Request by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory for an Incidental Harassment Authorization to Allow the Incidental Take of Marine Mammals during a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the Northeast Atlantic Ocean, June–July 2013

submitted by

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory
61 Route 9W, P.O. Box 1000
Palisades, NY 10964-8000

to

National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Protected Resources
1315 East–West Hwy, Silver Spring, MD 20910-3282

Application Prepared by

LGL Limited, environmental research associates
22 Fisher St., POB 280
King City, Ont. L7B 1A6

8 January 2013

LGL Report TA8233-2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

SUMMARY 1

I. OPERATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED 1

Overview of the Activity 1

Source Vessel Specifications 3

Airgun Description 4

Predicted Sound Levels 4

Description of Operations 7

II. DATES, DURATION, AND REGION OF ACTIVITY 8

III. SPECIES AND NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS IN AREA 8

IV. STATUS, DISTRIBUTION AND SEASONAL DISTRIBUTION OF AFFECTED SPECIES OR STOCKS OF MARINE MAMMALS 8

Mysticetes 10

Odontocetes 12

V. TYPE OF INCIDENTAL TAKE AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED 16

VI. NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS THAT COULD BE TAKEN 16

VII. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SPECIES OR STOCKS 16

Summary of Potential Effects of Airgun Sounds 17

Tolerance 17

Masking 17

Disturbance Reactions 17

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects 20

Possible Effects of Multibeam Echosounder and Sub-bottom Profiler Signals 20

Numbers of Marine Mammals that could be "Taken by Harassment" 21

Basis for Estimating "Take by Harassment" 21

Potential Number of Marine Mammals Exposed 22

Conclusions 24

VIII. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SUBSISTENCE 24

IX. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON HABITAT 24

X. ANTICIPATED IMPACT OF LOSS OR MODIFICATION OF HABITAT ON MARINE MAMMALS 25

XI. MITIGATION MEASURES 25

Planning Phase 25

Proposed Exclusion Zones 26

Mitigation During Operations 27

Power-down Procedures 27

Shut-down Procedures 28

Ramp-up Procedures 28

Special Procedures for Situations or Species of Concern 28
XII. PLAN OF COOPERATION 29
XIII. MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN 29
Vessel-based Visual Monitoring 29
Passive Acoustic Monitoring 30
PSO Data and Documentation 31
XIV. COORDINATING RESEARCH TO REDUCE AND EVALUATE INCIDENTAL TAKE 32
XV. LITERATURE CITED 32

Request by Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory for an Incidental Harassment Authorization to Allow the Incidental Take of Marine Mammals during a Marine Geophysical Survey by the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* in the Northeast Atlantic Ocean, June–July 2013

SUMMARY

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory (L-DEO), with funding from the U.S. National Science Foundation (NSF), plans to conduct a high-energy, 2-D and 3-D seismic survey in the northeast Atlantic Ocean west of Spain in June–July 2013. The seismic survey would use a towed array of 18 airguns with a total discharge volume of ~3300 in^3. The seismic survey would take place in International Waters in and within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of Spain in water depths >3000 m. L-DEO requests that it be issued an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA) allowing non-lethal takes of marine mammals incidental to the planned seismic survey. This request is submitted pursuant to Section 101 (a)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), 16 U.S.C. § 1371(a)(5).

Numerous species of marine mammals inhabit the northeast Atlantic Ocean. Several of these species are listed as ***endangered*** under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA): the sperm, North Atlantic right, humpback, sei, fin, and blue whales. ESA-listed sea turtle species that could occur in the survey area include the ***endangered*** leatherback, hawksbill, green, and Kemp's ridley turtles, and the ***threatened*** loggerhead turtle and roseate tern.

The items required to be addressed pursuant to 50 C.F.R. § 216.104, "Submission of Requests", are set forth below. They include descriptions of the specific operations to be conducted, the marine mammals occurring in the study area, proposed measures to mitigate against any potential injurious effects on marine mammals, and a plan to monitor any behavioral effects of the operations on those marine mammals.

I. OPERATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED

A detailed description of the specific activity or class of activities that can be expected to result in incidental taking of marine mammals.

Overview of the Activity

L-DEO plans to conduct a seismic survey in the northeast Atlantic Ocean west of Spain at between ~41.5–42.5°N and ~11.5–17.5°W (Fig. 1). Water depths in the survey area range from ~3500 m to >5000 m. The seismic survey would be conducted International Waters and within the EEZ of Spain, and would be scheduled to occur for ~39 days during 1 June–14 July 2013. Some minor deviation from these dates would be possible, depending on logistics and weather.

L-DEO plans to use conventional seismic methodology in the Deep Galicia Basin of the northeast Atlantic Ocean west of Spain. The goal of the proposed research is to collect data necessary to study the rifted continental to oceanic crust transition in the Deep Galicia Basin west of Spain. This margin and its conjugate are among the best studied magma-poor, rifted margins in the world, and the focus of studies



FIGURE 1. Location of the proposed seismic surveys and OBH/S instruments at the proposed study site in the northeast Atlantic Ocean during June–July 2013, and marine protected areas in Spain.

has been the faulting mechanics and modification of the upper mantle associated with such margins. Over the years, a combination of 2-D seismic reflection profiling, general marine geophysics, and ocean drilling have identified a number of interesting features of the margin. Among these are the S reflector, which has been interpreted to be a detachment fault overlain with fault bounded, rotated, continental crustal blocks and underlain by serpentinized peridotite, and the Peridotite Ridge, composed of serpentinized peridotite and thought to be upper mantle exhumed to the seafloor during rifting.

To achieve the project's goals, the Principal Investigators (PIs), Drs. D.S. Sawyer (Rice University), J.K. Morgan (Rice University), and D.J. Shillington (L-DEO) propose to use a 3-D seismic reflection survey, 2-D survey, and a long-offset seismic program extending through the crust and S detachment into the upper mantle to characterize the last stage of continental breakup and the initiation of seafloor spreading, relate post-rifting subsidence to syn-rifting lithosphere deformation, and inform the nature of detachment faults. Ocean Bottom Seismometers (OBSs) and Ocean Bottom Hydrophones (OBHs) would also be deployed during the program. It is a cooperative program with scientists from the U.K., Germany, Spain, and Portugal.

The survey would involve one source vessel, the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth*. The *Langseth* would deploy an array of 18 airguns as an energy source with a total volume of ~3300 in^3. The receiving system would consist of four 6000-m hydrophone streamers at 200-m spacing and up to 78 OBH/S instruments. The OBH/Ss would be deployed and retrieved by a second vessel, the R/V *Poseidon*, provided by the German Science Foundation. As the airgun array is towed along the survey lines, the hydrophone streamer would receive the returning acoustic signals and transfer the data to the on-board processing system. The OBH/Ss record the returning acoustic signals internally for later analysis.

A total of ~5834 km of survey lines, including turns, would be shot in a grid pattern with a single line extending to the west (Fig. 1). There would be additional seismic operations in the survey area associated with airgun testing and repeat coverage of any areas where initial data quality is sub-standard. In our calculations (see § VII), 25% has been added for those additional operations.

In addition to the operations of the airgun array, a multibeam echosounder (MBES) and a sub-bottom profiler (SBP) will also be operated from the *Langseth* continuously throughout the survey. All planned geophysical data acquisition activities would be conducted by L-DEO with on-board assistance by the scientists who have proposed the study. The vessel would be self-contained, and the crew would live aboard the vessel for the entire cruise.

Source Vessel Specifications

The R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* is described in § 2.2.2.1 of the Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Overseas Environmental Impact Statement (OEIS) for Marine Seismic Research funded by the National Science Foundation or Conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (June 2011) and Record of Decision (June 2012), referred to herein as the PEIS. The vessel speed during seismic operations would be 4.5 kt (~8.3 km/h).

The *Poseidon* has a length of 60.8 m, a beam of 11.4 m, and a maximum draft of 4.7 m. The ship is powered by diesel-electric propulsion. The traction motor produces 930 kW and drives one propeller directly. The propeller has five blades, and the shaft typically rotates at 220 revolutions per minute (rpm). The vessel also has a 394 hp bowthruster, which would not be used during OBH/S deployment and retrieval. The *Poseidon* typically cruises at 8.5 kt (15.7 km/h) and has a range of 7408 km.

Other details of the Poseidon *include the following:*

Owner:	Federal State of Schleswig-Holstein
Operator:	Briese Schiffahrts GmbH & Co. KG Abteilung Forschungsschifffahrt Hafenstraße 12, 26789 Leer
Flag:	Germany
Date Built:	1976
Gross Tonnage:	1105
Accommodation Capacity:	26 including 11 scientists

Airgun Description

During the survey, the airgun array to be used would consist of 18 airguns (plus 2 spares), with a total volume of ~3300 in^3. The airgun array is described in § 2.2.3.1 of the PEIS, and the airgun configuration is illustrated in the PEIS Figure 2.11. It would be towed at a depth of 9 m. The shot interval would be ~15 s (37.5 m).

Predicted Sound Levels

Received sound levels have been predicted by L-DEO's model (Diebold et al. 2010; see also Appendix H of the PEIS) as a function of distance from the airguns for the 18-airgun array and for a single 1900LL 40-in^3 airgun, which would be used during power downs (Figs. 2 and 3). This modeling approach uses ray tracing for the direct wave traveling from the array to the receiver and its associated source ghost (reflection at the air-water interface in the vicinity of the array), in a constant-velocity half-space (infinite homogeneous ocean layer, unbounded by a seafloor). In addition, propagation measurements of pulses from the 18-airgun array have been reported in deep (~1600 m) and shallow (50 m) water in the Gulf of Mexico in 2007–2008 (Diebold et al. 2010); at the slope site (intermediate water depth), only propagation measurements of pulses from the 36-airgun array were obtained.

For deep and intermediate-water cases, these field measurements cannot be used readily to derive mitigation radii, because at those sites the calibration hydrophone was located at a roughly constant depth of 350–500 m, which may not intersect all the isopleths at their widest point from the sea surface down to the maximum relevant water depth for marine mammals of ~2000 m. Figures 2 and 3 for the 36-airgun array in Diebold et al. (2010) show how the values along the maximum SPL line that joins the points where the isopleths attain their maximum width (providing the maximum distance associated with each sound level) can differ from values obtained along a constant depth line. At short ranges, where the direct arrivals dominate and the effects of seafloor interactions are minimal, the data recorded at the deep and slope sites are suited for comparison with modeled levels at the depth of the calibration hydrophone. At longer ranges, the comparison with the mitigation model—constructed from the maximum SPL through the entire water column at varying distances from the airgun array—is the most relevant. The results are summarized below.

Comparisons at short ranges between sound levels for direct arrivals recorded by the calibration hydrophone and modeled results for the same array tow depth for the 36-airgun array are in good agreement (Figs. 12 and 14 in Diebold et al. [2010]). As a consequence, isopleths falling within this domain can be predicted reliably by the L-DEO model, even if they would be sampled imperfectly by measurements obtained at a single depth. At longer distances, the calibration data show that seafloor reflected and sub-seafloor refracted arrivals dominate, whereas the direct arrivals become weak and/or incoherent (Figs. 11, 12 and 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]). Aside from local topography effects, the region around the critical distance (~5 km in Figs. 11 and 12, and ~4 km in Fig. 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]) is where the observed levels rise very close to the mitigation model curve. However, the observed sound



Figure 2. Modeled received sound levels (SELs) from the 18-airgun subarray planned for use during the survey in the northeast Atlantic Ocean during June–July 2013, at a 9-m tow depth. Received rms levels (SPLs) are expected to be ~10 dB higher. The plot at the top provides the radius to the 170-dB SEL isopleth as a proxy for the 180-dB rms isopleth, and the plot at the bottom provides the radius to the 150-dB SEL isopleth as a proxy for the 160-dB rms isopleth. A maximum depth of 2000 m is considered.



Figure 3. Modeled received sound levels (SELs) from a single 40-in^3 airgun planned for use as a mitigation gun during the proposed survey in the northeast Atlantic Ocean, during June–July 2013. Received rms levels (SPLs) are expected to be ~10 dB higher. Received rms levels (SPLs) are expected to be ~10 dB higher. The plot at the top provides the radius to the 170-dB SEL isopleth as a proxy for the 180-dB rms isopleth and the plot at the bottom provides the radius to the 150-dB SEL isopleth as a proxy for the 160-dB rms isopleth.

levels are found to fall almost entirely below the mitigation model curve (Figs. 11, 12, and 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]). Thus, analysis of the GoM calibration measurements demonstrates that although simple, the L-DEO model is a robust tool for estimating mitigation radii.

Here we use for the 18-airgun array the deep-water radii obtained from modeled levels in deep water down to a maximum depth of 2000 m. The intermediate-water radii are derived from the deep-water ones by applying a correction factor (multiplication) of 1.5, such that observed levels at very near offsets fall below the corrected mitigation curve (Fig. 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]).

Measurements have not been reported for the single 40-in^3 airgun. The PEIS defines a low-energy source as any towed acoustic source whose received level is ≤180 dB at 100 m, including any single airgun with a volume ≤425 in^3. In § 2.4.2 of the PEIS, Alternative B (the Preferred Alternative) conservatively applies a 100-m exclusion zone (EZ) for all low-energy acoustic sources in water depths >100 m. That approach is adopted here for the single Bolt 1900LL 40-in^3 airgun that would be used during power downs. No fixed, full 160-dB zone has been defined yet for the same suite of low-energy sources, therefore, L-DEO model results are used here to determine the 160 dB radius for the 40-in^3 airgun.

