section 7 regulations (50 C.F.R. §402.14(i)). These terms and conditions are non-discretionary. If the BOEM and/or their contractors fail to ensure compliance with these terms and conditions and the RPMs they implement, the protective coverage of section 7(o)(2) may lapse.

1. To implement RPM #1, BOEM must contact us within 48 hours of beginning and ending of biannual sampling (nmfs.gar.incidental-take@noaa.gov).

2. To comply with RPM #2, at least one of the survey staff onboard the trawl survey must have completed NEFOP observer training or other training in protected species identification and safe handling (inclusive of taking genetic samples from Atlantic sturgeon). Reference materials for identification, disentanglement, safe handling, and genetic sampling procedures must be available on board the survey vessel (available at: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/new-england-mid-atlantic/consultations/section-7-take-reporting-programmatics-greater-atlantic).
3. To implement the requirements of RPM #2, any sea turtles or Atlantic sturgeon caught and/or retrieved in any fisheries survey gear must first be identified to species or species group. Each ESA-listed species caught and/or retrieved must then be properly documented using appropriate equipment and data collection forms. Obtaining biological data and samples must occur as outlined below. Live, uninjured animals should be returned to the water as quickly as possible after completing the required handling and documentation.

a. The Sturgeon and Sea Turtle Take Standard Operating Procedures must be followed (https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/sturgeon_&_sea_turtle_take_sops_external.pdf).
b. Survey vessels should have a passive integrated transponder (PIT) tag reader onboard capable of reading 134.2 kHz and 125 kHz encrypted tags (e.g., Biomark GPR Plus Handheld PIT Tag Reader) and this reader should be used to scan any captured sea turtles and sturgeon for tags. Any recorded tags must be recorded on the take reporting form (see below).
c. Genetic samples must be taken from all captured Atlantic sturgeon (alive or dead) to allow for identification of the DPS of origin of captured individuals and tracking of the amount of incidental take. This must be done in accordance with the *Procedures for Obtaining Sturgeon Fin Clips* (https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/sturgeon_genetics_sampling_revised_june_2019.pdf).
    i. Fin clips must be sent to a NMFS approved laboratory capable of performing genetic analysis and assignment to DPS of origin. To the extent authorized by law, BOEM is responsible for the cost of the genetic analysis. BOEM has arrangements in place to cover the costs of shipping and analysis of any samples. Results of genetic analysis, including assigned DPS of origin must be submitted to NMFS within 6 months of the sample collection.
    ii. Subsamples of all fin clips and accompanying metadata form must be held and submitted to the Atlantic Coast Sturgeon Tissue Research Repository on a quarterly basis. The Sturgeon Genetic Sample Submission Form is available for download at: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/new-england-mid- atlantic/consultations/section-7-take-reporting-programmatics-greater-atlantic).
d. All captured sea turtles and Atlantic sturgeon must be documented with required measurements and photographs. The animal's condition and any marks or injuries must be described. This information must be entered as part of the record for each incidental take. A NMFS Take Report Form must be filled out for each individual sturgeon and sea turtle (download at: https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2021-07/Take%20Report%20Form%2007162021.pdf?null) and submitted to NMFS as described below.

4. To implement the requirements of RPM 2, any sea turtles or Atlantic sturgeon caught and retrieved in gear used in fisheries surveys must be handled and resuscitated (if unresponsive) according to established protocols and whenever at-sea conditions are safe for those handling and resuscitating the animal(s) to do so. Specifically:
    a. Priority must be given to the handling and resuscitation of any sea turtles or sturgeon that are captured in the gear being used, if conditions at sea are safe to do so. Handling times for these species should be minimized (i.e., kept to 15 minutes or less) to limit the amount of stress placed on the animals.
    b. All survey vessels must have copies of the sea turtle handling and resuscitation requirements found at 50 CFR 223.206(d)(1) prior to the commencement of any on-water activity (download at: https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-

migration/sea_turtle_handling_and_resuscitation_measures.pdf). These handling and resuscitation procedures must be carried out any time a sea turtle is incidentally captured and brought onboard the vessel during the proposed actions.

c. If any sea turtles that appear injured, sick, or distressed, are caught and retrieved in fisheries survey gear, survey staff must immediately contact the Greater Atlantic Region Marine Animal Hotline at 866-755-6622 for further instructions and guidance on handling the animal, and potential coordination of transfer to a rehabilitation facility. If unable to contact the hotline (e.g., due to distance from shore or lack of ability to communicate via phone), the USCG should be contacted via VHF marine radio on Channel 16. If required, hard-shelled sea turtles (i.e., non-leatherbacks) may be held on board for up to 24 hours following handling instructions provided by the Hotline, prior to transfer to a rehabilitation facility.
d. Attempts must be made to resuscitate any Atlantic sturgeon that are unresponsive or comatose by providing a running source of water over the gills as described in the Sturgeon Resuscitation Guidelines (https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration-miss/Resuscitation-Cards-120513.pdf).
e. Provided that appropriate cold storage facilities are available on the survey vessel, following the report of a dead sea turtle or sturgeon to NMFS, and if NMFS requests, any dead sea turtle or Atlantic sturgeon must be retained on board the survey vessel for transfer to an appropriately permitted partner or facility on shore as safe to do so.
f. Any live sea turtles or Atlantic sturgeon caught and retrieved in gear used in any fisheries survey must ultimately be released as quickly as possible following the required handling and documentation.

5. To implement the requirements of RPM 3, GARFO PRD must be notified as soon as possible of all interactions or observations of listed species. Specifically:

    a. GARFO PRD must be notified within 24 hours of any interaction with a sea turtle or sturgeon (nmfs.gar.incidental-take@noaa.gov). The report must include at a minimum: (1) survey name and applicable information (e.g., vessel name, station number); (2) GPS coordinates describing the location of the interaction (in decimal degrees); (3) gear type involved; (4) tow time, gear configuration and any other pertinent gear information; (5) time and date of the interaction; and (6) identification of the animal to the species level. Additionally, the e-mail must transmit a copy of the NMFS Take Report Form (download at: https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2021-07/Take%20Report%20Form%2007162021.pdf?null) and a link to or acknowledgement that a clear photograph or video of the animal was taken (multiple photographs are suggested, including at least one photograph of the head scutes). If reporting within 24 hours is not possible due to distance from shore or lack of ability to communicate via phone, fax, or email, reports must be submitted as soon as possible; late reports must be submitted with an explanation for the delay.

b. In the event of a suspected or confirmed vessel strike of a sea turtle or sturgeon by any project vessel in any location, including observation of any injured sea turtle/sturgeon or sea turtle/sturgeon parts, BOEM or their contractors must report the incident to NMFS GARFO (nmfs.gar.incidental-take@noaa.gov; and NMFS New England/Mid-Atlantic Regional Stranding Hotline (866-755-6622)) as soon as feasible. The report must include the following information: (A) Time, date, and location (latitude/longitude) of the incident; (B) Species identification (if known) or description of the animal(s) involved; (C) Vessel's speed during and leading up to the incident; (D) Vessel's course/heading and what operations were being conducted (if applicable); (E) Status of all sound sources in use; (F) Description of avoidance measures/requirements that were in place at the time of the strike and what additional measures were taken, if any, to avoid strike; (G) Environmental conditions (e.g., wind speed and direction, Beaufort scale, cloud cover, visibility) immediately preceding the strike; (H) Estimated size and length of animal that was struck; (I) Description of the behavior of the animal immediately preceding and following the strike; (J) Estimated fate of the animal (e.g., dead, injured but alive, injured and moving, blood or tissue observed in the water, status unknown, disappeared); and (K) To the extent practicable, photographs or video footage of the animal(s).

c. In the event that an injured or dead marine mammal, Atlantic sturgeon, or sea turtle is sighted, BOEM or Rutgers must report the incident to NMFS GARFO (nmfs.gar.incidental-take@noaa.gov) and NMFS New England/Mid-Atlantic Regional Stranding Hotline (866-755-6622) as soon as feasible, but no later than 24 hours from the sighting. The report must include the following information: (A) Time, date, and location (latitude/longitude) of the first discovery (and updated location information if known and applicable); (B) Species identification (if known) or description of the animal(s) involved; (C) Condition of the animal(s) (including carcass condition if the animal is dead); (D) Observed behaviors of the animal(s), if alive; (E) If available, photographs or video footage of the animal(s); and (F) General circumstances under which the animal was discovered. Staff responding to the hotline call will provide any instructions for handling or disposing of any injured or dead animals, which may include coordination of transport to shore, particularly for injured sea turtles.

d. If a North Atlantic right whale is observed at any time by PSOs or personnel on any project vessels, during any project-related activity or during vessel transit, BOEM or their contractors must immediately report sighting information to NMFS (866-755-6622), the U.S. Coast Guard via channel 16 and through the WhaleAlert app (http://www.whalealert.org/).

e. Within 30 days of completion of each survey season, a report must be sent to NMFS that compiles all information on any observations and interactions with

ESA-listed species. This report must also contain information on all survey activities that took place during the season including location of gear set, duration of soak/trawl, and total effort. The report on survey activities must be comprehensive of all activities, regardless of whether ESA-listed species were observed. This report must be submitted by email to nmfs.gar.incidental-take@noaa.gov.

6. To implement the requirements of RPM #4, BOEM must exercise its authority to assess the implementation of measures to minimize and monitor incidental take of ESA-listed species during activities described in this Opinion. If any term and condition(s) is/are not being complied with, BOEM, as appropriate, must immediately take effective action to ensure prompt implementation.

As explained above, reasonable and prudent measures are measures to minimize the amount or extent of incidental take (50 C.F.R. §402.02) that must be implemented in order for the incidental take exemption to be effective. The reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions are specified, as required by 50 CFR 402.14 (i)(1)(ii), (iii) and (iv), to document the incidental take by the proposed action, minimize the impact of that take on ESA-listed species. We document our consideration of these requirements for reasonable and prudent measures and terms and conditions here. We have determined that all of these RPMs and associated terms and conditions are reasonable and necessary or appropriate, to minimize or document take and that they all comply with the minor change rule. That is, none of these RPMs or their implementing terms and conditions alter the basic design, location, scope, duration, or timing of the action, and all involve only minor changes.

RPM 1 and 3/Term and Conditions 1 and 5
Documenting take that occurs is essential to ensure that reinitiation of consultation occurs if the amount or extent of take identified in the ITS is exceeded. Some measures for documenting and reporting take are included in the proposed action. The requirements of Term and Conditions 1 and 5 enhance or clarify those requirements. Documentation and timely reporting of observations of whales, sea turtles, and Atlantic sturgeon is important to monitoring the amount or extent of actual take compared to the amount or extent of take exempted. The reporting requirements included here will allow us to track the progress of the action and associated take. Proper identification and handling of any sturgeon and sea turtles that are captured in the survey gear is essential for documenting take and to minimize the extent of that take (i.e., reducing the potential for further stress, injury, or mortality). The measures identified here are consistent with established best practices for proper handling and documentation of these species.

RPM 2 and 4/Term and Conditions 2-4
RPM 2 and 4 and their associated terms and conditions are reasonable and necessary or appropriate to ensure the proper identification, handling and documentation of any listed species encountered during trawling. This is essential for monitoring the level of incidental take associated with the proposed action. Compliance will also minimize the potential for captures of sturgeon and sea turtles in the trawl gear to be lethal. These RPMs and Terms and Conditions represent only a minor change as compliance may result in a minor increase in cost and will not affect the efficacy or efficiency of the field sampling methods. The required biological

measurements, inclusive of taking fin clips from Atlantic sturgeon, is not expected to increase stress or result in any injury of any captured sea turtle or sturgeon.

RPM 4/Term and Condition 6
RPM 4 and its associated terms and conditions are reasonable and necessary or appropriate to minimize and monitor incidental take. Measures to minimize and monitor incidental take, whether part of the proposed action or this ITS, first must be implemented in order to achieve the beneficial results anticipated in this Opinion for ESA listed species. Likewise, such measures once implemented must be effective at minimizing and monitoring incidental take consistent with the analysis. While the measures described as part of the proposed action and in the ITS are consistent with best practices in other field studies, and are anticipated to be practicable and functional, gathering information in situ through observation, inspection, and assessment may confirm expectations or reveal room for improvement in a measure's design or performance, or in their contractors implementation and compliance.

11.0 CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to Section 7(a)(2), which requires agencies to ensure that all projects will not jeopardize the continued existence of listed species, Section 7(a)(1) of the ESA places a responsibility on all federal agencies to "utilize their authorities in furtherance of the purposes of this Act by carrying out programs for the conservation of endangered species." Conservation Recommendations are discretionary agency activities to minimize or avoid adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species or critical habitat, to help implement recovery plans, or to develop information in furtherance of these identified purposes. As such, NMFS recommends that the BOEM consider implementing the following Conservation Recommendations consistent with its authorities:

1. Support additional research regarding the abundance and distribution of Atlantic sturgeon in the project area in order to understand the distribution and habitat use and aid in density modeling efforts, including the use of acoustic telemetry networks to monitor for tagged fish.
2. Submit all acoustic telemetry data to the Mid-Atlantic Acoustic Telemetry Observation System (MATOS) database for coordinated tracking of marine species over broader spatial scales in US Animal Tracking Network and Ocean Tracking Network.

12.0 REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION

This concludes formal consultation on the proposal by the BOEM to carry out the "New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features: In the Field" research project. As 50 C.F.R. §402.16 states, reinitiation of formal consultation is required and shall be requested by the Federal agency or by the Service, where discretionary Federal involvement or control over the action has been retained or is authorized by law and:
(1) If the amount or extent of taking specified in the incidental take statement is exceeded;
(2) If new information reveals effects of the action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not previously considered;

(3) If the identified action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat that was not considered in the biological opinion or written concurrence; or,
(4) If a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the identified action.

13.0 LITERATURE CITED

Note: citations are organized by section of the Biological Opinion in the heading below; citations that appear in more than one section may appear more than once in this list

1.0 Introduction, 2.0 Consultation History, and 3.0 Description of the Proposed Action

BOEM. 2022. New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features: In the Field Research Project biological assessment.

Grothues, T.M., J. Dobarro, J. Ladd, A. Higgs, G. Niezgoda, and D. Miller. 2008, October. Use of a multi-sensored AUV to telemeter tagged Atlantic sturgeon and map their spawning habitat in the Hudson River, USA. In *2008 IEEE/OES Autonomous Underwater Vehicles* (pp. 1-7). IEEE.

NMFS. 2020b. South Atlantic Regional Biological Opinion (SARBO) for Dredging and Material Placement Activities in the Southeast United States. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation Biological Opinion: SERO-2019-03111. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/sarbo_acoustic_revision_6-2020-opinion_final.pdf.

4.0 Listed Species and Critical Habitat in the Action Area

North Atlantic Right Whale

Baumgartner, M.F., F.W. Wenzel, N.S.J. Lysiak, and M.R. Patrician. 2017. North Atlantic Right Whale Foraging Ecology and its Role in Human-Caused Mortality. Marine Ecological Progress Series 581: 165–181.

Best, P. B., J. Bannister, R. L. Brownell, and G. Donovan. 2001. Right whales: Worldwide status. The Journal of Cetacean Research and Management (Special Issue) 2.

Bishop, A. L., Crowe, L. M., Hamilton, P. K., and Meyer-Gutbrod, E. L. 2022. Maternal lineage and habitat use patterns explain variation in the fecundity of a critically endangered baleen whale. Frontiers in Marine Science. Vol. 9-2022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.880910

Boivin-Rioux, A., Starr, M., Chasse, J., Scarratt, M., Perrie, W., and Long, Z. X. 2021. Predicting the Effects of Climate Change on the Occurrence of the Toxic Dinoflagellate Alexandrium catenella Along Canada's East Coast. Frontiers in Marine Science, 7, Article 608021. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.608021

Bort, J., S. M. V. Parijs, P. T. Stevick, E. Summers, and S. Todd. 2015. North Atlantic right whale Eubalaena glacialis vocalization patterns in the central Gulf of Maine from October 2009 through October 2010. Endangered Species Research 26(3):271-280.

Brennan, C. E., Maps W.C., Gentleman, F., Plourde, S., Lavoie, D., Lehoux, C., Krumhansl, K. A. and Johnson, C. L. 2019. A coupled dynamic model of the spatial distribution of copepod prey for the North Atlantic right whale on the Eastern Canadian Shelf. Prog. Oceanogr., 171, 1–21.

Christiansen, F., Dawson, S.M., Durban, J.W., Fearnbach, H., Miller, C.A., Bejder, L., Uhart, M., Sironi, M., Corkeron, P., Rayment, W. and Leunissen, E. 2020. Population comparison of right whale body condition reveals poor state of the North Atlantic right whale. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 640, pp.1-16.

Cole, T. V. N., and coauthors. 2013. Evidence of a North Atlantic right whale Eubalaena glacialis mating ground. Endangered Species Research 21(1):55-64.

Cole, T.V.N., P. Duley, M. Foster, A. Henry and D.D. Morin. 2016. 2015 Right Whale Aerial Surveys of the Scotian Shelf and Gulf of St. Lawrence. Northeast Fish. Sci. Cent. Ref. Doc. 16-02. 14pp.

Corkeron, P., Hamilton, P., Bannister, J., Best, P., Charlton, C., Groch, K.R., Findlay, K., Rowntree, V., Vermeulen, E. and Pace III, R.M. 2018. The recovery of North Atlantic right whales, Eubalaena glacialis, has been constrained by human-caused mortality. Royal Society open science, 5(11), p.180892.http://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.180892

Daoust, P.-Y., E. L. Couture, T. Wimmer, and L. Bourque. 2018. Incident Report: North Atlantic Right Whale Mortality Event in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, 2017. Collaborative Report Produced by: Canadian Wildlife Health Cooperative, Marine Animal Response Society, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada., http://www.cwhcrcsf.ca/docs/technical_reports/Incident%20Report%20Right%20Whales%20EN.pdf.