Table 1 shows the 180-dB EZ for the single airgun from the PEIS and, using the modeled measurements for the 18-airgun array and the 160-dB EZ for the single airgun, the distances at which the rms sound levels are expected to be received. The 180-dB re 1 μPa_{rms} distance is the safety criterion as specified by NMFS (2000) for cetaceans. The 180-dB distance would also be used as the exclusion zone for sea turtles, as required by NMFS in most other recent seismic projects (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b; Holst and Beland 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst 2009; Antochiw et al. n.d.). If marine mammals or sea turtles were detected within or about to enter the appropriate exclusion zone, the airguns would be immediately powered down (or shut down if necessary).

Southall et al. (2007) made detailed recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria. NSF would be prepared to revise its procedures for estimating numbers of mammals should NMFS implement new acoustic criteria guidelines. However, currently the procedures are based on best practices noted by Pierson et al. (1998) and Weir and Dolman (2007).

Description of Operations

The survey would involve one source vessel, the R/V *Marcus G. Langseth*. The *Langseth* would deploy an array of 18 airguns as an energy source with a total volume of ~3300 in^3. The receiving system would consist of four 6000-m hydrophone streamers at 200-m spacing and up to 78 OBH/S instruments. The OBH/Ss would be deployed and retrieved by a second vessel, the R/V *Poseidon*, provided by the German Science Foundation. As the airgun array is towed along the survey lines, the hydrophone streamer would receive the returning acoustic signals and transfer the data to the on-board processing system. The OBH/Ss record the returning acoustic signals internally for later analysis.

A total of ~5834 km of survey lines, including turns, would be shot in a grid pattern with a single line extending to the west (Fig. 1). There would be additional seismic operations in the survey area associated with turns, airgun testing, and repeat coverage of any areas where initial data quality is sub-standard. In our calculations (see § VII), 25% has been added for those additional operations. In addition to the operations of the airgun array, a Kongsberg EM 122 multibeam echosounder (MBES) and a Knudsen Chirp 3260 sub-bottom profiler (SBP) will also be operated from the *Langseth* continuously throughout the survey. These sources are described in § 2.2.3.1 of the PEIS.

TABLE 1. Predicted distances from the airgun array to which sound levels ≥180 and 160 dB re 1 μPa$_{rms}$ are expected to be received during the proposed survey in the northeast Atlantic, 1 June–12 July 2013. Radii for the full airgun array and for the 160-dB radii for the single mitigation gun are based on L-DEO model results. The 180-dB exclusion zone (EZ) for the single mitigation airgun is the conservative EZ for all low-energy acoustic sources in water depths >100 m defined in the PEIS.

Source and Volume	Water Depth (m)	Predicted RMS Radii (m)	
		180 dB	160 dB
Single Bolt airgun, 40 in^3	>1000 m	100	388
	100–1000 m	100	582
18 airguns, 3300 in^3	>1000 m	1116	6908
	100–1000 m	1674	10,362

II. DATES, DURATION, AND REGION OF ACTIVITY

The date(s) and duration of such activity and the specific geographical region where it will occur.

The survey activities would encompass the area between ~41.5–42.5°N and ~11.5–17.5°W in the northeast Atlantic Ocean west of Spain in International Waters and in the EEZ of Spain (Fig. 1). Water depths in the survey range from ~3500 m to >5000 m. The exact dates of the activities depend on logistics and weather conditions. The *Langseth* would depart from Lisbon, Portugal, or Vigo, Spain, on 1 June 2013 and spend ~1 day in transit to the proposed survey area. The seismic surveys would be expected to take ~39 days, with completion on ~12 July. The *Langseth* would then transit to Lisbon or Vigo.

III. SPECIES AND NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS IN AREA

The species and numbers of marine mammals likely to be found within the activity area

Twenty-five marine mammal species could occur near the proposed survey area. To avoid redundancy, we have included the required information about the species and (insofar as it is known) numbers of these species in § IV, below.

IV. STATUS, DISTRIBUTION AND SEASONAL DISTRIBUTION OF AFFECTED SPECIES OR STOCKS OF MARINE MAMMALS

A description of the status, distribution, and seasonal distribution (when applicable) of the affected species or stocks of marine mammals likely to be affected by such activities

Sections III and IV are integrated here to minimize repetition.

Thirty-nine species of marine mammals, including 29 odontocetes, 7 mysticetes, and 3 pinnipeds, are known to occur in the eastern North Atlantic Ocean. Of those, 25 cetacean species (6 mysticetes and 19 odontocetes) could occur near the proposed survey site (Table 3). Six of the 25 species are listed under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA) as ***Endangered***: the North Atlantic right, humpback, blue, fin, sei, and sperm whales. Nine cetacean species, although present in the wider eastern North Atlantic Ocean, likely would not be found near the proposed survey area at ~42°N because their ranges generally do not extend south of ~45°N in northeastern Atlantic waters (Atlantic white-sided dolphin, *Lagenorhynchus acutus*, and

Table 3. The habitat, regional abundance, and conservation status of marine mammals that could occur in or near the proposed survey site.

Species	Occurrence near survey location	Habitat	Abundance in the North Atlantic	ESA[1]	IUCN[2]	CITES[3]
Mysticetes North Atlantic right whale	Rare	Coastal and shelf waters	396[4]	EN	EN	I
Humpback whale	Common-Uncommon	Mainly nearshore waters and banks	11,570[5]	EN	LC	I
Common minke whale	Common-Uncommon	Coastal, offshore	121,000[6]	NL	LC	I
Sei whale	Common-Uncommon	Mostly pelagic	12-13,000[7]	EN	EN	I
Fin whale	Common-Uncommon	Slope, mostly pelagic	24,887[8]	EN	EN	I
Blue whale	Common-Uncommon	Coastal, shelf and pelagic	937[9]	EN	EN	I
Odontocetes Sperm whale	Common-Uncommon	Usually deep pelagic, steep topography	13,190[10]	EN	VU	I
Pygmy sperm whale	Rare	Deep waters off shelf	395[4,11]	NL	DD	II
Dwarf sperm whale	Rare	Deep waters off shelf		NL	DD	II
Cuvier's beaked whale	Common-Uncommon	Slope and pelagic	6992[12]; 100,000[13]	NL	LC	II
Northern bottlenose whale	Common-Uncommon	Pelagic	~40,000[14]	NL	DD	I
True's beaked whale	Rare	Pelagic	6992[12]	NL	DD	II
Gervais beaked whale	Uncommon	Pelagic	6992[12]	NL	DD	II
Sowerby's beaked whale	Uncommon	Pelagic	6992[12]	NL	DD	II
Blainville's beaked whale	Uncommon	Pelagic	6992[12]	NL	DD	II
Common bottlenose dolphin	Common-Uncommon	Coastal, shelf, pelagic	19,295[15]	NL	LC	II
Atlantic spotted dolphin	Common-Uncommon	Shelf, offshore	50,978[4]	NL	DD	II
Striped dolphin	Common-Uncommon	Off continental shelf	67,414[15]	NL	LC	II
Short-beaked common dolphin	Common-Uncommon	Shelf, pelagic, high relief	116,709[15]	NL	LC	II
Risso's dolphin	Common-Uncommon	Shelf, slope, seamounts	20,479[4]	NL	LC	II
Pygmy killer whale	Rare	Pelagic	N.A.	NL	DD	II
False killer whale	Common-Uncommon	Pelagic	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Killer whale	Common-Uncommon	Coastal, widely distributed	N.A.	NL	DD	II
Long-finned pilot whale	Common-Uncommon	Mostly pelagic	780,000[16]	NL	DD	II
Short-finned pilot whale	Common-Uncommon	Mostly pelagic, high-relief		NL	DD	II

N.A. Not available or not assessed.
[1] U.S. Endangered Species Act: EN = Endangered, NL = Not listed (ECOS 2012)
[2] Codes for IUCN classifications: EN = Endangered; VU = Vulnerable; LC = Least Concern; DD = Data Deficient. Classifications are from the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2012).
[3] Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (UNEP-WCMC 2012); Appendix I = Threatened with extinction; Appendix II = not necessarily now threatened with extinction but may become so unless trade is closely controlled.
[4] Western North Atlantic, in U.S. and southern Canadian waters (Waring et al. 2012)
[5] Likely negatively biased (Stevick et al. 2003)
[6] Central and Northeast Atlantic (IWC 2012)
[7] North Atlantic (Cattanach et al. 1993)
[8] Central and Northeast Atlantic (Víkingsson et al. 2009)
[9] Central and Northeast Atlantic (Pike et al. 2009).
[10] For the northeast Atlantic, Faroes-Iceland, and the U.S. east coast (Whitehead 2002)
[11] Both *Kogia* species
[12] For all beaked whales (Anonymous 2009)
[13] Worldwide estimate (Taylor et al. 2008)
[14] Eastern North Atlantic (NAMMCO 1995)
[15] European Atlantic waters beyond the continental shelf (Anonymous 2009)
[16] *Globicephala sp*. combined, Central and Eastern North Atlantic (IWC 2012)

white-beaked dolphin, *Lagenorhynchus albirostris*), or their ranges in the northeast Atlantic Ocean generally do not extend north of ~20°N (Clymene dolphin, *Stenella clymene*), 30°N (Fraser's dolphin, *Lagenodelphis hosei*), 34°N (spinner dolphin, *Stenella longirostris*), 35°N (melon-headed whale, *Peponocephala electra*), 37º (rough-toothed dolphin, *Steno bredanensis*), or 40°N (Bryde's whale, *Balaenoptera brydei*, and pantropical spotted dolphin, *Stenella attenuata*). Although Spitz et al. (2011) reported two strandings records

of melon headed whales for the Bay of Biscay, this species will not be discussed further, as it is unlikely to occur in the proposed survey area.

The harbor porpoise *Phocoena phocoena*) does not occur in deep offshore waters. No harbor porpoise were detected visually or acoustically during summer surveys off the continental shelf in the Biscay Bay area during 1989 and 2007 (Lens 1991; Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009). Pinniped species are also not known to occur in the deep waters of the survey area.

General information on the taxonomy, ecology, distribution and movements, and acoustic capabilities of marine mammals are given in § 3.6.1 and § 3.7.1 of the NSF/USGS PEIS. One of the qualitative analysis areas (QAAs) defined in the PEIS is on the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, at 26ºN, 40ºW, ~2800 km from the proposed survey area. The general distribution of mysticetes and odontocetes in the North Atlantic is discussed in § 3.6.3.4 and § 3.7.3.4 of the PEIS, respectively. The rest of this section deals specifically with species distribution off the north and west coast of the Iberian Peninsula.

Several systematic surveys have been conducted in the Bay of Biscay area, which has been found to be one of the most productive areas and the centre of highest cetacean diversity in the northeast Atlantic (Hoyt 2005). The second North Atlantic Sightings Survey (NASS) occurred in waters off the continental shelf from the southern U.K. to northern Spain in July–August 1989 (Lens 1991). The Cetacean Offshore Distribution and Abundance in the European Atlantic (CODA) included surveys from the U.K. to southern Spain during July 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009). Additional information is available from coastal surveys off northwest Spain (e.g., López et al. 2004; Spyrakos et al. 2011), stranding records for northwest Spain (e.g., López et al. 2003), and sighting records off western-central (Brito et al. 2009) and southern (Castor et al. 2010) Portugal. Records from the Ocean Biogeographic Information System (OBIS) database hosted by Rutgers and Duke University (Read et al. 2009) were also included.

Mysticetes

North Atlantic Right Whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*)

The North Atlantic right whale is known to occur primarily in the continental shelf waters off the eastern U.S. and Canada, from Florida to Nova Scotia (Reeves et al. 2002). Historically, it also occurred off southeast Greenland (Knowlton et al. 1992; Mellinger et al. 2011), but the status of the eastern North Atlantic population of right whales is currently unknown. There were few sightings of right whales in the eastern North Atlantic during the 20th century, including off Iceland, Spain (including the Bay of Biscay), the Azores, Portugal, and Madeira (Casinos and Vericad 1976; Aguilar 1981; Brown 1986; Knowlton et al. 1992; Martin and Walker 1997). Recent (2007–2008), visual and acoustic detections of North Atlantic right whales off southeast Greenland (Mellinger et al. 2011) and a sighting in the Azores in January 2009 (Silva et al. 2012) suggest that there could be a remaining central or eastern sub-population of North Atlantic right whales. No right whales were identified during summer surveys in the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain during 1989 (Lens 1991) or 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009).

Humpback Whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*)

A small number of humpback whales migrate from their summer feeding grounds in the North Atlantic to Cape Verde (Wenzel et al. 2009). No humpback whales were identified during summer surveys in the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain during 1989 (Lens 1991) or 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009). However, Casinos and Vericad (1976) reported several records of this species for the Bay of Biscay. In addition, there are five OBIS records off northwest

Spain, including two whaling records (Smith 2002), two sightings by the U.K. Royal Navy near 44.5°N, 10–14°W (Maughan 2003), and one sighting at 42.2°N, 9.5°W (College of the Atlantic, Allied Whale 2004). López et al. (2002) also reported a stranding off northwest Spain in 1993. Single humpback whale sightings have been made off the west central coast of Portugal (Brito et al. 2009) and off southern Portugal (Castro et al. 2010).

Common Minke Whale (*Balaenoptera acutorostrata*)

Basto d'Andrade (2008) reported one minke whale during a survey of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in July 2007. However, the abundance and density for this area based on the 2007 survey was estimated at zero (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). For the waters north (~45.5–53°) of the Bay of Biscay, abundance was estimated at 1218 minke whales with a density estimate of 0.004/km^2 (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). Lens (1991) did not report any confirmed minke whale sightings during a summer survey in the Bay of Biscay area in 1989. Casinos and Vericad (1976) reported two records of minke whales in the Bay of Biscay. In addition, there are seven OBIS sightings of minke whales off northwest Spain just east of the proposed survey area between 41.6–44.1ºN and 9.6–10.2ºW (Maughan 2003). López et al. (2002) also reported 10 strandings off northwest Spain during 1990–1999, and Lens et al. (2005) reported two stranded minke whales off northwest Spain for 2004–2005. Brito et al. (2009) reported one minke whale off west central Portugal, and Castro et al. (2010) reported one sighting off southern Portugal.

Sei Whale (*Balaenoptera borealis*)

During a survey of European waters from the U.K. to the southern coast of the Iberian Peninsula in July 2007, sei whale sightings (n = 18) were only made in the survey block off northwest Spain (Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009). The abundance estimate for the area off northwest Spain was 366 sei whales, and the density estimate was 0.002/km^2 (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). Lens (1991) did not report any sei whale sightings during a summer survey in the Bay of Biscay area in 1989. During the 20th century, sei whales were taken off northwest Spain, one of the major whaling grounds off the Iberian Peninsula (Sanpera and Aguilar 1992). There are 242 OBIS whaling records of sei whales off northwest Spain (Smith 2002) and one sighting just east of the survey area at ~42ºN, 10ºW (Maughan 2003).

Fin Whale (*Balaenoptera physalus*)

Fin whales were the most frequently identified cetacean species during summer surveys in the Bay of Biscay area in 1989 (n = 38) and 2007 (n = 297). Several sightings were made within and near the survey area off northwest Spain (Lens 1991; Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009). During the July 2007 survey of European waters from the U.K. to the southern coast of the Iberian Peninsula, the survey block off northwest Spain had the highest density of fin whales (0.019/km^2), and the best abundance estimate was 3206 (Anonymous 2009; Cañadas et al. 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). Fin whale density was predicted to be highest in areas with sea surface temperatures of 16–19°C and depths of 1000–3500 m, with peak densities occurring within 50 m of the 2000-m isobath (Anonymous 2009). There are nearly 4000 OBIS whaling records of fin whales off northwest Spain (Smith 2002) and five sightings during July 1995 just northeast of the survey area at ~44.5ºN, 10.3ºW (Maughan 2003). Single fin whale sightings were also made in coastal waters of northwest Spain during surveys by López et al. (2004) and Spyrakos et al. (2011).

Blue Whale (*Balaenoptera musculus*)

The blue whale's summer range in the northeast Atlantic extends from the waters north of Svalbard and the Barents Sea south to the Bay of Biscay (Rice 1998). Although the winter range is mostly unknown, some occur near Cape Verde (Rice 1998). No blue whales were identified during summer surveys in the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters during 1989 or 2007 (Lens 1991; Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009). Casinos and Vericad (1976) reported one record for the Bay of Biscay. There are 15 OBIS whaling records for blue whales off the northwest coast of Spain (Smith 2002), and several more whaling records for west-central Portugal (Brito et al. 2009).

Odontocetes

Sperm Whale (*Physeter macrocephalus*)

During acoustic and visual surveys of European waters from the U.K. to the southern Iberian Peninsula in July 2007, sperm whale densities were highest in the Bay of Biscay and off the northwestern Iberian Peninsula, and a total of 247 sperm whales were detected acoustically (Anonymous 2009; Swift et al. 2009). Sperm whales were one of the most commonly sighted cetacean species during summer surveys of the Bay of Biscay area in 1989 (n = 30) and 2007 (n = 42). Several sightings were made within and near the survey area off northwest Spain (Lens 1991; Basto d'Andrade 2008; Anonymous 2009). The best abundance estimate for the area off northwest Spain was 611, and the density estimate was 0.003/km^2 (Anonymous 2009; Cañadas et al. 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). In the Bay of Biscay, sperm whale habitat consists of the complex canyon area of the lower northern Celtic-Biscay shelf edge, the edge of the Biscay abyssal plain, and the Santander canyon near Bilbao, Spain (Anonymous 2009).

There are over 4000 OBIS whaling records of sperm whales off northwest Spain (Smith 2002). In addition, sperm whales have been sighted by U.K. Royal Navy vessels just to the east of the survey area at 42.7°N, 9.6°W and off the north coast of Spain near ~45°N, 8.6°W (Maughan 2003).

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

There are no OBIS sightings of pygmy or dwarf sperm whales near the proposed survey area off northwest Spain (IOC 2012). However, there are at least nine stranding records of pygmy sperm whales in the Bay of Biscay and northwest Spain for 1984–2010 (López et al. 2002; Lens et al. 2005; Santos et al. 2006; Spitz et al. 2011), and one stranding of a dwarf sperm whale in the Bay of Biscay in 1999 (Spitz et al. 2011).

Cuvier's Beaked Whale (*Ziphius cavirostris*)

Several sightings (n = 13) of Cuvier's beaked whale were made during surveys of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in July 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008). In addition, 60 sightings of Cuvier's beaked whale were made in the Bay of Biscay during 1998–2002 (Kiszka et al. 2007). The best abundance estimate for all beaked whales combined for the area off northwest Spain was 597, and the density estimate was 0.004/km^2 (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). Casinos and Vericad (1976) also reported at least two records for the Bay of Biscay. Five strandings were reported for northwest Spain during the 1990s (López et al. 2002). Spitz et al. (2011) reported on 10 strandings for the Bay of Biscay: 2 in 1998–1999 and 8 during 2000–2008.

There are no OBIS sightings of Cuvier's beaked whale near the proposed survey area off northwest Spain (IOC 2012).

Northern bottlenose whale (*Hyperoodon ampullatus*)

One sighting of two northern bottlenose whales was made during surveys of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in July 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008). Nine sightings of 32 individuals were made in deep waters (average depth of 3349 m) of the southern Bay of Biscay during 1998–2002; the mean group size was 2.8 (Kiszka et al. 2007). In addition, five sightings of seven northern bottlenose whales were made during aerial surveys of the Bay of Biscay between 2001 and 2006 (Certain 2008). Casinos and Vericad (1976) reported several records of this species for the Bay of Biscay, and one stranding was reported for the Bay of Biscay by Spitz et al. (2011).

There are no OBIS sightings of northern bottlenose whale near the proposed survey area off northwest Spain (IOC 2012).

True's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon mirus*)

In the eastern Atlantic Ocean, there are stranding records of True's beaked whale from Ireland (54ºN) to the Canaries (29ºN; MacLeod et al. 2006). One True's beaked whale was seen in the southern Bay of Biscay during 1998–2002 (Kiszka et al. 2007). Four sightings of unidentified beaked whales were also made during surveys of the Bay of Biscay area in July–August 1989 (although no sightings occurred off northwest Spain; Lens 1991), two sightings of unidentified beaked whales were made in the Bay of Biscay in 1999 (Kiszka et al. 2007), one sighting was made during 2001–2006 (Certain 2008), and nine sightings were reported during surveys of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in July 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008).

There are no OBIS sightings of True's beaked whale near the proposed survey area (IOC 2012).

Gervais' Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon europaeus*)

MacLeod et al. (2006) noted several stranding records for Blainville's beaked whale on the Iberian Peninsula, but there are no OBIS sighting records near the proposed survey area (IOC 2012). Nine sightings of unidentified beaked whales were made during surveys of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in July 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008).

Sowerby's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon bidens*)

One sighting of two Sowerby's beaked whales was made during surveys of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in July 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008). In addition, a sighting of three Sowerby's beaked whales was seen in the southern Bay of Biscay during 1998–2002 (Kiszka et al. 2007). Three strandings were reported for the Bay of Biscay by Spitz et al. (2011). There are no OBIS sightings of Sowerby's beaked whale near the proposed survey area (IOC 2012).

Blainville's Beaked Whale (*Mesoplodon densirostris*)

Blainville's beaked whale is the most widely distributed *Mesoplodon* species (Mead 1989), although it is generally limited to pelagic tropical and warmer temperate waters (Jefferson et al. 2008). MacLeod et al. (2006) noted several stranding records for Blainville's beaked whale on the Iberian Peninsula, but there are no OBIS sighting records near the proposed survey area (IOC 2012).

Common Bottlenose Dolphin (*Tursiops truncatus*)

During a survey of European waters from the U.K. to the southern coast of the Iberian Peninsula in July 2007, the survey block off northwest Spain had the lowest bottlenose dolphin density (0.005/km^2); the best estimate of abundance for the same area was 876 (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). Basto d'Andrade (2008) reported eight sightings of bottlenose dolphins during the 2007 summer surveys in the Biscay Bay area, whereas Lens (1991) did not report any sightings of bottlenose dolphins during surveys

of the area in the summer of 1989. There is one OBIS sighting of common bottlenose dolphin near the proposed survey area at ~43.5ºN, 9.1ºW (Maughan 2003). Bottlenose dolphins have also been sighted during surveys of coastal waters off northwest Spain (e.g., López et al. 2004; Pierce et al. 2010; Spyrakos et al. 2011).

Atlantic Spotted Dolphin (*Stenella frontalis*)

There are no OBIS sightings of Atlantic spotted dolphin near the proposed survey area (IOC 2012). No sightings of Atlantic spotted dolphins have been reported for surveys in the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters (Lens 1991; Kiszka et al. 2007; Basto d'Andrade 2008; Certain 2008) or off the central coast of Portugal (Brito et al. 2009).

Striped Dolphin (*Stenella coeruleoalba*)

Striped dolphins were one of the most commonly sighted cetacean species during summer surveys of the Bay of Biscay area and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in 2007; 111 sightings were made, 68 of which were mixed groups of striped and short-beaked common dolphins (Basto d'Andrade 2008). One of the sightings occurred inside the proposed study area (Basto d'Andrade 2008). A single striped dolphin sighting was made by Lens (1991) during summer surveys of the Bay of Biscay area. The best abundance estimate for the area off northwest Spain was 10,501, and the density was estimated at 0.047/km^2 (Anonymous 2009; Cañadas et al. 2009; Macleod et al. 2009).

Surveys of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain showed that increased chlorophyll-*a* concentrations near submarine canyons and shelf-slope breaks were correlated with increased numbers of striped dolphins (Basto d'Andrade 2008).

There are no OBIS sightings of striped dolphins off west Spain; the OBIS sighting closest to the proposed survey area is a sighting by the U.K. Royal Navy to the southeast at 40.8ºN, 9.9ºW (Maughan 2003). During coastal surveys off west Spain, Spyrakos et al. (2011) reported four sightings of striped dolphins.

Short-beaked Common Dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*)

Common dolphins were one of the most commonly sighted cetacean species during summer surveys of the Bay of Biscay area and adjacent waters off northwest Spain in 1989 (Lens 1991) and 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008). Fifteen sightings were made during surveys in 1989 (Lens 1991), and 180 sightings (68 of which were mixed groups with striped dolphins) were made in 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008). Based on Basto d'Andrade (2008), at least three of the sightings occurred inside the proposed study area. The best abundance estimate for the area off northwest Spain was 21,071, and the density was estimated at 0.077/km^2 (Anonymous 2009; Cañadas et al. 2009; Macleod et al. 2009).

Surveys of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain showed that increased chlorophyll-*a* concentrations near submarine canyons and shelf-slope breaks were correlated with increased numbers of common dolphins (Basto d'Andrade 2008).

There are numerous OBIS sightings of common dolphins around the Iberian Peninsula (IOC 2012). U.K. Royal Navy vessels reported nine sightings between 42.2º–43.5ºN and 9.6º–10.9ºW, and two sightings near 45ºN, 8.4ºW (Maughan 2003). Common dolphins were frequently sighted during surveys of coastal waters off northwest Spain (e.g., López et al. 2004; Pierce et al. 2010; Spyrakos et al. 2011).

Risso's Dolphin (*Grampus griseus*)

One sighting of a group of four Risso's dolphins was made during surveys of the Bay of Biscay area during summer 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008). In addition, 14 sightings were made during surveys

of the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters to the north during 1998–2002, and six sightings were made in the Bay of Biscay between 2001 and 2006 (Certain 2008). There have been at least 42 strandings off northwest Spain (Abollo et al. 1998; López et al. 2002; Lens et al. 2005). Risso's dolphins have also been sighted during surveys of coastal waters off northwest Spain (e.g., López et al. 2004; Pierce et al. 2010; Spyrakos et al. 2011). There are no OBIS sightings of Risso's dolphin off northwest Spain; the OBIS sighting closest to the proposed survey area is off Portugal at 41.4ºN, 8.8ºW (Faustino 2000).

Pygmy Killer Whale (*Feresa attenuata*)

Williams et al. (2002) reported two sightings of pygmy killer whales in the southern Bay of Biscay, at ~45.3°N; these are the most northerly sightings for this species. No pygmy killer whales were seen during summer surveys in the Bay of Biscay in 1999 (Lens 1991) or 2007 (Basto d'Andrade 2008). There are no OBIS sightings of the pygmy killer whale near the proposed survey area (IOC 2012).

False Killer Whale (*Pseudorca crassidens*)

Two groups totalling 13 false killer whales were sighted in the central and southern part of the Bay of Biscay during 1998–2002, in water >2000 m deep (Kiszka et al. 2007). There are no OBIS sightings of false killer whales off northwest Spain; there are two OBIS records from the National Whale and Dolphin Sightings and Strandings database off southwest Spain at 36ºN, 6ºW (IOC 2012).

Killer Whale (*Orcinus orca*)

As part of a study to detect the impact of oceano-climatic changes on the marine ecosystem, Hemery et al. (2008) reported that the killer whale disappeared from the southern part of the Bay of Biscay during the course of the study period (1974–2000); however, Kiszka et al. (2007) reported five killer whale sightings for the central and southern part of the Bay of Biscay during 1998–2002, all in deep (>2000 m) oceanic water (Kiszka et al. 2007). Casinos and Vericad (1976) also reported several records of this species for the Bay of Biscay. There are 10 OBIS records of killer whales off the Iberian Peninsula, but none are located near the proposed study area (IOC 2012). López et al. (2002) reported one stranding off northwest Spain in 1990.