Davis, G.E., Baumgartner, M.F., Bonnell, J.M., Bell, J., Berchok, C., Bort Thornton, J., Brault, S., Buchanan, G., Charif, R.A., Cholewiak, D. and Clark, C.W., 2017. Long-term passive acoustic recordings track the changing distribution of North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis) from 2004 to 2014. Scientific reports, 7(1), pp.1-12.

Davies, K. T. A. and S. W. Brillant. 2019. Mass human-caused mortality spurs federal action to protect endangered North Atlantic right whales in Canada. Marine Policy 104: 157-162.

Devine, L., Scarratt, M., Plourde, S., Galbraith, P. S., Michaud, S. and Lehoux, C. 2017. Chemical and biological oceanographic conditions in the estuary and Gulf of St. Lawrence during 2015. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc, 2017/034. v + 48 pp.

DFO (Department of Fisheries and Ocean). 2013. Gulf of St. Lawrence Integrated Management Plan. Department of Fisheries and Ocean Canada, Quebec, Gulf and Newfoundland and Labrador Regions No. DFO/2013-1898. Available from: http://dfo-mpo.gc.ca/oceans/management-gestion/gulf-golfe-eng.html.

DFO. 2014. Recovery strategy for the North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis) in Atlantic Canadian Waters [Final]. Department of Fisheries and Ocean Canada, Ottawa. Species at Risk Act Recovery Strategy Series. Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Ottawa. pp. Available from: https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/species-risk-public-registry.html

DFO. 2020. Action Plan for the North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis) in Canada Proposed. Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Ottawa. Species at Risk Act Action Plan Series. Available from: https://www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/species-risk-public-registry.html

Frasier, T.R., Gillett, R.M., Hamilton, P.K., Brown, M.W., Kraus, S.D. and White, B.N., 2013. Postcopulatory selection for dissimilar gametes maintains heterozygosity in the endangered North Atlantic right whale. Ecology and Evolution, 3(10), pp.3483-3494.

Fortune, S. M. E., A. W. Trites, C. A. Mayo, D. A. S. Rosen, and P. K. Hamilton. 2013. Energetic requirements of North Atlantic right whales and the implications for species recovery. Marine Ecology Progress Series 478:253-272.

Fortune, S. M. E., and coauthors. 2012. Growth and rapid early development of North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis). Journal of Mammalogy 93(5):1342-1354.

Fujiwara, M., and H. Caswell. 2001. Demography of the endangered North Atlantic right whale. Nature 414(6863):537-541.

Ganley, L.C., Byrnes, J., Pendleton, D.E., Mayo, C.A., Friedland, K.D., Redfern, J.V., Turner, J.T., and Brault, S. 2022. Effects of changing temperature phenology on the abundance of a critically endangered baleen whale. Global Ecology and Conservation, 38, e02193. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2022.e02193

Gavrilchuk, K., Lesage, V., Fortune, S. M. E., Trites, A. W., and Plourde, S. 2021. Foraging habitat of North Atlantic right whales has declined in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada, and may be insufficient for successful reproduction. Endangered Species Research, 44, 113-136. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr01097

Gavrilchuk, K., Lesage, V., Fortune, S., Trites, A. W., and Plourde, S. 2020. A mechanistic approach to predicting suitable foraging habitat for reproductively mature North Atlantic right whales in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Canada Science Advisory Report.

Grieve, B.D., Hare, J.A. & Saba, V.S. 2017. Projecting the effects of climate change on Calanus finmarchicus distribution within the U.S. Northeast Continental Shelf. Sci Rep 7, 6264.

Hamilton, P. K., Knowlton, A. R., Marx, M. K., & Kraus, S. D. (1998). Age structure and longevity in North Atlantic right whales Eubalaena glacialis and their relation to reproduction. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 171, 285-292. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24831743

Hayes, S. A., Joesphson, E., Maze-Foley, K., and Rosel, P. 2022. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments - 202022. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science 426 Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, June.. Available from: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/s3/2023-01/Draft%202022%20Atlantic%20SARs_final.pdf

Hayes, S. H., Josephson, E., Maze-Foley, K., Rosel, P. E., Wallace, J. 2021. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments 202. Northeast Fisheries Science Center (U.S.). NOAA technical memorandum NMFS-NE; 288. https://doi.org/10.25923/6tt7-kc16

Hayes, S. A., Joesphson, E., Maze-Foley, K., and Rosel, P. 2019. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments - 2018. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science 426 Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, June. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE -258. Available from: https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/20611.

Hayes, S. A, Joesphson, E., Maze-Foley, K., and Rosel, P. 2018a. North Atlantic Right Whales-Evaluating Their Recovery Challenges in 2018 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service Northeast Fisheries Science Center Woods Hole, Massachusetts September 2018 NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-247 https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/19086

Hodge, K. B., C. A. Muirhead, J. L. Morano, C. W. Clark, and A. N. Rice. 2015. North Atlantic right whale occurrence near wind energy areas along the mid-Atlantic U.S. coast: Implications for management. Endangered Species Research 28(3):225-234.

Hunt, K. E., C. J. Innis, C. Merigo, and R. M. Rolland. 2016. Endocrine responses to diverse stressors of capture, entanglement and stranding in leatherback turtles (Dermochelys coriacea). Conservation Physiology 4(1): 1-12.

Jacobsen, K., M. Marx, and N. Ølien. 2004. Two-way trans-Atlantic migration of a North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis). Marine Mammal Science 20(1):161–166.

Johnson, C., E. Devred, B. Casault, E. Head, and J. Spry. 2017. Optical, chemical, and biological oceanographic conditions on the Scotian Shelf and in the Eastern Gulf of Maine in 2015. Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Ottowa, Canada. DFO Can. Sci. Advis. Sec. Res. Doc. 2017/012.

Kenney RD. 2018. What if there were no fishing? North Atlantic right whale population trajectories without entanglement mortality. Endang Species Res 37:233-237.

Kenney, R. D. 2009. Right whales: Eubalaena glacialis, E. japonica, and E. australis. Pages 962-972 in W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig, and J. G. M. Thewissen, editors. Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals, Second edition. Academic Press, San Diego, California.

Kenney, R. D., H. E. Winn, and M. C. Macaulay. 1995. Cetaceans in the Great South Channel, 1979-1989: Right whale (Eubalaena glacialis). Continental Shelf Research 15(4/5):385-414.

Knowlton, A.R., J. Sigurjonsson, J.N. Ciano, and S.D. Kraus. 1992. Long distance movements of North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis). Mar. Mamm. Sci. 8(4): 397 405.

Kraus S.D., R. M. Pace III and T.R. Frasier. 2007. High Investment, Low Return: The Strange Case of Reproduction in Eubalaena Glacialis. Pp 172-199. In: S.D. Kraus and R.M. Rolland (eds.) The Urban Whale. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England. vii-xv + 543pp

Kraus, S. and J. J. Hatch. 2001. Mating strategies in the North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis). Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 2: 237-244.

Krumhansl, K. A., Head, E. J. H., Pepin, P., Plourde, S., Record, N. R., Runge, J. A., and Johnson, C. L. 2018. Environmental drivers of vertical distribution in diapausing Calanus copepods in the Northwest Atlantic. Progress in Oceanography, 162, 202-222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2018.02.018

Krzystan, A.M., Gowan, T.A., Kendall, W.L., Martin, J., Ortega-Ortiz, J.G., Jackson, K., Knowlton, A.R., Naessig, P., Zani, M., Schulte, D.W. and Taylor, C.R., 2018. Characterizing residence patterns of North Atlantic right whales in the southeastern USA with a multistate open robust design model. Endangered Species Research, 36, pp.279-295.

Lehoux, C., Plourde, S., and Lesage, V. 2020. Significance of dominant zooplankton species to the North Atlantic Right Whale potential foraging habitats in the Gulf of St. Lawrence : a bio-energetic approach. DFO Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat. Research Document 2020/033. iv + 44 p.

Leiter, S.M., K. M. Stone1, J. L. Thompson, C. M. Accardo, B. C. Wikgren, M. A. Zani, T. V. N. Cole, R. D. Kenney, C. A. Mayo, and S. D. Kraus. 2017. North Atlantic right whale Eubalaena glacialis occurrence in offshore wind energy areas near Massachusetts and Rhode Island, USA. Endang. Species Res. Vol. 34: 45–59. doi.org/10.3354/esr00827

Lockyer, C. 1984. Review of baleen whale (Mysticeti) reproduction and implications for management. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6:27-50.

Lysiak, N.S., Trumble, S.J., Knowlton, A.R. and Moore, M.J. 2018. Characterizing the duration and severity of fishing gear entanglement on a North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis) using stable isotopes, steroid and thyroid hormones in baleen. Frontiers in Marine Science, 5, p.168.

Malik, S., Brown M. W., Kraus, S. D., and White, B. N. 2000. Analysis of mitochondrial DNA diversity within and between north and south Atlantic right whales. Marine Mammal Science. 16 (3): 545-558. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2000.tb00950.x

Matthews, L. P., J. A. McCordic, and S. E. Parks. 2014. Remote acoustic monitoring of North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis) reveals seasonal and diel variations in acoustic behavior. PLoS One 9(3):e91367.

Mayo, C.A., Ganley, L., Hudak, C.A., Brault, S., Marx, M.K., Burke, E. and Brown, M.W., 2018. Distribution, demography, and behavior of North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis) in Cape Cod Bay, Massachusetts, 1998–2013. Marine Mammal Science, 34(4), pp.979-996.

McLeod, B.A., 2008. Historic Levels of Genetic Diversity in the North Atlantic Right, Eubalaena Glacialis, and Bowhead Whale, Balaena Mysticetus. Library and Archives Canada= Bibliothèque et Archives Canada, Ottawa.

McLeod, B. A., and B. N. White. 2010. Tracking mtDNA heteroplasmy through multiple generations in the North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis). Journal of Heredity 101(2):235-239.

Mellinger, D. et al. 2011. Confirmation of right whales near a nineteenth-century whaling ground east of southern Greenland. Biology letters. 7. 411-3. 10.1098/rsbl.2010.1191.

Meyer-Gutbrod, E. L., and C. H. Greene. 2018. Uncertain recovery of the North Atlantic right whale in a changing ocean. Global Change Biology 24(1):455–464.

Meyer-Gutbrod, E., and C. Greene. 2014. Climate-Associated Regime Shifts Drive Decadal-Scale Variability in Recovery of North Atlantic Right Whale Population. Oceanography

Meyer-Gutbrod, E.L., Greene, C.H., Davies, K.T. and Johns, D.G. 2021. Ocean regime shift is driving collapse of the North Atlantic right whale population. Oceanography, 34(3), pp.22-31.

Meyer-Gutbrod, E. L., Greene, C. H., & Davies, K. T. A. 2018. Marine Species Range Shifts Necessitate Advanced Policy Planning: The Case of the North Atlantic Right Whale. Oceanography, 31(2), 19–23. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26542646

Monsarrat, S., Pennino, M.G., Smith, T.D., Reeves, R.R., Meynard, C.N., Kaplan, D.M. and Rodrigues, A.S. 2016. A spatially explicit estimate of the prewhaling abundance of the endangered North Atlantic right whale. Conservation Biology, 30(4), pp.783-791.

Moore, M.J., Rowles, T.K., Fauquier, D.A., Baker, J.D., Biedron, I., Durban, J.W., Hamilton, P.K., Henry, A.G., Knowlton, A.R., McLellan, W.A. and Miller, C.A. 2021. REVIEW Assessing North Atlantic right whale health: threats, and development of tools critical for conservation of the species. Diseases of Aquatic Organisms, 143, pp.205-226.

Morano, J.L., Rice, A.N., Tielens, J.T., Estabrook, B.J., Murray, A., Roberts, B.L. and Clark, C.W. 2012. Acoustically detected year-round presence of right whales in an urbanized migration corridor. Conservation Biology, 26(4), pp.698-707.

NMFS. 2022. North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis) 5-year review: Summary and evaluation. National Marine Fisheries Service Greater Atlantic Regional Office. Gloucester, MA. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2022-12/Sign2_NARW20225YearReview_508-GARFO.pdf

NMFS. 2017. North Atlantic Right Whale (Eubalaena glacialis) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2005. Recovery plan for the North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service.

O'Brien, O., Pendleton, D.E., Ganley, L.C., McKenna, K. R., Kenney, R. D., Quintana-Rizzo, E., Mayo, C. A. Kraus, S. D., and Redfern, J. V. 2022. Repatriation of a historical North Atlantic right whale habitat during an era of rapid climate change. Sci Rep 12, 12407.https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-16200-

Pace III, R. M., Corkeron, P. J., & Kraus, S. D. 2017. State–space mark–recapture estimates reveal a recent decline in abundance of North Atlantic right whales. Ecology and Evolution, 7(21), 8730-8741.

Pendleton, D.E., Tingley, M.W., Ganley, L.C., Friedland, K.D., Mayo, C., Brown, M.W., McKenna, B.E., Jordaan, A., and Staudinger, M.D. 2022. Decadal-scale phenology and seasonal climate drivers of migratory baleen whales in a rapidly warming marine ecosystem. Global Change Biology, 28(16): 4989-5005. https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16225

Pershing, A. J., Alexander, M. A., Brady, D. C., Brickman, D., Curchitser, E. N., Diamond, A. W., McClenachan, L., Mills, K. E., Nichols, O. C., Pendleton, D. E., Record, N. R., Scott, J. D., Staudinger, M. D., and Wang, Y. 2021. Climate impacts on the Gulf of Maine ecosystem: A review of observed and expected changes in 2050 from rising temperatures. Elemental-Science of the Anthropocene, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2020.00076

Pettis, H. M., and P. K. Hamilton. 2015. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium 2015 Annual Report Card. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium, http://www.narwc.org/pdf/2015%20Report%20Card.pdf.

Pettis, H. M., and P. K. Hamilton. 2016. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium 2016 Annual Report Card. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium,

Pettis, H. M., R. M. I. Pace, R. S. Schick, and P. K. Hamilton. 2017a. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium 2017 Annual Report Card. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium, http://www.narwc.org/pdf/2017%20Report%20CardFinal.pdf.

Pettis, H. M., and coauthors. 2017b. Body condition changes arising from natural factors and fishing gear entanglements in North Atlantic right whales Eubalaena glacialis. Endangered Species Research 32:237-249.

Pettis, H.M., Pace, R.M., Hamilton, P.K. 2018. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium 2018 Annual Report Card. Report to the North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium, https://www.narwc.org/uploads/1/1/6/6/116623219/2018report_cardfinal.pdf

Pettis, H. M., R. M. Pace, III, and P. K. Hamilton. 2020. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium 2019 annual report card. Report to the North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium. Available from: www.narwc.org.

Pettis, H.M., Pace, R.M. III, Hamilton, P.K. 2021. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium 2020 Annual Report Card. Report to the North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium. https://www.narwc.org/uploads/1/1/6/6/116623219/2020narwcreport_cardfinal.pdf

Pettis, H.M., Pace, R.M. III, Hamilton, P.K. 2022. North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium 2021 Annual Report Card. Report to the North Atlantic Right Whale Consortium. https://www.narwc.org/uploads/1/1/6/6/116623219/2021report_cardfinal.pdf

Plourde, S., Lehoux, C., Johnson, C. L., Perrin, G., and Lesage, V. 2019. North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis) and its food: (I) a spatial climatology of Calanus biomass and potential foraging habitats in Canadian waters. Journal of Plankton Research, 41(5), 667-685. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbz024

Quintana-Rizzo, E., Leiter, S., Cole, T.V.N., Hagbloom, M.N., Knowlton, A.R., Nagelkirk, P., Brien, O.O., Khan, C.B., Henry, A.G., Duley, P.A. and Crowe, L.M. 2021. Residency, demographics, and movement patterns of North Atlantic right whales Eubalaena glacialis in an offshore wind energy development in southern New England, USA. Endangered Species Research, 45, pp.251-268.

Radvan, S. 2019. “Effects of inbreeding on fitness in the North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis).” A Thesis Submitted to Saint Mary’s University, Halifax, Nova Scotia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science, Major and Honours Certificate in Biology. April 2019, Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Rastogi, T., Brown, M.W., McLeod, B.A., Frasier, T.R., Grenier, R., Cumbaa, S.L., Nadarajah, J. and White, B.N. 2004. Genetic analysis of 16th-century whale bones prompts a revision of the impact of Basque whaling on right and bowhead whales in the western North Atlantic. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 82(10), pp.1647-1654.

Record, N.R., Runge, J.A., Pendleton, D.E., Balch, W.M., Davies, K.T., Pershing, A.J., Johnson, C.L., Stamieszkin, K., Ji, R., Feng, Z. and Kraus, S.D. 2019. Rapid climate-driven circulation changes threaten conservation of endangered North Atlantic right whales. Oceanography, 32(2), pp.162-169. Retrieved October 14, 2020, from https://www.jstor.org/stable/26651192

Reed, J., New, J., Corkeron, P., and Harcourt, R. 2022. Multi-event modeling of true reproductive states of individual female right whales provides new insights into their decline. Frontiers in Marine Science. Vol. 9 – 2022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.994481

Reeves R. R. Smith T. D. Josephson E. A. 2007. Near-annihilation of a species: right whaling in the North Atlantic. Pp. 39–74 in The urban whale: North Atlantic right whales at the crossroads (Kraus S. D. Rolland R. R., eds.). Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Robbins, J., A. R. Knowlton, and S. Landry. 2015. Apparent survival of North Atlantic right whales after entanglement in fishing gear. Biological Conservation 191:421-427.