Long-finned Pilot Whale (*Globicephala melas*)

The North Atlantic subspecies of the long-finned pilot whale (*G. m. melas*) ranges in the northeast Atlantic from ~68ºN in Norway south to Madeira at ~33ºN (Culik 2010). During a survey of European waters from the U.K. to the southern coast of the Iberian Peninsula in July 2007, the survey block off northwest Spain had the lowest pilot whale density (0.001/km^2); the best estimate of abundance was 194 long-finned pilot whales (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). Modeling predicted that pilot whale densities would be higher in deeper waters, seabed slopes, and areas with warmer temperatures (Anonymous 2009). During the 2007 survey, a total of 18 sightings of long-finned pilot whales were made in the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters off northwest Spain (Basto d'Andrade 2008); Lens (1991) reported 7 sightings of *Globicephala* sp. for surveys conducted in the area in 1989. There are several OBIS sightings of long-finned pilot whale in the Bay of Biscay area; five sightings were made by the U.K. Royal Navy northeast of the proposed survey area between 44.2º–45.3ºN and 8.1º–9.9ºW (Maughan 2003). Long-finned pilot whales have also been sighted during surveys of coastal waters off northwest Spain (e.g., López et al. 2004; Pierce et al. 2010; Spyrakos et al. 2011).

Short-finned Pilot Whale (*Globicephala macrorhynchus*)

During a survey of European waters from the U.K. to the southern coast of the Iberian Peninsula in July 2007, the survey block off northwest Spain had the lowest pilot whale density (0.001/km^2); the

abundance estimate for that same block for long- and short-finned pilot whales combined was 238 (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009). There are three OBIS sightings of short-finned pilot whale off the Iberian Peninsula, all reported by the U.K. Royal Navy between 38.6º–45.3ºN and 8.2º–11.2ºW (Maughan 2003). López et al. (2002) reported 15 stranding records for northwest Spain in 1998.

V. TYPE OF INCIDENTAL TAKE AUTHORIZATION REQUESTED

The type of incidental taking authorization that is being requested (i.e., takes by harassment only, takes by harassment, injury and/or death), and the method of incidental taking.

L-DEO requests an IHA pursuant to Section 101 (a)(5)(D) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) for incidental take by harassment during its planned seismic survey in the northeast Atlantic during June–July 2013.

The operations outlined in § I have the potential to take marine mammals by harassment. Sounds will be generated by the airguns used during the survey, by echosounders, and by general vessel operations. "Takes" by harassment will potentially result when marine mammals near the activities are exposed to the pulsed sounds generated by the airguns or echosounders. The effects will depend on the species of marine mammal, the behavior of the animal at the time of reception of the stimulus, as well as the distance and received level of the sound (see § VII). Disturbance reactions are likely amongst some of the marine mammals near the tracklines of the source vessel. No take by serious injury is anticipated, given the nature of the planned operations and the mitigation measures that are planned (see § XI, MITIGATION MEASURES). No lethal takes are expected.

VI. NUMBERS OF MARINE MAMMALS THAT COULD BE TAKEN

By age, sex, and reproductive condition (if possible), the number of marine mammals (by species) that may be taken by each type of taking identified in [section V], and the number of times such takings by each type of taking are likely to occur.

The material for § VI and § VII has been combined and presented in reverse order to minimize duplication between sections.

VII. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SPECIES OR STOCKS

The anticipated impact of the activity upon the species or stock of marine mammal.

The material for § VI and § VII has been combined and presented in reverse order to minimize duplication between sections.

- First we summarize the potential impacts on marine mammals of airgun operations, as called for in § VII. A more comprehensive review of the relevant background information appears in § 3.6.4.3, § 3.7.4.3, and Appendix E of the PEIS.
- Then we summarize the potential impacts of operations by the echosounders. A more comprehensive review of the relevant background information appears in § 3.6.4.3, § 3.7.4.3, and Appendix E of the PEIS.
- Finally, we estimate the numbers of marine mammals that could be affected by the proposed survey in the northeast Atlantic during June–July 2013. This section includes a description of the rationale for the estimates of the potential numbers of harassment "takes" during the planned survey, as called for in § VI.

Summary of Potential Effects of Airgun Sounds

The effects of sounds from airguns could include one or more of the following: tolerance, masking of natural sounds, behavioral disturbance, and at least in theory, temporary or permanent hearing impairment, or non-auditory physical or physiological effects (Richardson et al. 1995; Gordon et al. 2004; Nowacek et al. 2007; Southall et al. 2007). Permanent hearing impairment (PTS), in the unlikely event that it occurred, would constitute injury, but temporary threshold shift (TTS) is not an injury (Southall et al. 2007). Although the possibility cannot be entirely excluded, it is unlikely that the project would result in any cases of temporary or permanent hearing impairment, or any significant non-auditory physical or physiological effects. If marine mammals encounter the survey while it is underway, some behavioral disturbance could result, but this would be localized and short-term. As a result of the monitoring and mitigation measures, no marine mammals are expected to be exposed to sounds from the survey at levels causing behavioral disturbance.

Tolerance

Numerous studies have shown that pulsed sounds from airguns are often readily detectable in the water at distances of many kilometers. Several studies have shown that marine mammals at distances more than a few kilometers from operating seismic vessels often show no apparent response. That is often true even in cases when the pulsed sounds must be readily audible to the animals based on measured received levels and the hearing sensitivity of that mammal group. Although various baleen whales and toothed whales, and (less frequently) pinnipeds have been shown to react behaviorally to airgun pulses under some conditions, at other times mammals of all three types have shown no overt reactions. The relative responsiveness of baleen and toothed whales are quite variable.

Masking

Masking effects of pulsed sounds (even from large arrays of airguns) on marine mammal calls and other natural sounds are expected to be limited, although there are very few specific data on this. Because of the intermittent nature and low duty cycle of seismic pulses, animals can emit and receive sounds in the relatively quiet intervals between pulses. However, in exceptional situations, reverberation occurs for much or all of the interval between pulses (e.g., Simard et al. 2005; Clark and Gagnon 2006), which could mask calls. Some baleen and toothed whales are known to continue calling in the presence of seismic pulses, and their calls usually can be heard between the seismic pulses. The sounds important to small odontocetes are predominantly at much higher frequencies than are the dominant components of airgun sounds, thus limiting the potential for masking. In general, masking effects of seismic pulses are expected to be minor, given the normally intermittent nature of seismic pulses.

Disturbance Reactions

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

Reactions to sound, if any, depend on species, state of maturity, experience, current activity, reproductive state, time of day, and many other factors (Richardson et al. 1995; Wartzok et al. 2004; Southall et al. 2007; Weilgart 2007). If a marine mammal does react briefly to an underwater sound by changing its behavior or moving a small distance, the impacts of the change are unlikely to be significant to the

individual, let alone the stock or population. However, if a sound source displaces marine mammals from an important feeding or breeding area for a prolonged period, impacts on individuals and populations could be significant (e.g., Lusseau and Bejder 2007; Weilgart 2007). Given the many uncertainties in predicting the quantity and types of impacts of noise on marine mammals, it is common practice to estimate how many marine mammals would be present within a particular distance of industrial activities and/or exposed to a particular level of industrial sound. In most cases, this approach likely overestimates the numbers of marine mammals that would be affected in some biologically important manner.

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

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

Responses of *humpback whales* to seismic surveys have been studied during migration, on summer feeding grounds, and on Angolan winter breeding grounds; there has also been discussion of effects on the Brazilian wintering grounds. Off Western Australia, avoidance reactions began at 5–8 km from the array, and that those reactions kept most pods ~3–4 km from the operating seismic boat; there was localized displacement during migration of 4–5 km by traveling pods and 7–12 km by more sensitive resting pods of cow-calf pairs. However, some individual humpback whales, especially males, approached within distances of 100–400 m.

In the Northwest Atlantic, sighting rates were significantly greater during non-seismic periods compared with periods when a full array was operating, and humpback whales were more likely to swim away and less likely to swim towards a vessel during seismic vs. non-seismic periods. On their summer feeding grounds in southeast Alaska, there was no clear evidence of avoidance, despite the possibility of subtle effects, at received levels up to 172 re 1 μPa on an approximate rms basis. It has been suggested that South Atlantic humpback whales wintering off Brazil may be displaced or even strand upon exposure to seismic surveys, but data from subsequent years, indicated that there was no observable direct correlation between strandings and seismic surveys.

There are no data on reactions of *right whales* to seismic surveys, but results from the closely related *bowhead whale* show that their responsiveness can be quite variable depending on their activity (migrating vs. feeding). Bowhead whales migrating west across the Alaskan Beaufort Sea in autumn, in particular, are unusually responsive, with substantial avoidance occurring out to distances of 20–30 km from a medium-sized airgun source. However, more recent research on bowhead whales corroborates earlier evidence that, during the summer feeding season, bowheads are not as sensitive to seismic sources.

Reactions of migrating and feeding (but not wintering) *gray whales* to seismic surveys have been studied. Off St. Lawrence Island in the northern Bering Sea, it was estimated, based on small sample sizes, that 50% of feeding gray whales stopped feeding at an average received pressure level of 173 dB re 1 μPa on an (approximate) rms basis, and that 10% of feeding whales interrupted feeding at received

levels of 163 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. Those findings were generally consistent with the results of experiments conducted on larger numbers of gray whales that were migrating along the California coast, and western Pacific gray whales feeding off Sakhalin Island, Russia.

Various species of *Balaenoptera* (blue, sei, fin, and minke whales) have occasionally been seen in areas ensonified by airgun pulses; sightings by observers on seismic vessels off the United Kingdom from 1997 to 2000 suggest that, during times of good sightability, sighting rates for mysticetes (mainly fin and sei whales) were similar when large arrays of airguns were shooting vs. silent, although there was localized avoidance. Singing fin whales in the Mediterranean moved away from an operating airgun array.

Data on short-term reactions by cetaceans to impulsive noises are not necessarily indicative of long-term or biologically significant effects. It is not known whether impulsive sounds affect reproductive rate or distribution and habitat use in subsequent days or years. However, gray whales have continued to migrate annually along the west coast of North America with substantial increases in the population over recent years, despite intermittent seismic exploration (and much ship traffic) in that area for decades. The western Pacific gray whale population did not seem affected by a seismic survey in its feeding ground during a previous year, and bowhead whales have continued to travel to the eastern Beaufort Sea each summer, and their numbers have increased notably, despite seismic exploration in their summer and autumn range for many years.

Toothed Whales.—Little systematic information is available about reactions of toothed whales to sound pulses. However, there are recent systematic studies on sperm whales, and there is an increasing amount of information about responses of various odontocetes to seismic surveys based on monitoring studies. Seismic operators and marine mammal observers on seismic vessels regularly see dolphins and other small toothed whales near operating airgun arrays, but in general there is a tendency for most delphinids to show some avoidance of operating seismic vessels. In most cases, the avoidance radii for delphinids appear to be small, on the order of 1 km or less, and some individuals show no apparent avoidance. The beluga, however, is a species that (at least at times) shows long-distance (10s of km) avoidance of seismic vessels. Captive bottlenose dolphins and beluga whales exhibited changes in behavior when exposed to strong pulsed sounds similar in duration to those typically used in seismic surveys, but the animals tolerated high received levels of sound before exhibiting aversive behaviors.

Most studies of *sperm whales* exposed to airgun sounds indicate that the sperm whale shows considerable tolerance of airgun pulses; in most cases the whales do not show strong avoidance, and they continue to call, but foraging behavior can be altered upon exposure to airgun sound. There are almost no specific data on the behavioral reactions of *beaked whales* to seismic surveys. However, some northern bottlenose whales remained in the general area and continued to produce high-frequency clicks when exposed to sound pulses from distant seismic surveys. Most beaked whales tend to avoid approaching vessels of other types, and may also dive for an extended period when approached by a vessel. In any event, it is likely that most beaked whales would also show strong avoidance of an approaching seismic vessel, although this has not been documented explicitly.

Odontocete reactions to large arrays of airguns are variable and, at least for delphinids, seem to be confined to a smaller radius than has been observed for the more responsive of the mysticetes and some other odontocetes. A ≥170 dB disturbance criterion (rather than ≥160 dB) is considered appropriate for delphinids, which tend to be less responsive than the more responsive cetaceans.

Hearing Impairment and Other Physical Effects

Temporary or permanent hearing impairment is a possibility when marine mammals are exposed to very strong sounds. TTS has been demonstrated and studied in certain captive odontocetes and pinnipeds exposed to strong sounds. However, there has been no specific documentation of TTS let alone permanent hearing damage, i.e., PTS, in free-ranging marine mammals exposed to sequences of airgun pulses during realistic field conditions. Current NMFS policy regarding exposure of marine mammals to high-level sounds is that cetaceans and pinnipeds should not be exposed to impulsive sounds with received levels ≥180 dB and 190 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}, respectively (NMFS 2000). These criteria have been used in establishing the exclusion (=shut-down) zones planned for the proposed seismic survey. However, those criteria were established before there was any information about minimum received levels of sounds necessary to cause auditory impairment in marine mammals.

Recommendations for science-based noise exposure criteria for marine mammals, frequency-weighting procedures, and related matters were published by Southall et al. (2007). Those recommendations have not, as of late 2012, been formally adopted by NMFS for use in regulatory processes and during mitigation programs associated with seismic surveys. However, some aspects of the recommendations have been taken into account in certain environmental impact statements and small-take authorizations. NMFS has indicated that it may issue new noise exposure criteria for marine mammals that account for the now-available scientific data on TTS, the expected offset between the TTS and PTS thresholds, differences in the acoustic frequencies to which different marine mammal groups are sensitive (e.g., M-weighting or generalized frequency weightings for various groups of marine mammals, allowing for their functional bandwidths), and other relevant factors.

Several aspects of the planned monitoring and mitigation measures for this project are designed to detect marine mammals occurring near the airgun array, and to avoid exposing them to sound pulses that might, at least in theory, cause hearing impairment (see § XI and § XIII). Also, many marine mammals and (to a limited degree) sea turtles show some avoidance of the area where received levels of airgun sound are high enough such that hearing impairment could potentially occur. In those cases, the avoidance responses of the animals themselves would reduce or (most likely) avoid any possibility of hearing impairment.

Non-auditory physical effects may also occur in marine mammals exposed to strong underwater pulsed sound. Possible types of non-auditory physiological effects or injuries that might (in theory) occur in mammals close to a strong sound source include stress, neurological effects, bubble formation, and other types of organ or tissue damage. It is possible that some marine mammal species (i.e., beaked whales) may be especially susceptible to injury and/or stranding when exposed to strong transient sounds. However, there is no definitive evidence that any of these effects occur even for marine mammals in close proximity to large arrays of airguns. Such effects, if they occur at all, would presumably be limited to short distances and to activities that extend over a prolonged period. Marine mammals that show behavioral avoidance of seismic vessels, including most baleen whales, some odontocetes, and some pinnipeds, are especially unlikely to incur non-auditory physical effects. The brief duration of exposure of any given mammal, the deep water in the study area, and the planned monitoring and mitigation measures would further reduce the probability of exposure of marine mammals to sounds strong enough to induce non-auditory physical effects.

Possible Effects of Multibeam Echosounder and Sub-bottom Profiler Signals

The PEIS concluded in § 3.6.4.3, § 3.7.4.3 that operation of multibeam echosounders (MBES) and sub-bottom profilers (SBP) is not likely to impact mysticetes or odontocetes because the intermittent and

narrow, downward-directed nature of the MBES and SBP acoustic sources would result in no more than one or two brief ping exposures of any individual animal, given the movement and speed of the vessel.

Numbers of Marine Mammals that could be "Taken by Harassment"

All anticipated takes would be "takes by harassment", involving temporary changes in behavior. The mitigation measures to be applied will minimize the possibility of injurious takes. (However, as noted earlier, there is no specific information demonstrating that injurious "takes" would occur even in the absence of the planned mitigation measures.) In the sections below, we describe methods to estimate the number of potential exposures to various received sound levels and present estimates of the numbers of marine mammals that could be affected during the proposed seismic program. The estimates are based on a consideration of the number of marine mammals that could be disturbed appreciably by operations with the 36-airgun array to be used during ~5834 km of seismic surveys in the northeast Atlantic Ocean. The sources of distributional and numerical data used in deriving the estimates are described in the next subsection.

It is assumed that, during simultaneous operations of the airgun array and the other sources, any marine mammals close enough to be affected by the MBES, SBP, and acoustic release transponders would already be affected by the airguns. However, whether or not the airguns are operating simultaneously with the other sources, marine mammals are expected to exhibit no more than short-term and inconsequential responses to the MBES, SBP, and acoustic release transponders, given their characteristics (e.g., narrow downward-directed beam) and other considerations described in § 3.6.4.3, § 3.7.4.3, and Appendix E of the PEIS. Such reactions are not considered to constitute "taking" (NMFS 2001). Therefore, no additional allowance is included for animals that could be affected by sound sources other than airguns.

Basis for Estimating "Take by Harassment"

The estimates are based on a consideration of the number of marine mammals that could be within the area around the operating airgun array where the received levels (RLs) of sound >160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} are predicted to occur (see Table 1). The estimated numbers are based on the densities (numbers per unit area) of marine mammals expected to occur in the area in the absence of a seismic survey. To the extent that marine mammals tend to move away from seismic sources before the sound level reaches the criterion level and tend not to approach an operating airgun array, these estimates are likely to overestimate the numbers actually exposed to the specified level of sounds. The overestimation is expected to be particularly large when dealing with the higher sound-level criteria, e.g., 180 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}, as animals are more likely to move away before RL reaches 180 dB than they are to move away before it reaches (for example) 160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}. Likewise, they are less likely to approach within the ≥180 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} radius than they are to approach within the considerably larger ≥160 dB radius.

We used densities presented in the CODA final report for surveys off northwest Spain in 2007 (Anonymous 2009; Macleod et al. 2009) to estimate how many animals could be exposed during the proposed survey. The density reported for "unidentified large whale" was allocated to the humpback whale, and the density for beaked whales was allocated to Cuvier's beaked whale, as this was the most numerous species of beaked whale sighted during surveys off northwest Spain (see Basto d'Anstrade 2008). Except for beaked whales and bottlenose dolphins, all reported densities were corrected for trackline detection probability [$f(0)$] and availability [$g(0)$] biases by the authors of the CODA report. We chose not to correct the other densities, as $f(0)$ and $g(0)$ are specific to the location and cetacean habitat. Although there is some uncertainty about the representativeness of the data and the assumptions used in the calculations below, the approach used here is believed to be the best available approach.

The estimated numbers of individuals potentially exposed presented below are based on the 160-dB re 1 μPa_{rms} criterion for all cetaceans. It is assumed that marine mammals exposed to airgun sounds that strong could change their behavior sufficiently to be considered "taken by harassment". Table 3 shows the density estimates calculated as described above and the estimates of the number of different individual marine mammals that potentially could be exposed to ≥160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} during the seismic survey if no animals moved away from the survey vessel. The *Requested Take Authorization* is given in the far right column of Table 3. For species for which densities were not calculated as described above but for which there were OBIS sightings around the Azores, we have included a *Requested Take Authorization* for the mean group size for the species.

It should be noted that the following estimates of exposures to various sound levels assume that the proposed survey would be completed; in fact, the ensonified areas calculated using the planned number of line-kilometers ***have been increased by 25%*** to accommodate turns, lines that may need to be repeated, equipment testing, etc. As is typical during offshore ship surveys, inclement weather and equipment malfunctions are likely to cause delays and may limit the number of useful line-kilometers of seismic operations that can be undertaken. Also, any marine mammal sightings within or near the designated exclusion zones would result in the shut down of seismic operations as a mitigation measure. Thus, the following estimates of the numbers of marine mammals potentially exposed to 160-dB re 1 μPa_{rms} sounds are precautionary and probably overestimate the actual numbers of marine mammals that could be involved. These estimates assume that there would be no weather, equipment, or mitigation delays, which is highly unlikely.

Furthermore, as summarized in "Summary of Potential Airgun Effects", above, and the PEIS, delphinids seem to be less responsive to airgun sounds than are some mysticetes. The 160-dB (rms) criterion currently applied by NMFS, on which the following estimates are based, was developed based primarily on data from gray and bowhead whales. A ≥170 dB re 1 μPa disturbance criterion (rather than ≥160 dB) is considered appropriate for delphinids (and pinnipeds), which tend to be less responsive than the more responsive cetaceans. The estimates of "takes by harassment" of delphinids given below are thus considered precautionary.

Potential Number of Marine Mammals Exposed

The number of different individuals that could be exposed to airgun sounds with received levels ≥160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} on one or more occasions can be estimated by considering the total marine area that would be within the 160-dB radius around the operating seismic source on at least one occasion, along with the expected density of animals in the area. The number of possible exposures (including repeated exposures of the same individuals) can be estimated by considering the total marine area that would be within the 160-dB radius around the operating airguns, including areas of overlap. During the proposed survey, the transect lines are closely spaced relative to the 160-dB distance. Thus, the area including overlap is 8.2 x the area excluding overlap, so a marine mammal that stayed in the survey area during the entire survey could be exposed ~8 times, on average. However, it is unlikely that a particular animal would stay in the area during the entire survey. The numbers of different individuals potentially exposed to ≥160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} were calculated by multiplying the expected species density times the anticipated area to be ensonified to that level during airgun operations excluding overlap. The area expected to be ensonified was determined by entering the planned survey lines into a MapInfo GIS, using the GIS to identify the relevant areas by "drawing" the applicable 160-dB buffer (see Table 1) around each seismic line, and then calculating the total area within the buffers.

TABLE 3. Densities and estimates of the possible numbers of individuals that could be exposed to ≥160 dB re 1 μPa$_{rms}$ during L-DEO's proposed seismic survey in the Deep Galicia Basin west of Spain during June–July 2013. The proposed sound source consists of an 18-airgun array with a total discharge volume of ~3300 in^3. Species in italics are listed under the ESA as endangered. The column of numbers in boldface shows the numbers of Level B "takes" for which authorization is requested.

Species	Reported Density (#/km^2) MacLeod et al. (2009)[1]	Correction Factor[2]	Estimated Density (#/km^2)	Ensonified Area (km^2)	Calculated Take[3]	% of Regional Pop'n[4]	Requested Level B Take Authorization
Mysticetes							
North Atlantic right whale	*0*		*0*	8046	*0*	*0*	*0*
Humpback whale	*0.001*		*0.001*	8046	*8*	*0.07*	*8*
Minke whale	0		0	8046	0	<0.01	3[5]
Sei whale	*0.002*		*0.002*	8046	*16*	*0.13*	*16*
Fin whale	*0.019*		*0.019*	8046	*153*	*0.61*	*153*
Blue whale	*0*		*0*	8046	*0*	*0.21*	*2*[5]
Odontocetes							
Sperm whale	*0.003*		*0.003*	8046	*24*	*0.18*	*24*
Pygmy/dwarf sperm whale	0		0	8046	0	<0.01	0
Northern bottlenose whale	0		0	8046	0	0.01	4[5]
Cuvier's beaked whale	0.004		0.004	8046	32	0.46	32
Mesoplodon spp[6].	0		0	8046	0	0.10	7[5]
Bottlenose dolphin	0.005		0.005	8046	40	0.21	40
Atlantic spotted dolphin	0		0	8046	0	<0.01	0
Striped dolphin	0.047		0.047	8046	378	0.56	378
Short-beaked common dolphin	0.077		0.077	8046	620	0.53	620
Risso's dolphin	0		0	8046	0	0.02	4[5]
Pygmy killer whale	0		0	8046	0	N/A	0
False killer whale	0		0	8046	0	N/A	10[5]
Killer whale	0		0	8046	0	N/A	5[5]
Long-finned pilot whale	0.001		0.001	8046	8	<0.01	8
Short-finned pilot whale	0		0	8046	0	<0.01	5[5]

[1] Densities from MacLeod et al. 2009 were corrected for *f*(0) and *g*(0) by the authors, except for bottlenose dolphin and beaked whales; there is only one density estimate, so no minimum, mean, or maximum density is given

[2] No correction factors were applied for these calculations

[3] Calculated take is estimated density (reported density x correction factor) multiplied by the 160-dB ensonified area (including the 25% contingency)

[4] Requested takes expressed as percentages of the regional populations in the North Atlantic (Table 3); N/A means not available

[5] Requested take authorization was increased to group size for species for which densities were not available but that have been sighted near the proposed survey area

[6] May include True's, Gervais', Sowerby's, and Blainville's beaked whales

Applying the approach described above, ~6437 km^2 (~8046 km^2 including the 25% contingency) would be within the 160-dB isopleth on one or more occasions during the proposed survey. Because this approach does not allow for turnover in the mammal populations in the area during the course of the survey, the actual number of individuals exposed may be underestimated, although the conservative (i.e., probably overestimated) line-kilometer distances used to calculate the area may offset this. Also, the approach assumes that no cetaceans would move away or toward the trackline as the R/V *Langseth* approaches in response to increasing sound levels before the levels reach 160 dB. Another way of interpreting the estimates that follow is that they represent the number of individuals that are expected (in the absence of a seismic program) to occur in the waters that would be exposed to ≥160 dB re 1 μPa$_{rms}$.

The estimate of the number of individual cetaceans that could be exposed to seismic sounds with received levels ≥160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms} during the proposed survey is 1279 (Table 4). That total includes 201 cetaceans listed as ***Endangered*** under the ESA, including 153 fin whales (0.61%), 24 sperm whales (0.18%), 16 sei whales (0.13% of the regional population), and 8 humpback whales (0.07%).

In addition, 32 beaked whales (particularly Cuvier's beaked whale) could be exposed during the survey (Table 4). Most (82%) of the cetaceans potentially exposed are delphinids; the short-beaked common dolphin, striped dolphin, and bottlenose dolphin are estimated to be the most common delphinid species in the area, with estimates of 620 (0.53% of the regional population), 378 (0.56%), and 40 (0.21%) exposed to ≥160 dB re 1 μPa_{rms}, respectively.

Conclusions

The proposed seismic survey will involve towing an airgun array that introduces pulsed sounds into the ocean, along with simultaneous operation of an MBES and SBP. The survey will employ a 18-airgun array similar to the airgun arrays used for typical high-energy seismic surveys. The total airgun discharge volume is ~3300 in^3. Routine vessel operations, other than the proposed airgun operations, are conventionally assumed not to affect marine mammals sufficiently to constitute "taking". No "taking" of marine mammals is expected in association with echosounder operations given the considerations discussed in § 3.6.4.3, § 3.7.4.3, and Appendix E of the PEIS.

Cetaceans.—In § 3.6.7 and 3.7.7, the PEIS concluded that airgun operations with implementation of the proposed monitoring and mitigation measures may result in a small number of Level B behavioral effects in some mysticete and odontocete species in the North Atlantic QAA; that Level A effects were highly unlikely; and that operations were unlikely to adversely affect ESA-listed species.