Rodrigues, A. et al. 2018. Forgotten Mediterranean calving grounds of grey and North Atlantic right whales: evidence from Roman archaeological records. Proc. R. Soc. B.28520180961 http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.0961

Rolland, R.M., Schick, R.S., Pettis, H.M., Knowlton, A.R., Hamilton, P.K., Clark, J.S. and Kraus, S.D., 2016. Health of North Atlantic right whales Eubalaena glacialis over three decades: from individual health to demographic and population health trends. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 542, pp.265-282.

Ross, C. H., Pendleton, D. E., Tupper, B., Brickman, D., Zani, M. A., Mayo, C. A., and Record, N. R. 2021. Projecting regions of North Atlantic right whale, Eubalaena glacialis, habitat suitability in the Gulf of Maine for the year 2050. Elementa: Science of the Anthropocene, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2020.20.00058

Salisbury, D. P., C. W. Clark, and A. N. Rice. 2016. Right whale occurrence in the coastal waters of Virginia, U.S.A.: Endangered species presence in a rapidly developing energy market. Marine Mammal Science 32(2):508-519.

Schaeff, C.M., Kraus, S.D., Brown, M.W., Perkins, J.S., Payne, R. and White, B.N. 1997. Comparison of genetic variability of North and South Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena), using DNA fingerprinting. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 75(7), pp.1073-1080.

Silber, G. K., Lettrich, M. D., Thomas, P. C., Baker, J. D., Baumgartner, M. F., Becker, E. A., Boveng, P. L., Dick, D., Fiechter, J., Forcada, J., Forney, K. A., Griffis, R., Hare, J. A., Hobday, A. J., Howell, D., Laidre, K. L., Mantua, N. J., Quakenbush, L. T., Santora, J. A., . . . Waples, R. S. 2017. Projecting Marine Mammal Distribution in a Changing Climate. Frontiers in Marine Science, 4, 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2017.00413

Simard Y., Roy N., Giard S., and Aulanier F. 2019. North Atlantic right whale shift to the Gulf of St. Lawrence in 2015, revealed by long-term passive acoustics. Endang Species Res 40:271-284. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr01005

Sorochan, K. A., Brennan, C. E., Plourde, S., and Johnson, C. L. 2021a. Spatial variation and transport of abundant copepod taxa in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence in autumn. Journal of Plankton Research, 43(6), 908-926. https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbab066

Sorochan, K. A., Plourde, S., Baumgartner, M. F., and Johnson, C. L. 2021b. Availability, supply, and aggregation of prey (Calanus spp.) in foraging areas of the North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis). ICES Journal of Marine Science, 78(10), 3498-3520. https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsab200

Sorochan, K. A., Plourde S. E., Morse R., Pepin, P., Runge, J., Thompson, C., Johnson, C. L. 2019. North Atlantic right whale (Eubalaena glacialis) and its food: (II) interannual variations in biomass of Calanus spp. on western North Atlantic shelves, Journal of Plankton Research. 41(5);687–708, https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbz044

Stewart J.D., Durban J.W., Knowlton A.R., Lynn M.S., Fearnbach H., Barbaro J., Perryman W.L., Miller C.A., Moore M.J. 2021. Decreasing body lengths in North Atlantic right whales. Curr Biol. 26;31(14):3174-3179.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2021.04.067.

Stewart JD, Durban JW, Europe H, Fearnbach H and others. 2022. Larger females have more calves: influence of maternal body length on fecundity in North Atlantic right whales. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 689:179-189. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps14040

Stone K.M., Leiter S.M., Kenney R.D., Wikgreen B.C., Thompson J.L., Taylor J.K.D. and S.D. Kraus. 2017. Distribution and abundance of cetaceans in a wind energy development area offshore of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. Journal of Coastal Conservation 21:527-543

Van der Hoop, J., Corkeron, P., & Moore, M. 2017. Entanglement is a costly life-history stage in large whales. Ecology and evolution, 7(1), 92-106.

Waldick, R. C., Kraus, S. S., Brown, M., & White, B. N. 2002. Evaluating the effects of historic bottleneck events: An assessment of microsatellite variability in the endangered, North Atlantic right whale. Molecular Ecology, 11(11), 2241– 2250. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-294X.2002.01605.x

Whitt, A. D., K. Dudzinski, and J. R. Laliberte. 2013. North Atlantic right whale distribution and seasonal occurrence in nearshore waters off New Jersey, USA, and implications for management. Endangered Species Research 20(1):59-69.

Fin Whale:

Allison C. 2017. International Whaling Commission Catch Data Base v. 6.1. As cited in Cooke, J.G. 2018. Balaenoptera physalus. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018:e.T2478A50349982. http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T2478A50349982.en.

Archer, F. I., Brownell, R. L., Hancock-Hanser, B. L., Morin, P. A., Robertson, K. M., Sherman, K. K., Calambokidis, J., Urban R, J., Rosel, P. E., Mizroch, S. A., Panigada, S., and Taylor, B. L. 2019. Revision of fin whale Balaenoptera physalus (Linnaeus, 1758) subspecies using genetics. Journal of Mammology. 100(5);1653-1670. https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyz121

Archer, F.I., Morin, P.A., Hancock-Hanser, B.L., Robertson, K.M., Leslie, M.S., Bérubé, M., Panigada, S. and Taylor, B.L., 2013. Mitogenomic phylogenetics of fin whales (Balaenoptera physalus spp.): genetic evidence for revision of subspecies. PLoS One, 8(5), p.e63396.

Carretta, J. V., K. A. Forney, E. M. Oleson, D. W. Weller, A. R. Lang, J. Baker, M. M. Muto, H. Brad, A. J. Orr, H. Huber, M. S. Lowry, J. Barlow, J. E. Moore, D. Lynch, L. Carswell, and R. L. Brownell Jr. 2019a. U.S. Pacific marine mammal stock assessments: 2018. National Marine Fisheries Service, La Jolla, CA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SWFSC-617. Available from: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-stock-assessments.

Cooke, J.G. 2018b. Balaenoptera borealis. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2018: e.T2475A130482064. http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2018-2.RLTS.T2475A130482064.en.

Donovan, G. P. 1991. A review of IWC stock boundaries. Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. 13, 39–68.

Henry, A., Smith, A., Garron, M., Morin, D., Reid, A., Ledwell, W., Cole, T. 2022. Serious injury and mortality determinations for baleen whale stocks along the Gulf of Mexico, United States East Coast, and Atlantic Canadian Provinces, 2016-2020. US Dept Commer Northeast Fish Sci Cent Ref Doc. 22-13; 61 p.

IWC. 2017. Strategic Plan to Mitigate the Impacts of Ship Strikes on Cetacean Populations: 2017-2020. IWC.

Mizroch, S. A., D. W. Rice, and J. M. Breiwick. 1984b. The fin whale, Balaenoptera physalus. Marine Fisheries Review 46(4):20-24.

Muto, M. M., Helker, T., Angliss, R. P., Boveng, P. L., Breiwick, J. M., Cameron, M, F., Clapman, P. J., Dahle, Dahlheim, M.E. 2019. Alaska marine mammal stock assessments, 2018. U.S. Dep. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-AFSC-393, 390 p.

Nadeem, K., J. E. Moore, Y. Zhang, and H. Chipman. 2016. Integrating population dynamics models and distance sampling data: A spatial hierarchical state-space approach. Ecology 97(7):1735-1745.

NMFS. 2019b. Fin Whale (Balaenoptera physalus) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, MD, February 2019. 40 pp. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/document/fin-whale-5-year-review

NMFS. 2016b. Fin whale (Balaenoptera physalus physalus): California/Oregon/Washington stock. Stock Assessment Report: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/sars/species.htm.

NMFS. 2010a. Recovery plan for the fin whale (Balaenoptera physalus). U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Ohsumi, S., and S. Wada. 1974. Status of whale stocks in the North Pacific, 1972. Report of the International Whaling Commission 24:114-126.

Thomas, P.O., Reeves, R.R. and Brownell Jr, R.L., 2016. Status of the world's baleen whales. Marine Mammal Science, 32(2), pp.682-734.

Green Sea Turtle:

66 Federal Register 20057. April 6, 2016. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To List Eleven Distinct Population Segments of the Green Sea Turtle (Chelonia mydas) as Endangered or Threatened and Revision of Current Listings Under the Endangered Species Act. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/04/06/2016-07587/endangered-and-threatened-wildlife-and-plants-final-rule-to-list-eleven-distinct-population-segments

81 Federal Register 20057. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To List Eleven Distinct Population Segments of the Green Sea Turtle (Chelonia mydas) as Endangered or Threatened and Revision of Current Listings Under the Endangered Species Act. Document Number: 2016-07587

Avens, L., and Snover, M.L., 2013. Age and age esimtation in sea turtles, in: Wyneken, J., Lohmann, K.J., Musick, J.A. (Eds.), The Biology of Sea Turtles Volume III. CRC Press Boca Raton, FL, pp. 97–133.

Frazer, N.B., Ehrhart, L.M., 1985. Preliminary growth models for green, Chelonia mydas, and loggerhead, Caretta caretta, turtles in the wild. Copeia 1, 73–79.

Goshe, L.R., Avens, L., Scharf, F.S., Southwood, A.L. 2010. Estimation of age at maturation and growth of Atlantic green turtles (Chelonia mydas) using skeletochronology. Mar. Biol. 157, 1725–1740.

Hirth, H.F. 1997. Synopsis of the biological data on the green turtle Chelonia mydas (Linnaeus 1758). Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C, Biological Report 97(1), 120 pages.

Mendonça, M.T. 1981. Comparative growth rates of wild immature Chelonia mydas and Caretta caretta in Florida. J. Herpetol. 15, 447–451.

NMFS and USFWS. 1991. Recovery plan for U.S. population of Atlantic green turtle (Chelonia mydas). National Marine Fisheries Service, Washington, DC. 52 pp

Seminoff, J.A., Allen, C.D., Balazs, G.H., Dutton, P.H., Eguchi, T., Haas, H., Hargrove, S.A., Jensen, M., Klemm, D.L., Lauritsen, A.M. and MacPherson, S.L., 2015. Status review of the green turtle (Chelonia mydas) under the Engangered Species Act.National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Southwest Fisheries Science Center.

Shamblin, B. M., Dutton, P. H., Shaver, D. J., Bagley, D. A., Putman, N. F., Mansfield, K. L., Ehrhart, L. M., Peña, L. J., Nairn, C. J. 2016. Mexican origins for the Texas green turtle foraging aggregation: A cautionary tale of incomplete baselines and poor marker resolution. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. Vol. 488. Pgs. 111-120. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2016.11.009.

Witherington, B.E., Bresette, M.J., Herren, R. 2006. Chelonia mydas – green Turtle, in: Meylan, P.A. (Ed.), Biology and Conservation of Florida Turtles. Chelonian Research Monographs 3:90-104.

Zurita, J.C., Herrera P., R., Arenas, A., Negrete, A.C., Gómez, L., Prezas, B., Sasso, C.R. 2012. Age at first nesting of green turtles in the Mexican Caribbean, in: Jones, T.T., Wallace, B.P. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 31st Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-631, p. 75.

Kemps Ridley Sea Turtle:

Avens, L., Goshe, L. R., Coggins, L., Shaver, D. J., Higgins, B., Landry, A. M., Bailey, R. 2017. Variability in age and size at maturation, reproductive longevity, and long-term growth dynamics for Kemp's ridley sea turtles in the Gulf of Mexico. PLOS ONE 12(3): e0173999. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173999

Bjorndal K. A., Parsons J., Mustin W., Bolten A. B. 2014. Variation in age and size at sexual maturity in Kemp's ridley sea turtles. Endang Species Res 25:57-67. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00608

Chaloupka, M., Zug, G. R. 1997. A polyphasic growth function for the endangered Kemp's ridley sea turtle, Lepidochelys kempii. Fishery Bulletin Seattle. 95(4); 849-856.

Caillouet, C. W., Raborn, S. W., Shaver, D. J., Putman, N. F., Gallaway, B. J., Mansfield, K. L. 2018. Did Declining Carrying Capacity for the Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Population Within the Gulf of Mexico Contribute to the Nesting Setback in 2010−2017? Chelonian Conservation and Biology, 17(1), 123-133. https://doi.org/10.2744/CCB-1283.1

Dutton, P. H. , Pease, V. , & Shaver, D. J. . (2006). Characterization of mtDNA variation among Kemp's ridleys nesting on Padre Island with reference to Rancho Nuevo genetic stock In Frick M., Panagopoulou A., Rees A. F., & Williams K. (Compilers), Twenty sixth annual symposium on sea turtle biology and conservation, book of abstracts, April 3–8 (p. 189). Athens, Greece: International Sea Turtle Society. 376 pp.

Epperly, S.P., Heppell, S.S., Richards, R.M., Castro Martínez, M.A., Zapata Najera, B.M., Sarti Martínez, A.L., Peña, L.J. and Shaver, D.J. 2013. Mortality rates of Kemp's ridley sea turtles in the neritic waters of the United States. In Proceedings of the thirty-third annual symposium of sea turtle biology and conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC (Vol. 645).

Heppell, S. S., D. Crouse, L. Crowder, S. Epperly, W. Gabriel, T. Henwood and R. Marquez. 2005. A population model to estimate recovery time, population size and management impacts on Kemp's ridley sea turtles. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 4:761-766

NMFS, USFWS, and SEMARNAT. 2011. BiNational Recovery Plan for the Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle (Lepidochelys kempii), Second Revision. National Marine Fisheries Service. Silver Spring, Maryland 156 pp. + appendices.

NMFS and USFWS. 2015. Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle (Lepidochelys Kempii) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. 63 p. https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/17048

Putman, N.F., Mansfield, K.L., He, R., Shaver, D.J. and Verley, P. 2013. Predicting the distribution of oceanic-stage Kemp's ridley sea turtles. Biology Letters, 9(5), p.20130345.

Schmid, J. R., Witzel, W. N. 1997. Age and growth of wild Kemp's ridley turtles (Lepidochelys kempi): Cumulative results of tagging studies in Florida. Chelonian Conservation and Biology. 2(4):532-537.

Schmid, J. R. and A. Woodhead. 2000. Von Bertalanffy growth models for wild Kemp's ridley turtles: analysis of the NMFS Miami Laboratory tagging database. In Turtle Expert Working Group Assessment update for the Kemp's ridley and loggerhead sea turtle populations in the western North Atlantic. NOAA Technical Memorandum. NMFS-SEFSC-444: 94-102.

Shaver, D.J., Wibbels, T. 2007. Head-starting the Kemp's ridley sea turtle. In: Plotkin PT (ed) Biology and conservation of ridley sea turtles. Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, MD, p 297–324

Snover, M.L., A.A. Hohn, L.B. Crowder, and S.S. Heppell. 2007. Age and growth in Kemp's ridley sea turtles: evidence from mark-recapture and skeletochronology. Pages 89-106 in Plotkin P.T. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

TEWG (Turtle Expert Working Group). 1998. An assessment of the Kemp's ridley (Lepidochelys kempii) and loggerhead (Caretta caretta) sea turtle populations in the western North Atlantic. NOAA Technical Memorandum. NMFS-SEFSC-409:96.

TEWG, 2000. Assessment Update for the Kemp's Ridley and Loggerhead Sea Turtle Populations in the Western North Atlantic. NMFS-SEFC-444

Tomas, J., and J. A. Raga. 2008. Occurrence of Kemp's ridley sea turtle (Lepidochelys kempii) in the Mediterranean. Marine Biodiversity Records 1(01).

Wibbels, T. & Bevan, E. 2019. Lepidochelys kempii (errata version published in 2019). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2019: e.T11533A155057916.

Zug, G. R., Kalb H. J. and Luzar, S. J. 1997. Age and growth in wild Kemp's ridley sea turtles Lepidochelys kempii from skeletochronological data. Biological Conservation 80: 261-268.

Loggerhead Sea Turtle:

76 Federal Register. 58868. September 22, 2011. Endangered and Threatened Species; Determination of Nine Distinct Population Segments of Loggerhead Sea Turtles as Endangered or Threatened. Document Number: 2011-23960

Avens, L., Goshe, L.R., Coggins, L., Snover, M.L., Pajuelo, M., Bjorndal, K.A. and Bolten, A.B., 2015. Age and size at maturation-and adult-stage duration for loggerhead sea turtles in the western North Atlantic. Marine Biology, 162(9), pp.1749-1767.

Bjorndal, K.A. 1997. Foraging ecology and nutrition of sea turtles. Pages 199-231 in Lutz, P.L. and J.A. Musick (editors). The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press. Boca Raton, Florida.

Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). 2003. Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C. 319 pages

Bolten, A.B., L.B. Crowder, M.G. Dodd, A.M. Lauristen, J.A. Musick, B.A. Schroeder, and B.E. Witherington. 2019. Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of Loggerhead Sea Turtles (Caretta caretta) Second Revision (2008). Sumbitted to National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD. 21 pp.

Casale, P., and A. D. Tucker. 2017. Caretta caretta (amended version of 2015 assessment). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2017:e.T3897A119333622. http://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2017-2.RLTS.T3897A119333622

Ceriani, S. A., and A. B. Meylan. 2017. Caretta caretta (North West Atlantic subpopulation). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2017:e.T84131194A119339029. https://doi.org/10.2305/iucn.uk.2015-4.rlts.t84131194a84131608.en

Conant, T.A., Dutton, P.H., Eguchi, T., Epperly, S.P., Fahy, C.C., Godfrey, M.H., MacPherson, S.L., Possardt, E.E., Schroeder, B.A., Seminoff, J.A. and Snover, M.L. 2009. Loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta) 2009 status review under the US Endangered Species Act. Report of the loggerhead biological review Team to the National Marine Fisheries Service, 222, pp.5-2.

Donaton, J., Durham, K., Cerrato, R., Schwerzmann, J. and Thorne, L.H., 2019. Long-term changes in loggerhead sea turtle diet indicate shifts in the benthic community associated with warming temperatures. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 218, pp.139-147.

Ehrhart, LM., D.A. Bagley, and W.E. Redfoot. 2003. Loggerhead turtles in the Atlantic Ocean: geographic distribution, abundance, and population status. Pages 157-174 in Bolten, A.B. 182 and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

LaCasella, E.L., Epperly, S.P., Jensen, M.P., Stokes, L. and Dutton, P.H. 2013. Genetic stock composition of loggerhead turtles Caretta caretta bycaught in the pelagic waters of the North Atlantic. Endangered Species Research, 22(1), pp.73-84.

Heppell, S.S. 2005. Development of alternative quantitative tools to assist in jeopardy evaluation for sea turtles. Report for the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 35 pp. http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/PDFdocs/CR_Heppell_2005_Quantitative_Tools.pdf

Mansfield, K.L. 2006. Sources of mortality, movements and behavior of sea turtles in Virginia. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Gloucester Point, Virginia. 343 pages.

Masuda, A. 2010. Natal Origin of Juvenile Loggerhead Turtles from Foraging Ground in Nicaragua and Panama Estimated Using Mitochondria DNA. California State University, Chico, California.

Morreale, S.J. and E.A. Standora. 2005. Western North Atlantic waters: crucial developmental habitat for Kemp's ridley and loggerhead sea turtles. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 4:872-882.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2001. Stock assessments of loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles and an assessment of the impact of the pelagic longline fishery on the loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles of the Western North Atlantic. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-455.

NMFS and USFWS. 2008. Recovery plan for the northwest Atlantic population of the loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta), second revision. National Marine Fisheries Service and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service) and SEFSC. 2009. An assessment of loggerhead sea turtles to estimate impacts of mortality reductions on population dynamics. NMFS SEFSC Contribution PRD-08/09-14. 45 pp.

Richards, P. M., S. P. Epperly, S. S. Heppell, R. T. King, C. R. Sasso, F. Moncada, G. Nodarse, D. J. Shaver, Y. Medina, and J. Zurita. 2011. Sea turtle population estimates incorporating uncertainty: A new approach applied to western North Atlantic loggerheads Caretta caretta. Endangered Species Research 15: 151-158.

Seney, E.E. and J.A. Musick. 2007. Historical diet analysis of loggerhead sea turtles (Caretta caretta) in Virginia. Copeia 2007(2):478-489.

Shamblin, B.M., Bolten, A.B., Abreu-Grobois, F.A., Bjorndal, K.A., Cardona, L., Carreras, C., Clusa, M., Monzón-Argüello, C., Nairn, C.J., Nielsen, J.T. and Nel, R., 2014. Geographic patterns of genetic variation in a broadly distributed marine vertebrate: new insights into loggerhead turtle stock structure from expanded mitochondrial DNA sequences. PLoS One, 9(1), p.e85956.

Shamblin, B.M., Bolten, A.B., Bjorndal, K.A., Dutton, P.H., Nielsen, J.T., Abreu-Grobois, F. A., Reich, K.J., Witherington, B.E., Bagley, D.A., Ehrhart, L.M., Tucker, A.D., Addision, D.S., Areanas, A., Johnson, C., Carthy, R.R., Lamont, M.M., Dodd, M.G., Gaines, M.S., LaCasella, E., Nairn, C.J. 2012. Expanded mitochondrial control region sequences increase resolution of stock structure among North Atlantic loggerhead turtle rookeries. Marine Ecology Progress Series. Vol. 469: 145-160. doi: 10.3354/meps09980

Stewart, K.R., LaCasella, E.L., Jensen, M.P., Epperly, S.P., Haas, H.L., Stokes, L.W. and Dutton, P.H. 2019. Using mixed stock analysis to assess source populations for at-sea bycaught juvenile and adult loggerhead turtles (Caretta caretta) in the north-west Atlantic. Fish and Fisheries, 20(2), pp.239-254.

Witherington, B., P. Kubilis, B. Brost, and A. Meylan. 2009. Decreasing annual nest counts in a globally important loggerhead sea turtle population. Ecological Applications 19(1):30-54.

Witzell, W.N. 2002. Immature Atlantic loggerhead turtles (Caretta caretta): suggested changes to the life history model. Herpetological Review 33(4):266-269.

TEWG 2009. An assessment of the loggerhead turtle population in the western North Atlantic Ocean. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-575. 142 pages. Available at http://www.sefsc.noaa.gov/seaturtletechmemos.jsp.

Leatherback Sea Turtles:

77 Federal Register 4170. January 26, 2012. Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Rule to Revise the Critical Habitat Designation for the Endangered Leatherback Sea Turtle. Document Number: 2012-995. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2012/01/26/2012-995/endangered-and-threatened-species-final-rule-to-revise-the-critical-habitat-designation-for-the

85 Federal Register 48332. August 10, 2020. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife; 12-Month Finding on a Petition To Identify the Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Turtle as a Distinct Population Segment and List It as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act. Document Number: 2020-16277. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/08/10/2020-16277/endangered-and-threatened-wildlife-12-month-finding-on-a-petition-to-identify-the-northwest-atlantic

Avens, L., J. C. Taylor, L. R. Goshe, T. T. Jones, and M. Hastings. 2009. Use of skeletochronological analysis to estimate the age of leatherback sea turtles Dermochelys coriacea in the western North Atlantic. Endangered Species Research 8(3):165-177.

Avens L, Goshe LR, Zug GR, Balazs GH, Benson SR, Harris H. 2020. Regional comparison of leatherback sea turtle maturation attributes and reproductive longevity. Marine Biology 167: 4. Published 2019, Updated, 2020.

Benson, S.R., Eguchi, T., Foley, D.G., Forney, K.A., Bailey, H., Hitipeuw, C., Samber, B.P., Tapilatu, R.F., Rei, V., Ramohia, P. and Pita, J., 2011. Large-scale movements and high-use areas of western Pacific leatherback turtles, Dermochelys coriacea. Ecosphere, 2(7), pp.1-27.

Bond EP, James MC. 2017. Pre-nesting movements of leatherback sea turtles, Dermochelys coriacea, in the Western Atlantic. Frontiers in Marine Science 4.

Carreras C, Godley BJ, Leon YM, Hawkes LA, Revuelta O, Raga JA, Tomas J. 2013. Contextualising the last survivors: population structure of marine turtles in the Dominican Republic. PLoS ONE 8: e66037.

Dodge, K.L., J.M. Logan, and M.E. Lutcavage. 2011. Foraging Ecology of Leatherback Sea Turtles in the Western North Atlantic Determined through Multi-Tissue Stable Isotope Analyses. Marine Biology 158: 2813-2824.

Dodge KL, Galuardi B, Lutcavage ME. 2015. Orientation behaviour of leatherback sea turtles within the North Atlantic subtropical gyre. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London: Biological Sciences 282.

Dutton, P. H., B. W. Bowen, D. W. Owens, A. Barragan, and S. K. Davis. 1999. Global phylogeography of the leatherback turtle (Dermochelys coriacea). Journal of Zoology 248:397-409.

Dutton PH, Roden SE, Stewart KR, LaCasella E, Tiwari M, Formia A, Thomé JC, Livingstone SR, Eckert S, Chacon-Chaverri D, et al. 2013. Population stock structure of leatherback turtles (Dermochelys coriacea) in the Atlantic revealed using mtDNA and microsatellite markers. Conservation Genetics 14: 625-636.

Eckert SA. 2006. High-use oceanic areas for Atlantic leatherback sea turtles (Dermochelys coriacea) as identified using satellite telemetered location and dive information. Marine Biology 149: 1257-1267.

Eckert, K.L., B.P. Wallace, J.G. Frazier, S.A. Eckert, and P.C.H. Pritchard. 2012. Synopsis of the Biological Data on the Leatherback Sea Turtle (Dermochelys Coriacea). U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Technical Publication BTP-R4015-2012, Washington, D.C.

Eckert S. 2013. An assessment of population size and status of Trinidad's leatherback sea turtle nesting colonies. WIDECAST Information Document No. 2013-01.

Eckert KL, Wallace BP, Spotila JR, Bell BA. 2015. Nesting, ecology, and reproduction. Spotila JR, Santidrián Tomillo P, editors. The leatherback turtle: biology and conservation. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press. p. 63.

Fossette S, Witt MJ, Miller P, Nalovic MA, Albareda D, Almeida AP, Broderick AC, Chacon-Chaverri D, Coyne MS, Domingo A, et al. 2014. Pan-atlantic analysis of the overlap of a highly migratory species, the leatherback turtle, with pelagic longline fisheries. Proc Biol Sci 281: 20133065.

Hays, G. C. 2000. The implications of variable remigration intervals for the assessment of population size in marine turtles. Journal of Theoretical Biology 206(2):221-7.

James, M. C., R. A. Myers, and C. A. Ottensmeyer. 2005a. Behaviour of leatherback sea turtles, Dermochelys coriacea, during the migratory cycle. Proceedings of the Royal Society Biological Sciences Series B 272(1572):1547-1555.

James MC, Andrea Ottensmeyer C, Myers RA. 2005b. Identification of high-use habitat and threats to leatherback sea turtles in northern waters: new directions for conservation. Ecology Letters 8: 195-201

James MC, Eckert SA, Myers RA. 2005c. Migratory and reproductive movements of male leatherback turtles (Dermochelys coriacea). Marine Biology 147: 845-853.

Lum L.L. 2006. Assessment of incidental sea turtle catch in the artisanal gillnet fishery in Trinidad and Tobago, West Indies. Applied Herpetology 3: 357 - 368.

Mazaris, A. D., Schofield, G., Gkazinou, C., Almpanidou, V., & Hays, G. C. 2017. Global sea turtle conservation successes. Science advances, 3(9), e1600730.

Molfetti E, Vilaca ST, Georges JY, Plot V, Delcroix E, Le Scao R, Lavergne A, Barrioz S, dos Santos FR, de Thoisy B. 2013. Recent demographic history and present fine-scale structure in the Northwest Atlantic leatherback (Dermochelys coriacea) turtle population. PLoS ONE 8: e58061.

NMFS and USFWS. 1992. Recovery plan for leatherback turtles in the U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico. National Marine Fisheries Service, Washington, D.C. 65 pp.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998. Recovery Plan for the U.S. Pacific Population of the Leatherback Turtle (Dermochelys coriacea). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD

NMFS and USFWS. 2013. Leatherback sea turtle (Dermochelys coriacea) 5-year review: Summary and evaluation. NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Southeast Region, Jacksonville Ecological Services Office.

NMFS and USFWS. 2020. Endangered Species Act status review of the leatherback turtle (Dermochelys coriacea). Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group. 2018. Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Turtle (Dermochelys coriacea) Status Assessment (Bryan Wallace and Karen Eckert, Compilers and Editors). Conservation Science Partners and the Wider Caribbean Sea Turtle Conservation Network (WIDECAST). WIDECAST Technical Report No. 16. Godfrey, Illinois. 36 pp.

Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group. 2019. Dermochelys coriacea Northwest Atlantic Ocean subpopulation. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2019.

Paladino FV, O'Connor MP, Spotila JR. 1990. Metabolism of leatherback turtles, gigantothermy, and thermoregulation of dinosaurs. Nature 344: 858-860.

Price ER, Wallace BP, Reina RD, Spotila JR, Paladino FV, Piedra R, Vélez E. 2004. Size, growth, and reproductive output of adult female leatherback turtles Dermochelys coriacea. Endangered Species Research 5: 8.

Reina RD, Mayor PA, Spotila JR, Piedra R, Paladino FV. 2002. Nesting ecology of the leatherback turtle, Dermochelys coriacea, at Parque Nacional Marino Las Baulas, Costa Rica: 1988–1989 to 1999–2000. Copeia 2002: 653-664.

Santidrián Tomillo P, Vélez E, Reina RD, Piedra R, Paladino FV, Spotila JR. 2007. Reassessment of the leatherback turtle (Dermochelys coriacea) nesting population at Parque Nacional Marino Las Baulas, Costa Rica: Effects of conservation efforts. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 6: 54-62.

Santidrián-Tomillo, P., Robinson, N. J., Fonseca, L. G., Quirós-Pereira, W., Arauz, R., Beange, M., ... & Wallace, B. P., 2017. Secondary nesting beaches for leatherback turtles on the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. Latin american journal of aquatic research, 45(3), 563-571.

Sarti Martínez, L., Barragán, A. R., Muñoz, D. G., García, N., Huerta, P., & Vargas, F. 2007. Conservation and biology of the leatherback turtle in the Mexican Pacific. Chelonian Conservation and Biology, 6(1), 70-78.

Shoop, C. R., and R. D. Kenney. 1992. Seasonal distributions and abundances of loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles in waters of the northeastern United States. Herpetological Monographs 6:43-67.

Spotila JR, Dunham AE, Leslie AJ, Steyermark AC, Plotkin PT, Paladino FV. 1996. Worldwide population decline of Dermochelys coriacea: are leatherback turtles going extinct? Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2: 209-222.

Tapilatu, R.F., Dutton, P.H., Tiwari, M., Wibbels, T., Ferdinandus, H.V., Iwanggin, W.G. and Nugroho, B.H. 2013. Long-term decline of the western Pacific leatherback, Dermochelys coriacea: a globally important sea turtle population. Ecosphere, 4(2), pp.1-15.

TEWG. 2007. An assessment of the leatherback turtle population in the Atlantic Ocean. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-555. p. 116.

Tiwari, M., B. P. Wallace, and M. Girondot. 2013b. Dermochelys coriacea (Northwest Atlantic Ocean subpopulation). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T46967827A46967830. International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Available from: https://www.iucnredlist.org/ja/species/46967827/184748440.

Tiwari, M., W. B.P., and M. Girondot. 2013a. Dermochelys coriacea (West Pacific Ocean subpopulation). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T46967817A46967821. International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Available from: https://www.iucnredlist.org/ja/species/46967817/46967821.

Wallace, B.P., Sotherland, P.R., Santidrian Tomillo, P., Reina, R.D., Spotila, J.R. and Paladino, F.V. 2007. Maternal investment in reproduction and its consequences in leatherback turtles. Oecologia, 152(1), pp.37-47.

Wallace, B.P., and Jones, T.T. 2008. What makes marine turtles go: A review of metabolic rates and their consequences. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology. 456(1-2):8-24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2007.12.023

Wallace BP, DiMatteo AD, Hurley BJ, Finkbeiner EM, Bolten AB, Chaloupka MY, Hutchinson BJ, Abreu-Grobois FA, Amorocho D, Bjorndal KA, et al. 2010. Regional management units for marine turtles: a novel framework for prioritizing conservation and research across multiple scales. PLoS ONE 5: e15465

Atlantic Sturgeon:

77 Federal Register 5880. February 6, 2012. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened and Endangered Status for Distinct Population Segments of Atlantic Sturgeon in the Northeast Region. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2012/02/06/2012-1946/endangered-and-threatened-wildlife-and-plants-threatened-and-endangered-status-for-distinct

77 Federal Register 5914. February 6, 2012. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Listing Determinations for Two Distinct Population Segments of Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2012/02/06/2012-1950/endangered-and-threatened-wildlife-and-plants-final-listing-determinations-for-two-distinct

82 Federal Register. 39160. August 17, 2017. Endangered and Threatened Species; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Endangered New York Bight, Chesapeake Bay, Carolina and South Atlantic Distinct Population Segments of Atlantic Sturgeon and the Threatened Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Sturgeon

Armstrong, J.L. and J.E. Hightower. 2002. Potential for restoration of the Roanoke River population of Atlantic sturgeon. Journal of Applied Ichthyology 18(4-6):475-480.

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 1998a. Amendment 1 to the interstate fishery management plan for Atlantic sturgeon. Management Report No. 31, 43 pp.

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 1998b. Atlantic Sturgeon Stock Assessment Peer Review Report. March 1998. 139 pp.

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 2007. Special Report to the Atlantic Sturgeon Management Board: Estimation of Atlantic sturgeon bycatch in coastal Atlantic commercial fisheries of New England and the Mid-Atlantic. August 2007. 95 pp.

ASMFC. 2010. Annual Report. 68 pp.

ASMFC. 2017. Atlantic Sturgeon Benchmark Stock Assessment and Peer Review Report, Arlington, VA. 456p. http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/AtlMenhadenBoardNov2017/AtlSturgonBenchmarkStockAssmt_PeerReviewReport_2017.pdf

ASSRT. 2007. Status review of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus). Atlantic Sturgeon Status Review Team, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office, Gloucester, Massachusetts, February 23. Available from: https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/document/status-review-atlantic-sturgeon-acipenser-oxyrinchus-oxyrinchus

Bain, M.B. 1997. Atlantic and shortnose sturgeons of the Hudson River: Common and divergent life history attributes. Environmental Biology of Fishes 48(1-4):347-358.

Bain, M.B., N. Haley, D. Peterson, K.K. Arend, K.E. Mills, and P.J. Sullivan. 2000. Shortnose sturgeon of the Hudson River: An endangered species recovery success. Page 14 in Twentieth Annual Meeting of the American Fisheries Society, St. Louis, Missouri.

Balazik, M.T., Garman G., Fine M., Hager C., and McIninch S. (2010). Changes in age composition and growth characteristics of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) over 400 years. Biology Letters 6, 708–710

Balazik, M.T., S.P. McIninch, G.C. Garman, and R.J. Latour. 2012. Age and growth of Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, Virginia, 1997 – 2011. Transactions of the

American Fisheries Society 141(4):1074-1080.

Balazik, M.T., G.C. Garman, J.P. VanEenennaam, J. Mohler, and C. Woods III. 2012a. Empirical evidence of fall spawning by Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, Virginia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 141(6):1465-1471.

Balazik M.T. and J.A. Musick. 2015. Dual Annual Spawning Races in Atlantic Sturgeon. PLoS ONE 10(5): e0128234.

Boreman, J. 1997. Sensitivity of North American sturgeons and paddlefish to fishing mortality. Environmental Biology of Fishes 48:399-405.