In this IHA Application, estimates of the numbers of marine mammals that could be exposed to strong airgun sounds during the proposed program have been presented, together with the requested "take authorization". The estimated numbers of animals potentially exposed to sound levels sufficient to cause appreciable disturbance are very low percentages of the regional population sizes (Table 3). The estimates are likely overestimates the actual number of animals that would be exposed to and would react to the seismic sounds. The reasons for that conclusion are outlined above. The relatively short-term exposures are unlikely to result in any long-term negative consequences for the individuals or their populations.

VIII. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON SUBSISTENCE

The anticipated impact of the activity on the availability of the species or stocks of marine mammals for subsistence uses.

There is no subsistence hunting near the proposed survey area, so the proposed activities will not have any impact on the availability of the species or stocks for subsistence users.

IX. ANTICIPATED IMPACT ON HABITAT

The anticipated impact of the activity upon the habitat of the marine mammal populations, and the likelihood of restoration of the affected habitat.

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

discussed in § VII, above. This section briefly reviews the conclusions of the PEIS about effects of airguns on fish and invertebrates.

Effects of seismic sound on marine invertebrates (crustaceans and cephalopods), marine fish, and their fisheries are discussed in § 3.2.4 and § 3.3.4 and Appendix D of the PEIS. The PEIS concluded that there could be changes in behavior and other non-lethal, short-term, temporary impacts, and injurious or mortal impacts on a small number of individuals within a few meters of a high-energy acoustic source, but that there would be no significant impacts of NSF-funded marine seismic research on populations.

X. Anticipated Impact of Loss or Modification of Habitat on Marine Mammals

The anticipated impact of the loss or modification of the habitat on the marine mammal populations involved.

The proposed activity is not expected to have any habitat-related effects that could cause significant or long-term consequences for individual marine mammals or their populations, because operations will be limited in duration. However, a small minority of the marine mammals that are present near the proposed activity may be temporarily displaced as much as a few kilometers by the planned activity.

XI. Mitigation Measures

The availability and feasibility (economic and technological) of equipment, methods, and manner of conducting such activity or other means of effecting the least practicable adverse impact upon the affected species or stocks, their habitat, and on their availability for subsistence uses, paying particular attention to rookeries, mating grounds, and areas of similar significance.

Marine mammals and sea turtles are known to occur in the proposed study area. To minimize the likelihood that impacts will occur to the species and stocks, airgun operations will be conducted in accordance with the MMPA and the ESA, including obtaining permission for incidental harassment or incidental 'take' of marine mammals and other endangered species. The proposed activities will take place in International Waters.

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

Planning Phase

As discussed in § 2.4.1.1 of the PEIS, mitigation of potential impacts from the proposed activities begins during the planning phases of the proposed activities. Part of the considerations was whether the research objectives could be met with a smaller source than the full, 36-airgun, 6600-in^3 *Langseth* array, and it was decided that the scientific objectives could be met using two 18-airgun arrays, operating in "flip-flop" mode, and towed at a depth of ~9 m. Thus, the source volume would not exceed 3300 in^3 at any time. The PIs worked with L-DEO and NSF to identify potential time periods to carry out the survey taking into consideration key factors such as environmental conditions (i.e., the seasonal presence of marine mammals, sea turtles, and seabirds), weather conditions, equipment, and optimal timing for other proposed seismic surveys using the R/V *Langseth*. Most marine mammal species are expected to occur in the area year-round, so altering the timing of the proposed project likely would result in no net benefits for those species.

Proposed Exclusion Zones

Received sound levels have been predicted by L-DEO's model (Diebold et al. 2010; see also Appendix H of the PEIS) as a function of distance from the airguns for the 18-airgun array and for a single 1900LL 40-in^3 airgun, which would be used during power downs (Figs. 2 and 3). This modeling approach uses ray tracing for the direct wave traveling from the array to the receiver and its associated source ghost (reflection at the air-water interface in the vicinity of the array), in a constant-velocity half-space (infinite homogeneous ocean layer, unbounded by a seafloor). In addition, propagation measurements of pulses from the 18-airgun array have been reported in ~1600 m water depth (deep water), 50 m depth (shallow water), and a slope site (intermediate water depth) in the Gulf of Mexico (GoM) in 2007–2008 (Diebold et al. 2010).

For deep and intermediate-water cases, these field measurements cannot be used readily to derive mitigation radii, because at those sites the calibration hydrophone was located at a roughly constant depth of 350–500 m, which may not intersect all the isopleths at their widest point from the sea surface down to the maximum relevant water depth for marine mammals of ~2000 m. Figures 2 and 3 for the 36-airgun array in Diebold et al. (2010) show how the values along the maximum SPL line that joins the points where the isopleths attain their maximum width (providing the maximum distance associated with each sound level) can differ from values obtained along a constant depth line. At short ranges, where the direct arrivals dominate and the effects of seafloor interactions are minimal, the data recorded at the deep and slope sites are suited for comparison with modeled levels at the depth of the calibration hydrophone. At longer ranges, the comparison with the mitigation model—constructed from the maximum SPL through the entire water column at varying distances from the airgun array—is the most relevant. The results are summarized below.

Comparisons at short ranges between sound levels for direct arrivals recorded by the calibration hydrophone and modeled results for the same array tow depth for the 36-airgun array are in good agreement (Figs. 12 and 14 in Diebold et al. [2010]). As a consequence, isopleths falling within this domain can be predicted reliably by the L-DEO model, even if they would be sampled imperfectly by measurements obtained at a single depth. At longer distances, the calibration data show that seafloor reflected and sub-seafloor refracted arrivals dominate, whereas the direct arrivals become weak and/or incoherent (Figs. 11, 12 and 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]). Aside from local topography effects, the region around the critical distance (~5 km in Figs. 11 and 12, and ~4 km in Fig. 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]) is where the observed levels rise very close to the mitigation model curve. However, the observed sound levels are found to fall almost entirely below the mitigation model curve (Figs. 11, 12, and 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]). Thus, analysis of the GoM calibration measurements demonstrates that although simple, the L-DEO model is a robust tool for estimating mitigation radii.

Here we use for the 18-airgun array the deep-water radii obtained from modeled levels in deep water down to a maximum depth of 2000 m. The intermediate-water radii are derived from the deep-water ones by applying a correction factor (multiplication) of 1.5, such that observed levels at very near offsets fall below the corrected mitigation curve (Fig. 16 in Diebold et al. [2010]).

Measurements have not been reported for the single 40-in^3 airgun. The PEIS defines a low-energy source as any towed acoustic source whose received level is ≤180 dB at 100 m, including any single air-gun with a volume ≤425 in^3. In § 2.4.2 of the PEIS, Alternative B (the Preferred Alternative) conservatively applies a 100-m exclusion zone (EZ) for all low-energy acoustic sources in water depths >100 m. That approach is adopted here for the single Bolt 1900LL 40-in^3 airgun that would be used during power downs. No fixed, full 160-dB zone has been defined yet for the same suite of low-energy sources, therefore, L-DEO model results are used here to determine the 160 dB radius for the 40-in^3 airgun.

Table 1 shows the 180-dB EZ for the single airgun from the PEIS and, using the modeled measurements for the 18-airgun array and the 160-dB EZ for the single airgun, the distances at which the rms sound levels are expected to be received. The 180-dB re 1 μPa_{rms} distance is the safety criterion as specified by NMFS (2000) for cetaceans. The 180-dB distance would also be used as the EZ for sea turtles, as required by NMFS in most other recent seismic projects (e.g., Smultea et al. 2004; Holst et al. 2005a,b; Holst and Beland 2008; Holst and Smultea 2008; Hauser et al. 2008; Holst 2009; Antochiw et al. n.d.). If marine mammals or sea turtles are detected within or about to enter the appropriate EZ, the airguns would be powered down (or shut down if necessary) immediately.

Detailed recommendations for new science-based noise exposure criteria were published in early 2008 (Southall et al. 2007). NSF and L-DEO will be prepared to revise its procedures for estimating numbers of mammals "taken", EZs, etc., as may be required by any new guidelines that result. As yet, NMFS has not specified a new procedure for determining EZs.

Mitigation During Operations

Mitigation measures that will be adopted during the proposed survey include (1) power-down procedures, (2) shut-down procedures, (3) ramp-up procedures, and (4) special procedures for situations or species of particular concern.

Power-down Procedures

A power down involves decreasing the number of airguns in use such that the radius of the 180-dB (or 190-dB) zone is decreased to the extent that marine mammals or turtles are no longer in or about to enter the EZ. A power down of the airgun array will also occur when the vessel is turning from one seismic line to another. During a power down, one airgun will be operated. The continued operation of one airgun is intended to alert marine mammals and turtles to the presence of the seismic vessel in the area. In contrast, a shut down occurs when all airgun activity is suspended.

If a marine mammal or turtle is detected outside the EZ but is likely to enter the EZ, the airguns will be powered down before the animal is within the EZ. Likewise, if a mammal or turtle is already within the EZ when first detected, the airguns will be powered down immediately. During a power down of the airgun array, the 40-in^3 airgun will be operated. If a marine mammal or turtle is detected within or near the smaller EZ around that single airgun (Table 1), it will be shut down (see next subsection).

Following a power down, airgun activity will not resume until the marine mammal or turtle has cleared the safety zone. The animal will be considered to have cleared the safety zone if

- it is visually observed to have left the EZ, or
- it has not been seen within the zone for 15 min in the case of small odontocetes, or
- it has not been seen within the zone for 30 min in the case of mysticetes and large odontocetes, including sperm, pygmy sperm, dwarf sperm, and beaked whales, or
- the vessel has moved outside the EZ for turtles, e.g., if a turtle is sighted close to the vessel and the ship speed is 8.3 km/h, it would take the vessel ~8 min to leave the turtle behind.

During airgun operations following a shut down whose duration has exceeded the time limits specified above, the airgun array will be ramped up gradually. Ramp-up procedures are described below. During past R/V *Langseth* marine geophysical surveys, following an extended power-down period, the seismic source followed ramp-up procedures to return to the full seismic source level. Under a power-down scenario, however, a single mitigation airgun still would be operating to alert and warn animals of the on-going activity. Furthermore, under these circumstances, ramp-up procedures may unnecessarily extend the length of the survey time needed to collect seismic data. LDEO and NSF have concluded in consultation

with NMFS that ramp up is not necessary after an extended power down. This assessment therefore does not include this practice as part of the monitoring and mitigation plan.

Shut-down Procedures

The operating airgun(s) will be shut down if a marine mammal or turtle is seen within or approaching the EZ for the single airgun. Shut downs will be implemented (1) if an animal enters the EZ of the single airgun after a power down has been initiated, or (2) if an animal is initially seen within the EZ of the single airgun when more than one airgun (typically the full array) is operating. Airgun activity will not resume until the marine mammal or turtle has cleared the safety zone, or until the PSO is confident that the animal has left the vicinity of the vessel. Criteria for judging that the animal has cleared the safety zone will be as described in the preceding subsection.

Ramp-up Procedures

A ramp-up procedure will be followed when the airgun array begins operating after a specified period without airgun operations. It is proposed that, for the present survey, this period would be ~8 min. Similar periods (~8–10 min) were used during previous L-DEO surveys. Ramp up will not occur if a marine mammal or sea turtle has not cleared the safety zone as described earlier.

Ramp up will begin with the smallest airgun in the array (40 in^3). Airguns will be added in a sequence such that the source level of the array will increase in steps not exceeding 6 dB per 5-min period over a total duration of ~35 min. During ramp up, the PSOs will monitor the EZ, and if marine mammals or turtles are sighted, a power down or shut down will be implemented as though the full array were operational.

If the complete EZ has not been visible for at least 30 min prior to the start of operations in either daylight or nighttime, ramp up will not commence unless at least one airgun (40 in^3 or similar) has been operating during the interruption of seismic survey operations. Given these provisions, it is likely that the airgun array will not be ramped up from a complete shut down at night or in thick fog, because the outer part of the safety zone for that array will not be visible during those conditions. If one airgun has operated during a power-down period, ramp up to full power will be permissible at night or in poor visibility, on the assumption that marine mammals and turtles will be alerted to the approaching seismic vessel by the sounds from the single airgun and could move away. Ramp up of the airguns will not be initiated if a sea turtle or marine mammal is sighted within or near the applicable EZs during the day or night.

As noted above under "Power-down Procedures", during past R/V *Langseth* marine geophysical surveys, following an extended power-down period, the seismic source followed ramp-up procedures to return to the full seismic source level. Under a power-down scenario, however, a single mitigation airgun still would be operating to alert and warn animals of the on-going activity.

Special Procedures for Situations or Species of Concern

It is unlikely that a North Atlantic right whale would be encountered, but if so, the airguns will be shut down immediately if one is sighted at any distance from the vessel because of its rarity and conservation status. Also, it is unlikely that concentrations of humpback, fin, sperm, blue, or sei whales would be encountered, but if so, they will be avoided.

XII. PLAN OF COOPERATION

Where the proposed activity would take place in or near a traditional Arctic subsistence hunting area and/or may affect the availability of a species or stock of marine mammal for Arctic subsistence uses, the applicant must submit either a plan of cooperation or information that identifies what measures have been taken and/or will be taken to minimize any adverse effects on the availability of marine mammals for subsistence uses. A plan must include the following:

(i) A statement that the applicant has notified and provided the affected subsistence community with a draft plan of cooperation;

(ii) A schedule for meeting with the affected subsistence communities to discuss proposed activities and to resolve potential conflicts regarding any aspects of either the operation or the plan of cooperation;

(iii) A description of what measures the applicant has taken and/or will take to ensure that proposed activities will not interfere with subsistence whaling or sealing; and

(iv) What plans the applicant has to continue to meet with the affected communities, both prior to and while conducting activity, to resolve conflicts and to notify the communities of any changes in the operation.

Not applicable. The proposed activity will take place in the northeast Atlantic Ocean, and no activities will take place in or near a traditional Arctic subsistence hunting area.