Bowen, B. W., Avise, J. C. 1990. Genetic structure of Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico populations of sea bass, menhaden, and sturgeon: Influence of zoogeographic factors and life-history patterns. Marine Biology. 107: 371–381.

Breece, M.W., Oliver, M., Cimino, M. A., Fox, D. A. 2013. Shifting distributions of adult Atlantic sturgeon amidst post-industrialization and future impacts in the Delaware River: a maximum entropy approach. PLOS ONE 8(11): e81321. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0081321

Brown, J.J. and G.W. Murphy. 2010. Atlantic sturgeon vessel strike mortalities in the Delaware River. Fisheries 35(2):72-83.

Brundage III, H.M. and J. C. O'Herron, II. 2009. Investigations of juvenile shortnose and Atlantic sturgeons in the lower tidal Delaware River. Bull. N.J. Acad. Sci. 54(2):1–8.

Bushnoe, T.M., J.A. Musick, D.S. Ha. 2005. Essential spawning and nursery habitat of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus) in Virginia. Provided by Jack Musick, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Gloucester Point, Virginia.

Calvo, L., H.M. Brundage, D. Haivogel, D. Kreeger, R. Thomas, J.C. O'Herron, and E. Powell. 2010. Effects of flow dynamics, salinity, and water quality on the Eastern oyster, the Atlantic sturgeon, and the shortnose sturgeon in the oligohaline zone of the Delaware Estuary. Prepared for the US Army Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District.

Caron, F., D. Hatin, and R. Fortin. 2002. Biological characteristics of adult Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus) in the St. Lawrence River estuary and the effectiveness of management rules. Journal of Applied Ichthyology 18:580-585.

Crance, J.H. 1987. Guidelines for using the delphi technique to develop habitat suitability index curves. Biological Report. Washington, D. C., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 82:36.

Colette, B. and G. Klein-MacPhee. 2002. Bigelow and Schroeder's Fishes of the Gulf of Maine. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Collins, M. R., Smith, T. I J. 1997. Management Briefs: Distributions of Shortnose and Atlantic Sturgeons in South Carolina. North American Journal of Fisheries Management. 17(4):995-1000. 10.1577/1548-8675(1997)017<0995:MBDOSA>2.3.CO;2

Collins, M.R., S G. Rogers, T. I. J. Smith, and M.L. Moser. 2000a. Primary factors affecting sturgeon populations in the southeastern United States: Fishing mortality and degradation of essential habitats. Bulletin of Marine Science 66(3):917-928.

Collins, M.R., Smith, T.I., Post, I.J., Post, W.C., Pashuk, O. 2000b. Habitat Utilization and Biological Characteristics of Adult Atlantic Sturgeon in Two South Carolina Rivers. 129(4):982-988. https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8659(2000)129<0982:HUABCO>2.3.CO;2

Dadswell, M.J., 2006. A review of the status of Atlantic sturgeon in Canada, with comparisons to populations in the United States and Europe. Fisheries, 31(5), pp.218-229.

DiJohnson, AM. 2019. Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) Behavioral Responses to Vessel Traffic. Thesis Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in the Natural Resource Graduate Program of Delaware State University and Habitat Use in the Delaware River, USA. https://desu.dspacedirect.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12090/442/DiJohnson_desu_1824M_10122.pdf

Dovel, W.L. and T.J. Berggren. 1983. Atlantic sturgeon of the Hudson Estuary, New York. New York Fish and Game Journal 30(2): 140-172.

Dunton, K.J., A. Jordaan, K.A. McKown, D.O. Conover, and M.G. Frisk. 2010. Abundance and Distribution of Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus) within the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, Determined from Five Fishery-Independent Surveys. U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service Fishery Bulletin 108: 450–465.

Dunton, K.J., Chapman D., Jordaan A., Feldheim K., O'Leary S.J., McKown K.A., and Frisk, M.G. (2012). Genetic mixed-stock analysis of Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus, in a heavily exploited marine habitat indicates the need for routine genetic monitoring. Journal of Fish Biology, 80(1), 207-217

Dunton, K.J., Jordaan A., Conover D.O, McKown K.A., Bonacci L.A., and Frisk M.G. (2015). Marine distribution and habitat use of Atlantic sturgeon in New York lead to fisheries interactions and bycatch. Marine and Coastal Fisheries: Dynamics, Management, and Ecosystem Science, 7(1), 18-32

Erickson, D.L., Kahnle, A., Millard, M.J., Mora, E.A., Bryja, M., Higgs, A., Mohler, J., DuFour, M., Kenney, G., Sweka, J. and Pikitch, E.K. 2011. Use of pop-up satellite archival tags to identify oceanic-migratory patterns for adult Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus Mitchell, 1815. Journal of Applied Ichthyology, 27(2), pp.356-365.

Fernandes, S.J., G.B. Zydlewski, J. Zydlewski, G.S. Wippelhauser, and M.T. Kinnison. 2010. Seasonal distribution and movementskahnle of shortnose sturgeon and Atlantic sturgeon in the Penobscot River Estuary, Maine. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 139:1436–1449.

Fritts, M. W., Grunwald, C., Wirgin, I., King, T. L., Peterson, D. L. 2016. Status and Genetic Character of Atlantic Sturgeon in the Satilla River, Georgia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. 145(1):69-82. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00028487.2015.1094131

Gilbert, C.R. 1989. Species profiles: Life histories and environmental requirements of coastal fishes and invertebrates (Mid-Atlantic Bight): Atlantic and shortnose sturgeons. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report. Washington, D. C., U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station. 82.

Greene, K. E., Zimmerman, J. L., Laney, R. W., & Thomas-Blate, J. C. (2009). Atlantic coast diadromous fish habitat: a review of utilization, threats, recommendations for conservation, and research needs. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Habitat Management Series, 464, 276.

Hager, C., J. Kahn, C. Watterson, J. Russo, and K. Hartman. 2014. Evidence of Atlantic sturgeon spawning in the York River system. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 143(5): 1217-1219.

Hatin, D., Fortin, R., Caron, F. 2002. Movements and aggregation areas of adult Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus) in the St Lawrence River estuary, Québec, Canada. Journal of Applied Ichthyology. Vol 18: 586-594. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0426.2002.00395.x

Hildebrand S.F. and W.C. Schroeder. 1928. Acipenseridae: Acipenser oxyrhynchus, Mitchill. Pp. 72- 77. In: Fishes of Chesapeake Bay, Bulletin of the Bureau of Fisheries, No. 43.

Hilton, E.J., Kynard B., Balazik M.T., Horodysky A.Z., and Dillman C. B. (2016). Review of the biology, fisheries, and conservation status of the Atlantic sturgeon, (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus Mitchill, 1815). Journal of Applied Ichthyology, 32(1), 30-66

Holland, B.F. Jr. and G.F. Yelverton. 1973. Distribution and biological studies of anadromous fishes offshore North Carolina. N. C. Department Natural Resources Special Science Report:.24.

Kahn, J., C. Hager, J. C. Watterson, J. Russo, K. Moore, and K. Hartman. 2014. Atlantic sturgeon annual spawning run estimate in the Pamunkey River, Virginia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 143(6): 1508-1514.

Kahnle, A.W., Hattala, K.A., McKown, K.A., Shirey, C.A., Collins, M.R., Squiers Jr, T.S. and Savoy, T. 1998. Stock status of Atlantic sturgeon of Atlantic Coast estuaries. Report for the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Draft III.

Kahnle, A. W., K. A. Hattala, K. McKown. 2007. Status of Atlantic sturgeon of the Hudson River estuary, New York, USA. In J. Munro, D. Hatin, K. McKown, J. Hightower, K. Sulak, A. Kahnle, and F. Caron (editors). Proceedings of the symposium on anadromous sturgeon: Status and trend, anthropogenic impact, and essential habitat. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD

Kazyak, D.C., White, S.L., Lubinski, B.A., Johnson, R. and Eackles, M. 2021. Stock composition of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) encountered in marine and estuarine environments on the US Atlantic Coast. Conservation Genetics, pp.1-15.

Kynard, B. and M. Horgan. 2002. Ontogenetic behavior and migration of Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus, and shortnose sturgeon, A. brevirostrum, with notes on social behavior. Environmental Biology of Fishes 63:137-150.

Kocik, J., C. Lipsky, T. Miller, P. Rago, and G. Shepherd. 2013. An Atlantic sturgeon population index for ESA management analysis. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Center Reference Document 13-06. Available from: http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/publications/crd/.

Laney, R.W., Hightower, J.E., Versak, B.R., Mangold, M.F., Cole, W.W. and Winslow, S.E., 2007. Distribution, habitat use, and size of Atlantic sturgeon captured during cooperative winter tagging cruises, 1988-2006. In American Fisheries Society Symposium (Vol. 56, p. 167). American Fisheries Society.

Leland, J.G. 1968. A survey of the sturgeon fishery of South Carolina. Contributions from Bears Bluff Laboratories, Bears Bluff Laboratories No. 47. 27 pp.

Lichter, J., H. Caron, T. Pasakarnis, S. Rodgers, T. Squiers, and C. Todd. 2006. The ecological collapse and partial recovery of a freshwater tidal ecosystem. Northeastern Naturalist 13:153-178.

McCord, J. W., Collins, M. R., Post, W. C., & Smith, T. I. (2007). Attempts to develop an index of abundance for age-1 Atlantic sturgeon in South Carolina, USA. In American Fisheries Society Symposium (Vol. 56, p. 397). American Fisheries Society.

Mohler, J. W. "Culture manual for the Atlantic sturgeon Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus." *US Fish & Wildlife Service, Region* 5 (2003).

Murawski, S.A. and A.L. Pacheco. 1977. Biological and fisheries data on Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrhynchus (Mitchill). Sandy Hook Laboratory, Northeast Fisheries Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, US Department of Commerce.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). (2013). Endangered Species Act section 7 consultation biological opinion: Continued implementation of management measures for the Northeast Multispecies, Monkfish, Spiny Dogfish, Atlantic Bluefish, Northeast Skate Complex, Mackerel/Squid/Butterfish, and Summer Flounder/Scup/Black Sea Bass Fisheries, GARFO2012-00006. December 16, 2013. 440 p.

NMFS. 2017a. Designation of critical habitat for the Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, and Chesapeake Bay Distinct Population Segments of Atlantic Sturgeon: ESA Section 4(b)(2) impact analysis and biological source document with the economic analysis and final regulatory flexibility analysis. Finalized June 3, 2017. 244 p.

NMFS. 2018. ESA RECOVERY OUTLINE - Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, Chesapeake Bay, Carolina, and South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic Sturgeon. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/ats_recovery_outline.pdf

NMFS. 2022a. Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. National Marine Fisheries Service Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2022b. New York Bight Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. National Marine Fisheries Service Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2022c. Chesapeake Bay Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. National Marine Fisheries Service Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office Gloucester, Massachusetts.

NMFS. 2022d. National Marine Fisheries Service Endangered Species Act Section 7 Biological Opinion USACE Permit for the New Jersey Wind Port (NAP-2019-01084-39). United States. National Marine Fisheries Service. Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office. https://doi.org/10.25923/j8gz-g091

Niklitschek, E.J. and Secor, D.H., 2005. Modeling spatial and temporal variation of suitable nursery habitats for Atlantic sturgeon in the Chesapeake Bay. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 64(1), pp.135-148.

Niklitschek, E.S. and D.H. Secor. 2010. Experimental and field evidence of behavioral habitat selection by juvenile Atlantic (Acipenser oxyrinchus) and shortnose (Acipenser brevirostrum) sturgeons. Journal of Fish Biology 77:1293-1308.

Oakley, N. C. 2003.Status of shortnose sturgeon, Acipenser brevirostrum, in the Neuse River, North Carolina. http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/resolver/1840.16/2646

O'Leary, S.J., Dunton, K.J., King, T.L., Frisk, M.G., Chapman, D. D. (2014). Genetic diversity and effective number of breeders of Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrhinchus oxyrhinchus. Conservation Genetics. DOI: 10.1007/s10592-014-0609-9

Oliver, M. J., Breece, M. W., Fox, D. A., Haulsee, D. E., Kohut, J. T., Manderson, J., & Savoy, T. (2013). Shrinking the haystack: using an AUV in an integrated ocean observatory to map Atlantic Sturgeon in the coastal ocean. Fisheries, *38*(5), 210-216.

Ong, T.-L., J. Stabile, I. Wirgin, andJ. R. Waldman. 1996. Genetic diver- gence between Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus and A. o. deso- toi as assessed by mitochondrial DNA sequencing analysis. Copeia 1996:464-469.

Post, B., T. Darden, D.L. Peterson, M. Loeffler, and C. Collier. 2014. Research and Management of Endangered and Threatened Species in the Southeast: Riverine Movements of Shortnose and Atlantic sturgeon, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. 274 pp.

Pyzik, L., J. Caddick, and P. Marx. 2004. Chesapeake Bay: Introduction to an ecosystem. EPA 903-R-04-003, CBP/TRS 232/00. 35 pp.

Richardson, B. and Secor D. (2016). Assessment of critical habitats for recovering the Chesapeake Bay Atlantic sturgeon distinct population segment. Final Report. Section 6 Species Recovery Grants Program Award Number: NA13NMF4720042.

Savoy, T. and D. Pacileo. 2003. Movements and important habitats of subadult Atlantic sturgeon in Connecticut waters. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. 132:1-8.

Savoy, T., L. Maceda, N.K. Roy, D. Peterson, and I. Wirgin. 2017. Evidence of natural reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the Connecticut River from unlikely sources. PLoS ONE 12(4):e0175085.

Schueller, P. and D.L. Peterson. 2010. Abundance and recruitment of juvenile Atlantic sturgeon in the Altamaha River, Georgia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. 139:1526-1535.

Scott, W.B. and E.J. Crossman. 1973. Freshwater fishes of Canada. Bulletin of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada. 184:1-966.

Secor, D. H., Niklitschek, E. J., Stevenson, J. T., Gunderson, T. E., Minkkinen, S. P., Richardson, B. 2000. Dispersal and growth of yearling Atlantic sturgeon Acipenser oxyrinchus, released into Chesapeake Bay(*). National Marine Fisheries Service. Fishery Bulletin (Vol. 98, Issue 4).

Secor, D.H. 2002. Atlantic sturgeon fisheries and stock abundances during the late nineteenth century. American Fisheries Society Symposium. 28:89-98.

Secor, D. H. and J. R. Waldman. 1999. Historical abundance of Delaware Bay Atlantic sturgeon and potential rate of recovery. American Fisheries Society Symposium 23: 203-216.

Secor, D.H., O'Brien M.H.P., Coleman N., Horne A., Park I., Kazyak D.C., Bruce D.G., and Stence C. (2021). Atlantic sturgeon status and movement ecology in an extremely small spawning habitat: The Nanticoke River-Marshyhope Creek, Chesapeake Bay, Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture, DOI: 10.1080/23308249.2021.1924617

Smith, T.I.J., D.E. Marchette, and R.A. Smiley. 1982. Life history, ecology, culture and management of Atlantic sturgeon, *Acipenser oxyrhynchus oxyrhynchus*, Mitchill. Final Report to US Fish and Wildlife Service. Project AFS-9. 75 pp.

Smith, T.I.J. 1985. The fishery, biology, and management of Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrhynchus, in North America. Environmental Biology of Fishes. 14:61-72.

Smith, T.I.J. and J.P. Clugston. 1997. Status and management of Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrinchus, in North America. Environmental Biology of Fishes. 48:335-346.

Squiers, T., M. Smith, and L. Flagg. 1979. Distribution and abundance of shortnose and Atlantic sturgeon in the Kennebec River Estuary. Research Reference Document 79/13.

Stein, A. B., Friedland, K. D., & Sutherland, M. 2004. Atlantic sturgeon marine distribution and habitat use along the northeastern coast of the United States. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 133(3), 527-537

Stein, A. B., K. D. Friedland, and M. Sutherland. 2004b. Atlantic sturgeon marine bycatch and mortality on the continental shelf of the Northeast United States. North American Journal of Fisheries Management. 24: 171-183.

Stein, A.B., K.D. Friedland, and M. Sutherland. 2004a. "Atlantic Sturgeon Marine Distribution and Habitat Use along the Northeastern Coast of the United States." Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 133: 527-537.

Stevenson, J.T. and D.H. Secor. 1999. Age determination and growth of Hudson River Atlantic sturgeon Acipenser oxyrinchus. Fishery Bulletin. 98:153-166.

Stevenson, JT. 1997. In Life history characteristics of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus) in the Hudson River and a model for fishery management, Master's thesis. University of Maryland, College Park.

Sulak, Ken & Randall, Michael. (2002). Understanding sturgeon life history: Enigmas, myths, and insights from scientific studies. Journal of Applied Ichthyology. 18. 519 - 528. 10.1046/j.1439-0426.2002.00413.x.

Sweka, J.A., Mohler, J., Millard, M.J., Kehler, T., Kahnle, A., Hattala, K., Kenney, G. and Higgs, A. 2007. Juvenile Atlantic sturgeon habitat use in Newburgh and Haverstraw Bays of the Hudson River: Implications for population monitoring. North American Journal of Fisheries Management, 27(4), pp.1058-1067.

Timoshkin, V. P. 1968. Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser sturio L.) caught at sea. Journal of Ichthyology 8(4):598.

Van Den Avyle, M. J. 1984. Atlantic Sturgeon. The Service. 82(11).

Van Eenennaam, J., S.I. Doroshov, G.P. Moberg, J.G. Watson, D.S. Moore, and J. Linares. 1996. Reproductive conditions of the Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus) in the Hudson River. Estuaries and Coasts. 19:769-777.

Vladykov, V.D. and J.R. Greeley. 1963. Order Acipenseroidei. Pp. 24-60. In: Fishes of Western North Atlantic. Memoir Sears Foundation for Marine Research, Number 1. 630 pp.

Waldman, J. R., Hart, J. T., Wirgin, I. I. 1996. Stock Composition of the New York Bight Atlantic Sturgeon Fishery Based on Analysis of Mitochondrial DNA. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. 125(3):364-371.

Waldman, J. R., and I. I.Wirgin. 1998. Status and restoration options for Atlantic sturgeon in North America. Conservation Biology 12: 631-638. https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8659(1996)125%3C0364:SCOTNY%3E2.3.CO;2

Waldman, J. R., King, T., Savoy, T., Maceda, L., Grunwald, C., & Wirgin, I. (2013). Stock origins of subadult and adult Atlantic sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrinchus, in a non-natal estuary, Long Island Sound. Estuaries and Coasts, 36, 257-267.

Wippelhauser, G.S. 2012. A regional conservation plan for Atlantic sturgeon in the U.S. Gulf of Maine. Maine Department of Marine Resources. 37pp.

Wippelhauser, G.S., Bartlett, J., Beaudry, J., Enterline, C., Gray, N., King, C., Noll, J., Pasterczyk, M., Valliere, J., Waterhouse, M. and Zink, S. 2013. A regional conservation plan for Atlantic sturgeon in the US Gulf of Maine.Available at: https://www.maine.gov/dmr/science-research/species/documents/I%20-%20Atlantic%20Sturgeon%20GOM%20Regional%20Conservation%20Plan.pdf

Wippelhauser, G., and T.S. Squiers. 2015. Shortnose Sturgeon and Atlantic Strurgeon in the Kennebec River System, Maine: a 1977-2001 Retrospective of Abundance and Important Habitat. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 144(3):591-601.

Wippelhauser, G.S., Sulikowski, J., Zydlewski, G.B., Altenritter, M.A., Kieffer, M. and Kinnison, M.T. 2017. Movements of Atlantic Sturgeon of the Gulf of Maine inside and outside of the geographically defined distinct population segment. Marine and Coastal Fisheries, 9(1), pp.93-107.

Wirgin, I., Waldman, J., Stabile, J., Lubinski, B., & King, T. (2002). Comparison of mitochondrial DNA control region sequence and microsatellite DNA analyses in estimating population structure and gene flow rates in Atlantic sturgeon Acipenser oxyrinchus. Journal of Applied Ichthyology, 18(4-6), 313-319.

Wirgin, I., and T. King. "Mixed stock analysis of Atlantic sturgeon from coastal locales and a non-spawning river." NMFS Sturgeon Workshop, Alexandria, VA. 2011.

Wirgin, I., Maceda L., Waldman J.R., Wehrell S., Dadswell M., and King T. (2012). Stock origin of migratory Atlantic Sturgeon in Minas Basin, Inner Bay of Fundy, Canada, determined by microsatellite and mitochondrial DNA analyses. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 141(5), 1389-1398

Wirgin, I., M. W. Breece, D. A. Fox, L. Maceda, K. W. Wark, and T. King. 2015a. Origin of Atlantic Sturgeon collected off the Delaware coast during spring months. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 35(1): 20-30.

Wirgin, I., L. Maceda, C. Grunwald, and T. L. King. 2015b. Population origin of Atlantic sturgeon Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus bycatch in U.S. Atlantic coast fisheries. Journal of Fish Biology 86(4): 1251-1270.

5.0 Environmental Baseline

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 2017. Atlantic Sturgeon Benchmark Stock Assessment Peer Review Report. Accessed November 27, 2018. Retrieved from: http://www.asmfc.org/files/Meetings/76AnnualMeeting/AtlanticSturgeonBoardPresentations_Oc t2017.pdf

ASSRT (Atlantic Sturgeon Status Review Team). 2007. Status review of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus). National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office, Atlantic Sturgeon Status Review Team.

Barco, S. G., M. L. Burt, R. A. DiGiovanni, Jr., W. M. Swingle, and A. S. Williard. 2018. Loggerhead turtle, Caretta caretta, density and abundance in Chesapeake Bay and the temperate ocean waters of the southern portion of the Mid-Atlantic Bight. Endangered Species Research 37: 269-287.

Biedron I, Mihnovets N, Warde A, Michalec J and others (2009) Determining the seasonal distribution of ce - taceans in New York coastal waters using passive acoustic monitoring. Abstracts of 18th Bienn Conf Biol Mar Mamm, Québec City, 12–16 Oct 2009, p 34

Bigelow, H.B., 1933. Studies of the waters on the continental shelf, Cape Cod to Chesapeake Bay. I. The cycle of temperature.

BOEM. 2022. New York Bight Fish, Fisheries, and Sand Features: In the Field Research Project biological assessment.

Bort, J., S. M. V. Parijs, P. T. Stevick, E. Summers, and S. Todd. 2015. North Atlantic right whale Eubalaena glacialis vocalization patterns in the central Gulf of Maine from October 2009 through October 2010. Endangered Species Research 26(3):271-280.

Borobia, M., Gearing, P.J., Simard, Y. et al. 1995. Blubber fatty acids of finback and humpback whales from the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Marine Biology 122, 341–353 (1995). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00350867

Bowman R, Lyman E, Mattila D, Mayo C, Brown M (2001) Habitat management lessons from a satellite-tracked right whale. Abstracts of 14th Bienn Conf Biol Mar Mamm, Van couver, 28 Nov–3 Dec 2001, p 31

Braun-McNeill, J. and S. P. Epperly. 2002. Spatial and temporal distribution of sea turtles in the western North Atlantic and the U.S. Gulf of Mexico from Marine Recreational Fishery Statistics Survey (MRFSS). Marine Fisheries Review 64(4): 50-56.

Braun-McNeill, J., C. R. Sasso, S. P. Epperly, and C. Rivero. 2008. Feasibility of using sea surface temperature imagery to mitigate cheloniid sea turtle–fishery interactions off the coast of northeastern USA. Endangered Species Research 5(2-3): 257-266.

Castelao, R., S. Glenn, and O. Schofield. 2010. Temperature, salinity, and density variability in the central Middle Atlantic Bight. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, *115*(C10).

Ceriani, S. A., J. D. Roth, D. R. Evans, J. F. Weishampel, and L. M. Ehrhart. 2012. Inferring foraging areas of nesting loggerhead turtles using satellite telemetry and stable isotopes. PLoS ONE 7(9): e45335.

CETAP. 1982. A characterization of marine mammals and turtles in the mid-and north Atlantic areas of the U.S. outer continental shelf. Cetacean and Turtle Assessment Program, University of Rhode Island, South Kingston, Rhode Island. Final report. Sponsored by the Bureau of Land Management under contract AA551-CT8-48.

Clark, C. W. 1995. Application of U.S. Navy underwater hydrophone arrays for scientific research on whales. Reports of the International Whaling Commission 45.

Cole, T.V.N., P. Hamilton, A. Glass, P. Henry, R.M. Duley, B.N. Pace III, T. White, T. Frasier. 2013. “Evidence of a North Atlantic Right Whale Eubalaena glacialis Mating Ground.” Endangered Species Research 21: 55–64.

Cook, R.R. and P.J. Auster. 2007. A Bioregional Classification of the Continental Shelf of Northeastern North America for Conservation Analysis and Planning Based on Representation. Marine Sanctuaries Conservation Series NMSP-07-03. U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Sanctuary Program, Silver Spring, MD.

Conserve Wildlife Foundation of New Jersey (CWFNJ). 2021. New Jersey Endangered and Threatened Species Field Guide. Available: http://www.conservewildlifenj.org/species/fieldguide/.

Dadswell, M.J. 2006. “A Review of the Status of Atlantic Sturgeon in Canada, with Comparisons to Populations in the United States and Europe.” Fisheries 31: 218-229.

Damon-Randall, K., M. Colligan, and J. Crocker. 2013. Composition of Atlantic Sturgeon in Rivers, Estuaries, and Marine Waters. National Marine Fisheries Service, NERO, Unpublished Report. February 2013. 33 pp.

Davies, K.T., M.W. Brown, P.K. Hamilton, A.R. Knowlton., C.T. Taggart, and A.S. Vanderlaan. 2019. Variation in North Atlantic right whale Eubalaena glacialis occurrence in the Bay of Fundy, Canada, over three decades. *Endangered Species Research*, *39*, pp.159-171.

Davis, G.E., et al. 2017. “Long-Term Passive Acoustic Recordings Track the Changing Distribution of North Atlantic Right Whales (Eubalaena Glacialis) from 2004 to 2014. Scientific Reports 7, no. 13460: 1-12. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/gcb.15191

Davis et al. 2020. Exploring movement patterns and changing distributions of baleen whales in the western North Atlantic using a decade of passive acoustic data. Global Change Biology. Vol 26. Issue 9: 4812-4840.

DNV-GL. 2021. *South Fork Wind Farm Navigation Safety Risk Assessment*. Appendix M in Construction and Operations Plan South Fork Wind Farm. Prepared for Deepwater Wind, LLC. Document No. 10057311-HOU-R-01. Medford, Massachusetts: DNV-GL.

Dodge, K.L., J.M. Logan, and M.E. Lutcavage. 2011. “Foraging Ecology of Leatherback Sea Turtles in the Western North Atlantic Determined through Multi-Tissue Stable Isotope Analyses.” Marine Biology 158: 2813-2824.

Dow, W., Eckert, K., Palmer, M. and Kramer, P., 2007. An atlas of sea turtle nesting habitat for the wider Caribbean region. The Wider Caribbean Sea Turtle Conservation Network and The Nature Conservancy, Beaufort, North Carolina.

Dovel, W.L. and T.J. Berggren. 1983. Atlantic sturgeon of the Hudson Estuary, New York. New York Fish and Game Journal 30(2): 140-172.

Dunton, K.J., A. Jordaan, K.A. McKown, D.O. Conover, and M.G. Frisk. 2010. "Abundance and Distribution of Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus) within the Northwest Atlantic Ocean, Determined from Five Fishery-Independent Surveys." U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service Fishery Bulletin 108: 450–465.

Dunton, K. J., A. Jordaan, D. O. Conover, K. A. McKown, L. A. Bonacci, and M. G. Frisk. 2015. Marine distribution and habitat use of Atlantic sturgeon in New York lead to fisheries interactions and bycatch. Marine and Coastal Fisheries 7(1): 18-32.

Eckert, S.A. 1998. Perspectives on the use of satellite telemetry and other electronic technologies for the study of marine turtles, with reference to the first year-long tracking of leatherback turtles. In: Epperly, S. P. and J. Braun. Proceedings of the 17th Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. Orlando, FL US Department of Commerce. NOAA Tech. Memor. NMFS-SEFSC-415, p. 294.

Eckert, K.L., B.P. Wallace, J.G. Frazier, S.A. Eckert, and P.C.H. Pritchard. 2012. Synopsis of the Biological Data on the Leatherback Sea Turtle (Dermochelys Coriacea). U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Technical Publication BTP-R4015-2012, Washington, D.C.

EPA. 2015. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Office of Water and Office of Research and Development. (2015). National Coastal Condition Assessment 2010 (EPA 841-R-15-006). Washington, DC. December 2015. http://www.epa.gov/national-aquatic-resource-surveys/ncca

Erickson, D. L., et al. 2011. Use of pop-up satellite archival tags to identify oceanic-migratory patterns for adult Atlantic Sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus Mitchell, 1815. J. Appl. Ichthyol. 27: 356–365.

Estabrook, B.J., Hodge, K.B., Salisbury, D.P., Ponirakis, D., Harris, D.V., Zeh, J.M., Parks, S.E. and Rice, A.N., 2019. Year-1 Annual Survey Report for New York Bight Whale Monitoring Passive Acoustic Surveys October 2017–October 2018. Contract C009925.

Estabrook, B.J., Hodge, K.B., Salisbury, D.P., Ponirakis, D., Harris, D.V., Zeh, J.M., Parks, S.E. and Rice, A.N., 2020. Year-2 Annual Survey Report for New York Bight Whale Monitoring Passive Acoustic Surveys October 2018–October 2019. Contract C009925.

Eyler, S., M. Mangold, and S. Minkkinen. 2004. Atlantic Coast sturgeon tagging database. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Maryland Fishery Resources Office, Annapolis

George, R. H. 1997. Health problems and diseases of sea turtles. In Lutz, P.L. and Musick, J.A. (Eds.), The Biology of Sea Turtles (Volume I, pp. 363-385). CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Goff, J.A., J.A. Austin Jr. S. Gulick, S. Nordfjord, B. Christensen, C. Sommerfield, H. Olson, and C. Alexander. 2005. Recent and modern marine erosion on the New Jersey outer shelf. *Marine Geology*, *216*(4), pp.275-296.

Gong, D.J., J.T. Kohut, and S.M. Glenn. 2010. Seasonal climatology of wind-driven circulation on the New Jersey Shelf. J Geophys Res. 115(C4):C04006. https://doi.org/10.1029/2009JC005520.

Griffin, D. B., S. R. Murphy, M. G. Frick, A. C. Broderick, J. W. Coker, M. S. Coyne, M. G. Dodd, M. H. Godfrey, B. J. Godley, L. A. Hawkes, T. M. Murphy, K. L. Williams, and M. J. Witt. 2013. Foraging habitats and migration corridors utilized by a recovering subpopulation of adult female loggerhead sea turtles: implications for conservation. Marine Biology 160(12): 3071-3086.

Hain, J. H. W., M. J. Ratnaswamy, R. D. Kenney, and H. E. Winn. 1992. The fin whale, Balaenoptera physalus, in waters of the Northeastern United States continental shelf. Report of the International Whaling Commission 42.

Hayes, S., E. Josephson, K. Maze-Foley, and P. Rosel, eds. 2021. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments—2020. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NE-271. *https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2021-07/Atlantic%202020%20SARs%20Final.pdf?null%09*

Hayes, S.A., E. Josephson, K. Maze-Foley, P.E. Rosel (eds). (2020). US Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments - 2019 U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, MA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-264, July 2020. 479 pp.

Henry, A., M. Garron, D. M. Morin, A. Reid, W. Ledwell, and T. V. N. Cole. 2020. Serious injury and mortality determinations for baleen whale stocks along the Gulf of Mexico, United States East Coast, and Atlantic Canadian Provinces, 2013-2017. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Center Reference Document 20-06. Available from: https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/25359.

Henry, A., A. Smith, M. Garron, D. M. Morin, A. Reid, W. Ledwell, and T. V. N. Cole. 2022. Serious injury and mortality determinations for baleen whale stocks along the Gulf of Mexico, United States East Coast, and Atlantic Canadian Provinces, 2016-2020. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Center

Reference Document 22-13. Available from:
https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/45279.

Houghton, R.W., R. Schlitz, R.C. Beardsley, B. Butman, and J.L. Chamberlin. 1982. The Middle Atlantic Bight Cold Pool: Evolution of the temperature structure during summer 1979. J Phys Oceanogr. 12:1019–29. https:// doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1982)012% 3C1019:TMABCP%3E2.0.CO;2.

James, M. C., S. A. Eckert, and R. A. Myers. 2005b. Migratory and reproductive movements of male leatherback turtles (Dermochelys coriacea). Marine Biology 147: 845.

James, M. C., C. A. Ottensmeyer, S. A. Eckert, and R. A. Myers. 2006a. Changes in diel diving patterns accompany shifts between northern foraging and southward migration in leatherback turtles. Canadian Journal of Zoology 84: 754+.

Johnson, J.H., D.S. Dropkin, B.E. Warkentine, J.W. Rachlin, and W.D. Andrews. 1997. Food habits of Atlantic sturgeon off the central New Jersey coast. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 126:166-170.

Kaplan, B., ed. 2011. Literature Synthesis for the North and Central Atlantic Ocean. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, Gulf of Mexico OCS Region, New Orleans, LA. OCS Study BOEMRE 2011-012. 447 pp.

Kazyak, D.C., White, S.L., Lubinski, B.A., Johnson, R. and Eackles, M., 2021. Stock composition of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) encountered in marine and estuarine environments on the US Atlantic Coast. Conservation Genetics, pp.1-15.

Kenney, R.D., and H.E. Winn. 1986. “Cetacean High-Use Habitats of the Northeast United States Continental Shelf.” Fishery Bulletin 84: 345–357.

Kenney, R.D. and Winn, H.E., 1987. Cetacean biomass densities near submarine canyons compared to adjacent shelf/slope areas. Continental Shelf Research, 7(2), pp.107-114.

Kenney, R.D., and K.J. Vigness-Raposa. 2010. RICRMC (Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council) Ocean Special Area Management Plan (SAMP), Volume 2. Appendix, Chapter 10. Marine Mammals and Sea Turtles of Narragansett Bay, Block Island Sound, Rhode Island Sound, and Nearby Waters: An Analysis of Existing Data for the Rhode Island Ocean Special Area Management Plan.

Knowlton AR, Ring JB, Russell B (2002) Right whale sightings and survey effort in the mid Atlantic region:migratory corridor, time frame, and proximity to port entrances. Report to the NMFS Ship Strike Working Group, Silver Spring, MD. Available at www. nero. noaa.gov/shipstrike/midatanticreportrFINAL.pdf

Knowlton, A.R., J. Sigurjonsson, J.N. Ciano, and S.D. Kraus. 1992. Long distance movements of North Atlantic right whales (Eubalaena glacialis). Mar. Mamm. Sci. 8(4): 397 405.

Kraus, S.D., R.D. Kenney, C.A Mayo, W.A. McLellan, M.J. Moore, D.P. Nowacek. 2016a. "Recent Scientific Publications Cast Doubt on North Atlantic Right Whale Future." Frontiers in Marine Science 3, no. 137:1-3.

Kraus, S.D., et al. 2016b. Northeast Large Pelagic Survey Collaborative Aerial and Acoustic Surveys for Large Whales and Sea Turtles. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Sterling, Virginia. OCS Study BOEM 2016-054.

Küsel, E.T., M.J. Weirathmueller, K.E. Zammit, S.J. Welch, K.E. Limpert, and D.G. Zeddies. 2022. Underwater Acoustic and Exposure Modeling. Document 02109, Version 1.0 DRAFT. Technical report by JASCO Applied Sciences for Ocean Wind LLC.