XIII. MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

The suggested means of accomplishing the necessary monitoring and reporting that will result in increased knowledge of the species, the level of taking or impacts on populations of marine mammals that are expected to be present while conducting activities and suggested means of minimizing burdens by coordinating such reporting requirements with other schemes already applicable to persons conducting such activity. Monitoring plans should include a description of the survey techniques that would be used to determine the movement and activity of marine mammals near the activity site(s) including migration and other habitat uses, such as feeding...

L-DEO proposes to sponsor marine mammal monitoring during the present project, in order to implement the proposed mitigation measures that require real-time monitoring, and to satisfy the anticipated monitoring requirements of the IHA.

L-DEO's proposed Monitoring Plan is described below. L-DEO understands that this Monitoring Plan will be subject to review by NMFS, and that refinements may be required.

The monitoring work described here has been planned as a self-contained project independent of any other related monitoring projects that may be occurring simultaneously in the same regions. L-DEO is prepared to discuss coordination of its monitoring program with any related work that might be done by other groups insofar as this is practical and desirable.

Vessel-based Visual Monitoring

PSO observations will take place during daytime airgun operations and nighttime start ups of the airguns. Airgun operations will be suspended when marine mammals or turtles are observed within, or about to enter, designated exclusion zones [see § XI above] where there is concern about potential effects on hearing or other physical effects. PSOs will also watch for marine mammals and turtles near the seismic vessel for at least 30 min prior to the planned start of airgun operations. Observations will also be made during daytime periods when the *Langseth* is underway without seismic operations, such as during transits.

During seismic operations, at least four visual PSOs will be based aboard the *Langseth*. PSOs will be appointed by L-DEO with NMFS concurrence. During the majority of seismic operations, two PSOs

will monitor for marine mammals and sea turtles around the seismic vessel. Use of two simultaneous observers will increase the effectiveness of detecting animals around the source vessel. However, during meal times, only one PSO may be on duty. PSO(s) will be on duty in shifts of duration no longer than 4 h. Other crew will also be instructed to assist in detecting marine mammals and turtles and implementing mitigation requirements (if practical). Before the start of the seismic survey, the crew will be given additional instruction regarding how to do so.

The *Langseth* is a suitable platform for marine mammal and turtle observations. When stationed on the observation platform, the eye level will be ~21.5 m above sea level, and the observer will have a good view around the entire vessel. During daytime, the PSO(s) will scan the area around the vessel systematically with reticle binoculars (e.g., 7×50 Fujinon), Big-eye binoculars (25×150), and with the naked eye. During darkness, night vision devices (NVDs) will be available (ITT F500 Series Generation 3 binocular-image intensifier or equivalent), when required. Laser rangefinding binoculars (Leica LRF 1200 laser rangefinder or equivalent) will be available to assist with distance estimation. Those are useful in training observers to estimate distances visually, but are generally not useful in measuring distances to animals directly; that is done primarily with the reticles in the binoculars.

Passive Acoustic Monitoring

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

The PAM system consists of hardware (i.e., hydrophones) and software. The "wet end" of the system consists of a towed hydrophone array that is connected to the vessel by a tow cable. The tow cable is 250 m long, and the hydrophones are fitted in the last 10 m of cable. A depth gauge is attached to the free end of the cable, and the cable is typically towed at depths <20 m. The array will be deployed from a winch located on the back deck. A deck cable will connect the tow cable to the electronics unit in the main computer lab where the acoustic station, signal conditioning, and processing system will be located. The acoustic signals received by the hydrophones are amplified, digitized, and then processed by the Pamguard software. The system can detect marine mammal vocalizations at frequencies up to 250 kHz.

One acoustic PSO or PSAO (in addition to the 4 visual PSOs) will be on board. The towed hydrophones will ideally be monitored 24 h per day while at the seismic survey area during airgun operations, and during most periods when the *Langseth* is underway while the airguns are not operating. However, PAM may not be possible if damage occurs to the array or back-up systems during operations. One PSO will monitor the acoustic detection system at any one time, by listening to the signals from two channels via headphones and/or speakers and watching the real-time spectrographic display for frequency ranges produced by cetaceans. The PSAO monitoring the acoustical data will be on shift for 1–6 h at a time. All observers are expected to rotate through the PAM position, although the most experienced with acoustics will be on PAM duty more frequently.

When a vocalization is detected while visual observations are in progress, the PSAO will contact the visual PSO immediately, to alert him/her to the presence of cetaceans (if they have not already been seen), and to allow a power down or shut down to be initiated, if required. The information regarding the

call will be entered into a database. The data to be entered include an acoustic encounter identification number, whether it was linked with a visual sighting, date, time when first and last heard and whenever any additional information was recorded, position and water depth when first detected, bearing if determinable, species or species group (e.g., unidentified dolphin, sperm whale), types and nature of sounds heard (e.g., clicks, continuous, sporadic, whistles, creaks, burst pulses, strength of signal, etc.), and any other notable information. The acoustic detection can also be recorded for further analysis.

PSO Data and Documentation

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

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

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

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

All observations and power downs or shut downs will be recorded in a standardized format. Data will be entered into an electronic database. The accuracy of the data entry will be verified by computerized data validity checks as the data are entered and by subsequent manual checking of the database. These procedures will allow initial summaries of data to be prepared during and shortly after the field program, and will facilitate transfer of the data to statistical, graphical, and other programs for further processing and archiving.

Results from the vessel-based observations will provide

1. The basis for real-time mitigation (airgun power down or shut down).
2. Information needed to estimate the number of marine mammals potentially taken by harassment, which must be reported to NMFS.
3. Data on the occurrence, distribution, and activities of marine mammals and turtles in the area where the seismic study is conducted.
4. Information to compare the distance and distribution of marine mammals and turtles relative to the source vessel at times with and without seismic activity.
5. Data on the behavior and movement patterns of marine mammals and turtles seen at times with and without seismic activity.

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

activities). The report will also include estimates of the number and nature of exposures that could result in "takes" of marine mammals by harassment or in other ways.

XIV. COORDINATING RESEARCH TO REDUCE AND EVALUATE INCIDENTAL TAKE

Suggested means of learning of, encouraging, and coordinating research opportunities, plans, and activities relating to reducing such incidental taking and evaluating its effects.

L-DEO and NSF will coordinate the planned marine mammal monitoring program associated with the seismic survey with other parties that may have interest in this area. L-DEO and NSF will coordinate with applicable U.S. agencies (e.g., NMFS), and will comply with their requirements.

XV. LITERATURE CITED

Abollo, E., A. López, C. Gestal, P. Benavente, and S. Pascual. 1998. Long-term recording of gastric ulcers in cetaceans stranded on the Galician (NW Spain) coast. **Diseases Aquat. Organ.** 32:71-72.

Aguilar, A. 1981. The black right whale, *Eubalaena glacialis*, in the Cantabrian Sea. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 31:457-459.

Anonymous. 2009. Cetacean offshore distribution and abundance in the European Atlantic (CODA). Unpubl. rep. to the European Commission. 42 p. + Annexes. Accessed on 26 November 2012 at http://biology.st-andrews.ac.uk/coda/documents/CODA_Final_Report_11-2-09.pdf.

Antochiw, D., A. Dubuque, S. Milne, D. Palacios, and M. Piercy. n.d. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring report for the Costa Rica 3D seismic survey (Bangs Crisp Project) in the Pacific Ocean offshore Costa Rica, 7 April 2011–12 May 2011, R/V *Marcus G. Langseth*. Rep. from RPS, Houston, TX, for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 45 p. + app.

Basto d'Andrade, M.I.L. 2008. Spatial distribution of cetaceans in the Bay of Biscay and implications of the Marine Strategy Directive for their conservation. M.Sc. thesis, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon. 69 p.

Brito, C., N. Vieira, E. Sá, and I. Carvalho. 2009. Cetaceans' occurrence off the west central Portugal coast: a compilation of data from whaling, observations of opportunity and boat-based surveys. **JMATE** 2:10-13. Accessed in August 2011 at http://www.oers.ca/journal/Volume%202/200921brinto.pdf.

Brown, S.G. 1986. Twentieth-century records of right whales (*Eubalaena glacialis*) in the northeast Atlantic Ocean. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm. Spec. Iss.** 10:121-127.

Cañadas, A., M.L. Burt, K. Macleod, E. Rogan, B. Santos, J.A. Vázquez, and P.S. Hammond. 2009. Appendix II: Model-based estimates of cetacean abundance in offshore European Atlantic waters. Unpubl. rep. for the European Commission. Accessed at http://biology.st-andrews.ac.uk/coda/documents/CODA_Appendix_II_model-based_estimates.pdf on 26 November 2012,

Casinos, A. and J.-R. Vericad. 1976. The cetaceans of the Spanish coasts: a survey. **Mammalia** 40(2):267-290.

Castro, J., S. Magalhaes, P. Verborgh, and R. de Stephanis. 2010. First survey of cetaceans in the south of Portugal. 24th Ann. Meet. Europ. Cetac. Soc., Stralsund, Germany 22–24 March 2010.

Cattanach, K.L., J. Sigurjónsson, S.T. Buckland, and T. Gunnlaugsson. 1993. Sei whale abundance in the North Atlantic, estimated from NASS-87 and NASS-89 data. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 43:315-321.

Certain, G., V. Ridoux, O. van Canneyt, and V. Bretagnolle. 2008. Delphinid spatial distribution and abundance estimates over the shelf of the Bay of Biscay. **ICES J. Mar. Sci.** 65:656-666.

Clark, C.W. and G.C. Gagnon. 2006. Considering the temporal and spatial scales of noise exposures from seismic surveys on baleen whales. Working Pap. SC/58/E9. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K. 9 p.

College of the Atlantic, Allied Whale. 2004. Allied Humpback Whale Catalogue, 1976–2003. OBIS. Retrieved 2012-11-27 from http://www.iobis.org.

Culik, B.M. 2010. Odontocetes: the toothed whales: distribution, behaviour, migration, and threats. *Globicephala melas* (Traill, 1809). UNEP/CMS Secretariat, Bonn, Germany. Accessed on 29 October 2012 at http://www.cms.int/reports/small_cetaceans/data/G_melas/g_melas.htm.

Diebold, J.B., M. Tolstoy, L. Doermann, S.L. Nooner, S.C. Webb, and T.J. Crone. 2010. R/V Marcus G. Langseth seismic source: modeling and calibration. **Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.** 11(12), Q12012, doi:10.1029/2010GC003126. 20 p.

ECOS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Environmental Conservation Online System). 2012. Species report–listed animals. Accessed on 1 November 2012 at http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/pub/listedAnimals.jsp.

Faustino, C. 2000. Cetacean distribution in the Portuguese continental coast (in Portuguese). University of Algarve, 69. Retrieved 2012-11-28 from http://www.iobis.org.

Gordon, J., D. Gillespie, J. Potter, A. Frantzis, M.P. Simmonds, R. Swift, and D. Thompson. 2004. A review of the effects of seismic surveys on marine mammals. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):16-34.

Greene, C.R., Jr. 1997. Physical acoustics measurements. p. 3-1 to 3-63 *In*: W.J. Richardson (ed.), Northstar marine mammal monitoring program, 1996: marine mammal and acoustical monitoring of a seismic program in the Alaskan Beaufort Sea. LGL Rep. 2121-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and Greeneridge Sciences Inc., Santa Barbara, CA, for BP Explor. (Alaska) Inc., Anchorage, AK, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Anchorage, AK, and Silver Spring, MD. 245 p.

Hauser, D.D.W., M. Holst, and V.D. Moulton. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, April–August 2008. LGL Rep. TA4656/7-1. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., and St. John's, Nfld., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 98 p.

Hemery, G., F. D'Amico, I. Castege, B. Dupont, J. D'Elbee, Y. Lalanne, and C. Mouches. 2008. Detecting the impact of oceano-climatic changes on marine ecosystems using a multivariate index: the case of the Bay of Biscay (North Atlantic-European Ocean). **Global Change Biol.** 14:27-38.

Holst, M. 2009. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's TAIGER marine seismic program near Taiwan, April–July 2009. LGL Rep. TA4553-4. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont. for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 103 p.

Holst, M. and J. Beland. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic testing and calibration study in the northern Gulf of Mexico, November 2007–February 2008. LGL Rep. TA4295-2. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 77 p.

Holst, M. and M.A. Smultea. 2008. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off Central America, February–April 2008. LGL Rep. TA4342-3. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 133 p.

Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005a. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean off Central America, November–December 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-30. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 125 p.

Holst, M., M.A. Smultea, W.R. Koski, and B. Haley. 2005b. Marine mammal and sea turtle monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's marine seismic program off the northern Yucatán Peninsula in the southern Gulf of Mexico, January–February 2005. LGL Rep. TA2822-31. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 96 p.

Hoyt, E., 2005. Marine protected areas for whales, dolphins and porpoises: a world handbook for cetacean habitat conservation. Earthscan, London, U.K. 492 p.

IOC (Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO). 2012. The Ocean Biogeographic Information System. Web. http://www.iobis.org. Consulted on 26/10/2012.

IUCN (The World Conservation Union). 2012. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Version 2012.2. Accessed on 1 November 2012 at http://www.iucnredlist.org.

IWC (International Whaling Commission). 2012. Whale population estimates–The International Whaling Commission's most recent information on estimated abundance. Accessed on 1 November 2012 at http://iwcoffice.org/estimate.

Jann, B., J. Allen, M. Carrillo, S. Hanquet, S.K. Katona, A.R. Martin, R.R. Reeves, R. Seton, P.T. Stevick, and F.W. Wenzel. 2003. Migration of a humpback whale (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) between the Cape Verde Islands and Iceland. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 5:125-129.

Jefferson, T.A., M.A. Webber, and R.L. Pitman. 2008. Marine mammals of the world—A comprehensive guide to their identification. Elsevier, Academic Press, Amsterdam, Netherlands. 573 p.

Kiszka, J., K. Macleod, O., Van Canneyt, D. Walker, and V. Ridoux. 2007. Distribution, encounter rates, and habitat characteristics of toothed cetaceans in the Bay of Biscay and adjacent waters from platform-of-opportunity data. **ICES J. Mar. Sci**. 64:1033-1043.

Knowlton, A.R., J. Sigurjósson, 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.

Lens, S. 1991. North Atlantic sightings survey 1989: report of the Spanish cruise. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 41:539-543.

Lens, S., J. Pantoja, J.A. Vázquez, and E. Urquiola. 2005. Spain progress report on cetacean research, May 2004 to April 2005 with statistical data for the calendar year 2004. Working pap. SC/57. Int. Whal. Comm., Cambridge, U.K.

López, A., M.B. Santos, G.J. Pierce, A.F. González, X. Valeiras, and A. Guerra. 2002. Trends in strandings and by-catch of marine mammals in north-west Spain during the 1990s. **J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U.K.** 82:513-521.

López, A., G.J. Pierce, M.B. Santos, J. Gracia, and A. Guerra. 2003. Fishery by-catches of marine mammals in Galician waters: results from on-board observations and interview survey of fishermen. **Biol. Conserv.** 111:25-40.

López, A., G.J. Pierce, X. Valeiras, M.B. Santos, and A. Guerra. 2004. Distribution patterns of small cetaceans in Galician waters. **J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U.K.** 84:283-294.

Lusseau, D. and L. Bejder. 2007. The long-term consequences of short-term responses to disturbance experience from whalewatching impact assessment. **Int. J. Comp. Psych.** 20(2-3):228-236.

MacLeod, C.D., W.F. Perrin, R. Pitman, J. Barlow, L. Ballance, A. D'Amico, T. Gerrodette, G. Joyce, K.D. Mullin, D.L. Palka, and G.T. Waring. 2006. Known and inferred distributions of beaked whale species (Cetacea: Ziphiidae). **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 7(3):271-286.

Macleod, K., M.L. Burt, A. Cañadas, E. Rogan, B. Santos, A. Uriarte, O. Van Canneyt, J.A. Vázquez, and P.S. Hammond. 2009. Appendix I: Design-based estimates of cetacean abundance in offshore European Atlantic waters. Unpubl. rep. to the European Commission presented to the IWC Scientific Committee. Accessed at http://biology.st-andrews.ac.uk/coda/documents/CODA_Appendix_I_design-based_estimates.pdf in November 2012.

Martin, A.R. and F.J. Walker. 1997. Sighting of a right whale (*Eubalaena glacialis*) with calf off S.W. Portugal. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 13(1):139-140.

Maughan, B. 2003. United Kingdom Royal Navy cetacean sightings. United Kingdom Hydrographic Office. Taunton, Somerset, U.K. Retrieved 2012-10-23 from http://www.iobis.org.

McCauley, R.D., M.-N. Jenner, C. Jenner, K.A. McCabe, and J. Murdoch. 1998. The response of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) to offshore seismic survey noise: preliminary results of observations about a working seismic vessel and experimental exposures. **APPEA (Austral. Petrol. Product. Explor. Assoc.) J.** 38:692-707.

McCauley, R.D., J. Fewtrell, A.J. Duncan, C. Jenner, M.-N. Jenner, J.D. Penrose, R.I.T. Prince, A. Adhitya, J. Murdoch, and K. McCabe. 2000. Marine seismic surveys: analysis of airgun signals; and effects of air gun exposure on humpback whales, sea turtles, fishes and squid. Rep. from Centre for Marine Science and Technology, Curtin Univ., Perth, W.A., for Austral. Petrol. Prod. Assoc., Sydney, N.S.W. 188 p.

Mead, J.G. 1989. Beaked whales of the genus *Mesoplodon*. p. 349-430 *In*: S.H. Ridgway and R.J. Harrison (eds.), Handbook of marine mammals, Vol. 4: River dolphins and the larger toothed whales. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. 444 p.

Mellinger, D.K., S.L. Nieukirk, K. Klinck, H. Klinck, R.P. Dziak, P.J. Clapham, and B. Brandsdóttir. 2011. Confirmation of right whales near a nineteenth-century whaling ground east of southern Greenland. **Biol. Lett.** 7:411-413.

NAMMCO (North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission). 1995. Report of the joint meeting of the Scientific Committee working groups on northern bottlenose and killer whales and management procedures. p. 89-99 *In*: NAMMCO Annual Report 1995, NAMMCO, Tromsø, Norway.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2000. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities: marine seismic-reflection data collection in southern California/Notice of receipt of application. **Fed. Regist.** 65(60, 28 Mar.):16374-16379.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2001. Small takes of marine mammals incidental to specified activities: oil and gas exploration drilling activities in the Beaufort Sea/Notice of issuance of an incidental harassment authorization. **Fed. Regist.** 66(26, 7 Feb.):9291-9298.

Nowacek, D.P., L.H. Thorne, D.W. Johnston, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Responses of cetaceans to anthropogenic noise. **Mamm. Rev.** 37(2):81-115.

NRC (National Research Council). 2005. Marine mammal populations and ocean noise/Determining when noise causes biologically significant effects. U.S. Nat. Res. Counc., Ocean Studies Board, Committee on characterizing biologically significant marine mammal behavior (Wartzok, D.W., J. Altmann, W. Au, K. Ralls, A. Starfield, and P.L. Tyack). Nat. Acad. Press, Washington, DC. 126 p.

Pierce, G.J., M. Caldas, J. Cedeira, M. Begoña Santos, Á. Llavona, P. Covelo, G. Martinez, J. Torres, M. Sacau, and A. López. 2010. Trends in cetacean sightings along the Galician coast, north-west Spain, 2003–2007, and inferences about cetacean habitat preferences. **J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U.K.** 90(8):1547-1560.

Pierson, M.O., J.P. Wagner, V. Langford, P. Birnie, and M.L. Tasker. 1998. Protection from, and mitigation of, the potential effects of seismic exploration on marine mammals. Chapter 7 *In*: M.L. Tasker and C. Weir (eds.), Proc. Seismic Mar. Mamm. Worksh., London, U.K., 23–25 June 1998.

Pike, D.G., G.A. Víkingsson, T. Gunnlaugsson, and N. Øien. 2009. A note on the distribution and abundance of blue whales (*Balaenoptera musculus*) in the central and northeast North Atlantic. **NAMMCO Sci. Publ.** 7:19-29.

Read, A.J., P.N. Halpin, L.B. Crowder, B.D. Best, and E. Fujioka (eds.). 2009. OBIS-SEAMAP: Mapping marine mammals, birds and turtles. World Wide Web electronic publication. Accessed on 20 September 2011 at http://seamap.env.duke.edu.

Reeves, R.R., B.S. Stewart, P.J. Clapham, and J.A. Powell. 2002. Guide to marine mammals of the world. Chanticleer Press, New York, NY. 527 p.

Rice, D.W. 1998. Marine mammals of the world, systematics and distribution. Spec. Publ. 4. Soc. Mar. Mammal., Allen Press, Lawrence, KS. 231 p.

Richardson, W.J., C.R. Greene, Jr., C.I. Malme, and D.H. Thomson. 1995. Marine mammals and noise. Academic Press, San Diego. 576 p.

Sanpera C, and A. Aguilar. 1992. Modern whaling off the Iberian Peninsula during the 20th century. **Rep. Int. Whal. Comm.** 42: 723–730.

Santos, M.B., G.J. Pierce, A. López, R.J. Reid, V. Ridoux, and E. Mente. 2006. Pygmy sperm whales *Kogia breviceps* in the Northeast Atlantic: new information on stomach contents and strandings. **Mar. Mamm. Sci.** 22(3):600–616.

Silva, M.A., L. Steiner, I. Cascão, M.J. Cruz, R. Prieto, T. Cole, P.K. Hamilton, and M. Baumgartner. 2012. Winter sighting of a known western North Atlantic right whale in the Azores. **J. Cetac. Res. Manage.** 12(1):65-69.

Simard, Y., F. Samaran, and N. Roy. 2005. Measurement of whale and seismic sounds in the Scotian Gully and adjacent canyons in July 2003. p. 97-115 *In*: K. Lee, H. Bain, and C.V. Hurley (eds.), Acoustic monitoring and marine mammal surveys in The Gully and outer Scotian Shelf before and during active seismic surveys. Environ. Stud. Res. Funds Rep. 151. 154 p. (Published 2007).

Smith, T.D. (ed.). 2002. World whaling database: individual whale catches, North Atlantic. *In*: M.G Barnard and J.H. Nicholls (comp.), HMAP Database (www.hull.ac.uk/history/MHSC/hmap12.htm). Retrieved 2012-10-23 from http://www.iobis.org.

Smultea, M.A., M. Holst, W.R. Koski, and S. Stoltz. 2004. Marine mammal monitoring during Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory's seismic program in the southeast Caribbean Sea and adjacent Atlantic Ocean, April–June 2004. LGL Rep. TA2822-26. Rep. from LGL Ltd., King City, Ont., for Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia Univ., Palisades, NY, and Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Silver Spring, MD. 106 p.

Southall, B.L., A.E. Bowles, W.T. Ellison, J.J. Finneran, R.L. Gentry, C.R. Greene Jr., D. Kastak, D.R. Ketten, J.H. Miller, P.E. Nachtigall, W.J. Richardson, J.A. Thomas, and P.L. Tyack. 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. **Aquat. Mamm.** 33(4):411-522.

Spitz, J., Y. Cherel, S. Bertin, J. Kiszka, A. Dewez, and V. Ridoux. 2011. Prey preferences among the community of deep-diving odontocetes from the Bay of Biscay, Northeast Atlantic. **Deep-Sea Res. I.** 58:273-282.

Spyrakos, E., T.C. Santos-Diniz, G. Martinez-Iglesias, J.M. Torres-Palenzuela, and G.J. Pierce. 2011. Spatiotemporal patterns of marine mammal distribution in coastal waters of Galicia, NW Spain. **Hydrobiologia** 670:87-109.

Stevick, P.T., J. Allen, P.J. Clapham, N. Friday, S.K. Katona, F. Larsen, J. Lien, D.K. Mattila, P.J. Palsbøll, J. Sigurjónsson, T.D. Smith, N. Øien, and P.S. Hammond. 2003. North Atlantic humpback whale abundance and rate of increase four decades after protection from whaling. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 258:263-273.

Swift, R.J., D. Gillespie, J.A. Vázquez, K. Macleod, and P.S. Hammond. 2009. Appendix IV: Abundance of sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) estimated from acoustic data for Blocks 2, 3 and 4 (French and Spanish sectors). Unpubl. rep. to the European Commission. Retrieved 2012-11-26 from http://biology.st-andrews.ac.uk/coda/documents/CODA_Appendix_IV_Acoustic_sperm_whale_estimates.pdf.

Taylor, B.L., R. Baird, J. Barlow, S.M. Dawson, J. Ford, J.G. Mead, G. Notarbartolo di Sciara, P. Wade, and R.L. Pitman. 2008. *Ziphius cavirostris*. *In*: IUCN 2012. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Version 2012.2. Accessed on 5 December 2012 at http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/23211/0

Tolstoy, M., J. Diebold, L. Doermann, S. Nooner, S.C. Webb, D.R. Bohenstiehl, T.J. Crone, and R.C. Holmes. 2009. Broadband calibration of R/V *Marcus G. Langseth* four-string seismic sources. **Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.** 10, Q08011, doi:10.1029/2009GC002451.

UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre). 2012. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna. Appendices I, II, and II. Valid from 25 September 2012. Accessed on 1 November 2012 at http://www.cites.org/eng/app/2012/E-2012-09-25.pdf.

Víkingsson, G.A., D.G. Pike, G. Desportes, N. Øien, Th. Gunnlaugsson, and D. Bloch. 2009. Distribution and abundance of fin whales (*Balaenoptera physalus*) in the northeast and central Atlantic as inferred from the North Atlantic sightings surveys 1987–2001. **NAMMCO Sci. Publ**. 7:49-72.

Waring, G.T., E. Josephson, K. Maze-Foley, and P.E. Rosel (eds.). 2012. U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico marine mammal stock assessments–2011. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NE-221. Nat. Mar. Fish. Serv., Northeast Fish. Sci. Center, Woods Hole, MA. 319 p.

Wartzok, D., A.N. Popper, J. Gordon, and J. Merrill. 2004. Factors affecting the responses of marine mammals to acoustic disturbance. **Mar. Technol. Soc. J.** 37(4):6-15.

Weilgart, L.S. 2007. A brief review of known effects of noise on marine mammals. **Int. J. Comp. Psychol.** 20:159-168.

Weir, C.R. and S.J. Dolman. 2007. Comparative review of the regional marine mammal mitigation guidelines implemented during industrial seismic surveys, and guidance towards a worldwide standard. **J. Int. Wildl. Law Policy** 10(1):1-27.

Wenzel, F.W., J. Allen, S. Berrow, C.J. Hazevoet, B. Jann, R.E. Seton, L. Steiner, P. Stevick, P. López Suárez, and P. Whooley. 2009. Current knowledge on the distribution and relative abundance of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*) off the Cape Verde Islands, eastern North Atlantic. **Aquatic Mamm.** 35(4):502-510.

Whitehead, H. 2002. Estimates of the current global population size and historical trajectory for sperm whales. **Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.** 242:295-304.

Williams, A.D., R. Williams, and T. Brereton. 2002. The sighting of pygmy killer whales (*Feresa attenuata*) in the southern Bay of Biscay and their association with cetacean calves. **J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U.K.** 82:509-511.