Kynard, B., M. Horgan, M. Kieffer, and D. Seibel. 2000. Habitats used by shortnose sturgeon in two Massachusetts rivers, with notes on estuarine Atlantic sturgeon: A hierarchical approach. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 129(2): 487-503.

LaBrecque, E, C. Curtice, J. Harrison, S.M. Van Parijs, P.N. Halpin. 2015. "Biologically Important Areas for Cetaceans within US Waters—East Coast Region." Aquatic Mammals 41, no. 1: 17–29.

Laney, R.W. et al. 2007. Distribution, habitat use, and size of Atlantic sturgeon captured during cooperative winter tagging cruises, 1988–2006. Pages 167-182. In: J. Munro, D. Hatin, J. E. Hightower, K. McKown, K. J. Sulak, A. W. Kahnle, and F. Caron, (editors), Anadromous sturgeons: Habi¬tats, threats, and management. Am. Fish. Soc. Symp. 56, Bethesda, MD

Leiter, S.M., et al. 2017. "North Atlantic Right Whale Eubalaena Glacialis Occurrence in Offshore Wind Energy Areas near Massachusetts and Rhode Island, USA." Endangered Species Research 34: 45–59.

Lentz, S.J. 2017. Seasonal warming of the Middle Atlantic Bight Cold Pool. J Geophys Res-Oceans. 122:941–54. https://doi.org/ 10.1002/2016JC012201.

Lentz, S., Shearman, K., Anderson, S., Plueddemann, A., & Edson, J. 2003. Evolution of stratification over the New England shelf during the Coastal Mixing and Optics study, August 1996–June 1997. J Geophys Res- Oceans. 108(C1):3008–14. https://doi.org/ 10.1029/2001JC001121.

Mansfield, K. L., V. S. Saba, J. A. Keinath, and J. A. Musick. 2009. Satellite tracking reveals dichotomy in migration strategies among juvenile loggerhead turtles in the Northwest Atlantic. Marine Biology 156: 2555-2570.

Meyer-Gutbrod EL, Greene CH, Sullivan PJ, Pershing AJ (2015) Climate-associated changes in prey availability drive reproductive dynamics of the North Atlantic right whale population. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 535:243-258. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps11372

Meyer-Gutbrod, E.L., Greene, C.H., Davies, K.T. and Johns, D.G., 2021. Ocean regime shift is driving collapse of the North Atlantic right whale population. *Oceanography*, *34*(3), pp.22-31.

Miles, T., S. Murphy, J. Kohut, S. Borsetti, and D. Munroe, 2021. Offshore wind energy and the Mid-Atlantic Cold Pool: A review of potential interactions. *Marine Technology Society Journal*, *55*(4), pp.72-87.

Milton, S. L. and P. L. Lutz. 2003. Physiological and genetic responses to environmental stress. In Musick, J.A. and Wyneken, J. (Eds.), The Biology of Sea Turtles, Volume II (pp. 163–197). CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Morano, J. L., and coauthors. 2012. Acoustically detected year-round presence of right whales in an urbanized migration corridor. Conservation Biology 26(4):698-707.

Morreale, S. J., A. Meylan, S. S. Sadove, and E. A. Standora. 1992. Annual occurrence and winter mortality of marine turtles in New York waters. Journal of Herpetology 26: 301-308.

Morreale, S. J. and E. A. Standora. 1998. Early life stage ecology of sea turtles in northeastern U.S. waters. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-413: 49. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 75 Virginia Beach Drive, Miami, Florida.

Morreale, S. J. and E. A. Standora. 2005. Western North Atlantic waters: crucial developmental habitat for Kemp's ridley and loggerhead sea turtles. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 4(4): 872-882.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). 2006. New Jersey Marine Mammal and Sea Turtle Conservation Workshop Proceedings. Endangered and Nongame Species Program Division of Fish and Wildlife. April 17–19, 2006. Available: https://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/ ensp/pdf/marinemammal_seaturtle_workshop06.pdf.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). 2010. Ocean/Wind Power Ecological Baseline Studies January 2008–December 2009. Final Report. Prepared for New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Office of Science by Geo-Marine, Inc., Plano, Texas. Available: https://dspace.njstatelib.org/xmlui/handle/10929/68435.

New Jersey Port Access Route Study (NJ PARS). 2020. Vessel Traffic Analysis for Port Access Route Study: Seacoast of New Jersey including the offshore approaches to the Delaware Bay, Delaware Available: https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2022/03/24/2022-06228/port-access-route-study-seacoast-of-new-jersey-including-offshore-approaches-to-the-delaware-bay

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2010. Recovery Plan for the Sperm Whale (Physeter Macrocephalus). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS. 2010. Recovery plan for the fin whale (Balaenoptera physalus). U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS. 2011. Preliminary summer 2010 regional abundance estimate of loggerhead turtles (Caretta caretta) in northwestern Atlantic Ocean continental shelf waters. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Centers, Woods Hole, MA. Center Reference Document 11-03. Available from: https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/3879.

NMFS. 2013a. Biological report on the designation of marine critical habitat for the loggerhead sea turtle, Caretta caretta. National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS. 2019a. 2018 Annual report of a comprehensive assessment of marine mammal, marine turtle, and seabird abundance and spatial distribution in U.S. waters of the western North Atlantic Ocean – AMAPPS II. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast and Southeast Fisheries Science Centers, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Available from: https://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/psb/AMAPPS/.

NMFS. 2023. Biological Opinion for the Ocean Wind 1Wind Farm. GARFO-2022-02397

NMFS, USFWS, SEMARNET, CNANP, and PROFEPA. 2011. Bi-national recovery plan for the Kemp's ridley sea turtle (Lepidochelys kempii), second revision. National Marine Fisheries Service, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Secretariat of Environment & Natural Resources, National Commissioner of the Natural Protected Areas, Administrator of the Federal Attorney of Environmental Protection, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2011. Preliminary Summer 2010 Regional Abundance Estimate of Loggerhead Turtles (Caretta caretta) in Northwestern Atlantic Ocean Continental Shelf Waters. Northeast Fisheries Science Center Reference Document 11-03. Woods Hole, Massachusetts: U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center. April.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2012. 2011 Annual Report to the Inter-Agency Agreement M10PG00075/0001: A Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean. Prepared by NMFS-NEFSC, Woods Hole, Massachusetts and NMFS-SEFSC, Miami, Florida.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2013. 2012 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean. Prepared by NMFS-NEFSC, Woods Hole, Massachusetts and NMFS-SEFSC, Miami, Florida.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2014. 2013 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean. Prepared by NMFS-NEFSC, Woods Hole, Massachusetts and NMFS-SEFSC, Miami, Florida.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2016. 2016 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean - AMAPPS II. Prepared by NMFS-NEFSC, Woods Hole, Massachusetts and NMFS-SEFSC, Miami, Florida.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2018. 2017 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean - AMAPPS II. Prepared by NMFS-NEFSC, Woods Hole, Massachusetts and NMFS-SEFSC, Miami, Florida.

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2022. 2021 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean - AMAPPS III. Prepared by NMFS-NEFSC, Woods Hole, Massachusetts and NMFS-SEFSC,

Northeast Fisheries Science Center (NEFSC) and Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC). 2022. 2018 Annual Report of a Comprehensive Assessment of Marine Mammal, Marine Turtle, and Seabird Abundance and Spatial Distribution in US Waters of the Western North Atlantic Ocean - AMAPPS II. Prepared by NMFS-NEFSC, Woods Hole, Massachusetts and NMFS-SEFSC,

Palka, D., Aichinger Dias, L., Broughton, E., Chavez-Rosales, S., Cholewiak, D., Davis, G., et al. (2021). Atlantic Marine Assessment Program for Protected Species: FY15 – Fy19 (Washington DC: US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management), 330 p. Available at: https://marinecadastre. gov/espis/#/search/study/100066. OCS Study BOEM 2021-051.

Patel, S. et al. 2016. "Videography Reveals In-Water Behavior of Loggerhead Turtles (Caretta caretta) at a Foraging Ground." Frontiers in Marine Science. Volume 3. https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fmars.2016.00254; DOI=10.3389/fmars.2016.00254

Patel, S. H., S. G. Barco, L. M. Crowe, J. P. Manning, E. Matzen, R. J. Smolowitz, and H. L. Haas. 2018. Loggerhead turtles are good ocean-observers in stratified mid-latitude regions. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 213: 128-136.

Patrician, M.R., Biedron, I.S., Esch, H.C., Wenzel, F.W., Cooper, L.A., Hamilton, P.K., Glass, A.H. and Baumgartner, M.F. (2009), Evidence of a North Atlantic right whale calf (Eubalaena glacialis) born in northeastern U.S. waters. Marine Mammal Science, 25: 462-477. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2008.00261.x

Payne, M.P., D.N. Wiley, S.B. Young, S. Pittman, P.J. Clapham, and J.W. Jossi. 1990. "Recent Fluctuations in the Abundance of Baleen Whales in the Southern Gulf of Maine in Relation to Changes in Selected Prey." Fisheries Bulletin 88, no. 4: 687-696.

Polovina, J. I. Uchida, G. Balazs, E.A. Howell, D. Parker, P. Dutton. 2006. The Kuroshio Extension Bifurcation Region: a pelagic hotspot for juvenile loggerhead sea turtles. Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud. Oceanogr., 53, pp. 326-339

Roberts J.J., et al. 2016a. "Habitat-Based Cetacean Density Models for the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico." Scientific Reports 6: 22615. doi: 10.1038/srep22615

Roberts, J.J., L. Mannocci, P.N. Halpin. 2016b. Final Project Report: Marine Species Density Data Gap Assessments and Update for the AFTT Study Area, 2016-2017 (Opt. Year 1). Document version 1.4. Report prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic by the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Durham, NC.

Roberts, J. J., L. Mannocci, and P.N. Halpin. (2017). Final project report: Marine species density data gap assessments and update for the AFTT study area, 2016-2017 (Opt. Year 1). Document version 1.4. Report prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic by the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab. Durham, NC.

Roberts, J. J., Mannocci, L., Schick, R. S., & Halpin, P. N. (2018). Final Project Report: Marine Species Density Data Gap Assessments and Update for the AFTT Study Area, 2017-2018 (Opt. Year 2). Document version 1.2. Report by the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic Durham, NC, USA.

Roberts JJ, Schick RS, Halpin PN (2021) Final Project Report: Marine Species Density Data Gap Assessments and Update for the AFTT Study Area, 2020 (Option Year 4). Document version 2.2. Report prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic by the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Durham, NC

Roberts JJ, Schick RS, Halpin PN (2021) Final Project Report: Marine Species Density Data Gap Assessments and Update for the AFTT Study Area, 2020 (Option Year 4). Document version 2.1. Report prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic by the Duke University Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab, Durham, NC

Rochard, E.; Lepage, M.; Meauze, L., 1997: Identification and characterisation of the marine distribution of the European sturgeon Acipenser sturio. Aquat. Living Resour. 10, 101– 109.

Ruben, H. J. and S. J. Morreale. 1999. Draft biological assessment for sea turtles New York and New Jersey harbor complex. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, North Atlantic Division, New York District, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, NY 10278-0090, September 1999.

Savoy, T., L. Maceda, N.K. Roy, D. Peterson, and I. Wirgin. 2017. Evidence of natural reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the Connecticut River from unlikely sources. PLoS ONE 12(4):e0175085.

Scales, K. L., Miller, P. I., Hawkes, L. A., Ingram, S. N., Sims, D. W., and Votier, S. C. 2014. On the Front Line: frontal zones as priority at-sea conservation areas for mobile marine vertebrates. J. Appl. Ecol. 51, 1575–1583. doi: 10.1111/1365- 2664.12330

Schoelkopf, R. 2006. Unpublished stranding data for 1995–2005. Marine Mammal Stranding Center.

Shoop, C.R., and R.D. Kenney. 1992. Seasonal distributions and abundance of loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles in waters of the northeastern United States. Herpetological Monographs 6:43-67

Simard, Y., Roy, N., Giard, S. and Aulanier, F., 2019. North Atlantic right whale shift to the Gulf of St. Lawrence in 2015, revealed by long-term passive acoustics. *Endangered Species Research*, *40*, pp.271-284.

Smolowitz, R. J., S. H. Patel, H. L. Haas, and S. A. Miller. 2015. Using a remotely operated vehicle (ROV) to observe loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta) behavior on foraging grounds off the mid-Atlantic United States. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 471: 84-91.

Stein, A.B., K.D. Friedland, and M. Sutherland. 2004a. “Atlantic Sturgeon Marine Distribution and Habitat Use along the Northeastern Coast of the United States.” Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 133: 527-537.

Stein, A.B., K.D. Friedland, and M. Sutherland. 2004b. “Atlantic Sturgeon Marine Bycatch and Mortality on the Continental Shelf of the Northeast United States.” North American Journal of Fisheries Management 24: 171-183.

Turtle Expert Working Group (TEWG). 2009. An Assessment of the Loggerhead Turtle Population in the Western North Atlantic Ocean. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-575. U.S. Department of Commerce.

Wallace, BP, L. Avens, J. Braun-McNeill, C.M. McClellan. 2009. The diet composition of immature loggerheads: insights on trophic niche, growth rates, and fisheries interactions. J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol., 373 (1), pp. 50-57

Weeks, M., R. Smolowitz, and R. Curry. 2010. Sea turtle oceanography study, Gloucester, Massachusetts. Final Progress Report for 2009 RSA Program. Submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Regional Office.

Whitt, A.D., K. Dudzinski, and J.R. Laliberté. 2013. "North Atlantic Right Whale Distribution and Seasonal Occurrence in Nearshore Waters off New Jersey, USA, and Implications for Management." Endangered Species Research 20: 59–69.

Whitt, A.D., Powell, J.A., Richardson, A.G. and Bosyk, J.R., 2015. Abundance and distribution of marine mammals in nearshore waters off New Jersey, USA. *J. Cetacean Res. Manage.*, *15*(1), pp.45-59.

Winton, M. V., G. Fay, H. L. Haas, M. Arendt, S. Barco, M. C. James, C. Sasso, and R. Smolowitz. 2018. Estimating the distribution and relative density of satellite-tagged loggerhead sea turtles in the western North Atlantic using geostatistical mixed effects models. Marine Ecology Progress Series 586: 217-232.

Wirgin, I., L. Maceda, C. Grunwald, and T. King. 2015b. Population origin of Atlantic sturgeon bycaught in U.S. Atlantic coast fisheries. Journal of Fish Biology 85: 1251–1270.

Wirgin, I., M.W. Breece, D.A. Fox, L. Maceda, K.W. Wark, and T. King. 2015a. Origin of Atlantic sturgeon collected off the Delaware coast during spring months. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 35:20–30.

Wippelhauser, G. et al. 2017. Movements of Atlantic Sturgeon of the Gulf of Maine Inside and Outside of the Geographically Defined Distinct Population Segment, Marine and Coastal Fisheries, 9:1, 93-107, DOI: 10.1080/19425120.2016.1271845

Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution (WHOI). 2016. FVCOM Annual Climatology for Temperature, Stratification, and Currents (1978-2013). Northeast United States. Prepared for Northeast Regional Ocean Council, Northeast Ocean Data

Zoidis, A.M., Lomac-MacNair, K.S., Ireland, D.S., Rickard, M.E., McKown, K.A. and Schlesinger, M.D., 2021. Distribution and density of six large whale species in the New York Bight from monthly aerial surveys 2017 to 2020. *Continental Shelf Research*, *230*, p.104572.

Zollett, E. 2009. Bycatch of protected species and other species of concern in US east coast commercial fisheries. Endangered Species Research. 9. 49-59. 10.3354/esr00221.

62 Federal Register 6729. February 13, 1997. North Atlantic Right Whale Protection. Document Number: 97-3632

73 Federal Register 60173. October 10, 2008. Endangered Fish and Wildlife; Final Rule To Implement Speed Restrictions to Reduce the Threat of Ship Collisions With North Atlantic Right Whales. Document Number: E8-24177

6.0 Effects of the Action

Aguilar, A. 2002. Fin Whale: *Balaenoptera physalus*. In Perrin, W.F., Würsig, B. and Thewissen, J.G.M. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Marine Mammals (Second Edition)* (pp. 435-438). Academic Press, London.

ASMFC. 2006. Review of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Fishery Management Plan for Atlantic Sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrhincus). December 14, 2006. 12pp.

ASMFC TC. 2007. Estimation of Atlantic sturgeon bycatch in coastal Atlantic commercial fisheries of New England and the Mid-Atlantic. Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, Arlington, Virginia, August 2007. Special Report to the ASMFC Atlantic Sturgeon Management Board.

Epperly, S., L. Avens, L. Garrison, T. Henwood, W. Hoggard, J. Mitchell, J. Nance, J. Poffenberger, C. Sasso, and E. Scott-Denton. 2002. Analysis of sea turtle bycatch in the commercial shrimp fisheries of southeast U.S. waters and the Gulf of Mexico. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-490: 88. NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, Florida.

FHWG. 2008. Memorandum of agreement in principle for interim criteria for injury to fish from pile driving. California Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration, Fisheries Hydroacoustic Working Group. https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/ser/bio-fhwg-criteria-agree-a11y.pdf

Garrison. L. P. 2007. Defining the North Atlantic Right Whale Calving Habitat in the Southeastern United States: An Application of a Habitat Model. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOAA NMFS-SEFSC-553: 66 p.

Grieve, B.D., Hare, J.A. & Saba, V.S. Projecting the effects of climate change on Calanus finmarchicus distribution within the U.S. Northeast Continental Shelf. Sci Rep 7, 6264 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-06524-1

Hare JA, Morrison WE, Nelson MW, Stachura MM, Teeters EJ, Griffis RB, et al. 2016. A Vulnerability Assessment of Fish and Invertebrates to Climate Change on the Northeast U.S. Continental Shelf. PLoS ONE 11(2): e0146756. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0146756

Henwood, T. A. and W. E. Stuntz. 1987. Analysis of sea turtle captures and mortalities during commercial shrimp trawling. Fishery Bulletin **85**(4): 813-817.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2014: *Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2021. Summary for policymakers. In Masson-Delmotte, V., Zhai, P., Pirani, A., Connors, S.L., Péan, C., Berger, S., Caud, N., Chen, Y., Goldfarb, L., Gomis, M.I., Huang, M., Leitzell, K., Lonnoy, E., Matthews, J.B.R., Maycock, T.K., Waterfield, T., Yelekçi, O., Yu, R. and Zhou, B. (Eds.), *Climate change 2021: The physical science basis contribution of working group I to the sixth assessment report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.

Johnson, K. 2002. A review of national and international literature on the effects of fishing on benthic habitats. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-57; 72 p.

Kathleen A. Mirarchi Inc. and CR Environmental Inc. 2005. Smooth bottom net trawl fishing gear effect on the seabed: Investigation of temporal and cumulative effects. Prepared for U.S. Dept of Commerce NOAA/NMFS, Northeast Cooperative Research Initiative, Gloucester, Massachusetts. NOAA/NMFS Unallied Science Project, Cooperative Agreement NA16FL2264.

Kazyak, D. C., S. L. White, B. A. Lubinski, R. Johnson, and M. Eackles. 2021. Stock composition of Atlantic sturgeon (Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus) encountered in marine and estuarine environments on the U.S. Atlantic Coast. Conservation Genetics.

Learmonth, J.A., C.D. MacLeod, M.B. Santos, G.J. Pierce, H.Q.P. Crick and R.A. Robinson, 2006: Potential effects of climate change on marine mammals. Oceanogr. Mar. Biol., 44, 431-464.

Lutcavage, M. E. and P. L. Lutz. 1997. Diving Physiology. In Lutz, P.L. and Musick, J.A. (Eds.), *The Biology of Sea Turtles*. CRC Marine Science Series I: 277-296. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Miller, M.H. and C. Klimovich. 2017. Endangered Species Act Status Review Report: Giant Manta Ray (Manta birostris) and Reef Manta Ray (Manta alfredi). Report to National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources, Silver Spring, MD. September 2017. 128 Pp

Miller, T.J. and Shepherd, G.R., 2011. Summary of discard estimates for Atlantic sturgeon (White paper). NOAA/NMFS, Woods Hole, MA: Population Dynamics Branch.

Navy. 2017. Criteria and Thresholds for U.S. Navy Acoustic and Explosive Effects Analysis (Phase III). SSC Pacific. https://www.mitt-eis.com/portals/mitt-eis/files/reports/Criteria_and_Thresholds_for_U.S._Navy_Acoustic_and_Explosive_Effects_Analysis_June2017.pdfNEFMC. 2016. Omnibus Essential Fish Habitat Amendment 2: Final Environmental Assessment, Volume I-VI. New England Fishery Management Council in cooperation with the National Marine Fisheries Service, Newburyport, Massachusetts.

NEFMC. 2020. Fishing effects model, Northeast Region. New England Fishery Management Council, Newburyport, Massachusetts. Available from: https://www.nefmc.org/library/fishing-effects-model.

NMFS. 2023. Biological Opinion for the Ocean Wind 1Wind Farm. GARFO-2022-02397

National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2013. Hawksbill Sea Turtle (Eretmochelys Imbricata) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/17041

Norton, S.L., Wiley, T.R., Carlson, J.K., Frick, A.L., Poulakis, G.R. and Simpfendorfer, C.A. 2012. Designating Critical Habitat for Juvenile Endangered Smalltooth Sawfish in the United States. Marine and Coastal Fisheries, 4: 473-480. doi:10.1080/19425120.2012.676606

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. The Marine Fisheries Review 61(1): 74.

Popper, A. D. H., and A. N. 2014. Assessing the impact of underwater sounds on fishes and other forms of marine life. Acoustics Today 10(2):30-41.

Record, N., et al. 2019. Rapid Climate-Driven Circulation Changes Threaten Conservation of Endangered North Atlantic Right Whales. Oceanography, 32(2), 162-169. Retrieved October 14, 2020, from https://www.jstor.org/stable/26651192

Sasso, C. R. and S. P. Epperly. 2006. Seasonal sea turtle mortality risk from forced submergence in bottom trawls. Fisheries Research 81(1): 86-88.

Stein, A. B., Friedland, K. D., & Sutherland, M. 2004. Atlantic sturgeon marine distribution and habitat use along the northeastern coast of the United States. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, 133(3), 527-537

Stevenson D. 2004. Characterization of the fishing practices and marine benthic ecosystems of the northeast U.S. shelf, and an evaluation of the potential effects of fishing on essential fish habitat. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, January. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-181.

Young, C.N., Carlson, J., Hutchinson, M., Hutt, C., Kobayashi, D., McCandless, C.T., Wraith, J. 2018. Status review report: oceanic whitetip shark (Carcharhinius longimanus). Final Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. December 2017. 170pp

7.0 Cumulative Effects

8.0 Integration and Synthesis of Effects

ASMFC (Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission). 2017. Atlantic Sturgeon Benchmark Stock Assessment and Peer Review Report, Arlington, VA. 456.

Balazik, M.T., G.C. Garman, J.P. VanEenennaam, J. Mohler, and C. Woods III. 2012a. Empirical evidence of fall spawning by Atlantic sturgeon in the James River, Virginia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 141(6):1465-1471.

Carr, A. 1963. Panspecific reproductive convergence in *Lepidochelys kempi*. In Autrum, H., Bünning, E., v. Frisch, K., Hadorn, E., Kühn, A., Mayr, E., Pirson, A., Straub, J., Stubbe, H. and

Weidel, W. (Eds.), *Orientierung der Tiere / Animal Orientation: Symposium in Garmisch-Partenkirchen 17.–21. 9. 1962* (pp. 298-303). Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Damon-Randall, K., M. Colligan, and J. Crocker. 2013. Composition of Atlantic Sturgeon in Rivers, Estuaries, and Marine Waters. National Marine Fisheries Service, NERO, Unpublished Report. February 2013. 33 pp.

Daoust, P.-Y., E. L. Couture, T. Wimmer, and L. Bourque. 2017. Incident Report: North Atlantic Right Whale Mortality Event in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, 2017. Collaborative Report Produced by: Canadian Wildlife Health Cooperative, Marine Animal Response Society, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada., http://www.cwhcrcsf.ca/docs/technical_reports/Incident%20Report%20Right%20Whales%20EN.pdf.

Dutton, P., V. Pease, and D. Shaver. Characterization of mtDNA variation among Kemp's ridleys nesting on Padre Island with reference to Rancho Nuevo genetic stock. *In* Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology, 2006: 189.

Ernst, C. H. and R. Barbour. 1972. Turtles of the United States. University Press of Kentucky, Lexington. 347 pp.

Gallaway, B. J., et al. 2016. Development of a Kemp's ridley sea turtle stock assessment model. Gulf of Mexico Science 33(2): 138-157.

Hager, C., J. Kahn, C. Watterson, J. Russo, and K. Hartman. 2014. Evidence of Atlantic Sturgeon spawning in the York river system. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 143(5): 1217-1219.

Hayes, S. et al. 2018. North Atlantic Right Whales- Evaluating Their Recovery Challenges in 2018 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service Northeast Fisheries Science Center Woods Hole, Massachusetts September 2018 NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-NE-247 https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/19086

Hayes, S., E. Josephson, K. Maze-Foley, and P. Rosel, eds. 2021. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments—2020. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NE-271. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2021-07/Atlantic%202020%20SARs%20Final.pdf?null%09

Hayes, S., E. Josephson, K. Maze-Foley, P. Rosel, J. Wallace. eds. 2022: U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Marine Mammal Stock Assessments 2021. NOAA technical memorandum NMFS-NE ; 288. https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/45014

Hilton, E. J., B. Kynard, M. T. Balazik, A. Z. Horodysky, and C. B. Dillman. 2016. Review of the biology, fisheries, and conservation status of the Atlantic sturgeon, (*Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus* Mitchill, 1815). Journal of Applied Ichthyology 32(S1): 30-66.

Kahn, J., C. Hager, J. C. Watterson, J. Russo, K. Moore, and K. Hartman. 2014. Atlantic sturgeon annual spawning run estimate in the Pamunkey River, Virginia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 143(6): 1508-1514.

Kahn, J.E., Hager, C., Watterson, J.C., Mathies, N. and Hartman, K.J., 2019. Comparing abundance estimates from closed population mark-recapture models of endangered adult Atlantic sturgeon. Endangered Species Research, 39, pp.63-76.

Kocik, J., C. Lipsky, T. Miller, P. Rago, and G. Shepherd. 2013. An Atlantic sturgeon population index for ESA management analysis. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. Center Reference Document 13-06. Available from: http://www.nefsc.noaa.gov/publications/crd/.

Mazaris, A. D., Schofield, G., Gkazinou, C., Almpanidou, V., & Hays, G. C., 2017. Global sea turtle conservation successes. *Science advances*, *3*(9), e1600730.

Meylan, A. 1982. Estimation of population size in sea turtles. In Bjorndal, K.A. (Ed.), *Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles* (1 ed., pp. 1385-1138). Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

NMFS. 2011c. Preliminary summer 2010 regional abundance estimate of loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in northwestern Atlantic Ocean continental shelf waters. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Centers, Woods Hole, MA. Center Reference Document 11-03. Available from: https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/3879.

NMFS. 2013. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation on the Continued Implementation of Management Measures for the Northeast Multispecies, Monkfish, Spiny Dogfish, Atlantic Bluefish, Northeast Skate Complex, Mackerel!Squid/Butterfish, and Summer Flounder/Scup/Black Sea Bass Fisheries[Consultation No. F/NER/2012/01956] GARFO-2012-00006. National Marine Fisheries Service, Greater Atlantic Regional Fisheries Office, Gloucester, Massachusetts, December 16, 2013 https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/27911

NMFS. 2018. ESA RECOVERY OUTLINE - Gulf of Maine, New York Bight, Chesapeake Bay, Carolina, and South Atlantic DPS of Atlantic Sturgeon. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/ats_recovery_outline.pdf

NMFS 2020c. Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation: Reinitiation of Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 Consultation on the Implementation of the Sea Turtle Conservation Regulations under the ESA and the Authorization of the Southeast U.S. Shrimp Fisheries in Federal Waters under the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act (MSFMCA)[SERO-2021-00087]. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Regional Office, St. Petersburg, Florida, April 26, 2021.

NMFS 2022. 5-Year Review: Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Sturgeon. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2022-02/Atlantic%20sturgeon%20GOM%205-year%20review_FINAL%20SIGNED.pdf

NMFS 2022. 5-Year Review: New York Bight Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Sturgeon. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/2022-02/Atlantic%20sturgeon%20NYB%205-year%20review_FINAL%20SIGNED.pdf

NMFS 2022. 5-Year Review: Chesapeake Bay Distinct Population Segment of Atlantic Sturgeon. https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/document/chesapeake-bay-distinct-population-segment-atlantic-sturgeon-5-year-review

NMFS GARFO 2022. July 19, 2022. Biological Opinion issued to the USACE for the Paulsboro Marine Terminal. https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/44532

NMFS GARFO 2022. February 25, 2022. Biological Opinion issued to the USACE for the New Jersey Wind Port. https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/37549

NMFS-SEFSC. 2009. An assessment of loggerhead sea turtles to estimate impacts of mortality reductions on population dynamics. National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, Miami, Florida, July. NMFS-SEFSC Contribution PRD-08/09-14. Available from: https://grunt.sefsc.noaa.gov/P_QryLDS/download/PRB27_PRBD-08_09-14.pdf?id=LDS.

NMFS and USFWS. 1992. Recovery plan for leatherback turtles in the U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico. National Marine Fisheries Service, Washington, D.C. 65 pp.

NMFS and USFWS. 2008. Recovery plan for the northwest Atlantic population of the loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta), second revision. National Marine Fisheries Service and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS and USFWS. 2013. Leatherback Sea Turtle (Dermochelys coriacea) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation. National Marine Fisheries Service and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS and USFWS. 2015. KEMP'S RIDLEY SEA TURTLE(LEPIDOCHELYS KEMPII) 5-YEAR REVIEW: SUMMARY AND EVALUATION. NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE OFFICE OF PROTECTED RESOURCES SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND AND U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE SOUTHWEST REGION ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO, JULY 2015. https://repository.library.noaa.gov/view/noaa/17048

NMFS and USFWS. 2020. Endangered Species Act status review of the leatherback turtle (Dermochelys coriacea). Report to the National Marine Fisheries Service Office of Protected Resources and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Working Group. 2018. Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Turtle (Dermochelys coriacea) Status Assessment (Bryan Wallace and Karen Eckert, Compilers and

Editors). Conservation Science Partners and the Wider Caribbean Sea Turtle Conservation Network (WIDECAST). WIDECAST Technical Report No. 16. Godfrey, Illinois. 36 pp.

NPS. 2020. Review of the sea turtle science and recovery program, Padre Island National Seashore. National Park Service, Denver, Colorado. Available from: https://www.nps.gov/pais/learn/management/sea-turtle-review.htm.

Pace, R. M., P. J. Corkeron, and S. D. Kraus. 2017. State-space mark-recapture estimates reveal a recent decline in abundance of North Atlantic right whales. Ecology and Evolution:doi: 10.1002/ece3.3406.

Pace, R. M. 2021. Revisions and further evaluations of the right whale abundance model: improvements for hypothesis testing. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northeast Fisheries Science Center, Woods Hole, Massachusetts. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NE 269.

Peterson, D. L., P. Schueller, R. DeVries, J. Fleming, C. Grunwald, and I. Wirgin.2008. Annual run size and genetic characteristics of Atlantic sturgeon in theAltamaha River, Georgia. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society137:393–401

Richards, P. M., S. P. Epperly, S. S. Heppell, R. T. King, C. R. Sasso, F. Moncada, G. Nodarse, D. J. Shaver, Y. Medina, and J. Zurita. 2011. Sea turtle population estimates incorporating uncertainty: A new approach applied to western North Atlantic loggerheads Caretta caretta. Endangered Species Research 15: 151-158.

Richardson, B. and Secor, D., 2016. Assessment of Critical Habitats for Recovering the Chesapeake Bay Atlantic Sturgeon Distinct Population Segment. *Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Stevensville, MD*.

Ross, J. P. 1996. Caution urged in the interpretation of trends at nesting beaches. Marine Turtle Newsletter 74: 9-10.

Santidrián-Tomillo, P., Robinson, N. J., Fonseca, L. G., Quirós-Pereira, W., Arauz, R., Beange, M., ... & Wallace, B. P., 2017. Secondary nesting beaches for leatherback turtles on the Pacific coast of Costa Rica. *Latin american journal of aquatic research*, *45*(3), 563-571.

Sarti Martínez, L., Barragán, A. R., Muñoz, D. G., García, N., Huerta, P., & Vargas, F., 2007. Conservation and biology of the leatherback turtle in the Mexican Pacific. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology*, *6*(1), 70-78.

Savoy, T. L. Maceda, N. Roy, D. Peterson, I. Wirgin. 2017. Evidence of natural reproduction of Atlantic sturgeon in the Connecticut River from unlikely sources. PLoS ONE. 12(4): e0175085. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175085

Secor, D.H. 2002. Atlantic sturgeon fisheries and stock abundances during the late nineteenth century. American Fisheries Society Symposium. 2002. 89-98.

Secor, D.H., O'Brien, M.H.P., Coleman, N., Horne, A., Park, I., Kazyak, D.C., Bruce, D.G. and Stence, C., 2021. Atlantic Sturgeon Status and Movement Ecology in an Extremely Small Spawning Habitat: The Nanticoke River-Marshyhope Creek, Chesapeake Bay. *Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture*, pp.1-20.

Seminoff, J. A., and coauthors. 2015. Status review of the green turtle (Chelonia Mydas) under the endangered species act. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS-SWFSC-539.

Tapilatu, R. F., and coauthors. 2013. Long-term decline of the western Pacific leatherback, Dermochelys coriacea: A globally important sea turtle population. Ecosphere 4:15.

TEWG (Turtle Expert Working Group). 2007. An Assessment of the Leatherback Turtle Population in the Atlantic Ocean. NMFS-SEFSC-555

Tiwari, M., W. B.P., and M. Girondot. 2013a. Dermochelys coriacea (West Pacific Ocean subpopulation). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013: e.T46967817A46967821. International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Available from: https://www.iucnredlist.org/ja/species/46967817/46967821.

van der Hoop, J., Corkeron, P., & Moore, M. (2017). Entanglement is a costly life-history stage in large whales. Ecology and evolution, 7(1), 92-106.

Wallace, B.P., M. Tiwari & M. Girondot. 2013a. Dermochelys coriacea. In: IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2.

Wibbels, T. and E. Bevan. 2019. *Lepidochelys kempii*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2019: e.T11533A142050590. Retrived, from https://www.iucnredlist.org/species/11533/142050590.

76 Federal Register 58867 September 22, 2011. Endangered and Threatened Species; Determination of Nine Distinct Population Segments of Loggerhead Sea Turtles as Endangered or Threatened

85 FR 48332 August 10, 2020. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife; 12-Month Finding on a Petition To Identify the Northwest Atlantic Leatherback Turtle as a Distinct Population Segment and List It as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act

9.0 Conclusion

10.0 Incidental Take Statement

NMFS PD 02-110-19. Interim Guidance on the Endangered Species Act Term "Harass". December 21, 2016. https://media.fisheries.noaa.gov/dam-migration/02-110-19.pdf

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. 1998. Endangered Species Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultations and Conference

Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. 315 pp.
https://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/Documents/Consultations/esa_section7_handbook.pdf